

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 29

NOVEMBER 16, 1973 TO NOVEMBER 29, 1973

(PAGES 37439 TO 38794)

pose them is an invasion of the prerogative of the faculty; yet that is what HEW is directing Virginia to do.

Fourth, there should be "remedial courses and compensatory services for the "culturally deprived and those from 'low socio-economic groups' at all state-supported institutions."

The high school is the proper place for remedial and compensatory work: it is a familiar environment to almost every boy and girl, at least to the age of 16, and it is close to home. Students from the lower classes, who may be intimidated by strange surroundings, have a better chance to develop latent abilities in places where they feel at home.

In any case, the purpose of a college, especially if it goes by the name of liberal arts, is the pursuit and diffusion of knowledge. Students when they arrive should have a command of the basic tools. If they do not, they do not belong in any four-year college, where remedial work is a misuse of space, time, and personnel—not to mention money.

Finally, are colleges supposed to ignore race as a criterion, or not? HEW seems to be saying that it should be ignored when it works to the advantage of minorities, and taken into account when it works against them. Do blacks and other minorities really want to be the objects of such bureaucratic paternalism, or do they wish to make it on their own, without discrimination either for or against?

We hope that Madison and all other Virginia institutions will continue to accept applicants on the basis of their promise, as well as that can be judged, and regardless would make that impossible.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch,
Nov. 15, 1973]

WORTH FIGHTING FOR

With all the legal resources at its command, Virginia should oppose the latest Procrustean college desegregation edict from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This is no call for a return to massive resistance; it is a call for a return to sanity. For HEW's arrogant decree is one of the most insane orders ever to be issued by Washington's bureaucracy, and its implementation could have a tragic impact upon the quality of higher education in this state.

Ignoring the fact that physical, social and academic diversities contribute to the vitality and appeal of colleges and universities, HEW would transform them into institutions of dulling sameness. In a misguided effort to improve the quality of some colleges, HEW would worsen the quality of others. All, as a result, would become simply mediocre.

Today students are free to choose their colleges for a variety of reasons. They choose a college because they like its academic programs. Or its traditions. Or its location and physical characteristics. Or the composition of its student body. Or, perhaps, because Dear Old Dad went there.

And this is as it should be. College students are adults and they should be free to make some major decisions for themselves. Moreover, the pursuit of a college education is a highly individualistic undertaking in which the performance of each student is determined largely by his own attitudes and aspirations. Educators may find the herd approach unavoidable in elementary and secondary schools, but it is counterproductive in colleges.

Yet it is the herd approach that HEW would follow. It would restrict the right of students to choose their own colleges by effectively establishing racial quotas for the student bodies of both predominantly black and predominantly white institutions, Virginia State College and Norfolk State College, both predominantly black, are told that

they should increase their white enrollments until whites constitute "at least one third of the student body" at each. Certain predominantly white institutions—Virginia Military Institute, Madison College and Christopher Newport College among them—are warned that they must increase their percentage of black students.

There is no way, no way in the world, that state officials could guarantee the achievement of HEW's statistical goals without making direct or indirect force a component of college admissions policies. One way or another, some students would have to be required to attend specified colleges. This is precisely the brutish policy that now prevails in our public elementary and high schools. Are the young people of this nation, the greatest democracy on earth, to be given no freedom of choice at any point in their educational careers?

It should be enough to open all state-supported institutions of higher learning to students of all races on equal terms. Virginia has done this and more. Most of its predominantly white colleges and universities make conscientious efforts to attract additional black students. But this is not enough for HEW. It seems to be especially rankled by the fact that Virginia State and Norfolk State remain predominantly black. Yet many black educators, including Virginia State President Wendell P. Russell, are convinced that predominantly black institutions perform a vital educational role. In their opinion, predominantly black colleges can be far more effective than predominantly white institutions in meeting the educational needs of some young Negro men and women. But the protests of distinguished educators like Dr. Russell sail right over the heads of HEW's bureaucrats, who, if they could, would destroy both Virginia State and Norfolk State.

HEW's insanity does not end with its admissions decree. Incredibly, it would inject race as a factor in college grading systems, for under its edict colleges would be expected to develop "a method to insure that the attrition rate of black students in predominantly white institutions would be no greater than that of white students." In other words, colleges are to see to it that white and black students pass, fail and drop out at precisely the same rates. Obviously, this is something that no academically honest college can promise.

HEW's order should not go unchallenged. Gov. Linwood Holton should do all that he can to have it cancelled or modified, not as an act of defiance but as an act of reason. And though they might not be successful, Virginia's congressmen should make an effort to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which HEW cited as authority for its action. At stake is the future of higher education in Virginia, and that, HEW should be made to understand, is worth fighting for.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE JOHN P. SAYLOR

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to the many who have paid well-deserved tribute to Representative John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania. His unexpected death was a shock to all of us who have known him and worked with him over the years.

John Saylor was a man well-known far from the borders of his own home district. His leadership on the House Interior Committee made his name a household word in my home State of Arizona. His deep concern for my State's natural beauty and resources was understood and appreciated by our people.

He was a tough legislative fighter—a

man who was a forceful ally or a tenacious opponent. He spoke his mind and worked diligently for preservation of such national treasures as the Grand Canyon.

John Saylor was an environmentalist before the term became a national catchword.

He also had a most commendable record of working for the benefit of our veterans.

As a member of the Senate Interior Committee and more recently as minority leader of this committee, it was my privilege to work with Representative Saylor in his capacity as minority leader of the House committee. I know that he was a gentleman of high intelligence and utmost integrity.

Our Nation has lost one of its greatest legislators, and I join with those who have extended sympathy to the family.

ARMS CONTROL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article by William Epstein, former Director of the U.N.'s Disarmament Division, which appeared in the New York Times on November 17.

Mr. Epstein argues that the present debate in the U.N. General Assembly on arms control provides an urgently needed opportunity to discuss the curtailment of military budgets—first by the five nuclear powers and the two Germanys and then, eventually, by all countries.

I am sure that my colleagues share Mr. Epstein's concerns over continually escalating military budgets among the major powers. But he recognizes that "it would be better to leave it to the individual countries to decide in what sectors they would carry out the agreed reductions."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Epstein's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Nov. 17, 1973]

THE WORLD COULD BE OUTFITTED WITH PRUNING HOOKS

(By William Epstein)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Once again the General Assembly is debating arms control and the reduction of military expenditures—the biblical injunction of Isaiah to turn spears into pruning hooks—at a moment in modern history when nation has lifted sword against nation. The superpowers in recent days have observed their sophisticated weapons tested in the sands and over the skies of Sinai; blood has flowed on both sides of the Suez Canal. Whether hot war, cold war or détente, the military budgets spiral upward.

The arms race exacts an appalling toll in terms of human welfare in the rich as well as the poor countries. On both the national and the international level the world is afflicted by the threat of the three p's—poverty, population and pollution. To grapple with them, the enormous sums wasted in the futile arms race must be rechanneled to economic and social goals.

The paradox of the escalating arms race, despite more than a dozen arms control agreements, is all the more puzzling because of the recent improvement in the international climate. China and the two Germanys are now members of the United Nations, the

United States and the U.S.S.R. in their SALT agreements have agreed to stabilize the deterrent and give up the race for nuclear superiority.

Soviet-American détente seems to have survived the latest Middle East war, though subjected to severe strain. In the long run it may even have been strengthened by mutual efforts to end the conflict. A new opportunity was provided for the two superpowers to halt or curtail arms deliveries to the Arab and Israeli combatants. But instead of trying to increase security in the area at a lower level, the two powers have used the war as a testing ground for new weapons and are still feeding enormous quantities of arms to each side. The military establishments in both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. will no doubt use the fighting as an excuse for another round of budgetary increases.

The problem of the arms race should be met head on, not by interminable debate about limiting or reducing specific weapons and the number of troops but by cutting military budgets—by the five nuclear powers, the two Germans, eventually by all countries. It would not even be necessary to specify how and where military budgets should be cut; it would be better to leave it to the individual countries to decide in what sectors they would carry out the agreed reductions.

Times have also changed with respect to verification of any agreement for mutual reductions. The great powers now have a much better knowledge of each other's economic systems and technologies and have developed new techniques of economic monitoring; satellite and telecommunications surveillance can alert each side to any significant changes in the other side's activities; and intelligence information provides an additional alert to any evasions.

Foreign Minister Gromyko has proposed in the General Assembly that the five permanent members of the Security Council (the five nuclear powers) reduce their military budgets next year by 10 per cent and that a portion (10 per cent) of the savings be used to help the developing countries. This would leave 90 per cent of the savings for domestic purposes. Since these five countries are responsible for about three-quarters of the total of world military expenditures, the reduction, although a modest 10 per cent to begin with, would amount to about \$15 billion.

The developing and third world countries of course favor the idea, and it is likely that it will be approved in some form or other by the General Assembly. The United States and its allies have been notably cautious in their reactions and China has been hostile to it, calling it a fraud and hypocritical. Nevertheless, on reflection, all powers might find it in their interest to agree on budgetary cuts.

DELAYED FUNDING OF NATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I wish to speak today with regard to what seems to me an apparently endless delay in appropriating funds for our national education programs. Continuing resolutions are becoming more and more the rule rather than the exception.

As we all are well aware, Congress never did pass an education appropriations bill for fiscal 1973, and now, almost halfway through fiscal 1974, we are still authorizing funds under a continuing resolution, Public Law 93-124. Even when Congress does agree on an appropriations bill, its passage frequently has been delayed until October or November—well into the start of the fiscal year being funded. This kind of appropriations

process is obviously irresponsible, resulting, I believe, in grossly inefficient utilization of our tax dollars.

The people who suffer the most by congressional delays are the school district officials, and, ultimately, the children themselves. Even in so-called normal years when Congress passes an appropriations bill at the beginning of the fiscal year, school districts are subject to great strains in their planning for the next school year. Every month of delay in passing an appropriations bill causes more and more turmoil at the district level.

When dealing with education programs, delayed funding can have several major consequences which should be avoided. We all are aware of the fact that agencies like to spend the full amount of their appropriations. When funding is delayed, only minimal planning is possible and frequently programs are started which would have benefited by longer time on the drawing boards. There is no excuse for this kind of irresponsible grantmaking initiated by time pressures to use funds just because they are miraculously available. Furthermore, operating under a continuing resolution frequently results in the continuation of ineffective and outmoded programs—programs which have long existed beyond their usefulness. This is a kind of waste we simply cannot afford.

School officials operate with different calendar schedules than Congress. They do not have the freedom to indulge in political debates without causing serious losses to their programs. Hiring of new teachers and support staff usually takes place during April and May as does contract renewal of current staff. For many districts, hiring new personnel and retaining many currently employed is contingent upon receipt of Federal funds. Not knowing whether, when, or how much Federal money they will receive makes responsible budget planning almost impossible.

The losers in this deplorable situation are the children, the target of the well-intentioned funds. With inadequate resources to begin with—the funds we can allot to education being limited by other crucial demands on the national budget—we cannot afford to waste them on account of political and bureaucratic delays.

I have talked with several school superintendents representing a number of districts. These professional educators and administrators assure me that they would prefer a Federal commitment for a lesser amount of money at the time school budgets are determined rather than the indefinite prospect of possibly more money at a later date. It is impossible to hire teachers with only a promise of Federal funds; unfortunately teachers cannot eat and live on promises.

To emphasize the damage done by delayed Federal funding, which has been a problem for a number of years, I would like to quote from the first report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children on title I of ESEA:

There is no doubt that implementation of Title I was greatly hampered this year by the non-availability of funds until after the

school year began. Most personnel in needed specialties were already under contract, and school administrators were forced to plan projects almost overnight. The pressures of time gave State departments of education little opportunity to revise substantially many quickly conceived programs. We strongly urge the Congress to enact the next Title I appropriations bill as early as possible but not later than early summer 1966, to permit more careful program development and thus assure more effective use of funds.

Obviously, educators have been laboring beneath an unnecessary fiscal burden for years. The facts are the same today as they were in 1966. It is time to stop bickering and get moving on the fiscal 1974 appropriations bill. We must also think about ending this problem of delayed funding. Our goal is to help school districts—not to hinder their progress.

USE OF OUTDOOR RECREATION FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT INDOOR FACILITIES, A SENSIBLE IDEA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, several days ago, the Fargo Forum printed an editorial concerning a bill that was recently introduced by Senator BURDICK.

This proposal would permit money from the land and water conservation fund to be used to enclose outdoor recreation facilities when climatic conditions and increased use would justify the cost.

According to the Forum:

One example shows the wisdom of such an approach. In North Dakota, outdoor swimming pools can be used only sixty to seventy days a year, or at most ninety days, from Memorial Day to Labor Day. Put a roof over the pool, provide heat and the same outdoor pool can be used the year round.

I would like to compliment my colleague from North Dakota for his leadership in developing legislation which would enable people who live in communities that normally experience long winters to enjoy greater opportunities for traditionally outdoor forms of recreation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Forum's editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum, Nov. 8, 1973]

USE OF OUTDOOR RECREATION FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT INDOOR FACILITIES SENSIBLE IDEA

On the face of it, the granting of outdoor recreation funds to construct indoor recreation facilities sounds like an intentional illegal use of federal grants. There is, however, a lot of common sense to this idea as incorporated in a bill proposed by Sen. Quentin Burdick, D.-N.D.

He is sponsoring a measure in Congress that would allow municipalities and park districts, for instance, to use grant money from the Federal Land and Conservation Fund to bring some outdoor recreation facilities inside.

Sen. Burdick explained that the bill would permit the states to use 25 per cent of their annual apportionments from the fund to enclose certain traditionally outdoor recreation facilities where land or climatic conditions provide no feasible alternatives and increased public use justifies the cost.

One example shows the wisdom of such an approach. In North Dakota, outdoor swim-