

of those we face today. You have been very patient to listen so attentively. I hope that your reflective hours in the future you will think of poor Christopher and his problems, how veterinary medicine and you will provide the means for him to reach age 55, and whether your contribution will justify your name being written on the list of those who care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. LEGGETT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WATSON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks news coverage of the hearings conducted by the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity would lead most Americans outside the South to believe that the southern people, black and white, are forms of sub-Americans who should conform without question to massive Federal interference in their school systems while areas of the North should remain free from such discriminatory treatment.

I deeply resent the whole atmosphere under which the hearings were held which were obviously designed to malign the South and were devoid of any objectivity. Even more deeply I resent a liberal Member of the Senate, who knows absolutely nothing about the South, pretending to have all the answers for our region of the country. I am also fed up with the self-righteous, hypocritical double standard that people like the chairman of this committee apply in dealing with social problems of which they know nothing. If the Senator from Minnesota wants to examine in depth social attitudes and prejudices of which he should know a great deal, I respectfully suggest that he tell the Nation about the traditional plight of the Indians in his home State.

The hearings in themselves were a charade and a sham. They were conducted like mocked trials with obviously carefully selected witnesses who were chosen on the basis of what they were expected to say and what the committee wanted them to say. I do not know of an instance since the infamous Reconstruction era of a more blatant example of rigged hearings.

The arguments used by the chairman and so-called friendly witnesses to cram integration down the throats of the southern people were just absurd. But the rhetoric did clearly reveal the extraordinary length that liberals will go to malign one who dares to disagree with them, especially if the person disagreeing happens to be a southerner.

Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that the most intolerant and biased individual in our society is a liberal and yet the

whole concept of liberalism is one in which free discussions and different opinions are supposedly solicited.

If the fair-minded, thinking people of this Nation need any more proof of example of northern liberal intolerance toward the South, the hearings conducted by the Senator from Minnesota should convince them.

For a century the South has been treated as if it were not even a part of the Nation, and our people have been hounded and criticized for our beliefs. Northern liberal politicians and newsmen have angrily and sanctimoniously denounced us because we dare to have a philosophy which differs from their own.

But, Mr. Speaker, I say this most emphatically, this sick intolerance must cease if this Nation is to survive. The very decline of America can be laid at the feet of northern liberal moral decline and its witchdoctor sociology.

If America is to maintain its greatness and its standards, the South will lead the way. Northern liberals, whose philosophy of permissiveness has produced a scene of rampant dope addiction, rock bottom moral standards, unprecedented lawlessness and a diminished patriotism, have forfeited the right to speak for any section of this country, much less the Nation itself. In fact, if philosophical denunciation is in order, the people of this Nation, regardless of region, should denounce in the strongest terms, northern liberal thoughts and actions, and tell them that we shall have no more of it.

EEOC'S "MORE POWER" GRAB

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the authors and cosponsors of H.R. 17555 say this effort to expand the powers of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will further promote equal employment opportunities for American workers who are members of minority groups. This conclusion is totally incorrect. I cannot support the principles of this bill.

We must remember that all employment must be based on employee qualifications. This is as it should be. The employee's ability to perform determines the cost and quality of goods produced and services rendered.

I have repeatedly stated that the United States is a land of opportunity for everyone. A high school education is available to all of our youth; vocational-technical high schools have been built by the thousands.

It only follows that youth who are members of minority groups should take advantage of this education in order to qualify to properly compete for all employment.

I know that almost all trade unions have been carrying on active recruitment programs to get minority group youths employed in their apprentice programs. However, the trade unions have not been successful in this effort. Many members of minority groups who pass the most basic apprentice examination

either fail to show up for work or last only a few weeks on the job.

Obviously, they are not willing to take the time to properly learn a trade. Many of them would rather receive \$10 or \$15 less a week on welfare for doing nothing than put forth the effort to learn a trade which would eventually pay them a most substantial income. This same welfare which provides higher payments to fatherless families is breaking up the family structure and this causes more school dropouts.

The obvious advantage enjoyed by minority group members today is illustrated by the fact that colleges and universities are actively recruiting students from the ranks of minority groups. Many colleges and universities have lower standards of admission for minority group students and even subsidize them with scholarships.

I submit that the bureaucratic powers of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission need no further fattening. It already has enough. Its personnel have made it clear enough that they want more power and that they have been something more than zealous in pushing the power EEOC already enjoys.

For example, I am informed that, back in 1965, only four employees of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., then working on the world's largest aircraft carrier, were prepared to charge discrimination. Yet the EEOC summoned the full measure of its power to threaten the company's defense contracts, force a quota system of minority hiring, and compel the employers to sign an agreement that "conditions of the employee's skill and ability" were not "germane" to hiring.

In insisting that "conditions of employee's skill and ability" were not "germane" to hiring, the EEOC is attempting to commit a travesty on our American system. Our American system has long recognized an employee's skill and ability and has rewarded those who increase their skill and ability.

Yet, rather than attempt to stimulate members of minority groups to take advantage of the education available to them and to serve apprenticeships to learn trades, the EEOC would endanger our American system by simply legislating that quotas of minority groups be hired regardless of their skill and ability.

H.R. 17555 would permit EEOC to issue cease-and-desist orders in cases of discrimination allegedly practiced by companies or by labor unions and to reinstate or hire employees and conduct periodic checks to ascertain that EEOC orders are being carried out. Imagine what the EEOC bureaucrats would do with that additional power.

Consider, further, the additional impact of H.R. 17555's providing EEOC with the additional power to directly petition a court of appeals to force a company or a labor union to comply with EEOC's own orders based on EEOC's own prejudged findings of evidence of discrimination.

To grant the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission the power to bypass the Department of Justice in moving to the judicial branch with an executive branch legal action would establish a

dangerous precedent which could lead to other agencies, bureaus, and departments seeking to bypass the Department of Justice.

I think, further, that the effort to give the EEOC the power, as provided in H.R. 17555, to go to court over the head of the Justice Department with EEOC's self-acquired cases against industry and against organized labor is particularly peculiar and suspect in view of a critical fact which, presumably, we are supposed to ignore: The fact that, under title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which H.R. 17555 seeks to expand, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice has been greatly expanded and has been substantially reorganized in the interest of greater effectiveness in the defense of civil rights.

Back in 1957, when the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice was established, it was permitted about 15 lawyers. It now has 104 lawyers on the job, with more coming in to bring the Division to authorized strength of 133 lawyers, even as the Division seeks authorization to expand its recently-established Employment Section to 40 lawyers from its presently authorized strength of 30.

I insist that there is absolutely no justification for this effort by EEOC to pressure the Congress into giving it greater powers in the name of "Enforcement" of "Equal Employment Opportunities"—unless, of course, we wish to justify the well-established bureaucratic desire to perpetuate itself in power and to take unto itself ever greater, more authoritarian, power.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my distinguished colleagues to give most serious consideration to this which, to all of us, should be a most frightening—and real—possibility.

FUTURE AUTOMATIC ADJUSTMENTS IN PAY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CORBETT) was recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which is officially recommended by the administration to provide for future automatic adjustments in the pay of Federal employees.

In 1962, this Congress established the policy that the pay of our Federal employees should be comparable to the pay of employees in private industry for the same levels and types of work. In the intervening years, we have not had a very good record in implementing this comparability principle.

Several "one-shot" pay enactments in 1964 and 1965 fell far short of achieving full pay comparability, primarily because of the wage-price guidelines then laid down by President Johnson. The 1967 pay bill contained a three-step pay raise which accomplished a reasonable degree of comparability on the effective date of the third pay raise, July 1, 1969. The 6-percent pay raise, retroactive to January 1 of this year, which was recommended by President Nixon and enacted

on April 15, 1970, was another major effort to achieve full pay comparability.

However, it is evident that we are not going to either achieve or maintain full pay comparability until or unless we enact a permanent, rational, and orderly means for doing so.

The legislation recommended by the administration is intended to accomplish this objective. At least, it is a very sound basis upon which our committee can work to produce meaningful legislation on the subject before Congress adjourns this year.

For the information of the Members, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from the Honorable Robert E. Hampton, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting the proposed legislation to the House, a sectional analysis of the bill, and a statement of purpose and justification:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1970.

Hon. JOHN H. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am transmitting for the consideration of the Congress proposed legislation "To amend title 5, United States Code, to direct the President to adjust the rates for the statutory pay systems, to establish an Advisory Committee on Federal Salaries, and for other purposes." A draft bill, a sectional analysis of its provisions, and a statement of purpose and justification are enclosed.

In presenting his postal reform legislation, the President proposed new procedures for the adjustment of the salaries of postal workers. It is now important that an improved continuing procedure be established for adjusting the salaries of Federal employees under other statutory salary systems. These employees must be assured that their pay rates will be kept up to date in relationship to salaries paid in the private sector.

This proposed legislation is needed to reduce the time lag between salary surveys and schedule adjustments and to make other improvements in the procedure for applying the pay comparability policy adopted by Congress in 1962. It affords an appropriate role to employee organizations, the President, and the Congress. Employee organizations would be consulted by an agent of the President on the coverage of the Bureau of Labor Statistics survey, the salary comparison process and the adjustments required to achieve comparability with private enterprise salaries. An impartial Advisory Committee on Federal Salaries would review the findings of the President's agent and consider the views of employee organizations with respect to the analysis and pay proposals in the agent's report. This Advisory Committee would report to the President.

After reviewing the reports and recommendations of his agent and of the Advisory Committee, the President would make the appropriate salary adjustments and would report his actions to the Congress. If in any year the President should find it inappropriate to make the adjustments because of a national emergency or economic conditions affecting the general welfare, he would have to present an alternative plan to the Congress before September 1 which would become effective on October 1 unless either House disapproved on or before September 30.

The draft bill contemplates that the first two salary adjustments will be effective January 1, 1971 and January 1, 1972. Subsequently, these effective dates will be October 1 of each year, in order to get into better phase with the budget cycle.

Enactment of this draft bill will build on the precedents set in 1967 and in 1970 (1) by reducing the time lag and (2) by provid-

ing for a review of findings by an impartial group. It is necessary to implement proper the sound pay-fixing principles established by Congress in 1962. We urge that it be given prompt and favorable consideration.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that the enactment of this draft bill would be in accord with the program of the Administration.

A similar letter is being sent to the President of the Senate.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. HAMPTON,
Chairman.

SECTION ANALYSIS

(To accompany a draft bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to direct the President to adjust the rates for the statutory pay systems, to establish an Advisory Committee on Federal salaries, and for other purposes)

The first section of the draft bill provides that the act may be cited as the "Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1970."

Section 2 of the draft bill amends title 5, United States Code, by revising and restating sections 5301 and 5302, relating to the congressional policy for fixing pay rates for Federal statutory schedules, and by adding a new section 5302a, creating an Advisory Committee on Federal salaries.

The revised section 5301 continues the policy of the Congress that rates of pay for Federal statutory schedules shall be based on the principles that there shall be equal pay for substantially equal work, that pay distinctions shall be maintained in keeping with work and performance distinctions, and that Federal pay rates shall be comparable with private enterprise pay rate for the same levels of work. The pay systems covered these principles are identified as those in the General Schedule, the Foreign Service, and the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans Administration.

The revised section 5302 sets forth the procedure for carrying out the policy expressed in section 5301. The major change from existing law is the provision directing the President to make the annual adjustments by October 1 of each year. Similar authority on a temporary basis was, however, given to the President by the pay acts of 1967 and 1970.

Subsection (a) of the revised section 5302 requires that an agent of the President, after consulting with employee organizations, shall make an annual report to the President comparing Federal statutory salaries with private enterprise rates for the same levels of work as reflected in appropriate Bureau of Labor Statistics surveys and recommending appropriate adjustments in Federal salary rates. After considering the report of his agent and the recommendations thereon of an impartial Advisory Committee on Federal Salaries, the President would be required before October 1 of each year to adjust rates of the Federal statutory schedules. These adjustments would be effective on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after that date. Under existing law, the President makes recommendations to the Congress and the adjustments must be made through the regular legislative process.

Action by the President under revised section 5302 is mandatory. Under subsection (b) in any year that he determines it inappropriate to make the adjustment required by the law because of national emergency or economic conditions affecting the general welfare, he must prepare and transmit to Congress before September 1 in that year such alternative plan as he deems appropriate, and if before September 30 neither House has disapproved, the President's alternative plan shall become effective on October 1. Should either House disapprove, however, the President would have to make the adjustment re-

everyone who knows him knows that when the word "Honorable" is appended to the name AUGUSTUS HAWKINS it is not merely a customary title, a politeness, an act of protocol. It is a description, a statement of fact, almost a synonym for the name itself. He is in fact one of the best men here, honest, able, compassionate, intelligent—in short, what all of us ought to strive to be. Anyone who seeks to impugn the integrity of Gus HAWKINS simply calls his own integrity into question. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois was misinformed or misquoted and will want to set the record straight on this matter.

Many of us have remarked over the past few weeks that we are especially indebted to Congressmen HAWKINS and WILLIAM ANDERSON and to Mr. Tom Harkin for their diligence and courage in bringing the situation at Con Son to the attention of the Nation. I rise today simply to reiterate my thanks to these remarkable men for bringing credit to this House and adding to the honor of their country.

HEARINGS CONDUCTED BY SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY WERE A CHARADE AND A SHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WATSON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe all of you will agree that the gentleman in the well prides himself in trying to keep his patience, and that likewise he recognizes that we have some difficulties and everything is not perfect in the Southland. But at the same time I believe there is point beyond which a person's patience begins to break. Further, that there is a point when a person will stand up and speak out against those who would maliciously malign the great Southland.

Mr. Speaker, in a statement this past Thursday I said that the hearings conducted by the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Minnesota were a charade and a sham. As further proof of the ridiculous and misleading nature of these hearings, the chairman just made a brief visit to four Southern communities in three States and returned with a scathing denunciation of the entire South and its education system.

Mr. Speaker, this is comparable to someone from the South going to the Senator's home State for a few days, and not finding any Negroes in four randomly selected communities of that State, deciding that Minnesota has outlawed integration.

Now, the Senator's report upon completion of his fact-finding tour represents a personal insult to the people of the South, and it is an insult to the intelligence of every thinking American, regardless of region. It is an insult that must be challenged, and I challenge it here and now.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Senator from Minnesota to explain the real reason why he has singled out the Southern

part of this country for a much-publicized tour, especially in view of his well-known record of anti-Southern prejudices. Are there not serious problems crying for solution in other areas, even the District of Columbia? Why does the Senator direct attention away from these areas as well as his own State's problems?

Mr. Speaker, there are few, if any, people in this country less qualified than the Senator from Minnesota to speak on the subject of Southern education, or anything else down our way for that matter. The South is not obligated to listen to such rank insults and distorted, prejudged views of our section of the country. His voice is that of a totally discredited and outdated philosophy, and this Nation should no more heed his advice than physicists should listen to the advice of the president of the "Flat Earth Society."

It is obvious to me that the Senator is attempting to capitalize on the frustrations of people for his own political gain. Since an extended visit to the South would not enlighten the Senator because of biased views already held, it is certain that a few days tour would leave him appallingly short of information. Therefore, his brief visit was totally without probative value and can only be interpreted as a grandstand play. But in all fairness I do understand he sent a few of his staff underlings into the South, even South Carolina, to "survey" the situation—yet these people could not tell the difference between a school house and a filling station.

For generations the South has had to bear the cross of gratuitous criticism from uninformed outsiders. These breastbeaters strike holier-than-thou poses and lament conditions in the South in words revealing their paucity of knowledge on the subject. They add to their scarce knowledge certain wrong-headed notions supplied by their prejudices and go forth to propagandize another generation of their constituents in the age-old obsession of South-hating.

At a time when divisiveness is deplored by liberals and blamed on conservative attitudes and actions, professional South-haters foster and cultivate the rankest and most blatant divisiveness in this country. The Senator's tirade against our section of the country is the same old political demagoguery reminiscent of Thaddeus Stevens days over a century ago.

What the Senator called an investigation of three Southern States was in fact the typical whirlwind tour which is a requirement for anti-South propagandists prior to the periodic unleashing of their prejudices. The investigation is designed to lend credence to whatever the objective is. The southern evils which such investigations reveal and the repressions which are typically discovered are in fact attitudes and beliefs long-harbored in the mind of the South-hater currently holding forth in the other body.

The question begs: Why must we of the South endure any longer charades unethically described as investigations and political attacks piously couched in moralistic tones?

If honesty will not silence the likes of

the Senator from Minnesota in their criticism of the South, it would seem that the plight of their own citizens would.

I direct his attention to rampant crime which is largely a Northern problem. I direct his attention to epidemic drug addiction which is almost exclusively a problem of States outside the South. I direct his attention to the proliferation of pornography which originates outside the South and which threatens to contaminate our area. I direct his attention to large-scale race riots which are predominantly a northern and western problem and not one of the South. I direct his attention to organized crime which is strangling life from his and many other sections of the country.

Senator, your people need help. Get to work on your own problems!

Senator, it is easy to see now what motivates you. Is it that you direct attention elsewhere, so your people will not become too alarmed about their lives and conditions? That will not "wash" any longer. Senator, I advise you to get on your not-so-white charger and return to face the very real problems of your own area. Certainly your political fortunes are not contingent upon your villification of the South.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON. I yield to my distinguished friend and leader, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS).

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina.

I want to add this. I read this so-called report by the junior Senator from Minnesota. It emanated only from a politically sick mind, a frustrated mind, an ambitious mind, who would stop at nothing to fan the seeds of sectionalism and racism to further his own political gain. He is one of those whom Vice President Agnew aptly referred to as playing Russian roulette with the safety and security of this country.

I would say as Roosevelt once said: Plague on his house and plague on him. That is not fitting to be said of one who calls himself a Senator of the United States.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

As usual, the gentleman has said it more directly and eloquently than I.

NAFEC FACILITY ONE OF WORLD'S FINEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SANDMAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to several glaring inaccuracies in a report filed with the House by the Government Operations Committee. This report, dated July 16, 1970, contains findings affecting the Federal Aviation Administration in its development of an air traffic control system. These deficiencies exist on page 30 and page 56 of the report. The erroneous findings are used in an attempt to justify the recommendation of a phaseout of the research and

Delta Queen to slip away into mere memory.

Our distinguished colleague from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN) has a bill now before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee which would exempt the *Queen* from the 1966 safety law which was meant to apply only to ocean-going ships.

The Senate also is considering action and has attached a similar amendment to its pending maritime bill.

If no action is taken before November 2, the *Delta Queen* will cease to exist as a living tradition. She will be permanently retired.

In our rush to advance ourselves technologically as a nation we have lost or destroyed much along the way.

We now have a new way-of-life and a new standard-of-living. We no longer have with us enough of the symbols of the traditions which made this country the strong and independent Nation that it is today.

This strength and independence is exemplified in the *Delta Queen* and in the hearts of the men who pilot her up and down the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. She is a part of our heritage that should be preserved.

HAMBURGER, UTILITY BEEF AND IMPORTS

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Special Studies Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, because of complaints it had received, examined the behavior of retail beef prices last year in an effort to ascertain the reasons for the sharp rise in such prices. In the early part of this year, this subcommittee approved a draft report on the subject, which the full committee this spring referred back "for further study."

I am sure that other Members have received letters on the subject of retail beef prices, our meat supply and imports from cattle growers, public officers, housewives, and business consumers. As we all know, the fast foods franchise industry has grown in recent years and its increased utility of the lean grades of beef has increased the demand for such beef.

Interestingly enough, the price of hamburger, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, did not decline last fall until 2 months after the higher priced beef cuts began to decline. This year the BLS figures show, as of the end of May, that the retail prices of hamburger at 66.7 cents per pound is higher by 1.1 cents than the high point of September 1969. The June price is practically the same as that in May.

The Department of Agriculture reports show that utility cows were and have been higher in 1970 than for the comparable 1969 period, through the middle of July. The price of boning utility cow beef has far exceeded any 1969 prices through the middle of July.

I believe that the above figures have some bearing on whether the supply of

lean beef necessary for hamburger and manufacturing is in fact adequate to meet the demand. We are all cognizant of the recent action of the President by which the quota import figure for 1970 was set at 1.14 billion pounds. This was done at a time when imports for the first half of 1970 were approximately 600 million pounds. This quota figure leaves only 540 million pounds which can be imported for the second half of 1970, a reduction of 10 percent from the rate of the first half.

My position with respect to imports is one of supporting variable import limitations. I have not, contrary to published reports, asked for the repeal of restrictions on meat imports. These imports are basically the "hamburger" or "processing" grade of beef. I have tried to suggest that consideration be given to adjusting meat imports to meet the gap, if any, between the demand for lean beef and the domestic production of such beef.

The Ways and Means Committee is now working on a draft bill which would impose quotas on the manufactured products to be covered by that bill. It is reported that the pending proposal would impose a quota on a particular product when imports of that product exceed 15 percent of its domestic consumption. This percentage is to be compared with the present import restriction on beef of 6.7 percent of domestic production. Certainly if the 1964 Meat Import Quota Law were amended to allow imports to meet the gap between the demand for lean beef and the domestic production of such beef, it would still be more restrictive than the Ways and Means Committee's tentative formula for manufactured products.

I have given expression to this in a letter to a constituent of mine, a businessman, who as a consumer, is strongly exercised about retail beef prices. I include my letter to him as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

JULY 20, 1970.

Mr. A. R. MARTINO,
Waterbury, Conn.

DEAR TONY: Your letter of July 10, 1970 and the copy of your note of June 28, 1970 to the Department of Agriculture, have been read by me with much interest.

The hearings held by me last fall with respect to the sharp rise in the retail price of beef, to which your letter refers, show the problems facing the consumer. The adequacy of the supply of beef, including the relationship of import quotas and the consequent effect on prices to the consumer were one of the major phases of that hearing. Since then there have been, as you mentioned, revelations as to the inadequacy of domestic meat inspection and the unguarded use of antibiotics in feeding cattle, presenting dangers to consumers.

While the cattle growers trumpet their claim that they can provide enough beef to meet the demand of the American consumer, I am somewhat dubious insofar as lean beef is concerned. This is the beef that is used in combination with the fatty parts of the choice carcass for making hamburger and other manufactured meat products. The figures show that the wholesale price of beef used for manufacturing purposes is higher than it was last year. In addition, the retail price of hamburger for May, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, was higher than it was last year at its highest point. All the

statistics available to me with respect to prices for beef animals slaughtered for manufacturing purposes, mostly cows, lead me to believe that it is a strong reflection of an inadequate domestic supply of such beef as against the increasing demand for it. Without going into the complexities of the cow-calf and feeding industry and its time-cycle of over 2½ years, the supply of domestic lean beef cannot be accelerated without adverse effects on the production of choice beef.

The President, on June 30, 1970, performed the miraculous feat of increasing the amount of beef, mostly used for processing, which could be imported, while actually cutting back the rate of such imports. Under the 1964 Meat Imports Quota Law, the amount of meat which could be imported in 1970 without imposing a quota was 1098 million pounds, 110% of the quota. Imports for the first half of 1970 were approximately 600 million pounds, strongly indicating that the 110% figure would be exceeded long before the end of the year.

As required by law, the President imposed a quota of 998 million pounds, and in the same document, suspended it, allowing imports to equal 1140 million pounds. As 600 million pounds were already imported, the second half imports can total only 540 million pounds or a reduction of 10% over the first half of the year.

I intend to watch closely the effect of this governmental action on the retail price of beef. It may be doubted that it will prove highly beneficial to the consumer.

My reason for all this detail on the most recent happenings in the beef picture is because of your interest in the matter. I fully appreciate your support of my work as your representative in Congress.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Chairman.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY ARMY OF DUMPING OF NERVE GAS OFF CAPE CANAVERAL

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I impose upon the House at this time because of an announcement that has been issued today by the Department of the Army concerning the dumping of nerve gas some 250 miles east of Cape Canaveral, Fla.

Mr. Speaker, I am distressed to hear this news. I am very much concerned about it, and I am contacting the Secretary of Defense to ask that no action be taken to dump this gas, which is now scheduled to be dumped on the 10th of August, until the Subcommittee on Oceanography as well as other committees have an opportunity to look into it.

I have been assured by Chairman LENNON of the Subcommittee on Oceanography that hearings will be held this next week. I would urge the Secretary to withhold any action until this has been done.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE AUGUSTUS HAWKINS

(Mr. LOWENSTEIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker,

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Hart-Cooper amendment which will be cosponsored by other Senators, provides for an authorization of \$1.027 billion. These funds may be expended for deployment of the ABM system at Malmstrom and Grand Forks, the two sites authorized last year. Of the total, \$627.2 million is available for continuing phase I at Malmstrom and Grand Forks, the prototype deployment which was begun last year.

Also authorized was \$35 million under the amendment, as requested by the Department of Defense, for emplacement of additional sprint missiles at the two sites.

The full amount of \$365 million requested for research and development would be authorized for use for that purpose on the advanced ABM system, such as the so-called dedicated system,

specifically designed for Minuteman—a system advocated by many distinguished scientists and experts.

Last year over \$1 billion was authorized for deployment and, as of May 31, there was a \$224 million carryover.

Mr. President, a table which appears in the committee report indicates the funds requested and the funds for phase I that would be available under the Hart-Cooper amendment as compared to the amounts requested for phase I and phase II and recommended by the Armed Services Committee. The funds carried over from last year's authorization as of May 31 are indicated under table II.

I ask unanimous consent that these tabulations be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 1. SAFEGUARD PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971 RELATED ONLY TO PROTECTING THE DETERRENT AND NOT AREA DEFENSE

(In millions of dollars)

	Phase 1	Phase 2			Due to other.	Total
		Due to added SPRINTS at GF & MALM	Due to the Whiteman site	Due to advance prep Warren		
Authorization:						
R.D.T. & E.	365.0					365.0
Procurement	457.4		178.0	15.0		650.4
Family housing	8.8					8.8
Military construction	161.0	35.0	120.4	0.4	8.4	325.2
Subtotal in bill	992.2	35.0	298.4	15.4	8.4	1,349.4
Other not subject to authorization:						
Procurement	0.6					0.6
Military construction	8.0		6.1	3.0	2.9	20.0
Operations and maintenance	42.0				11.0	53.0
Military personnel	12.0				2.0	14.0
Subtotal	62.6		6.1	3.0	15.9	87.6
Total ABM program	1,054.8	35.0	304.5	18.4	24.3	1,437.0

TABLE 2

TABLE 2.—funds from fiscal year 1970 that remain unobligated¹

(In millions)

R.D.T. & E.	\$70
Procurement	92.3
Construction	62.3
Total	224.6

¹ Figures are as of May 31, 1970.

Mr. COOPER. The amendment, therefore, would provide ample funds—over \$1 billion—for demonstrating any necessary bargaining strength at the SALT talks.

May I say that the Senator from Michigan and I, as well as other Senators who indicate an interest in this amendment, support and want to support in every way possible the success of those talks.

In this year of difficult economic conditions, reductions in the Federal budget are of considerable importance. Our amendment would save \$322.2 million.

I point out that if the SALT talks succeed in the near future, and if the United States and the U.S.S.R. agree on what is termed zero ABM, no sites would be necessary to be deployed, including those previously authorized at Malmstrom and Grand Forks.

There are reports—and I hope that they are true—in the press that the SALT talks may result quite soon in a

preliminary agreement on the limitation on the ABM, if not a complete ban.

It has also been reported that if zero ABM is not agreed to by the United States and the Soviet Union, ABM protection of Moscow and Washington respectively is likely. In either of these events, the requested deployments at Malmstrom, Grand Forks, Whiteman or Warren Air Force Bases could not be used, and the work would not go forward at those sites.

Deployments at Malmstrom and Grand Forks, which our amendment would permit, would provide ample bargaining power that the administration states is requested.

I point out that the number of ABM missiles to be deployed at Malmstrom and Grand Forks are several times greater than those deployed by the Soviets in the Galosh system around Moscow—which is their only ABM system.

We believe that our amendment is in accord with the proposal of the Secretary of Defense to "fly before you buy" for prototype development. It will also assist the SALT talks without hindering the ability of this country to proceed with the development of an effective ABM system. For, if the Soviets proceed with the development of the SS-9's and other missiles, it may be necessary to deploy an effective missile defense system.

In fact, most of the scientists who have testified on the ABM have said that the development of an effective ABM system is of vital importance if the land based Minuteman deterrent is to be perfected. Such a system would add to the security of this Nation. But deployment of the ineffective Safeguard system would not add to the security of this country.

For this reason we believe our amendment would best meet the needs of this country at this crucial time and in the future if the Soviets proceed with the deployment of the SS-9's.

We will submit for formal printing the amendment on Monday in order to give those Senators who wish to cosponsor the amendment an opportunity to do so.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) and I have given the most sober consideration to the development of the amendment we introduce today.

Many of us believe the ABM system needs more research and development—that it is a waste of the taxpayers' money not to "fly before you buy."

But a number of Senators feel that the Senate last year gave the go-ahead to deployment at Grand Forks and Malmstrom, and that we should not replot that ground.

So, believing as we do that the important thing is to stop the momentum—the buildup, with its enormous total expense—we have decided to confine our amendment to eliminating the expansion of Safeguard to Whiteman, Mo., and Warren, Wyo.

This amendment would strike only \$322 million from the Safeguard authorization recommended by the Senate Armed Services Committee. It would leave \$1.03 billion. We would specifically authorize the \$35 million item listed by the Department of Defense and the committee under phase II for "added sprints at Grand Forks and Malmstrom" since the opponents of Safeguard have all along contended that additional Sprints were needed at Grand Forks and Malmstrom.

But more important than the money saving, in my book, is that through this amendment we offer an opportunity to halt the seeming all-out momentum to install a 12-site—or even a 14-site—Safeguard system, the benefit of which would be negligible and the cost enormous.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUPILS SCORE BELOW U.S. NORMS IN READING AND MATH

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this morning in the Washington Post there appeared an article by Lawrence Feinberg reporting on the tragic conditions in the District of Columbia schools.

The article cites recent test results released by the District of Columbia school system which indicate that student achievement in reading and mathematics is declining rather than improving or even remaining constant.

This conclusion is based on an analysis of the California testing bureau scores which compare the performance of children in the District of Columbia

schools to that of children in public schools in 11 other major cities.

The article reports that by the sixth grade, Washington students average seven-tenths of a year behind students in the other big cities, and by the ninth grade, they are 1.6 years behind their counterparts in 11 other large city systems, comparing the reading norms for the Nation as a whole, the students by the ninth grade are 2.2 years behind.

That does not, however, tell the whole story. If one looks at the table of achievement broken down by actual elementary and junior high schools, there are many elementary schools in this community in which students have such an abysmally low level of performance that it is nothing short of an utter and national disgrace.

Earlier this year the U.S. Senate created a Select Committee on Equal Education which I am privileged to chair and on which the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cook), now Presiding Officer, serves with such distinction.

I think this report states the fact that here in the Nation's Capital thousands and thousands of children are being doomed by being denied the basic tools of reading and arithmetic which are necessary for any achievement in American society.

We spend a lot of time, and rightfully, concerned about the crime rate in the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital. It is indeed awful. Perhaps we would get more action in reducing the crime rate if we were to seriously examine these kinds of statistics that indicate the tragic way in which we are denying children an adequate education and destroying thousands of school children before they ever have a chance.

It is my judgment that this kind of destruction to our schoolchildren is far more pervasive than many Americans suspect. It is a matter also that I feel deserves greater attention.

These statistics do not compare the achievement of these school children in the District of Columbia with school children generally. They compare them only with the school children in 11 other major cities which we know also have education difficulties.

Even by that standard, the District of Columbia is doing so poorly that the average student in the sixth grade is 1.6 years behind, and if we compare the Nation as a whole, he is 2.2 years behind.

The committee which I chair will shortly be holding hearings on the problems of equal educational opportunity in northern cities.

I know of no place where we could more appropriately begin than in the Nation's Capital, not only because of the tragic conditions cited in the report, but also because, of all the school systems in the country, this is the one in which Congress has a special responsibility and in which we have especially failed.

I would suggest that this report would shock the conscience of the Congress and of the Nation and that this Nation could respond in a way which would provide these children an opportunity to be a part of the fullness of American life.

Mr. President, I plan to make a more complete statement on this matter the early part of next week.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article of Mr. Feinberg which was published in the Washington Post this morning, together with a table on District of Columbia test results broken down by elementary and junior high schools.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUPILS SCORE BELOW
U.S. NORMS IN READING, MATH

(By Lawrence Feinberg)

Average reading achievement in Washington's elementary schools fell substantially this year, continuing a four-year decline that has left the school system well below national norms.

The city schools were just a few points below these norms in 1966-67.

Citywide scores on standardized mathematics tests are even lower than those in reading, but the decline in these exams has been less steep.

Results of the nationwide tests were disclosed last night at a meeting of the Washington school board. The board also received school-by-school results on a new test comparing Washington with the norms in 11 other big cities rather than with national standards that include suburban and rural school systems.

These results indicated that in only 23 of the city's 133 elementary schools is the median sixth-grade reading level equal to the norms in the big cities. Only two of Washington's 30 junior high schools matched these big-city standards.

The systemwide results on the new tests, prepared by the California Testing Bureau, show that the median score in reading for Washington's third-graders was four-tenths of a year below the big-city norm.

By sixth grade, Washington students average seven-tenths of a year behind the other big cities, and by ninth grade they are 1.6 years behind.

Compared with the higher reading norms for the nation as a whole, the Washington students are 2.2 years behind.

Because this was the first time the California tests were given in Washington, no school-by-school comparisons can be made with previous years.

However, a systemwide comparison was made by giving another examination, the Sequential Test of Educational Progress (STEP), to 10 percent of the city's students, selected at random, in the third, sixth, ninth, and 11th grades.

The STEP tests previously had been given to all students, but they are being phased out because local officials believe the California tests are better.

In the spring of 1967 both fourth- and sixth-graders in Washington had a median score in reading at the 47th percentile on the STEP test, compared to the nationwide norm of 50.

This spring the median for Washington's fourth-graders was at the 31st percentile on the test; for sixth-graders it was 35.

The median is the midpoint above which are the score of half those taking the test and below which are the scores of the other half.

For Washington ninth-graders, the median was also 35 in reading compared with the national median of 50, but it had sunk to that level one year ago. The median for 11-graders here stayed unchanged at 40. It had been at the 45th percentile in 1967.

The D.C. medians in mathematics on the STEP tests this year were 25 for fourth-

graders; 29 for sixth-graders; 24 for ninth-graders, and 24 for 11th-graders.

In 1967 the medians had clustered around 35.

In the school-by-school results on the California tests, the pattern of high and low scores generally followed the socio-economic levels of the students attending the different schools.

Thus, 10 of the 23 elementary schools with average reading scores above the big-city norm of 50 were located in ward three, the prosperous area west of Rock Creek Park.

They are the only elementary schools in Washington with mainly white student enrollments. The averages at some of them—91 at Lafayette, 85 at Murch, and 79 at Stoddert—are comparable with achievement levels in Bethesda, which is part of the Montgomery County school system.

The Shepard school, in a prosperous integrated area just off upper 16th Street NW, averaged at the 82d percentile in reading. About 70 per cent of its 550 students are Negro; about 30 per cent are white.

The nearby Takoma school averaged 56. Other schools with high scores were in Negro middle-class areas in Northeast Washington and in upper Northwest. Among them were Bunker Hill, Burroughs, Brightwood, Keene and River Terrace.

The 23 elementary schools that received Title One federal aid because they are in poverty areas generally had very low scores.

One exception was Walker-Jones, at 1st and L Streets NW, with an average reading score of 52. Walker-Jones also scored high in other standardized tests given in previous years. Its math scores were even higher than reading averaging 64. In most schools mathematics achievement scores were lower than reading.

The two junior highs whose ninth-graders averaged above the big-city norms were Deal, 80 in both reading and math, and Gordon, 52 in both subjects. Deal's ninth grade was about two-thirds white; Gordon had a small white majority. The two schools are both west of Rock Creek Park and are the only junior highs in the city with mainly white enrollments.

Five junior highs scored between the 41st and 46th percentiles. Four of them—Backus, Paul, Rabaut, and Taft—are in the semicircle of middle-class Negro neighborhoods in upper Northwest and far Northeast Washington. The fifth, Sousa, is near Fort Dupont Park in Southeast Washington.

The eight elementary schools in the Anacostia decentralization project had average reading scores slightly higher than those for the 16 elementary schools in the model schools division in Cardozo, again apparently reflecting socio-economic differences.

Among the Title One schools, half of which are in Cardozo, those in Project READ, which uses a series of programmed work books, did somewhat better than schools not in the project.

At Morgan, the city's oldest community controlled school, the results varied widely between the third and sixth grades, in contrast to most schools where the scores at the two levels were similar.

Morgan's third-graders scored at 50 in reading and 60 in mathematics. For sixth grade, the scores were 25 for reading and 27 for mathematics.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEST RESULTS

The table below gives reading and mathematics scores for District elementary and junior high schools during the last school year. In the elementary schools, there are separate figures for third- and sixth-graders. The junior high tests were given only ninth-graders. No senior high school scores were released yesterday.

The scores used are medians. Thus, if a school's third-grade median is 40, half the

third-graders there scored above 40, half below. The numbers are percentiles but they are based on big-city norm of 50 rather than on national norms. Thus, if a school's score is 40, it is ahead of two-fifths of the big-city schools across the country, and behind three-fifths.

The big-city norms used in this compilation are lower than national norms. Against national norms, District schools would score lower than shown here.

There are citywide figures at the top of both the elementary and junior high school lists.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

	Reading		Math	
	3d	6th	3d	6th
Citywide	34	36	30	32
Adams	24	34	30	26
Aiton	32	29	30	30
Amidon	33	0	34	0
Bancroft	25	24	24	19
Barnard	51	42	48	44
Beers	42	54	42	41
Benning	68	54	61	59
Birney	26	28	20	23
Blow-Pierce	31	29	42	21
Bowen	0	33	0	29
Brent	41	40	36	31
Brightwood	49	50	35	46
Brookland	30	45	34	38
Bruce	30	33	26	31
Bryan	24	35	36	33
Buchanan	18	0	27	30
Bundy	0	18	0	20
Bunker Hill	53	59	40	51
Burroughs	71	63	59	55
Burrville	26	32	26	28
Carver	33	25	35	21
Clack	45	45	31	36
Cleveland	23	24	13	16
Congress Heights	42	37	43	32
Cook	27	0	18	0
Cooke	25	18	20	19
Crummell	27	33	24	27
Davis	31	42	26	36
Draper	37	29	35	27
Drew	31	28	27	23
Eaton	80	32	69	77
Eckington	27	32	23	30
Edmonds	24	0	16	0
Emery	33	30	36	26
Fillmore	62	75	60	83
Gage	28	32	49	32
Garfield	30	32	27	29
Garrison	19	31	18	23
Gibbs	32	28	26	25
Giddings	28	22	19	26
Goding	28	28	21	25
Grant	0	65	0	63
Green	37	37	39	29
Grimke	21	25	21	28
Hardy	59	37	70	34
Harris	24	30	31	31
Harrison	21	25	24	20
Hayes	55	19	59	21
Hearst	83	71	90	79
Hendley	31	36	30	30
Houston	23	31	22	27
Hyde	40	0	29	99
Jackson	50	43	45	35
Jannet	77	79	87	78
Keene	55	65	53	58
Kenilworth	36	31	26	22
Ketcham	21	32	23	26
Key	48	75	61	51
Kimball	33	26	40	27
Kingsman	48	33	49	40
Lafayette	91	92	89	89
Langdon	38	37	32	34
Langston	0	0	0	0
LaSalle	62	55	50	49
Lewis	22	31	20	22
Logan	30	40	19	38
Lovejoy	30	26	33	34
Ludlow	27	21	25	18
Madison	17	23	19	27
Mann	28	24	27	21
Maury	79	71	68	67
McGogney	30	32	25	32
Merritt	27	28	36	28
Meyer	27	20	26	22
Miner	25	36	24	35
Monroe	24	29	20	31
Montgomery	31	27	34	23
Montgomery	20	18	18	13

	Reading		Math	
	3d	6th	3d	6th
Morgan	50	25	60	27
Morse	21	39	20	27
Mullen	29	30	24	25
Mott	21	30	21	25
Murch	84	86	79	82
Nalle	21	33	18	31
Nichols Avenue	46	0	41	0
Noyes	33	36	38	82
Orr	36	33	42	33
Oyster	42	81	67	73
Park View	35	33	30	31
Patterson	47	51	48	45
Payne	27	36	22	28
Peabody	25	26	14	16
Perry	0	15	0	12
Petworth	45	39	52	42
Plummer	36	38	38	31
Powell	41	49	33	44
Randle Highlands	44	42	37	35
Raymond	30	30	29	34
Richardson	23	27	34	23
River Terrace	51	50	45	40
Rudolph	29	38	23	36
Savoy	27	26	26	20
Seaton	23	20	11	18
Shadd	25	19	27	21
Shepherd	83	80	71	77
Simmons	37	33	33	26
Simon	28	33	29	31
Slater	31	49	24	44
Slowe	43	39	46	41
Smothers	31	41	27	45
Stanton	33	31	35	30
Stevens	35	35	20	42
Stoddert	79	80	81	86
Summer	38	37	42	40
Takoma	57	54	47	45
Taylor	25	18	14	16
Thomas	27	34	24	36
Thomson	25	18	31	21
Truesdell	38	36	30	35
Turner	27	24	25	30
Tyler	26	27	25	18
Van Ness	28	31	25	26
Walker-Jones	48	55	66	63
Watkins	32	18	30	20
Webb	38	35	36	31
West	68	57	61	47
Wheatley	27	33	21	30
Whittier	43	44	35	45
Wilson	24	32	19	23
Woodridge	45	48	40	33
Young	43	42	30	44

JUNIOR HIGHS

9th grade

	Reading		Math	
Citywide	32		28	
Backus	45		43	
Banneker	24		24	
Browne	32		28	
Deal	80		80	
Douglas	32		25	
Eliot	23		20	
Evans	21		23	
Francis	20		19	
Garnet-Patterson	28		21	
Gordon	52		52	
Hamilton	24		19	
Hart	31		40	
Hine	22		19	
Jefferson	31		27	
Johnson	None		None	
Kramer	31		31	
Langley	33		32	
Lincoln	24		17	
Macfarland	31		28	
Miller	31		24	
Paul	42		43	
Rabaut	42		32	
Randall	26		20	
Roper	26		21	
Shaw	20		17	
Sousa	46		40	
Stuart	23		21	
Taft	41		34	
Terrell	32		18	
Webster	32		18	
Woodson	36		37	

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, with the understanding that the recess not extend beyond 3:30 p.m. today.

The motion was agreed to, and at 3:21 p.m. the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 3:30 p.m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Cook).

SENATOR THURMOND'S ROLE IN ASSISTING SCHOOL BOARDS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post has alleged that my staff members and I had tried to "sell" forced desegregation plans to South Carolina school districts. This allegation is totally false, and I denounce it for what it is—a malicious fabrication. My staff and I have acted only as an advocate on behalf of the school districts that have come to us for help in obtaining the relief to which they are entitled.

The Post bases its entire allegation on anonymous sources. I challenge the Washington Post to produce these anonymous informants referred to as "top administration sources." I challenge the Post to prove that I ever tried to pressure any school district to accept any HEW plan.

At the request of numerous school districts, I have fought the total destruction of our public schools at the hands of ultraliberal zealots. On many occasions these zealots disregarded the law and the President's guidelines in making totally unreasonable demands upon the school districts in my State. My staff and I made ourselves available to the districts to assist them in reminding HEW of the requirements of the law and in opposing these unreasonable demands. We did not draw up any desegregation plans but simply fought for HEW's approval of the plans submitted by the various school boards.

I have never urged any school district to accept any plan. In fact, on numerous occasions, I have suggested to school trustees that they might come closer to getting justice by going to court if HEW would not come forward with reasonable plans.

The discussions at HEW have been most trying. The HEW zealots have a narrow view of their mission, and ignore the factors involved in quality education. Every district is different, and only the local officials can understand the impact of extreme plans upon their school systems. The Supreme Court has not yet defined what it means by a unitary school system, but HEW does not hesitate to impose its own interpretation of this difficult question.

The tirade conducted by the Washington Post against the South never seems to end. It appears daily in the form of false propaganda in the news columns, bigoted editorials, and distorted cartoons. The Post will go to any length to create dissension and animosity for purely political reasons, and to drive a wedge between the administration and the South.

In the same spirit of stirring up turmoil, the Post has continued to print the story that the Justice Department intends to send lawyers to the South to

enforce integration even after the President denied that there would be any coercion involved. The Post is apparently working in collusion with underlings in the bureaucracy to bring public pressure for ultra-left policies.

I was pleased with the President's statement Thursday night that the Federal Government would give such assistance only when requested by the States involved. It is hoped that this policy will be followed. We shall be on guard to watch whether his orders are carried out by his subordinates.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
AUGUST 3, 1970, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock Monday morning next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, August 3, 1970, at 11 a.m.

Since 1950 there has been a most substantial further inflation and a most substantial growth in population. The Congress has also passed legislation designating a new land-grant institution—Federal City College in the District of Columbia. The administration has supported, in testimony before both houses, which would designate colleges in Guam and the Virgin Islands as land-grant institutions. So the land-grant principle is still very much alive and supported by the Executive as well as Congress.

My third point is that these funds are very useful in the support of higher education. The University of Wisconsin, for instance, gets \$290,650. This seems like a small amount of money for a large university, but its importance is that the university is relatively unfettered in its use. The money can be put where it is needed most. The trouble with most Federal aid to higher education is that it is strictly earmarked as to how it can be spent.

If this appropriation is important to the University of Wisconsin, think how critical it is to the predominantly black land-grant colleges in the South. Their support from all sources is small. This appropriation is a very large part of the instructional budget in many of these institutions. To lose it would be literally disastrous.

Mr. President, if anyone were to ask why land-grant institutions should get this money and not other colleges and universities, I would say that all institutions of higher education should be similarly supported. I believe that every young American who can benefit from postsecondary education should be able to get it, regardless of his financial status. I support Federal assistance to the economically disadvantaged for that purpose. But the institutions cannot absorb another million students in the next 5 or 6 years—which they must if they are to do their job—without help, especially if they hope to stop the spiraling increases in tuition that make a mockery of equal opportunity.

So the land-grant instruction funds should not be killed. Instead we should use the principle of broad institutional aid which they represent in legislation to assist all colleges and universities in the land.

EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS AND SCHOOL INTEGRATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) and myself, I congratulate the distinguished members of the conference committee for their successes in preserving the safeguard provisos added by the Senate to the President's request for emergency school desegregation funds, and in sustaining the Senate's deletion of the so-called Jonas amendment designed to dismantle title VI of the Civil Rights Act as it applies to racial discrimination in public schools.

WHITTEN AMENDMENTS

I share the disappointment of the disappointed Senator from Washington (Senator MAGNUSON), and three of his colleagues on the conference committee—Senators CASE, FONG, and BOGGS—that

the so-called Whitten amendments, sections 209 and 210 of the Office of Education appropriation, have been retained in the conference report. I am concerned that the confusing language of these provisions may encourage some school districts to futile resistance of school desegregation required by law. However, because the Whitten amendments do not legally limit or dilute school desegregation requirements and because the administration has repeatedly assured us that these provisions will have no effect on Federal enforcement of these requirements, I reluctantly support the conference report in this regard.

I ask unanimous consent that relevant communications from the administration on this subject be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1970.

HON. CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MATHIAS: This is in response to your request for my views on Sections 209, 210 and 211, the school desegregation amendments, in H.R. 16916, the fiscal year 1971 Office of Education Appropriation Bill, as approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee. I am pleased to respond.

On April 21, my predecessor in this office, former Secretary Robert H. Finch, testified on this matter before the Committee on Appropriations. At the time, he expressed the Administration's opposition to these sections, which are unnecessary and undesirable.

I wish to reaffirm that opposition. While Sections 209 and 210, the so-called Whitten Amendments, would not, if enacted, alter school desegregation requirements under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, they would, nevertheless, encourage some people to believe that there has been a change in basic law when there was not, and thus serve to confuse local authorities as to their constitutional responsibility.

Section 211, the so-called Jonas Amendment, would deny vital Federal education aid to many school districts which implement desegregation plans contrary to "freedom of choice." Under this section, school districts would be penalized for carrying out desegregation plans ordered by the Federal courts, in conformity with State law, or in accordance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The effect of enacting Section 211, therefore, would be to tie the hands of local officials and encourage defiance of the constitutional obligation to desegregate.

As the President indicated in his comprehensive message on School desegregation, the appropriate role for the Federal Government is to assist school districts in meeting the requirements of the law in this difficult area. Sections 209, 210, and 211 would not serve that purpose. I know that you have been a leading opponent of similar amendments in the past. Your assistance in urging deletion of these sections when the Senate considers H.R. 16916 would be appreciated.

For your information I am enclosing an excerpt from Secretary Finch's testimony of April 21 in reference to the aforementioned sections.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely,

ELLIOTT RICHARDSON,
Secretary-designate.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1970.

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: This is in response to your request for my views on Sections 209, 210 and 211, the school desegregation amendments, in H.R. 16916, the fiscal year 1971 Office of Education Appropriation Bill, as approved by the Senate Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee. I am pleased to respond.

As you know, I testified on this matter before the Subcommittee on April 21. At the time, I expressed the Administration's opposition to these sections, which we regard as unnecessary and undesirable. An excerpt from my testimony is enclosed.

I wish to reaffirm that opposition. While Sections 209 and 210, the so-called Whitten Amendments, would not, if enacted, alter school desegregation requirements under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, they would, nevertheless, encourage some people to believe that there has been a change in basic law when there has not, and thus serve to confuse local authorities as to their constitutional responsibility.

Section 211, the so-called Jonas Amendment, would deny vital Federal education aid to many school districts which implement desegregation plans contrary to "freedom of choice." Under this section, school districts would be penalized for carrying out desegregation plans ordered by the Federal courts, in conformity with State law, or in accordance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The effect of enacting Section 211, therefore, would be to tie the hands of local officials and encourage defiance of the constitutional obligation to desegregate.

As the President indicated in his comprehensive message on school desegregation, the appropriate role for the Federal Government is to assist school districts in meeting the requirements of the law in this difficult area. Sections 209, 210 and 211 would not serve that purpose.

I would appreciate any assistance you may deem appropriate in urging deletion of these sections during this afternoon's full Committee session.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely,

BOB FINCH,
Secretary.

APRIL 17, 1970.

HON. WARREN MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Departments of
Labor and Health, Education and Wel-
fare, and Related Agencies, Committee
on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washing-
ton, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON:

DELETION OF "WHITTEN AND JONAS" AMENDMENTS

I am asking the Senate to delete sections 209 and 210—the so-called Whitten Amendments—and section 211—the so-called Jonas Amendment—from the House bill. Although I am convinced that sections 209 and 210 do not change basic law or Federal regulations, my concern is that the enactment of these two provisions would in fact encourage some people to believe that a change has been made in the basic law and thus give rise to much confusion. Further, it is my belief that language which pertains to the enforcement of school desegregation belongs in substantive legislation rather than in an appropriation bill. For these two reasons, I am convinced that sections 209 and 210 should be deleted. Even if they are not, however, I believe everyone should understand my conclusion that a school district that has not completed its Constitutional

obligation to achieve a unitary system would not be "desegregated" within the meaning of the proposed sections 209 and 210. Such a district, therefore, would be unaffected by these sections.

Section 211 should be stricken from the bill for several reasons. First, it would prevent the Federal Government and local school officials from carrying out the requirements of the Constitution—requirements which this section does not and cannot remove. What this provision does is to impose a penalty on a school district for carrying out its legal obligation to desegregate. The Department would be put in the position of having to prohibit many school districts from using Federal funds to draw up and implement desegregation plans pursuant to court order. It would thus tie the hands of the Federal Government and of local school officials in dealing with the non-discrimination requirement of law.

In addition to preventing enforcement officials from carrying out their legal obligations, section 211 would jeopardize the substantial progress made to date in school desegregation, and make more difficult the application of uniform standards in accordance with the Constitution. Furthermore, the amendment directly contravenes the President's March 24 statement on school desegregation in which he pledges to support the recent Supreme Court decisions mandating immediate desegregation. Freedom-of-choice plans, as has been demonstrated time and again, do not do this. Court decisions are unequivocal on this point. Because section 211 is not consistent with court rulings on "freedom-of-choice plans," it could only produce an administrative nightmare for the Department. It should be deleted.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, we are asking that your Committee return to the President's budget with respect to both the increases and decreases enacted by the House and delete from the bill sections 209, 210, and 211 of the general provisions.

In conclusion, I would commend the Committee for the promptness with which it has approached the House bill. I understand that you have already started hearings with outside witnesses. We will do our best to help you in your efforts to complete your work on this important bill.

Sincerely,

BOB FINCH,
Secretary.

SAFEGUARD PROVISIONS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased that the House, in approving the President's request for emergency assistance to desegregating school districts, has agreed to the limitations placed by the Senate on use of the funds. These elementary safeguards are essential to help insure that the funds will not be spent in districts which are desegregated in only the most token and misleading ways.

The first limitation prohibits assistance to local educational agencies which transfer, or have unlawfully transferred, property, services, or equipment to non-public schools which practice discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin.

The second limitation prohibits use of the emergency assistance funds to supplant per pupil expenditures from non-Federal sources reduced as a result of desegregation or of the availability of the emergency assistance. This provision does not, however, prohibit assistance where State assistance calculated on a per-pupil basis declines by operation of existing law, solely because a local education agency contains fewer students

after desegregation than before. Nor does it prohibit assistance where State support of transportation is reduced, by operation of existing law, solely because a local education agency's transportation needs are reduced following desegregation. In these cases, aid has been reduced because of declining enrollment and reduced transportation needs and not because of action taken as a preparation for or consequence of desegregation.

The final safeguard assures that assistance will be made available on a nationwide basis to school districts desegregating under either Federal or State law. I regard this last provision as especially important. Our commitment to school integration must be a national commitment. The leadership of State government is vital to successful public school desegregation. It is, therefore, essential that Federal assistance be made available to desegregating districts in those States, such as California and Pennsylvania, which have required desegregation of schools as a matter of State law, as well as in those States where desegregation is taking place under Federal law.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we are considering today one of the most important appropriations bills which Congress will consider this session. For adequate Federal support is vitally necessary to achieve the high quality of education which is fundamental to a vigorous, productive, democratic Nation. The bill before us goes a long way toward providing that Federal support.

Mr. President, I want to commend particularly the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator MAGNUSON, and the ranking minority member, Senator CORTON, for their hard and effective work on this bill. I had the privilege to testify before the subcommittee and to work with these leaders on amendments which I thought were important. I had the opportunity to participate in the debate and discussion of the bill.

I think that in all of their work on this difficult, complicated, important legislation, the Senator from Washington was thorough, knowledgeable, and fair. He is a dedicated leader in the effort to give our Nation's youth the best possible education. The Senator from New Hampshire was equally effective and constructive in connection with the education appropriations.

So, I commend these leaders and the members of the committee for their work on the bill. Of course, there are areas where we might prefer to spend more and areas where we might prefer to spend less. But by and large, this is a balanced and very necessary bill.

Mr. President, I am pleased that in reaching a compromise on education appropriations, the House and the Senate conferees agreed to an increase of \$14 million in the national defense student loan program. As you know, this increase was approved by the Senate when it passed the amendment to increase Federal student assistance which I sponsored last month.

This increase brings the new total for direct student loans to \$243 million for

the coming academic year. The \$14 million will help an additional 23,000 students.

My own State of Massachusetts will receive an estimated \$594,111 of this increase, giving assistance to close to one thousand additional needy students who might not otherwise be able to attend school this fall. Whereas last year Massachusetts colleges and universities received only 52.6 percent of their approved requests for direct student loans, this year they will receive 62 percent.

And so, Mr. President, this increase represents a substantial improvement. As sponsor of the Senate amendment, I am proud that Congress is partially responding to the need.

However, Mr. President, present Federal spending for student assistance is still inadequate. And this failure to appropriate necessary Federal funds will deny thousands of young Americans in Massachusetts and across the country the opportunity to attend college this fall. Until the Federal Government makes a full and realistic commitment, our Nation's youth—especially those from low-income families—will be the ultimate losers.

The shortage of student aid is staggering. I am sure that every one of my colleagues has received many moving letters from parents and students who cannot find assistance, and in many cases have been forced to drop out or not even start college or vocational school. My own office in Boston receives an average of 40 to 50 telephone calls a week from distraught parents and youngsters who need financial help for their higher education. Yet all I can report to them is that Federal funds have long since run out.

The University of Massachusetts at Amherst has been forced to reject several hundred deserving applicants for national defense student loans this year. They use a nationally-developed testing service to determine how much a family can afford to pay. Yet with estimated tuition, room, board, costs and personal spending money of \$2,200 for each student, the university must deny aid to any family which can afford \$1,700 or more—even though the cost may be as much as \$500 more than the family can afford.

One State college in Massachusetts has calculated that the amount it receives for Federal student assistance works out to an average of only \$36.28 per student in attendance.

A number of factors have contributed to the severe pressure on families with college-age children.

First, with inflation over 6 percent, the increase in other costs leaves families with less for education. Yet at the same time, rises in tuition, fees, and room and board have raised the price tag of college.

In Massachusetts, Boston College recently announced a tuition increase of \$240 effective this coming September. This comes on top of a \$400 tuition increase just last year. In addition, room and board costs at Boston College will be raised by \$300 at the opening of the fall term.

This select committee was set up the day following the passage of the Stennis amendment to the elementary and secondary school bill in the Senate.

The legislative history of this committee is to the effect that the committee was set up to study de facto segregation—the type of segregation that is said to exist in areas outside the South—and to make recommendations with respect to a Federal policy regarding the handling of de facto segregation.

Mr. President, it must be borne in mind that the Supreme Court of the United States has not ruled that the segregation of the type that exists in the North—de facto segregation—is constitutional. It has not been ruled to be constitutional. There is nothing that would prevent the Federal bureaucracy from proceeding against de facto segregation, the segregation that exists in the North, that is said to come about through a fortuitous pattern of residence, whereas the so-called de jure segregation which is said to exist in the South comes about by reason of some past legal requirement on the part of State or local agencies.

Mr. President, I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 19, 1970, the date of the adoption of the resolution establishing the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, on page S2006. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), speaking for the adoption of Senate Resolution 359 creating the select committee, had this to say:

This committee would make an interim report by the first of August of this year, and a final report by January 31, 1971. The inquiry would consider all phases of the problem of de facto segregation, including development of possible alternatives to busing, which would still insure equal educational opportunities.

Mr. President, what a noble purpose for this committee. What could be a loftier aim for this committee than to study all phases of the problem of de facto segregation, including development of possible alternatives to busing, which would still insure equal educational opportunities? Who could be against that?

I say parenthetically that on yesterday I informed the able and distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the author of the resolution, that today at 11 o'clock in the morning I would address the Senate and that in the course of my remarks I would comment on the work of this select committee and on certain actions which he has taken in recent days with respect to that investigation.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota in speaking for this resolution had this to say:

The one observation I should like to make, which may be somewhat irrelevant in the light of our agreement here, is that we act on this proposal in the context of the action we took yesterday.

I might say parenthetically that referred to the adoption of the Stennis amendment.

He continued:

I view yesterday's action as one primarily directed at the problem of the dual school system. I know that many will disagree. That is how I view it. I view the action on this resolution—

Senate Resolution 359—

as the only step that can reasonably be taken, and in my opinion must be taken, to try to deal with the national problem of de facto segregation.

There we have again the purpose of the committee, stating that it is the only step that can be reasonably taken and in his opinion—that is in the opinion of the Senator from Minnesota—must be taken to deal with the national problem of de facto segregation.

So, with this thought in mind, knowing that the committee would act in accordance with the purpose of the committee as outlined by its advocates, I felt sure that the committee would be sending investigators into and perhaps holding hearings in the areas where de facto segregation exists.

I thought they would be taking testimony in Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, and the city of Washington, D.C.

Mr. President, so as not to encumber the RECORD I am not going to put in the RECORD the statements which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) placed in the RECORD last year as an introduction or as preliminary information in connection with the later considerations of the Stennis amendment. I am going to read sketchily from these pages.

Speaking with reference to the city of Philadelphia,

Philadelphia has 9 schools with a total enrollment of 7,206 that are 100 percent Negro. It has another 57 schools, with a total enrollment of 68,402, that are 99 percent to 99.9 percent Negro segregated. It has 26 schools, with a total enrollment of 26,333, that are 95 percent to 98.9 percent Negro segregated, and another 17 schools with a total enrollment of 14,571, that are 90 percent to 95 percent Negro segregated.

There are further tabulations, but I think that is enough to illustrate the point.

Mr. President, the item I just read appeared at page S15484 of the RECORD.

Then, appearing at page S16178, also in remarks by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS):

In New York City there are 119 schools which are 99 and 100 percent minority group segregated, which have a Negro enrollment of 89,957 or 19 percent of the city's total Negro enrollment. There are 207 schools having a Negro student enrollment of 146,575—43.7 percent of the city's total Negro enrollment—that are 95 to 100 percent minority group segregated.

Then, in the city of Washington, D.C., reading from page S15281, also from remarks by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS):

There are 56 schools with 41,109 students that are 100 percent Negro. There are another 57 schools that have 99 to 99.9 percent Negro students, which makes an aggregate of 113 schools with enrollments totaling 96,518 which are 99 to 100 percent Negro.

Then, with respect to the city of Chicago, reading from page S15997, the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), he stated:

On previous occasions I have talked about racial segregation in Chicago, where 248,677 or 80.6 percent of its 308,266 Negro student enrollment are attending schools which are 99 to 100 percent Negro, and where 90 percent of the total Negro enrollment of the city are in schools between 90 and 100 percent Negro.

In comparison to those astounding figures which played a prominent part in the passage on February 18, of the Stennis amendment in the Senate, providing for uniformity of application of Federal rules as to desegregation of public schools, the administration has stated categorically that by this September it will have desegregated 97 percent of the school districts in the South.

Now, Mr. President, is it not reasonable that a committee, formed for the purpose, as its sponsors stated, of checking, investigating, and making recommendations with respect to de facto segregation, the type which exists in Chicago, New York, and Philadelphia, would have inquired into conditions which exist in New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia, and that those areas would have been the proper and the likely fields of their activities?

Mr. President, if we had this report, which should have been filed on the 1st of August, we would know, or I assume we would know, if it made such a report, what activities the committee had undertaken with respect to making a study of de facto segregation.

Mr. President, I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) was in search of de facto segregation when, around the middle of last month, according to newspaper accounts published after the fact on his visits, he went to some three different communities in three different southern States. He went to Prattville, Ala. I might say that visit is the occasion for my speaking in the Chamber at this time. He went to the city, or town, because it is hardly more than that, of Homer, La.; and he went to the town of Uvalde, Tex., which gained its fame not for the de facto segregation it has, because I assume it has none, but because it was the hometown of the late great former Vice President of the United States, John Nance Garner.

Mr. President, the people of Alabama are a most hospitable people, and most friendly. We show true southern hospitality to all visitors within our borders. We welcome visitors to Alabama. We hope they will enjoy our wonderful climate, our lakes, our streams, our mountains, our gulf coast. We hope they will enjoy coming to Alabama, enjoy their stays there, and become citizens of our State if that is their wish. We welcome visitors into our State.

We were somewhat surprised and shocked at the unannounced visit of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota to Alabama and to other southern States. It occurs to the junior Senator from Alabama that if the distinguished Senator from Minnesota had been in search of de facto segregation, he would not have gone into those three small towns in Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas. He would have gone to States with millions of people where it is known that de facto segregation exists, of which his committee is charged with the duty and responsibility of making a study and making recommendations with regard to the method of dealing of the Federal Government with de facto segregation.

We read in the newspapers and heard through other news media that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota had

"821. 21. Jurisdiction of courts-martial not exclusive."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"821. 21. Limitation on jurisdiction of courts-martial."

(7) Section 849 (article 49) is amended by—

(A) striking out "not capital" in subsection (d); and

(B) striking out subsection (f).

(8) Section 852 (article 52) is amended by—

(A) striking out subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) No person may be convicted of any offense under this chapter except by the concurrence of two-thirds of the members of the court-martial present at the time the vote is taken or except as provided in section 845 (b) of this title (article 45 (b)).";

(B) striking out subsection (b); and

(C) redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(9) Section 856 (article 56) is amended to read as follows:

"§ 856. Art. 56. Maximum limits

"The punishment which a court-martial may direct for an offense may not exceed such limits as the President may prescribe for that offense. The President shall not have authority to modify or suspend punishment with respect to any particular geographical area or with respect to any particular offense."

(10) Section 867 (b) (1) (article 67 (b) (1)) is amended by striking out "or extends to death".

(11) Section 871 (article 71) is amended by—

(A) striking out "extending to death or" in the first sentence of subsection (a);

(B) striking out ", except a death sentence" in the second sentence of subsection (a); and

(C) striking out ", except a death sentence" in the second sentence of subsection (d).

(12) Sections 933 and 934 (articles 133 and 134) are amended to read as follows:

"§ 933. Art. 133. Conduct unbecoming an officer and gentleman

"Any commissioned officer, cadet, or midshipman who is guilty of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman shall be subject to punishment under section 815 (article 15) of this title.

"§ 934. Art. 134. General article

"Though not specifically mentioned in this chapter, all disorders and neglects to the prejudice of good order and discipline in the armed forces, all conduct of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces, of which persons subject to this chapter may be guilty, shall be taken cognizance of and punished under section 815 (article 15) of this title."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the sixth calendar month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business not be laid before the Senate until the morning business is completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 5(a), Public Law 87-758, the Speaker had

appointed Mrs. HANSEN of Washington as a member of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2484) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to authorize marketing agreements providing for the advertising of papayas.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3547) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Narrows unit, Missouri River Basin project, Colorado, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 11032. An act to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising;

H.R. 13125. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), as amended by the act of May 7, 1932 (47 Stat. 150), and as amended by the act of April 13, 1948 (62 Stat. 170), relating to the admission to the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13434. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Ariz., in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 90 and 122, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14097. An act to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 96, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14373. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Portsmouth, State of Virginia, certain lands situated within the Crawford urban renewal project (Va-53) in the city of Portsmouth, in exchange for certain lands situated within the proposed Southside neighborhood development project;

H.R. 14827. An act to provide for the disposition of funds to pay a judgment in favor of the Sac and Fox Tribes of Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 220, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15937. An act to curtail the mailing of certain articles which present a hazard to postal employees or mail processing machines by imposing restrictions on certain advertising and promotional matters in the mails, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 17695. An act to amend section 2735 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the finality of settlement effected under section 2733, 2734, 2734a, 2734b, or 2737.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2484) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to authorize marketing agreements providing for the advertising of papaya.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 11032. An act to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising;

H.R. 15937. An act to curtail the mailing of certain articles which present a hazard to postal employees or mail processing machines by imposing restrictions on certain advertising and promotional matters in the mails, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17695. An act to amend section 2735 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the finality of settlement effected under section 2733, 2734, 2734a, 2734b, or 2737; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

H.R. 13125. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676) as amended by the act of May 7, 1932 (47 Stat. 150), and as amended by the act of April 13, 1948 (62 Stat. 170) relating to the admission to the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13434. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Arizona, in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 90 and 122, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14097. An act to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 96, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14827. An act to provide for the disposition of funds to pay a judgment in favor of the Sac and Fox Tribes of Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 220, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

H.R. 14373. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Portsmouth, State of Virginia, certain lands situated within the Crawford urban renewal project (Va-53) in the city of Portsmouth, in exchange for certain lands situated within the proposed Southside neighborhood development project; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL). Under the previous order, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) is now recognized for a period of not to exceed 45 minutes.

EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, on February 19, 1970, Senate Resolution 359 was adopted by the Senate. This resolution sets up a Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity.

Then under date of March 17, 1970, Senate resolution 366 was passed by the Senate, providing for an appropriation of \$375,000 to defray the cost of the work of this committee. The terms of Senate Resolution 359 require that—

Not later than August 1, 1970, such select committee shall make an interim report to the appropriate committees of the Senate.

Some weeks ago in debate on the Senate floor, the junior Senator from Alabama expressed considerable interest in this resolution and expressed the hope that the report would be made feeling that it would have considerable bearing on the work of the Senate regarding a Federal policy with respect to the public schools of this country.

Inquiry this morning of the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity disclosed the fact that the interim report by August 1, required by the resolution creating the committee, has not been filed.

been to our State. After consulting we know not how many individuals—I assume with respect to the school situation in Alabama—he comes back as a 1-day expert on the public schools of Alabama and, after having briefly visited the other towns, as an expert on the condition in the public schools of those towns.

The junior Senator from Minnesota was under no duty to notify the junior Senator from Alabama that he proposed to make a trip into his State, though other Senators—I think of at least four—who have made trips to Alabama have come and informed us of their plans. But had the junior Senator from Alabama been advised by the Senator from Minnesota that he planned a trip to Alabama, the junior Senator from Alabama would have seen to it that a proper welcoming committee, a committee fully befitting his lofty position as a U.S. Senator and as chairman of the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunities, would have rolled out the red carpet for him and made available to him many more witnesses than those to whom he apparently was able to talk.

I have an editorial from the Dothan Eagle, from which I shall read, and which I ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I read from the editorial:

Finding people who visited and talked with the Senator was similar to finding someone interviewed in public opinion polls. That is to say, it takes a lot of doing if it can be done at all....

Nevertheless, Senator Mondale told the world that discrimination and repression of minorities continues to be "severe and blatantly open" in the States of the South.

How could that be when the administration is desegregating 97 percent of the school districts in the South and is desegregating none in the North?

I have a report from the regents of the University of the State of New York, dated in late 1969, stating that segregation in New York is rapidly increasing. Why did not the Senator from Minnesota go to those areas where de facto segregation exists, rather than go down to the State of Alabama, where our communities are under a court order to desegregate, and where our people, who are law-abiding citizens, will follow the decrees of the court?

In debate here with respect to the Stennis amendment one of the distinguished Senators from a section outside of the South said that if the same desegregation rules that are applied in the South were attempted to be applied in the North, it would take the U.S. Army to enforce those regulations.

How does that type of prospective conduct on the part of people outside the South compare with the law-abiding policies and actions of the people of the South?

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Alabama did not vote for the establishment of the select committee. He did not vote for the throwing away of \$375,-

000 of the taxpayers' money, providing for the so-called work of this committee. He did not vote for it because he knew that, even though the sponsors of the measure said that it was going to be a study of de facto segregation, the South would end up as the whipping boy of the investigations carried on by the committee.

Even though no report has been made, as required by the resolution itself, it would seem that, from the investigation that is being made, the ones being investigated are de jure segregation cases, most, if not all, of them being under court orders to desegregate, rather than areas in the North where, by HEW figures, segregation exists, is increasing, and nothing is being done about it.

I want to read in full—it is short—an editorial appearing in the Montgomery Advertiser of July 28. It is entitled "Pilgrim MONDALE's Progress." I gather he is likening the distinguished Senator from Minnesota to Christian, the Pilgrim in "Pilgrim's Progress."

At any rate, the title of the editorial is "Pilgrim MONDALE's Progress," and it reads as follows:

Senator Walter F. Mondale, Minnesota Democrat, is now an expert on southern race problems.

He qualified for that rating after a whirlwind tour of towns in three Southern states, including Prattville. Having thus gained all the knowledge he wanted, he announced Sunday that the Nixon Administration has been dragging its feet on school integration in the Deep South, with possibly explosive results.

Ninety-seven percent of the school districts to be integrated by the opening of school next month, but still he says:

The Nixon administration has been dragging its feet on school integration in the Deep South, with possibly explosive results.

He deplored, and again blamed on Nixon, the existence of separatist sentiment among some Negroes. He said he got the impression that integration enthusiasm among blacks "is beginning to wane," a development that he, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Equal Educational Opportunities, will not tolerate. He finds it as intolerable among blacks as whites, neither of whom are capable of judging what's good for them, presumably.

But think of it: an authority on southern problems actually coming South to find evidence to support his preconceptions. We might suggest that he would have much more to worry about had he investigated "de facto" segregation in the North, and saved the taxpayers some travel expenses to boot. But that would be rude to a visitor who came here with the loftiest of intentions—to fortify what he already knew from having read Uncle Tom's Cabin and other learned texts.

We gather that Mondale carefully selected the cities and towns he would visit to avoid contact with the problems of massive integration. He wasn't interested in that, but rather those areas where the problems could be neatly cupuled as attributable to not enough integration; hence, "explosive."

But, to repeat, he at least visited the South, which is so remarkable among northern experts on Dixie as to eclipse any suspicions we have about his intent.

Mr. President, the people of Alabama had varying reactions to the unscheduled and unannounced visit of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I dare

say they varied from indifference, to incredulity, to amusement, to outrage and indignation.

But, Mr. President, I am concerned that we set up a committee and appropriate \$375,000 for the work of that committee, and the sponsor of the committee says here, in an address before the Senate, that it is set up for the purpose of studying and making recommendations with respect to de facto segregation, that that is the only way they are going to reach this problem, to set up such a committee, and then we find the chairman of that committee making a whirlwind trip to three small towns in Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas.

Mr. President, we will not know without the report, and probably will not know with it, whether the committee ordered the Senator to go to the South looking for de facto segregation. I seriously doubt that the committee would have done that. We do not know whether he was acting personally or as the act of the committee. We will not know until we receive that report, and probably not then. We will not know when the committee is going to get down to the serious business for which it was created, to try to cope with and handle the de facto segregation in the North.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and article published in the Montgomery Advertiser, entitled "MONDALE Visit to Prattville Is Recalled," commenting on the Senator's trip to Alabama.

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

MONDALE VISIT TO PRATTVILLE IS RECALLED

PRATTVILLE.—Mrs. Sallie Hadnot, president of the Prattville Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, said she talked with Minnesota's Sen. Walter F. Mondale during a visit he made here July 14.

Mondale also reportedly talked to students and parents in Prattville, Homer, La., and Uvalde and San Antonio, Tex., during his trip.

Sources in Washington said it was believed that Mondale also talked in Alabama to Lucius Pitts, president of Miles College of Birmingham, and John Monroe, a professor at Miles, and to Montgomery attorney Fred Gray. Gray was out of the city and unavailable for comment.

Mrs. Hadnot said she understood that Mondale was to have talked with these persons but that it was not at the time she spoke with the senator.

Autauga County School Superintendent John R. Hargis said he knew nothing of the reported Mondale visit.

"If he came into Prattville," Hargis said, "he did not contact me or any of the people in my office."

Probate Judge E. A. "Bud" Grouby and Prattville City Clerk Donald Kelley both said they had heard nothing of such a visit. Mayor C. M. "Mack" Gray was out of town on vacation.

Mr. ALLEN. I read briefly from it, as follows:

Autauga County School Superintendent John R. Hargis said he knew nothing of the reported Mondale visit.

You would think that if an investigator were investigating schools, he would go to the school superintendent.

"If he came into Prattville," Hargis said, "he did not contact me or any of the people in my office."

The probate judge—this is the highest political officer on a local level in a county in Alabama—was not notified—

Probate Judge E. A. "Bud" Grouby and Prattville City Clerk Donald Kelley both said they had heard nothing of such a visit.

So, Mr. President, it is the hope of the Senator from Alabama that this committee, which was set up with such great hopes by the Senate as a means of combating de facto segregation, will get on the right track. If it was looking for de facto segregation, something must have gone wrong with its compass when it was directed down South rather than up North looking for de facto segregation.

Let us get it on the right course. Let us get it working on the problem in connection with which it was set up. Let us not worry about the desegregation of the South. HEW, the Justice Department, the Federal courts, the Chief Executive himself, are handling that, to the point that they make their boast that they will desegregate 97 percent of the school districts in the South by September.

There is no need for this committee helping out the existing agencies with respect to desegregating southern school districts. Let us let this committee do what it was set up to do—try to find the answer to the problem of de facto segregation, and come back in here with a recommendation for a uniform school policy for the Federal Government. That is what we need for this committee to do, rather than have its chairman roaming over the South, looking, we assume, for de facto segregation, which unfortunately he is not going to find a great deal of in Alabama and the South.

EXHIBIT 1

PROFILE OF AN EXPERT

Senator Walter F. Mondale of Minnesota whose political designation is listed in the 1970 Congressional Directory as "Democrat-Farmer-Labor," was appointed to the U.S. Senate to fill the unexpired term of Senator Hubert Humphrey, resigned. Subsequently he was elected in November 1966 to a full six-year term.

Senator Mondale, who is 42 or twice the minimum voting age, serves as chairman of the Senate's special committee on equal Educational Opportunity. He is an expert in his field, knows more about Equal Educational Opportunity than any other living person, bar none. This he does not challenge.

In mid-July he made an unannounced visit to Alabama, Louisiana and Texas to expand his expertise in the field of integrated education. Specifically, he said, he visited and talked with students, parents and residents in Prattville, Ala., Homer, La., and San Antonio, Tex.

Finding people who visited and talked with the Senator was similar to finding someone interviewed in public opinion polls. That is to say, it takes a lot of doing if it can be done at all. At any rate, the Senator quoted no impressive individuals and he failed to mention their qualifications to discuss the subject.

Nevertheless, Senator Mondale told the world that discrimination and repression of minorities continues to be "severe and blatantly open" in the States of the South.

Among his conclusions, he said, were these: "The abuses of the desegregation process that the select committee has heard testimony on—segregated classrooms, firing of

black faculty members, transfer of public funds to private academies—appear to be widespread.

"At least in communities I visited, discrimination and repression of minority groups is severe and blatantly open. This ranged from police brutality to insults, to economic sanctions such as firing of parents of black and Chicano students who were protesting discrimination etc."

"Despite this continuing discrimination and despite what amounts to a mockery of real and effective desegregation, most blacks I talked to in the South haven't abandoned the goal of integration. But time is running out."

Senator Mondale, who devoted four days to wrapping up his investigation in three States, even took a dim view of what the FBI has done to mix and mingle the races. "Person after person told us of their efforts to involve the department in protecting their rights, their attempts to report these abuses to the FBI and Justice Department attorneys, and the lack of action or the negative action they received."

It would appear that the Senator's whirlwind and thorough investigation was one-sided. He said nothing about the plans of school authorities to send white children many blocks from their home into Negro schools, the similar dispatch of white teachers, the orders to mix, mix regardless of the fact that such action lessens rather than increases education. Likewise, he neglected to mention rezoning of neighborhoods into school attendance zones to force integration. He also failed to say if he visited or talked with the first white student, parent or teacher. His was strictly an investigation according to color.

And this latter is of significance, curious significance but significance. According to the World Almanac, the 1960 census showed that Minnesota, the home of this emerging Senate expert on race, had 22,263 Negro citizens. By contrast, Alabama had 980,271, Louisiana 1,039,207 and Texas 1,187,125.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with a time limitation of 3 minutes on statements therein.

TRIBUTE TO DAN KIMBALL AND DORIS FLEESON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for several days I have wanted to say something about the passing of two old friends—Dan Kimball, a former Secretary of the Navy, and his wife, Doris Fleeson, a well-known columnist.

I valued the friendship of both. I found Dan Kimball a man with a big heart, a man with deep understanding, and with a deep appreciation of the affairs of state—domestically and in the field of foreign affairs.

I found Doris Fleeson a lady with a

sharp tongue and a sharp pen but a big heart. She was one of the really good columnists, in my opinion. She did not try to gloss over the facts as she understood them. She made her views known in no uncertain language. Everyone always knew where Doris stood.

It was a happy marriage. It was a coincidence that Doris Fleeson died on the 12th anniversary of her wedding to Dan Kimball. It was more than coincidental, I believe, that she died within 36 hours after Dan's death.

I just want to express my feeling and that of my wife on the passing of these two outstanding Americans. We extend every sympathy possible to those whom they have left behind. I wish to assure them that if there is any way in which I can be of service, I shall be more than happy to help in any way possible.

I can only say in closing, Mr. President: May their souls rest in peace.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper article appertaining to the passing of Dan Kimball and Doris Fleeson published in Sunday's Washington Post.

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

COLUMNIST DORIS FLEESON DIES AT 69, 36 HOURS AFTER DEATH OF HUSBAND, DAN KIMBALL

(By Gerald E. Bunker)

Doris Fleeson, one of the most successful women journalists in American newspaper history, died early yesterday morning of a coronary thrombosis at her home, 2120 S St. NW. She was 69.

Her death came just 36 hours after that of her second husband, Dan A. Kimball, Secretary of the Navy under President Truman. Yesterday would have been their 12th wedding anniversary.

Miss Fleeson launched a syndicated political column for the Evening Star and the Boston Globe in 1945, and at the time of her semi-retirement in 1967, was being published by more than 100 newspapers through the United Features Syndicate.

Known for her strong opinions and acerbic wit, she was praised yesterday by friends and colleagues for the unfailing professionalism of her writing.

"She could sit down at a typewriter in the Senate Press Gallery and in little more than an hour pound out a profound analysis of a complex situation," Mary McGrory, a columnist at The Evening Star and a longtime friend, said.

She was against injustice and unkindness. She was a fierce person. She was a person who was merciless towards her enemies and who adored her friends," Miss McGrory said.

Miss Fleeson, who fought all her life against "the thought that a woman's byline belongs only over the sob story," herself came up through the ranks of the old journalistic apprenticeship.

She was born in Sterling, Kan., a town that she later described as a "whistlestop" into a "very Republican" family.

After graduation from the University of Kansas in 1923, she borrowed \$65 and set out for Chicago determined to be a reporter.

After stints with the Pittsburg, Kan., Sun, and the Evanston, Ill., News Index, she became city editor of the Great Neck, N.Y., News.

"On one dark November night in 1927," Miss Fleeson once said, "I walked into the New York Daily News and demanded that see the editor. In 15 minutes I got him and

from the Washington office of the London Daily Express, deals with the information on nuclear reactors in operation and planned for Cuba. In addition, the Washington Daily News printed a story by Mr. Seaman on August 11, 1970, dealing with the overall control of Cuban affairs by Soviet technicians and advisers in Cuba.

In the London Daily Express article, Mr. Seaman has vividly depicted plans for the installation of a "critical" nuclear reactor in Cuba by 1971 or 1972. While the reactor's purpose is said to be peaceful, Mr. Seaman voiced grave doubts as to this, due to the vast numbers of Russian advisers and Cuban scientists trained in Russia, the current policy of familiarization visits by Soviet missile-carrying naval units, and flights by long-range reconnaissance and transport planes. In the Washington Daily News article, Mr. Seaman gives further evidence of Soviet influence in that Caribbean island. Ninety-five percent of the oil that runs Cuban ships, buses, trucks, and taxis is supplied by the Kremlin.

Since part of the debate against the ABM is based on the theory that we can ignore the increasing offensive power of the Soviets and their satellites on the ground that "capability" has nothing to do with "intentions," I believe these articles written by a firsthand observer in Cuba may give them pause. I ask unanimous consent that the articles and the telegram be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the London Daily Express,
Aug. 10, 1970]

FIDEL'S NUCLEAR SECRET WORRIES UNITED STATES

(By Donald Seaman)

This weekend in Havana I learned first details of Fidel Castro's secret experimental nuclear reactor, for long a worry to American intelligence services.

The reactor, shipped complete from Russia, is housed in what was ex-President Batista's old "West Point" military academy along the airport road leading from the Caribbean island's capital.

It is run by a staff of 51 scientists—all Cubans. The director was trained in Czechoslovakia, all the rest in Russian nuclear centres.

PEACEFUL?

All of them spent a minimum of five years' training under Russian supervision before the reactor itself was shipped over.

In scientific terms the reactor is "non-critical"—incapable of making the bomb. It is being used solely for experiments, some in the medical field and others in processes whereby the hard-up Cubans are trying to make paper from the pulp-like sugar cane residue.

But—and this is sure to increase U.S. concern—the Cuban scientists say plans are in hand for the Russians to give the Cubans their first "critical" nuclear reactor by 1971 or 1972.

According to my information, there is no indication that the new reactor, if and when it comes, is intended for anything but peaceful purposes.

Its very presence, however, linked with the presence of vast numbers of Russian advisers to Cuba, the current policy of familiarisation visits by missile-carrying Russian naval units, and flights by long-range reconnaissance and transport planes—will certainly arouse increased American fears.

Just why the Russians, whose foreign policy today is aimed at reaching an understanding with the U.S., should demonstrably underline their strength in Cuba and continue to pour in economic aid at the minimum, rate of a million dollars a day, is still the big question.

THOUSANDS

Exactly how many Russians there are in Cuba now is anyone's guess. They are never seen on the streets of Havana or Santiago. The lowest estimate I was given put the figure at 6,000. The highest was more than 20,000.

But what is certain is that they are there in strength in every field, military, political, and industrial.

In addition, there are thousands more from the Eastern Bloc—Bulgarian, Rumanian (drilling all round the coast for oil), and East German.

Russia has made Cuba the strongest military power in Latin America.

Castro's Russian-trained army is bigger than Britain's, a staggering 300,000 strong.

Cuba's population, incidentally, is 8 million, the same as London. Why this massive show of strength? To my mind Russia's return, her "percentage" from this hugely expensive outlay, is two-fold.

First, she demonstrates to all Latin America her power, her wealth, her boldness, smack in Uncle Sam's backyard.

Second, and more practically, Russian aims in Cuba are strictly long-term. The country has a history of violence, bloodshed, and treachery, and popular though Castro is, it is by no means impossible that his political enemies might make an attempt on his life.

So the presence in Cuba of an overwhelmingly powerful, Communist-indoctrinated army means insurance for the Russians that even if Fidel should go, their power and influence will remain undiminished.

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 11,
1970]

THE MAN WHO CALLS THE TUNE IN CUBA

(By Donald Seaman)

You never see a Russian on the streets in Cuba, but they are there, about 30,000 of them.

They control all life in that tropical, crocodile-shaped island that lies only 90 miles south of Florida.

Their ships and planes run the American blockade and sustain Cuba in every sense. Take fuel: 95 per cent of the oil that runs Cuba's ships, buses, trucks, cars and taxis is supplied by the Kremlin.

And the real boss of Cuba is Alexander Soldatov, the genial, English-speaking ambassador whose last post was at the Court of St. James.

LITTLE SUCCESS

His relationship with Fidel Castro is delicate. No one orders the big, bearded revolutionary to do anything: But the Russians suggest and their suggestions are almost law.

For the past two weeks I have been the only British journalist in Cuba. Every day I watched the Russian tankers enter Havana under the walls of Morro Castle to lie at anchor and pump out the lifeblood of this 11-year-old Marxist stronghold.

Rumanian oilmen have drilled every inch of the coast with little success. The two onshore fields they have working produce only 5 per cent of Cuba's needs. So, Moscow, via their man in Havana, Mr. Soldatov, calls the tune. If he stopped the oil supplies, Cuba would grind to a halt inside 10 days.

The message has begun to sink thru. In 1968, when the Russians invaded Czechoslovakia, Premier Castro placed on record his support.

It was a major decision. Communist states everywhere were shaken by the Russian brutality. But Fidel Castro, hero in revolution-

ary eyes the world over came to the aid of the party.—And Mr. Soldatov will make certain he never steps out of line.

FLAT BROKE

But after 11 years of revolutionary glory, Cuba is flat broke, running up debts like a losing gambler, and going further into the red with every passing month.

Pre-ier Castro has gone thru \$2 billion of U.S. investments; a half billion dollars of military aid from Russia; direct economic aid from Russia totalling a further \$2 billion and long and short term loans from the capitalist world amounting to another \$200 million.

Agreed, he pays his western debtors on the nose. His credit balance of payments from this year's sugar harvest has given \$200 million to play with. But it still spells bankruptcy for Cuba.

BIG PAYLOAD

The man who knows all this, who opens his wallet every day to keep Cuba alive, is Soldatov.

He ordered Castro to allow those missile-carrying naval ships to, twice in the past 10 months, manoeuvre off Cuba and the U.S. mainland.

He controls the intermittent but deeply worrying flights of the TU 95 "Bear" long range reconnaissance aircraft and the big payload Antonov transports.

He stations the MIGs and the radar and military advisers; he supplies teachers for Havana University and the nuclear reactor and the schools and he says how many rubles Cuba may have each day to keep running.

The name is Soldatov. He lives only 90 miles off America's backyard.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Senator PETER H. DOMINICK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This morning's London Express features article by its Cuban correspondent giving details of secret experimental nuclear reactor just installed after five years of training of Cuban operators in Russia with critical nuclear reactor due in 1971 or 1972. Article refers to frequent visits to Cuba of missile carrying Russian naval units, also flights of long-range reconnaissance planes and gives estimate of three hundred thousand men in Castro's Russian trained army. All data add up to urgent need for American ABM system. Believe our capacity for installation already far advanced as evidenced by ground to air missile discharged from our air carrier off north Vietnam that brought down two Russian MIGs seventy miles away. Urge every precaution for our Nation's safety.

EDWARD B. BENJAMIN.

SCHOOL INTEGRATION—A TIME TO FULFILL THE COMMITMENT

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, integration in our Nation's schools has become an issue of primary concern and utmost priority. This issue raises not only the crucial question of racial prejudice and bigotry, but presents even more strongly the question of the future of public schools and quality education. Continued resistance to quality school integration and the delaying tactics employed by high officials are shocking, especially when one realizes the situation has reached the crisis point.

The Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), chairman of the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, recently was a guest on the Columbia Broadcasting System's program "Face the Nation." On that show Sen-

S. 942—To establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts.

S. 3558—To establish program of financial and technical assistance to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically depressed areas.

THE ABM: A WHITE ELEPHANT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in considering the proposed anti-ballistic-missile system, several points should be emphasized.

We should recall, for example, that every White House science adviser since the creation of that office has expressed the gravest doubts about the feasibility of this system.

Since last year there have been two significant developments affecting the rationale for Safeguard. The first was the initiation of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. The second was Secretary Laird's admission, in effect, that the critics were right last year in pointing out that the system could be easily overwhelmed by enemy action.

The Secretary said in his posture statement on February 20 of this year that:

To be perfectly candid, Mr. Chairman, it must be recognized that the threat could actually turn out to be considerably larger than the Safeguard defense is designed to handle.

In practical terms, that statement means, and the Secretary elaborated on it so there could be no mistake, that if there is no arms limitation agreement the Soviet Union can nullify this system. On the other hand, if there is an agreement we will not need the system. In either case we are buying a useless collection of machinery.

Secretary Laird went on to argue that the Minuteman protection aspects of the system should be constructed "because the additional cost needed to defend a portion of Minuteman is small if the full area defense is bought."

But, Mr. President, the Armed Services Committee has rejected the full area defense; so the multibillion dollar ABM parasite now stands alone and exposed.

There is no evidence that this system will make any real difference in defending the United States against nuclear attack or in preventing a first strike. All we know for certain is that it will severely deplete our resources and accelerate the inflationary pressures which so concern the President that he has vetoed desperately needed funds for schools, housing, hospitals, water systems, and veterans programs.

Is it not true that most Senators really doubt that the Safeguard system will work? I fully believe that we will regret its construction.

The administration's argument seems to have been reduced to a single point—"the system may be no good, but it scares the Russians." They tell us that even though it may be worthless on its own, it has value as a bargaining chip.

But that astonishing argument defies both logic and history.

It suggests that we will gain a bargaining advantage by threatening the Soviets with wasting billions of our own

dollars. It asks Senators to see merit in telling an adversary that if he does not comply with our wishes we will inflict injury upon ourselves.

But beyond that, the recent history of our attempts to achieve limitations on the world's nuclear arsenals presents a clear lesson that any new weapons construction brings only escalation by the other side.

How can the proponents of this system answer the compelling logic set forth in a letter to the Washington Post this week by such distinguished Americans as Averell Harriman, Karl Kaysen, Adrian Fisher, Franklin Long, and Herbert Scoville. Mr. Harriman is the most experienced of all Americans in negotiations with the Soviet Union. His judgment and that of his respected colleagues should be carefully weighed.

They have reminded us that it has not been new weapons systems which have brought negotiating success. It has been rather, the kind of imaginative step President Kennedy took in announcing an end to nuclear testing, opening the door to the ban on tests in the atmosphere. It has been steps like the Senate's unanimous passage of the Pastore resolution in 1966, endorsing steps to halt the spread of nuclear weapons and leading to the Nonproliferation Treaty.

The administration suggests that the Safeguard is needed to advance SALT. I suggest that the case has become so weak that they are using SALT to get Safeguard. The issue is not whether we will give the President a bargaining chip, it is whether we will allow the negotiations to be misused as a debating point here at home, to pry loose a system the President appears determined to build no matter how overwhelming the case against it.

Let us not waste billions on this dreadful white elephant.

Let us not squander resources we urgently need to end hunger, clean up the cities, reduce crime, and build America as a land of dignity and peace.

Let us accept the moderate and thoughtful effort of Senator COOPER and Senator HART to restrain the deadly nuclear giant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter by Governor Harriman and his colleagues, to which I referred, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ABM VOTE AND THE SALT TALKS

Recently administration spokesmen have been insisting that unless the Congress authorizes the continued construction and expansion of the Safeguard ABM, it will not be possible to negotiate an agreement with the Soviets at SALT to limit strategic armaments. They argue that the negotiators need the Safeguard bargaining chip to induce the Russians to halt the deployment of their large SS-9 ICBMs.

This would appear to be an attempt to exploit the desire of the Senate and the public to achieve success in SALT in order to rescue the Safeguard program from defeat. The administration has always defended the Safeguard ABM defense of Minuteman sites on the basis that it was not a threat to the U.S.S.R. If true, why then should the continuation of this program be a chip to induce

the Soviets to agree to limit their offensive missile deployment?

The major U.S. threat to Soviet security lies in the deployment of the U.S. MIRV systems. On April 9, 1970, the Senate passed a resolution by a vote of 72 to 6 urging that the President propose to the U.S.S.R. an immediate suspension by both countries of further deployment of all offensive and defensive nuclear strategic weapons systems. Yet this MIRV chip has been thrown away by the accelerated deployment of the Minuteman III and Poseidon missiles with their MIRV warheads and by the reported proposal that any MIRV limitations must be accompanied by Soviet acceptance of extensive inspection of both offensive and defensive missile sites. There is no security justification for such urgent MIRV deployment since the heavy Soviet ABM which they were designed to penetrate could not be deployed and become operational for many, many years.

It has also been reported that the possible outcome of SALT would be an agreement that henceforth the United States and the U.S.S.R. will limit their ABMs to the defense of their capitals. The continued deployment of Safeguard at the Minuteman sites will not in any way contribute to the defense of Washington, and the Senate is being asked to endorse the expenditure of funds for useless hardware if SALT is successful and for an admittedly at best marginally effective system if it is unsuccessful. Why the U.S. should try to get the Soviets to agree to the deployment of ABM defenses for Washington and Moscow instead of a complete ABM ban is not clear, since the defense of Washington will not accomplish any of President Nixon's three objectives for an ABM system. A complete ban would eliminate the need for MIRVs and simplify the problems of verification by obviating any possible need for inspection. It is reported that the Soviets have indicated interest in such a complete ban.

Finally, history has unmistakably demonstrated that restraints, not accelerated weapons programs, pave the road to arms control. Overwhelming superiority did not induce the Soviets to accept the Baruch plan. On the other hand, President Kennedy's American University pledge to halt atmospheric nuclear testing as long as the Soviets did the same rapidly produced agreement to negotiate the Limited Test Ban Treaty in 1963. Similarly, the Senate passage without dissenting vote of the Pastore Resolution in 1966 endorsing efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons broke the ice toward starting serious U.S.-U.S.S.R. negotiations on the Nonproliferation Treaty.

If the Senate wishes to conserve funds and make a maximum contribution toward improving U.S. security by achieving arms limitations and agreement at SALT, it will refuse authorization of funds for the expansion of Safeguard and forbid the expenditure of additional funds for the continued deployment at the two Safeguard sites approved last year until it is satisfied that the negotiators have not been able to persuade the Soviets to agree to limitations on offensive and defensive missile systems.

In our judgment, a Senate vote against the ABM is a vote for success in SALT.

NUCLEAR REACTORS IN OPERATION AND PLANNED FOR CUBA

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from Mr. Edward B. Benjamin, of New Orleans, dated August 10, 1970, calling attention to an article dated August 10, 1970, written by Mr. Donald Seaman, chief foreign correspondent for the London Daily Express.

The article, a copy of which I obtained

ator MONDALE discussed the values of school integration, its prospects, and the need for national leadership in this effort to obtain equal educational opportunities for all children. He said at one point:

My position is that the only way to achieve integration is to do it responsibly, to bring the school children together in a quality environment in which quality education exists and in which everything possible is done to make it succeed. The present half-hearted system in many cases is doing great damage and to call it even desegregation is to stress the meaning of the word.

When asked about the attitudes of blacks in relation to integration—especially in view of the half-hearted policy being pursued at present—Senator MONDALE said:

Should . . . frustrations continue to develop and these open and acute diversions continue to occur, if the law of the land continues just to be some sort of trick as they see it, I can see where Black America will back off the whole objective of living together in an integrated society, and if that happens, then I think the darkest predictions of the Kerner Commission could well come true.

Mr. President, in order that Members of Congress as well as citizens around the country may have the opportunity to read the full text of Senator MONDALE's excellent remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the interview be printed in the RECORD.

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

FACE THE NATION

Broadcast over the CBS Television Network and the CBS Radio Network, July 26, 1970

Guest: Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, Democrat of Minnesota.

Reporters George Herman, CBS News; Jesse Cook, Time Magazine; Daniel Schorr, CBS News.

ANNOUNCER. Senator Mondale, the Justice Department says that by fall the old segregated school system of the South will have been wiped out. You have just returned from a trip through Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas. Is school segregation about to be dead?

Senator MONDALE. I doubt it very much. I think a good deal of the job remains ahead of us. Unless we get a more complete commitment out of the Justice Department and the President of the United States, I think this fall is going to be a very difficult period indeed.

ANNOUNCER. From CBS, Washington, in color, "Face the Nation," a spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview with Senator Walter Mondale, Democrat of Minnesota.

Senator Mondale will be questioned by CBS news correspondent Daniel Schorr, Jesse Cook of Time Magazine and CBS News Correspondent George Herman.

Mr. HERMAN. Senator, what did you mean by a difficult period? Do you mean there is likely to be a disruption of some kind?

Senator MONDALE. There could very well be disruption. I think there is deep remaining resistance to these court orders and there is growing concern in the black community among black teachers, among black leaders, as to the way in which it is being done.

In addition to this, there are all kinds of circuitous ways in which the resistance movement avoiding the reach of the Court orders, such as the private segregation academies and segregation within a school so that black children go to separate classes. In these

ways the hope for successful desegregation or integration is being frustrated and is creating great and serious problems that could well explode.

Mr. COOK. Senator, earlier this year you charged that the President is tearing us apart on this issue and you added that his civil rights record was one of political expediency which has sacrificed the cause of human rights.

Since then, as you know, the Administration has filed a host of desegregation suits, negotiated a number of voluntary compliances from several districts, altered its tax policies on segregationist academies, and you have called this hopeful but you don't seem to have basically altered your view of the Administration's motives or record. Why is that?

Senator MONDALE. Well, I think that what is really needed is a strong moral leadership role by the President of the United States. This he has refused to supply. Instead of that, it has been a negative, half-hearted appeal to the country to comply with the law.

In addition to this, the Justice Department has been off and on again so many times that the net result is to encourage resistance to the enforcement of the law in the South. And that is why when I say I am encouraged by the commencement of these lawsuits and by the change in the tax exemption issue by the Justice Department that, too, depends upon the administration of the Justice Department, of the Internal Revenue Service, and I wait to see what happens there.

Mr. SCHORR. Senator Mondale, you call it negative and halfhearted. Senator Strom Thurmond seems to think it is going much too far and that, as a result, President Nixon may have difficulty winning the South in the next election.

Do you think you are performing a service for the cause of integration by attacking the Administration from one side while Senator Thurmond is attacking from the other side?

Senator MONDALE. My position is that the only way to achieve integration is to do it responsibly, to bring the school children together in a quality environment in which quality education exists and in which everything possible is done to make it succeed.

The present half-hearted system in many cases is doing great damage and to call it even desegregation is to stress the meaning of the word. I don't know what Mr. Thurmond has in mind, but that is what I have in mind.

Mr. SCHORR. He has in mind 100 lawyers. If those 100 lawyers are going down to help and all these court suits that have been filed and all the things that Jesse has just mentioned. They have done a lot, haven't they?

Senator MONDALE. Well, let's take the case of the so-called 100 lawyers, because I think this is typical of what this nation has seen in this Administration's policies.

First, there was an announcement of the Justice Department that somewhere around 100 Federal officials, lawyers and assistants would seek to monitor outstanding Federal Court Orders and would establish temporary offices to which complaints could be made by concerned citizens in the South.

The next day Strom Thurmond gave his speech attacking it. The following day the Attorney General said this was only a tentative plan, and the following day the President of the United States attacked the proposal of his own Administration and called it a program of vigilante movements into the South. Now, how does anyone follow a course like that and come away with any confidence?

Mr. SCHORR. But, I don't want to argue with you, but did the President attack it or did he merely try to reassure the South that these people would not be behaving like the vigilantes? In any words, change the language but go ahead with the program.

Senator MONDALE. Well, he didn't say he was going ahead with the program. I hope he does, and if he does, I will commend him for it. But at this point it appears to me that he has criticized this tentative minimal proposal of his own Justice Department.

Mr. COOK. Senator, there has been a lot written and said recently in the last couple of weeks in a report to the President from members of his own Administration about the dangerously rising frustrations among blue-collar workers in the \$5,000 to \$10,000 a year category, 70 million Americans among them. This is the group that includes, as you know, whites most resentful of integration efforts. They can't buy their way out either by private schools or privileged neighborhoods.

How do you propose to spur integration as you have proposed on many occasions without pushing them over the brink?

Senator MONDALE. Well, I think that the first essential element is strong Presidential leadership, leadership which in strong terms says that integration is important to the health of this country and important to the education of our children.

I campaign and have campaigned for years with blue-collar workers. I wouldn't be in the United States Senate if it weren't for their support. I think they are a lot more decent and a lot more desirous of a healthy America than some people suppose, and if the President would provide the kind of leadership that this nation needs in this field and say: "Now, look, this country is tearing apart. It is becoming increasingly frustrated. The possibilities for civil disturbances and explosions are growing daily and millions of children are not getting a decent education. Increasingly we are living apart. And the curse of racism is perhaps the most serious social disease in America. And I say as the President of the United States it is time for us to start living together. It is time for us to spend the money that we need to spend for quality education to give these school children a chance, and I am asking all Americans to join me. I think if we heard that kind of talk out of the White House, we would get a much stronger response from the American people.

Mr. COOK. Senator, isn't this talk of the President providing national leadership, has he actually provided less than several previous Democratic Presidents?

Senator MONDALE. Well, first of all, I think in a sense that is irrelevant. But, secondly, I think that one of the high points of President Johnson's Administration was his consistent and strong support in these fields.

Most of the basic legislation that we now have in civil rights fields, including the Voting Rights Act, the Fair Housing Act, work protection clause, the basic Civil Rights Act, came about because of his leadership.

In addition to that, during his period of the Presidency, every Attorney General and every civil rights Assistant Attorney General was strongly committed and was seen as such by those who believed in desegregation. And during this period the Title VI office, which is the HEW office designed to use the Civil Rights Act to enforce compliance, was very active and very effectively active in trying to bring about desegregation.

In these and other ways, I think it was quite clear that that Administration was committed to the objective of desegregation, but let me say I think that is quite irrelevant. What really counts now is that Republicans and Democrats, whites and blacks, and all of us see the absolutely serious situation in which we now find ourselves and take those steps together.

Now, sometimes it misses press attention, but I have often commended this Administration when it has taken steps that I thought were in support of successful desegregation, only then to be disappointed

when they back off the things they have said. And all I am saying to this Administration, and I have said it to them privately, if you will support desegregation and quality integration, I will be the first to stand up and fight along with you to achieve that objective.

Mr. HERMAN. Senator, last night, you released two letters, one to the Attorney General, the other to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and those letters I note were written July 21. That is sometime ago. And in your letter to the Attorney General you say that you talk about the Attorney General's decision, rather the Assistant Attorney General's decision to send the task forces South and you say subsequent to that announcement other Administration officials, including the President, has indicated the announcement was premature, and so forth, and you go on.

Have you heard anything from the Administration since this letter of July 21?

Senator MONDALE. Mr. Thrower, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, has agreed to testify in early August. I have not yet heard from Attorney General Mitchell.

Mr. Cook. Senator Mondale—

Mr. HERMAN. Have you heard anything from Jerris Leonard, the Assistant Attorney General in question? Is he acceptable to you as a witness?

Senator MONDALE. Well, we have already heard from Assistant Attorney General—

Mr. HERMAN. But on this particular question that you raise.

Senator MONDALE. Well, we are hoping to have Attorney General Mitchell personally testify before us. Mr. Leonard, in response to several of our questions, said that he was unable to speak for this Administration in broad public policy, and we wish that Attorney General Mitchell would come before us so we would have a spokesman who could.

I feel that this is terribly important because one thing that is happening is that in this half-hearted program, literally hundreds of thousands of school children are being put into situations which in many cases are more destructive than nothing at all. I think we need a strong program of quality integration in which we agree to work for school environments that support children getting together and learning better than they are today. And I want to hear that from one of these Administration leaders, and hopefully Attorney General Mitchell would come before us so we could find out what the real policy is and perhaps be on stronger ground.

Mr. HERMAN. Well, as you know, the Administration, especially Mr. Mitchell, have repeatedly said, observe not what we say but what we do. Now, they have made this commitment, too, in their words, wipe out the old segregated school system by this fall. What do you think we are going to see by this fall? Will there be something that they can claim is, in fact, a wiping out of segregation?

Senator MONDALE. Well, I think that is a total mystery, which is why I would like to hear from Attorney General Mitchell, and I think further that both what an Administration says and what it does is terribly important. On both levels, it seems to me, there is substantial failure and I think it is just the sheer uncertainty of President policy which is contributing to the disarray and frustration which we see throughout the country.

Mr. SCHORR. Senator Mondale, after your recent quiet one-man trip South you reported that if this massive desegregation goes as it appears now to be going without the full elimination of discrimination, private academies, a lot of evasive tactics you said there will be difficulties, trouble. Can you describe what you expect to happen if things go as they appear now to be going?

Senator MONDALE. Well, first of all, let me

just comment on some of the things that I saw which we had earlier heard about.

One of the biggest things happening in some Southern States today is the development of the private segregation academy movement. This is not just a technical modest movement. This is a major development by which private segregation academies are being created and expanded to permit white children to flee desegregation schools.

Unless the Administration is serious about the enforcement of their tax-exemption policy, I think this movement will be encouraged.

Secondly, many of the so-called desegregated schools are desegregated only in the sense that the front door is one through which all students pass. After that, they never see each other again except at a distance. They go to classrooms, in many cases, in separate classes. They use the hallways at different times. Sometimes the black children are stuffed into the basement or into other abandoned buildings. Many times the black teachers are demoted or fired. I heard a great deal of that.

In addition, many of these segregation academies are being created in part through the transfer of public property as well. Occasionally a public school building is sold at a nominal price. School desks, text books, teaching materials, teaching equipment and the rest are given away or sold at nominal prices. And this is creating tremendous frustration in the South.

Mr. SCHORR. What consequences do you foresee if the schools open this way in September?

Senator MONDALE. Well, I think part of that was disclosed by this panel of young students that we had before our Committee. These are young students in their teens who had had experiences with these half-hearted, so-called desegregation experiences and it was clear that they were deeply frustrated and terribly alienated by the process.

Where that might take them, I don't know. I hope and pray that we won't have violence. We have had examples on the other side at Lamar, South Carolina, and so on, where we have seen violence erupt in opposition to desegregation. There are other examples of growing tension. I think only the strong Presidential leadership that I have talked about and strong leadership of the Justice Department, and that kind of support, will achieve enforcement of the law and bring about the kind of environment which offers hope to the school children.

Mr. SCHORR. But I have heard witnesses before your Committee say, black witnesses say, that if schools open with half-hearted desegregation, they won't take it. It won't work. It will break down again.

Senator MONDALE. Yes.

Mr. SCHORR. I don't understand what that means.

Senator MONDALE. Well, they many times spoke vaguely. Right now it is my impression that most black people still believe in integration. They still want to make it work, even though all of these frustrations are being visited upon them. But I am of the impression that support is beginning to wane as these events occur. Should this frustration continue to develop and these open and acute diversions continue to occur, if the law of the land continues just to be some sort of trick as they see it, I can see where Black America will back off the whole objective of living together in an integrated society, and if that happens, then I think the darkest predictions of the Kerner Commission could well come true.

Mr. Cook. Well, Senator, on that score, you billed your Committee when it began its hearings as one which would seek to develop a national demand for integration. Do you think you have actually made a dent, not just nationally, even Congressionally?

Senator MONDALE. Well, yes. In the adoption of the first section of the President's Emer-

gency Act, three amendments that largely came out of our work and from what we were able to develop in our Committee, including requiring that it be a national program, were adopted. Those are now part of the law.

When the President's full Emergency Act comes up, I am hopeful that much of what we have learned could be used to develop legislation before Senator Pell's Education Subcommittee and, as you know, we are now going to turn to the educational problems of segregated communities in the North, and to try to explore on a national basis—we have had much testimony along that line already, but we hope to have field trips which permit us to explore some of these equally difficult and compelling problems.

Now, one of the reasons that we have begun first with this field trip that I took into the South and some of the testimony that we have had in the South is that the President sent up an emergency bill which he had proposed be limited primarily to the Deep South States, and some of the border States.

I would think it far better if it were expanded to become a national law because this is a national problem. I think anyone who tries to convert it just into a Southern problem does great injustice to the South and delays the kind of national approach that we need.

Mr. HERMAN. Are you confident about American's response to problems and challenges of this kind? One of your interests is the problems of migrant workers. Now, they were first reported in shocking detail in 1901 by an industrial commission. CBS had "A Harvest of Shame" and "Hunger in America." Now we have the NBC White Paper. And still almost nothing at all has been accomplished.

Senator MONDALE. Mr. Herman, I spend most of my time in the Senate on human problem committees. I think I am on more of them perhaps than any other member of the Senate. I have been all over this country, in its ghettos, on its Indian Reservations, migrant camps and pockets of rural poverty, white poverty, with the Eskimos and Aleutians and all over, and I must say that I am stunned and shocked by the capacity of American society to permit human deprivation when those persons lack the power which we have to speak up for themselves. Lack political power to elect persons who understand and will work for the solution of their problems. Lack economic power through any kind of decent share of the wealth or through unions. And lack the social power to be heard and understood. I do not believe that most Americans would tolerate these conditions to exist if they had to live in them themselves.

Mr. SCHORR. With all respect, Senator Mondale, it is one thing to say that the American people wouldn't tolerate them or that they do seem to tolerate them, but you had the appropriate Subcommittee in the Senate, you had another week of hearings exposing these problems. Do you fold up, having gotten all the coverage, or do you introduce some legislation? What happens in Congress?

Senator MONDALE. Well, one of the reasons I spoke as despairingly as I did is during these hearings concerns an amendment which I had led the fight on in the Senate. The amendment would extend unemployment compensation to migrant workers. We adopted the amendment in the Senate but it was knocked out by the Conference Committee and yesterday was lost on the House Floor. For a year now I have been carrying on a campaign to get the Immigration Service to enforce the law at border crossings because the real source of migrant problems is the source of poor, impoverished migrant coming up freely from Mexico.

We have gotten no response from them at all. I have been supporting and have sponsored legislation for increased authorizations for migrant health programs, migrant edu-

ation programs, legal services for migrants, and the rest, only to find that they are not either properly funded or the funds somehow get diverted into other hands.

Mr. SCHORR. So it starts in Congress.

Senator MONDALE. It certainly starts in Congress.

Mr. SCHORR. Starts in Congress with Senators and Representatives—

Senator MONDALE. That is correct.

Mr. SCHORR.—who are more amenable to the pressures of the growers than to impoverished peons.

Mr. COOK. Senator, on that score—

Senator MONDALE. If I might just respond to this, in no sense am I trying to deflect the responsibility which Congress shares. I think we are all responsible. But it is the phenomenon which I think is sometimes ignored, and that is that if you find a powerless people in America, they are usually desperately poor people.

Mr. COOK. On that score, Senator, Liberal Democrats haven't been wildly enthusiastic about the President's Welfare Reform. Wouldn't that be the direct way to help these people, to put \$1600 a year directly into their pockets?

Senator MONDALE. Yes, I am one of those who believes that President Nixon's best proposal has been the family assistance plan. I would like to see it liberalized and improved, some changes made, but I think that the direction indicated by that legislation is terribly important and I have said so on many occasions.

Mr. HERMAN. The key to getting these bills that you want, this help for the poor people, and so forth, out of Congress is the election of people who think like yourself. You have a mid-term election coming up in November. How does it look to you? The Republicans seem pretty happy about their prospects.

Senator MONDALE. I don't know. I think we are going to pick up strength in the House. I think we have a very tough fight on our hands holding the Senate simply because of the 35 Senators up for re-election, twenty-five are Democratic. They control the White House and it permits the President to do a certain amount of campaigning around the country which we are now seeing. And I think we are going to have a tough year.

Mr. HERMAN. Do you find what the President has been doing this week improper?

Senator MONDALE. No, I think we can just label it for what it is. Presidents have been doing it for years. I didn't mean to imply that.

Mr. COOK. Let me push you just two years farther, Senator. There is a group of Liberal Democratic Senators, yourself among them, who might be described as the Lightning Could Strike Club, mentioned as Dark Horse Presidential possibilities. Do you consider yourself a member of that Club?

Senator MONDALE. No, I don't, and I have been impressed by how little I have been included in that list.

Mr. COOK. Impressed or depressed?

Senator MONDALE. Impressed. Let me say that I think one of the things that is terribly important is that Liberals in the Senate and in the House not all run for the Presidency. Some of us ought to stay back there and do the work and I am perfectly glad to be one of those.

Mr. HERMAN. Coming back to 1970, what do you see is the major problem for the Democrats or for the Republicans? Are you going to be helped by the state of the economy? Are you going to be helped by some of these issues like migrant workers and school segregation? Is there a national issue, in other words?

Senator MONDALE. I think the management of the economy is very much in issue. There has been a deliberate policy to slow economic growth. We have very high inflation. We have rising unemployment. We have an old eco-

nomics policy which has produced both extremes and has lost us through depressed economic growth nearly \$30 billion of wealth this year and perhaps \$12 billion to \$14 billion of revenue.

Mr. HERMAN. The President is sure to come out and say, as he has been saying all along, that Congress is doing the heavy spending while he is trying to cut.

Senator MONDALE. In fact, we have cut his budget nearly \$6 billion last year. His complaint when you analyze it is not that we are raising his budget, because in fact we cut his budget last year by that amount, but that we are trying to increase spending in human problem fields of health, of nutrition, of education, and the other fields while he would have us spend billions of dollars in such things as the supersonic transport, Phase 2 of the anti-ballistic missiles, space stations and shuttle programs, and things of that kind.

I think we have helped to reshape this nation's priorities but we have got a long way yet to go.

Mr. SCHORR. Senator, you gave a properly dignified response to the lightning-might-strike question. I want to ask you a somewhat different question because I don't think any man in your position would say I am running for President in 1972.

Senator MONDALE. I will.

Mr. SCHORR. You will? How do you mean that?

Senator MONDALE. I am not running.

Mr. SCHORR. You are not running. Well, let me—that is not the question I want to ask. I accept your announcement.

Since the death of two Kennedys, there are several with us today on Face the Nation, several Senate Liberals, each of whom has taken over a part of fighting causes of the poor. Senator McGovern, there is you, and there are a couple of others.

How do you see this process of acting as the exponent for social causes? What do you see as your future role?

Senator MONDALE. I don't know but I am absolutely convinced that unless these causes are fought and won, that this country is in for very serious difficulties.

In addition to that, I can't live with what I have seen, the poverty, the hunger, the destruction of children, the disgrace of the conditions under which these people live. I just can't live with it. And I feel a duty along with many others in the Congress to do all that I can to try to get this nation to shift its policies so that Americans by the millions who are now denied will have a decent chance for a full life.

Mr. HERMAN. Senator—

Senator MONDALE. We are a long way from that and I feel deeply about it.

Mr. HERMAN. We have about 15 seconds left. In that struggle that you have just outlined, are you going to have as the Junior Senator from Minnesota to help you, Mr. Hubert Humphrey?

Senator MONDALE. Yes, I am sure we will.

Mr. HERMAN. You are sure that he is going to be re-elected?

Mr. MONDALE. Yes, I am, and I am supporting him.

Mr. HERMAN. Okay. On that note, thank you very much for being with us today on Face the Nation.

Senator MONDALE. Thank you.

SENATOR HUGH SCOTT'S RECORD ON CRIME LEGISLATION

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, the Republicans in the Senate have enjoyed outstanding and effective leadership under the tutelage of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT). Senator SCOTT is a man of independent judgment, but at the same time he cou-

ples this with tenacious advocacy of most positions of our Republican administration.

His legislative record is a model which most Senators should study being particularly sound in the crime-fighting area.

Many of us have long been aware of the efforts of our distinguished minority leader, HUGH SCOTT, in the field of anti-crime legislation, but it is now time for all Senators and the public to become familiar with this remarkable record. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that a compilation of Senator SCOTT's legislative record in the fight against crime dating back to the 86th Congress be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR HUGH SCOTT'S RECORD ON CRIME LEGISLATION

America's Number One problem is crime. Senator Hugh Scott knows that although a root cause for crime is social disorder, crime can be controlled through better laws and better law enforcement. Senator Scott has been one of the Nation's leading advocates for more money to fight crime and for the appointment of stricter judges.

Republican Leader Hugh Scott has cited organized crime as a grave threat to the security of the United States. He says that organized crime is responsible for a great deal of corruption in government. This corruption can only be stopped by effective laws designed to eliminate organized crime.

The following summary of Senator Hugh Scott's record on key crime issues illustrates how he has worked to fight crime:

91ST CONGRESS Legislation

S.1509—To provide for appointment of court executive for each judicial circuit to administer activities of court in order to facilitate smooth functioning of court and to ensure the defendants and the public prompt justice in all cases.

S.1510—To require each judge and justice of the United States to file an annual financial report in order to maintain judicial integrity and public confidence in the courts.

S.1516—To establish a Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure with powers to investigate any judge whose good behavior or judicial fitness is in question in order to promote the honorable and efficient administration of justice.

S.2827—To allow college president to seek Federal court order to prevent campus disorders at any institution assisted by Federal funds.

S.3175—To establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice to act as coordinating center for information in field of juvenile delinquency and control and to serve as training center for local, State and Federal officials who are connected with the treatment and control of juvenile offenders.

S.3289—National Court Assistance Act—To establish an Institute for Judicial Studies and Assistance to promote the development and adoption of improvements in the judicial system at all levels, with power to make grants to local and state courts for the purpose of studying and implementing changes to ensure speedy and efficient justice in all cases.

Votes:

Voted to ratify treaty concerning offenses committed on board aircraft.

Voted for the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970.

Voted for the Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Control Act of 1970.

90TH CONGRESS

Legislation:

S. 676—To prohibit obstruction of Federal criminal investigations by any person.

S. 917—Safe Streets and Crime Control Act—Provides for a 5-year program of planning and program grants to States and local government to plan and execute programs to improve their police, courts, and correctional systems.

S. 1033—To establish within the Department of Justice the Office for Judicial Assistance in order to make studies and disseminate information pertaining to improvement in the administration and procedure of local and State courts; authorizes the Office to make grants to courts and organizations to make studies and implement improvements in court systems.

S. 2050—To prohibit electronic surveillance by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers.

S. 3304—To authorize the Bureau of Prisons to assist State and local governments.

Votes:

Voted to expand Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, relating to the recruiting and training of community service officers.

Voted to provide that a voluntary confession be admissible in evidence in any criminal proceeding brought by the United States.

Voted to provide that a confession made while under detention shall not be inadmissible solely because of delay between arrest and arraignment of a person charged with an offense against the United States or the District of Columbia.

Voted to allow Federal courts to reverse State cases involving admissions and confessions admitted as voluntarily given in cases where the highest court of the State had affirmed.

Voted to provide that law enforcement assistance grants be made directly to the States (block grants).

Voted for the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

Voted to provide that an institution of higher education, after notice and hearing to a student or an employee convicted of certain stated crimes or who had refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution, could deny payment to such individual under Federal programs assisted higher education.

89TH CONGRESS

Legislation:

S. 647—To provide that convicted persons will receive credit toward service of their sentences for time spent in custody for lack of bail.

S. 1409—To authorize the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to make grants to public or nonprofit agencies to improve the effectiveness of State and local police forces.

S. 1808—To facilitate rehabilitation of persons convicted of Federal offenses; to permit certain prisoners to work at paid employment or undertake community training courses while continuing as inmates.

S. 2113—To authorize civil commitment in lieu of criminal punishment for certain narcotic addicts.

88TH CONGRESS

Legislation:

S. 864—To provide for right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies.

S. 1057—To provide for representation of financially indigent criminals in U.S. Court cases.

87TH CONGRESS

Legislation:

S. 403—To provide for appointment of additional circuit and district judges.

S. 2984—To establish matching grant program, under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to improve education, training, and recruitment of State and local police forces.

86TH CONGRESS

Legislation:

S. 818—To provide for appointment of three additional district judges for eastern, and two for western Pennsylvania.

Senator Hugh Scott's fight against crime has been cited by our Nation's top law enforcement officials. Pennsylvania's own fight against crime has been greatly aided by Senator Scott's efforts to bring in more money and more assistance under such vital legislation as the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. Senator Scott will continue his work to make our society a safer one in which to live.

UNJUST PUNISHMENT FOR THE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, as of today, 47 air traffic controllers have been dismissed by the Federal Aviation Agency for their part in the alleged sickout of controllers this past spring. This policy of FAA underscores a continuing misconception as to why employee morale is low in air traffic control and also how best to correct this situation. These dismissals are a cruel punishment, and will only serve to reduce the morale and effectiveness of the air traffic controller. To deprive the flying public of the services of these professionals, simply to retaliate against them because of their organizational affiliation is clearly inequitable.

Other Federal employees, including over 220,000 postal employees, participated in an illegal strike against the Government and to date, no recrimination or sanctions have been imposed against any of them. This clearly indicates duplicity in the application of the law and for the controller to comprehend this dual standard is rather difficult. Both the Corson committee report and recent Federal court rulings on issues related to this dispute between FAA and the controllers, clearly state that the FAA should share equal responsibility for the work stoppage in late March. U.S. Federal Judge Hart in Washington stated that the controllers acted only after "extreme provocation" by the FAA. However, it appears thus far that FAA has chosen to ignore its culpability and has passed the entire burden on a relatively few among the leadership of the air traffic controllers. In a Wisconsin case, 2 controllers received virtually identical letters of proposed dismissal from the FAA; however, only one controller, the president of the Milwaukee chapter of Patco, was dismissed. The other controller was not.

Apparently new and more rational attitudes have been adopted by Patco, and it would be logical to assume that every means which the Government command should be utilized to encourage these new postures. The punitive measures that have been applied to the controllers are clearly a further depressant and a source of constant psychological pressure to the controller. A reinstatement of those controllers already ter-

minated, and a cessation of further punitive measures would be in the best interest of the controllers, the FAA and the flying public.

COMPUTER SERVICES

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate have recently expressed interest in the development of data processing and computer techniques with a view to their application to the administrative and legislative functions of the Senate.

Recently, the Subcommittee on Electrical and Mechanical Equipment of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, authorized by contract an in-depth study of computer adaptation to activities in that body.

To keep abreast of developments in this important area of technology and specifically to study and plan for future accommodations in the Senate, I am glad to announce that at the regular meeting of the Committee on Rules and Administration, held on August 5, 1970, the Committee unanimously agreed to the establishment of a subcommittee on computer services.

The new subcommittee will consist of Senator HOWARD W. CANNON and Senator CARL T. CURTIS and myself, as chairman.

It is the subcommittee's intention to employ competent and qualified staff to work with the subcommittee and to maintain appropriate liaison with Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, officials of the Senate, related Congressional offices, the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, the Comptroller General, and the industry itself.

It is the hope of the subcommittee to update Senate procedures wherever feasible so that we do not fall behind the times in the use of available technology.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, only lately have I begun to doubt the truth of Washington Irving's maxim that the idol of today pushes the hero of yesterday out of our recollection; and will, in turn, be supplanted by his successor of tomorrow. Over 1,400 American men are still held as prisoners by the North Vietnamese under conditions that violate the Geneva Convention. These men are—and will continue to be—heroes in anyone's book, by anyone's definition, according to anyone's standards. This, Mr. President, is the truth of the matter.

REMINDER TO SENATE OF PRESIDENTIAL ENDORSEMENT OF GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, on February 19, 1970, President Nixon broke the tragic stalemate on the Genocide Convention by requesting the Senate to move toward speedy ratification of this vital testament for human rights. I think that it is only proper that we be reminded of this initiative by the



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org