

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

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

VOLUME 116—PART 27

OCTOBER 9, 1970, TO OCTOBER 14, 1970  
(PAGES 35917 TO 37262)

Rev. John L. Reinsfelder, Pastor, St. Michael's Church, Frostburg, Maryland.

Rev. Francis Roscetti, O.F.M. Cap., Pastor, St. Anthony's Church, Ridgeley, West Virginia.

Rev. Joseph C. Simmons, Associate Pastor, St. Patrick Church, Cumberland, Maryland.

Rev. John T. Sleeman, Pastor, St. Peter's Church, Westernport, Maryland.

Rev. Richard Smith, Associate Pastor, St. Mary's Church, Cumberland, Maryland.

Rev. John Stankard, M.M., Maryknoll Fathers, Maryknoll, New York.

Rev. DeSales Young, O.F.M. Cap., Pastor, St. Ambrose Church, Cresaptown, Maryland.

#### ASSISTING MINISTERS

Rev. Bruce W. Barth, Pastor, Trinity Lutheran Church, Cumberland, Maryland.

Rev. William J. Cox, Pastor, Holy Cross Episcopal Church, Cumberland, Maryland.

Rev. William W. Crawford, Pastor, St. Mark's United Church of Christ, Cumberland, Maryland.

Rev. Goodwin Douglas, Pastor, Metropolitan A.M.E. Church, Cumberland, Maryland.

Rev. Vernon I. Naugle, Pastor, St. Luke's Lutheran Church, Cumberland, Maryland.

Rabbi Philip Rosenberg, B'er Chayim Temple, Cumberland, Maryland.

Rabbi Meier Samberg, Beth Jacob Synagogue, Cumberland, Maryland.

Rev. A. D. Tice, Pastor, Emmanuel United Methodist Church, Cumberland, Maryland.

#### LECTORS

Brother Lawrence J. Colhocker, F.S.C., Principal, Bishop Walsh High School.

Mr. William Walsh, Nephew of Bishop Walsh, Cumberland, Maryland.

#### COMMENTATOR

Brother James A. Vendetti, F.S.C., Faculty Member, Bishop Walsh High School.

#### CANTOR

Rev. Arthur W. Bastress, Pastor, Immaculate Heart of Mary Church, Baltimore, Maryland.

#### ORGANIST

Rev. James M. Burns, Director of Music, St. Dominic's Church, Baltimore, Maryland.

The Boys' Choir and Men's Choir of Immaculate Heart of Mary Church, Baltimore, Maryland are under the direction of Mr. Norman Sydnor.

### SECOND NATIONAL INDIAN EDUCATION CONFERENCE

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, at the end of August, the Second National Indian Education Conference was held in my home State, Minnesota. Some 800 American Indians and their friends attended the event.

A number of recommendations to the Federal Government for the improvement of American Indian education came out of the conference. In addition, the National Indian Education Association was organized. This group consists of 17 Indian people actively involved with education throughout the United States.

I am proud to report that the President of the organization is Mr. Will Antell, from my State. Mr. Dillon Platero, from the Navajo, was elected first vice president. He serves as the gifted director of the impressive Rough Rock Demonstration School. Mr. John Winchester, a Potawatomi Indian from Michigan, was elected second vice president. Mr. Sparlin Norwood, a Cherokee from Oklahoma, was elected secretary, and Mr. William Demmert, a Tlingit from Alaska, was elected treasurer.

I am happy to see American Indians from all parts of the country coming together to work on educational problems and pleased that Minnesota provided the forum for this great effort.

Also at the Second National Indian Education Conference, a major statement on national priorities was outlined in one of the workshops. This statement highlighted a number of crucial educational issues. I ask unanimous consent that the press release describing these events be printed in the RECORD.

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

August 28, 1970.

The Second National Indian Education Conference met in Minneapolis on August 26, 27, and 28 to assess programs in Indian education and to explore directions on a national scope.

A major workshop was National Priorities. The objective was to delineate a composite of Indian issues that are crucial to Indian people and the entire nation.

The U.S. Senate Special Sub-Committee on Indian Education said, "We have concluded that our national policies for educating American Indians are a failure of major proportions." It was stressed further that Congress, the U.S. Office of Education, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs implement these findings and those priorities as stated in the President's July 8th message to Congress.

Historically the Indian people have not been involved at federal, state or local levels in legislation and administrative decisions affecting their lives. The federal government now supports a policy of Indian self determination.

The following major priorities were listed by the workshop:

1. Scholarships for Indian students must be increased significantly on all levels. An equal emphasis should be placed on academic and vocational education. The appropriation for college scholarships should equal, if not surpass, the current \$38 million appropriation for vocational training.

2. Indians must have a more articulate voice in the education of Indian people on the local, state, and federal levels. The newly formed National Indian Education Association can be a powerful lobbying agent to develop strategy for Indian conceived plans and programs. Further, the Office of Education and other federal agencies concerned with the education of Indian people should establish a permanent committee composed of members of this association to analyze and develop new policies and programs in Indian education. It is imperative that Indian people be on school boards in direct proportion to the number of students enrolled in those schools.

3. The creation of a special developmental fund of \$4 million for demonstration and innovative moves in Indian education for the purpose of creating new educational systems, new methods of administration and specialized staff training operated and controlled by Indian groups, organizations and tribal governments.

4. Educational institutions should be assessed and restructured to make education more meaningful to Indian people. This must be implemented by native American communities. Indians must have a major role in this assessment and restructuring.

5. Indian studies programs and all research relating to Indians should be under the surveillance and control of Indian people.

6. The criteria for granting federal moneys should emphasize local Indian need and control as it affects the education of Indian children. All contracts for federal moneys concerning Indian education programs in urban and non-reservation areas should be with urban Indian organizations, centers and other

local Indian organizations; and on reservations with Indian groups, with Indian organizations and tribal governments.

7. The federal government should set aside adequate construction facilities moneys so that Indian communities may develop local school facilities.

We suggest careful appraisal of these priorities and a personal commitment to their implementation.

### WHO IS AFRAID OF BORIS AVERIANOV?

Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. President, who is afraid of Boris Averianov? Someone is, because on May 27 of this year the State Department announced that it had denied a visa to this Soviet labor leader. The United Auto Workers had asked the State Department to grant Mr. Averianov a visa so that he could attend a symposium sponsored by the United Nations and the United Auto Workers. The Department told the UAW that it would not recommend to the Justice Department that waiver be granted for Mr. Averianov but declined to say why. In a letter to Victor Reuther, Director of the International Affairs Department of the UAW, the Department stated that:

The United States Government has concluded that it is inadvisable at this time to change our long-standing policy on the admission of Soviet labor officials to this country.

Mr. Reuther wrote my office, commenting on the State Department decision and reporting on a conversation with U.N. Secretary General U Thant and U.N. Under Secretaries Ralph Bunche and Philippe de Seynes in which they indicated that the State Department action might be a violation of the convention between the United States and the United Nations. He asked that the Committee on Foreign Relations inquire into the denial of a visa to a delegate to a United Nations Conference solely on the ground that he was a Soviet trade union leader.

I therefore wrote Secretary Rogers on June 5, asking him to furnish me with a detailed explanation of the background and reasons for the decision. Mr. David M. Abshire, Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, replied on June 29. Instead of providing a detailed explanation of the background and reasons for the decision, Mr. Abshire's letter simply stated:

Among other factors, the Department of State must consider the view that Soviet trade unions are not independent organizations but rather are controlled instruments of Soviet policy. As you know, the AFL-CIO attaches the highest importance to this factor and has long and vigorously opposed contacts with Soviet labor officials.

I then wrote Mr. Abshire on July 10 asking him a number of specific questions including what specific criteria were used by the Department of State to determine whether the admission of a Soviet labor leader was consistent with the public interest, how the criteria of the public interest applied to the particular case of Mr. Averianov, why it made any difference whether Soviet trade unions were independent of or subordinate to Soviet policy, and which Soviet and other Communist labor leaders had been admitted to the United States in the last 5 years.