

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

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

VOLUME 115—PART 22

OCTOBER 9, 1969, TO OCTOBER 20, 1969

(PAGES 29313 TO 30642)

will not in the present instance, take an official position on a public issue like the moratorium, President Feaster said, reaffirming a long-standing policy in West Virginia institutions of higher learning.

James Butcher, student body president who is organizing Fairmont State's participation, has not sought sanction of the movement from the student council and has wisely and reasonably accepted the school's policy declaration. He and a Student Moratorium Committee have arranged for a march from the campus to the courthouse and a speech there by Dr. Wesley Bagby of West Virginia University, a history professor often identified with liberal causes.

Unlike the University's Daily Athenaeum, which has come out editorially in favor of the moratorium and has devoted much space to stunts designed to publicize it, the Columns at Fairmont State takes the position that each student should weigh the facts pro and con and only then make up his own mind about attending or staying away from class on Wednesday.

Patty Vandergrift, editor of the Columns, who is working on The Times while attending school, raises an interesting point in her discussion of the moratorium. "How will the people of Fairmont and especially contributors to school funds such as the Student Loan Fund react to FSC's participation?" she asks.

It would be safe to assume that most of the affluent supporters of the various funds raised to help students at Fairmont State are something less than left-wingers. Some of them already have voiced objections to the participation of certain athletes, whose education is being financed in part from publicly raised scholarship funds, in recent picket demonstrations in downtown Fairmont.

Others who give annually to the Student Loan Fund, where a dollar likely brings a greater return than any other investment in education, may take a dim view of a holiday from school called to protest a war in which this country is morally and legally involved however wrong it now seems.

We believe it is only natural for the younger generation to want a share of the decision-making process. College students are especially zealous to join protest movements of every kind and character. The male portion of the student population has a very real concern, for most of them face induction in the armed services as soon as their student deferments expire.

But we are experiencing some difficulty in deciding just who the students expect to convince with their nation-wide moratorium. Certainly it will not be President Nixon, who made his feeling "crystal clear" at his Sept. 30 press conference in reply to an inquiry on the moratorium.

Anti-war senators and other public figures already are doing just about as much as they can to bring about American disengagement in Vietnam. The student protest may provide them moral support in their endeavors, but its practical effect must be open to serious question.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3016) to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, to authorize advance funding of such programs, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Colorado proposes an amendment, as follows:

On page 4, line 10, strike "\$14,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,000,000".

On page 4, line 14, strike "\$240,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$120,000,000".

On page 4, line 18, strike "\$32,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$16,000,000".

On page 4, line 22, strike "\$80,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$40,000,000".

On page 5, line 2, strike "\$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$75,000,000".

On page 5, line 7, strike "\$3,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,600,000".

On page 5, line 11, strike "\$15,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,500,000".

On page 5, line 16, strike "\$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. DOMINICK. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator's request? The Chair hears none, and the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I do not know whether I am going to need the yeas and nays on this but, in effect, what this does is to take the second year add-ons and reduce them by 50 percent. This would save \$292 million in terms of authorization as opposed to \$584 million which was put on by the committee. There is \$2.048 billion authorized for fiscal 1970. There is \$2.148 billion authorized for fiscal 1971. These add-ons would add 584.2 million on top of \$2.148 billion for fiscal year 1971. It would be, in effect, a net increase of \$684 million in 1971.

It seems to me that we are completely out of the ball park on this type of figure. What I am suggesting is that we take the \$292.1 million, which is one-half the sum total proposed for "add-ons," and leave that in for 1971. This would mean an increase of approximately 10 percent over what the authorization will be in the main part of the bill for that same year.

Mr. President, I am ready to take it to a vote with that kind of explanation. I will be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I think it was unfortunate that the Senate accepted the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to remove from the bill all of the add-ons that the committee approved. I point out that roughly half the Republicans supported the add-ons we put on in the committee, and that the Democrats were unanimous. I further point out that on the Headstart program alone, as the OEO now converts to a year-round program—as I think every one agrees it should—and makes full conversion under the administration's budget, 179,000 children who are now covered in the Headstart program will go out of the program.

The Headstart program now is taking care of only 10 percent of the children in this country who need the benefits of the Headstart program. So what we would be doing would be to reduce the number of children who would be covered by the Headstart program. I am informed that the conversion of Headstart

to a year round program, without the new funds the committee has proposed, means that in Alabama approximately 4,700 children now under Headstart would be dropped from the program.

In Arkansas, an estimated 4,300 kids who need the benefits of the Headstart program would go off the program.

In California, 4,700 would go off.

In Florida, 3,400 would go off.

In Georgia, 5,700 would go off.

In Illinois, 9,300 children who are in the Headstart program now, a program in which we are trying to take disadvantaged children and give them an opportunity in life, will be taken off the program.

In Kentucky, 6,100 children would go off the program.

In Louisiana, 5,000 would go off.

In Michigan, 5,900.

In Minnesota, 2,700 would go off.

In Missouri, 3,600 kids would go off.

In New York, 10,600 children would go off.

Mr. President, is that what the U.S. Senate stands for?

Does it stand for taking kids off the Headstart program just to save a handful of dollars?

If that is what it stands for, I do not want any part of it.

Mr. President, let us look at the emergency food and medical services program. There are 400 community action programs in this country which have an emergency food and medical services program—almost every single one of them rural.

There are 600 urban programs—600 CAP programs—which have no emergency food and medical service programs at all.

The \$150 million would give them that program.

Does the U.S. Senate stand for not feeding kids who are hungry in the cities?

If that is what it stands for, then stand on the rollcall.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I ask the distinguished Senator, is it not a fact that the budget of President Nixon has asked for more money for OEO this year than Congress appropriated last year? I invite the attention of the Senate to the table on page 46 of the report, showing that fiscal year 1969 program expenditures were \$1,948,000,000.

In April, the administration revised those figures and asked for \$2,048,000,000.

The President has, therefore, asked for more money than was asked for last year. Is that not a fact?

Mr. NELSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I may interject there, is that not the amount in the bill?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct.

Mr. NELSON. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. He so states. Therefore, I do not understand the question of the Senator from Texas, indicating that he thought we had cut that amount.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to make one more point. There is \$50 million in the committee bill for fiscal 1971 for day care projects. This amendment

would cut that in half, to \$25 million. We authorized day care projects—title V-B—in 1967. We have people all over the country saying, "Why do not people work and earn a living?"

There are women all over the country who have dependents. They are asking to work. They are dying to work. They want to make a contribution. They do not want to sit home all day long, but they have little children to take care of. Yet we have not funded that program since it was enacted in 1967.

We passed a bill a few weeks ago in which we authorized employers and employees to join in making contributions to opening day-care centers at their plants. Under the committee bill, we could use this money to match the cost, so that mothers who want to get off welfare, who want to go out to the plant and make a contribution—or wherever they may want to go to work and earn a living—will find a place to leave their children. But here we are, being asked to cut the program by \$25 million.

All right, cut it \$25 million, but let us not run around the country saying, "Let us get people off welfare. Let us have people work. Let us have people work and earn their living," but at the same time make it impossible for them to do so.

If that is what the Senate stands for, let us have a rollcall vote. Let Senators live with their consciences. I will live with mine.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, one of the things that I have commended the President for is his frequent public support of programs to help children in the first 5 years of life. He has pointed out—and correctly, I think—that the institutions of this country, by and large, ignore children suffering from cultural and emotional deprivation until at least the age of 6, and for most of them it is then too late. They are already at the point where only a unique, costly, and personal effort can save them.

Thus, we have the anomaly in this country where, in a rich and powerful nation, millions and millions of children never have a chance. I have applauded the President for his statement. I have applauded him for saying we must redeem the promise of America for children in the years before they enter school, the years of dynamic growth and development.

Do we in the Senate say that the words of the President are hollow rhetoric? Are we going backward or forward? Is the Senate to believe the President and fight for a program which gives children, in the first 5 years of life, some chance for nutrition, some chance for reading and education, some chance for emotional and other kinds of strength which children must have, to avoid being destroyed?

The pending amendment would not only fail to add new positions, but would also strike approximately 180,000 children from the Headstart programs of this country. This reduction would occur even though now only 10 percent of the disadvantage children under age 6 are receiving any benefits under the Headstart program.

It seems to me to respond in that way is to regard the President's words as mere rhetoric, to take away those opportunities for many children in their first 5 years of life, to go backward rather than forward. That certainly makes a mockery of the President's words, and it denies to thousands and thousands of American children any hope for a meaningful opportunity in life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table which estimates the approximate number of children that may be stricken from the Headstart program, together with the committee proposal, be printed in the RECORD.

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

NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED BY HEADSTART, BY STATE, BY TYPE OF PROGRAM IN FISCAL YEAR 1969, AND ESTIMATED NET LOSS OF HEADSTART OPPORTUNITIES UNDER THE ADMINISTRATION BUDGET, BY STATE

State	Summer program	Full-year program	Estimated decrease under administration proposal for fiscal year 1970
Alabama.....	14,290	5,676	4,700
Alaska.....	375	1,141	125
Arizona.....	4,315	1,062	1,150
Arkansas.....	13,014	3,045	4,300
California.....	14,194	16,623	4,700
Colorado.....	3,383	3,747	1,100
Connecticut.....	3,255	2,130	1,100
Delaware.....	1,191	643	400
District of Columbia.....	3,515	2,405	1,200
Florida.....	10,364	6,724	3,400
Georgia.....	17,047	3,135	5,700
Hawaii.....	1,630	960	550
Idaho.....	1,145	1,130	350
Illinois.....	28,007	9,218	9,300
Indiana.....	6,485	4,198	2,150
Iowa.....	4,325	1,917	1,450
Kansas.....	2,338	1,989	770
Kentucky.....	18,348	3,689	6,100
Louisiana.....	15,076	4,893	5,000
Maine.....	3,573	647	1,200
Maryland.....	5,478	1,853	1,800
Massachusetts.....	5,046	4,467	1,700
Michigan.....	17,604	3,464	5,900
Minnesota.....	7,999	1,738	2,700
Mississippi.....	3,325	29,253	100
Missouri.....	10,911	6,293	3,600
Montana.....	360	976	100
Nebraska.....	1,475	1,568	500
Nevada.....	675	140	225
New Hampshire.....	2,567	229	850
New Jersey.....	10,924	4,731	3,600
New Mexico.....	3,744	1,685	1,200
New York.....	31,855	10,458	10,600
North Carolina.....	24,428	3,870	8,100
North Dakota.....	1,441	60	500
Ohio.....	20,834	7,691	7,000
Oregon.....	1,690	810	580
Oklahoma.....	8,653	4,737	2,900
Pennsylvania.....	12,510	10,186	4,200
Rhode Island.....	1,003	725	350
South Carolina.....	16,855	3,223	5,600
South Dakota.....	1,407	477	450
Tennessee.....	20,578	4,889	7,000
Texas.....	30,744	13,360	10,000
Utah.....	728	1,011	250
Vermont.....	1,443	500	500
Virginia.....	9,760	1,916	3,300
Washington.....	2,632	2,659	900
West Virginia.....	8,983	2,430	3,000
Wisconsin.....	4,132	2,444	1,400
Wyoming.....	1,539	495	500
Puerto Rico.....	6,715	6,013	2,200
Virgin Islands.....	500	.....	200
Guam.....	.....	250	.....
Trust territories.....	2,690	280	850
Indian grants.....	2,011	6,991	700
Migrant.....	760	.....	250
Total.....	446,899	216,714	.....

COMMITTEE BILL PREVENTS HEADSTART CUTBACKS

The Committee bill seeks to prevent an impending cutback of 180,000 Head Start opportunities by increasing authorization by \$120 million in FY 1970 and \$240 million in FY 1971.

Background

There are 6,000,000 disadvantaged American children under age six. Last year only 668,000 of them were able to participate in Head Start and receive the nutritional, educational and health services they need. A cutback in this program—which currently serves only about 10% of the preschool children in need—cannot be justified.

Impending cutback

Administration proposals call for substituting full-year Head Start programs for many of the summer Head Start programs currently being funded. This substitution, which the Committee supports, is based on OEO's conclusion that "evaluative evidence gathered so far suggests that full-year programs are more effective than summer in fostering sustained developmental gains."

But because full year programs cost about \$800 more per child than summer programs, if this substitution occurs without increasing the Head Start budget, there will be 180,000 fewer Head Start opportunities this year than there were last year.

NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED BY HEADSTART IN FISCAL YEAR 1969, AND UNDER ADMINISTRATION BUDGET FOR 1970

	Fiscal year 1969	Estimate, fiscal year 1970	Increase or decrease under administration budget
Full year.....	214,000	249,800	+35,800
Summer.....	450,000	225,000	-225,000
Experimental.....	0	9,700	+9,700
Parent and child centers (families).....	3,600	3,600	0
Total.....	667,600	488,100	-179,500

Committee proposal

The authorization increases in the Committee bill would permit the shift from summer programs to full year programs to occur without requiring a cutback in the number of children served.

Based on estimates that 300,000 of the current 450,000 summer Headstart slots could be converted to full-year programs in the next two years, at a net Federal cost of about \$800 per slot, this conversion would ultimately cost approximately \$240 million. The Committee authorizations are intended to permit sufficient funding to cover the initial costs of conversion in FY 1970, and the full cost of converting 300,000 slots in FY 1971.

The Committee believes it would be unwise and unfair to force a 27% reduction in the number of children served by Headstart by denying these needed authorization increases.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I do not want the RECORD to stand as though the Senate of the United States is acting like some kind of heartless fascist stepping on the heads of poor children. I think both the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Minnesota know better than that.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, did I suggest anywhere here that Senators are a bunch of fascists stepping on the heads of children?

Mr. DOMINICK. I would say the Senators left the general impression that what we were doing was cutting off funds for poor children all over the place.

Mr. NELSON. Does that make somebody a fascist stepping on children's heads?

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator from Wisconsin did not use those words; I did.

Mr. NELSON. I will say the Senator did, and he had better learn what the words mean.

Mr. DOMINICK. The \$2.048 billion we have for fiscal 1970 was increased in committee by \$100 million for fiscal 1971. We have \$2.148 billion, an amount that is not even being touched by this amendment; in addition to which, if my amendment is adopted, we will be adding another \$292 million to the \$2.148 billion.

So we are adding to the money authorized for expenditures for fiscal 1971, \$392 million over what it will be for this year, fiscal 1970.

Anybody who says that we are not supplying children and other facilities with needed funds and authorizations for funds just really is not looking at this amendment the way he ought to. A strong emotional appeal has been made against this amendment but it ignores practical realities. We cannot spend that much money.

We are talking about adding \$7 million for special impact programs; \$120 million for Headstart; \$16 million for legal services; \$40 million for comprehensive health services; \$75 million for emergency food and medical services; \$1,600,000 for senior opportunities; \$7.5 million for migrants; \$25 million for day-care centers; in addition to the \$100 million which the administration can use anyway it wants to in fiscal 1971.

So I do not take very kindly to the idea that we are depriving children of one thing after another.

What is the effect of the amendment? It has the net effect of saying we are going to add on to the authorization for fiscal 1971 a total of \$392 million.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to speak to the Senate with the greatest feeling of confidence in my colleagues, because this is a very human and deep thing that we are discussing now. Some of you may have been surprised that I voted with Senator DOMINICK on the last amendment. It is not of character for me, as the Senate knows; but I am handling the bill, on this side, for the administration, and having put the bill in under certain concepts, which I will explain to the Senate, I felt it was my duty, if I were to be trustworthy, to be faithful to those principles.

I know the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) is smiling at me. He has been in this position many times before, himself.

The position of the administration was, and is, that \$2.048 billion, which is the authorized amount, and which Senator DOMINICK's amendment did not challenge, represents its allocation of national priorities for the purpose of a poverty bill.

I am satisfied that within the administrative framework they have erected, in which the OEO is now a staff agency, essentially, rather than a line agency—and that most of the programs, as they mature and develop, are going to be turned over, as they have been in the case of the Job Corps and Headstart, to line agencies of the Federal Govern-

ment—the \$2.048 billion is about the right figure that they can handle and spend intelligently.

The add-ons, coming as they would, with only about 6 or 7 months left to put additional amounts into programs made me question whether they could be put to meaningful use.

That is coupled with the fact that we have big problems in education, which can use more money, which helps roughly the same people, the poor. We have massive problems with hunger and malnutrition, for which the Senate has voted a much bigger amount than the House may be willing to support. Appropriations may be competing, as it were, with poverty appropriations.

For all those reasons, I thought the network of money which would be available to the poor would be improved and benefited by the fact that I tried to encourage the administration rather than discourage it in respect to the plan which it has with regard to the OEO.

I do not believe, however, that these considerations apply to the amendment which the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) has now proposed to the bill; and I shall vote against it. There it is possible, and entirely practicable, to gear the OEO to higher standards in terms of its ability to utilize the amounts of money involved in the second year. I deeply believe the amounts are justified by the needs to be met.

I think the arguments which our colleagues have made, with respect especially to resources which go to children, are important, and can be deployed and well used as this type of administration—as I say, the OEO is now a different kind of agency—settles down and gets going.

The orders of magnitude are large. The Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) is absolutely right when he says \$300 million is a lot of money; but we have also enormous needs to fill, in critical areas such as Headstart and day-care centers. Day-care centers tie into the whole welfare plan which the administration itself has authored.

In addition, it is very significant, it seems to me, that notwithstanding my sponsorship of the administration's bill, I feel perfectly free to be against this amendment, because I think that, as to the year 1971, the plans of the administration—though I am not speaking for them in my opposition to this amendment—can accommodate intelligently, feasibly, and usefully the sums which have been added on here.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that at least for the authorization phase—after all, as the entire Senate knows, this matter still has to run the gauntlet of appropriations in due course—we ought not to cut off these opportunities which are available in the war against poverty at this particular point, in respect to fiscal year 1971; and I believe that that is a consistent position, in view of the approach which the administration has now taken with respect to OEO. I see nothing inconsistent, and I shall vote accordingly. I voted for the Dominick amendment insofar as it related to 1970, where I think there is a real question of practicability during changeover.

On the other hand, by fiscal 1971 the changeover will have been made and I am satisfied that the resources which we would authorize may be very effectively, feasibly, and practically used.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask that the Chair direct attachés to take seats or leave the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The attachés will please be seated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I said when I began that I was speaking in a most intimate way to the Senate, and I feel that way. I know it is very public, and there is nothing secret here, but in the sense of personal feeling and personal warmth on the subject, I did wish to communicate this point of view to the Senate.

To give just one example that happens to be, in my judgment, one of the most relevant, in March of 1967 there were 4½ million working mothers with children under 6 years of age. There are today only 531,000 spaces in licensed day-care centers and family homes which are equivalent to day-care centers—roughly speaking, as Senators can see, but between 10 and 12 percent of the need is actually being served.

Those of us who have had experience in government know that it takes time to get organized for a job; that when you change over an agency such as the OEO, there is a time lag in adjusting it to its new responsibilities. But I believe 1970 gives adequate time for that process to take place, and that in 1971 we ought to begin to endeavor to more nearly accomplish many of these things which need to be done. That is the purpose of the add-ons and that is why I feel constrained to vote "no" on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I shall be very brief.

If adopted, this amendment, will combine the additional \$100 million with the \$292 million that will be there. We will be providing about 15 percent additional funds for 1971 over those authorized for 1970. It strikes me that this is a pretty substantial improvement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), and the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present

and voting, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL) would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), and the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. SMITH) is necessarily absent because of death in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 124 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Allen	Ervin	Long
Allott	Fannin	McClellan
Baker	Goldwater	Miller
Bellmon	Griffin	Mundt
Bennett	Gurney	Pearson
Boggs	Hansen	Spong
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Talmadge
Byrd, W. Va.	Hollings	Thurmond
Cotton	Hruska	Tower
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Jordan, Idaho	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—47

Aiken	Hatfield	Pell
Anderson	Inouye	Prouty
Bayh	Jackson	Proxmire
Bible	Javits	Randolph
Burdick	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Cannon	Magnuson	Saxbe
Church	Mathias	Schweiker
Cooper	McGovern	Scott
Cranston	McIntyre	Smith, Maine
Eagleton	Metcalf	Sparkman
Ellender	Mondale	Symington
Fong	Montoya	Tydings
Gore	Moss	Williams, N.J.
Gravel	Nelson	Yarborough
Hart	Packwood	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Pastore	

NOT VOTING—20

Brooke	Goodell	Muskie
Case	Harris	Percy
Cook	Hughes	Russell
Dodd	Mansfield	Smith, Ill.
Dole	McCarthy	Stennis
Eastland	McGee	Stevens
Fulbright	Murphy	

So Mr. DOMINICK's amendments were rejected.

PROGRAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the distinguished acting majority leader whether he knows of any other amendments and also what will be the next order of business.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I understand, the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) has an amendment. I do not know at this time whether there will be a rollcall vote on that amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. There will not be.

Mr. KENNEDY. The leadership does not know whether any Senator is going to request a rollcall vote on final passage.

Mr. NELSON. We will ask for a rollcall vote on final passage.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is my understanding that at this point in time the Senator from Vermont has an amendment and

that there will not be a rollcall vote on the amendment. There will be a rollcall vote on final passage.

Mr. JAVITS. There may be one other amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. There may be one other amendment.

Then following final passage tonight, we will lay before the Senate the Eisenhower dollar minting measure, which will then be the pending business. That bill will be brought up for debate tomorrow. The Senate will convene at 12 noon tomorrow. After the disposition of that measure, the Senate will proceed to consideration of the two measures on the calendar dealing with potatoes, orders Nos. 412 and 414.

Mr. SCOTT. I understand that no votes are expected on the Eisenhower dollar matter tonight.

Mr. KENNEDY. There will be no votes on the Eisenhower dollar matter this evening.

Mr. DOMINICK. There will be a vote tomorrow.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will there be a vote on the amendment that the distinguished Senator from New York mentioned?

Mr. JAVITS. We really do not know. We hope not, but we do not know.

Mr. KENNEDY. So there definitely will be a rollcall vote on final passage of the pending bill. There is the possibility of a vote before, and then we will lay before the Senate the Eisenhower dollar matter.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1857.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1857) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation pursuant to Public Law 81-507, as amended, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, to enable it to carry out its powers and duties under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and under title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$474,305,000.

Sec. 2. Appropriations made pursuant to authority provided in section 1 shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure, for such period or periods as may be specified in Acts making such appropriations.

Sec. 3. Appropriations made pursuant to this Act may be used, but not to exceed \$2,500, for official reception and representation expenses upon the approval or authority of the Director, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

Sec. 4. In addition to such sums as are authorized by section 1 hereof, not to exceed \$3,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside the United States to be paid for in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be ex-

cess to the normal requirements of the United States.

Sec. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorization of any appropriation to the National Science Foundation shall expire (unless an earlier expiration is specifically provided) at the close of the first fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the authorization was enacted, to the extent that such appropriation has not theretofore actually been made.

Sec. 6. Notwithstanding any provision of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, or any other provision of law, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall keep the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate fully and currently informed with respect to all of the activities of the National Science Foundation.

Sec. 7. If any institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending or employed by such institution—

(a) that such individual has, after the date of the enactment of this act, willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to the disruption of the administration of such institution; or

(b) that such individual has been convicted in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or convicted of any group activity resulting in material damage to property, or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned;

then the institution shall deny any further payments to or for the benefit of such individual which (but for this section) would be due or payable to such individual and no part of any funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be available for the payment of any amount (as salary, as a loan or grant, or otherwise) to such individual.

Sec. 8. This Act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Authorization Act, 1970."

And amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House on S. 1857 and ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PELL, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. DOMINICK, and Mr. SCHWEIKER conferees on the part of the Senate.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3016) to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, to authorize advance funding of such programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send an