

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 25

NOVEMBER 6, 1969, TO NOVEMBER 17, 1969
(PAGES 33255 TO 34516)

While the progress being made by title III programs in Illinois and across the United States is encouraging, there is still much more to be done. Less than 2 percent of the elderly in the State and in the Nation are being served by these activities. And they will not be served unless the programs multiply and receive adequate funding.

I am today submitting an amendment to the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill that will increase the funds for title III. This legislation will provide for the appropriation of \$20 million, the full authorization, for that title, rather than the \$9 million recommended in the revised budget.

The additional funds provided by this amendment will make a significant impact in every State. For Illinois, they will make the difference between a \$700,000 grant—a slight increase from the \$613,000 approved last year—or a \$318,087 grant for title III programs representing almost a 50-percent decrease from the previous year. They will thus contribute to the expansion rather than the reduction of many worthwhile projects. There is no earthly reason why in a rich America of the 1970's we cannot provide better for poor senior citizens in great need of help.

Mr. President, I believe that every State, and the elderly of every State, will derive great benefit from an increased level of funding for title III of the Older Americans Act. I urge, therefore, that this amendment be adopted when it is considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 278) was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 AND RELATED ACTS—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 279 THROUGH 286
INCREASED AUTHORIZATIONS FOR VITAL
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, today I am submitting for the RECORD a series of amendments to S. 2218, which I proposed during the executive sessions held this week by the Education Subcommittee on bills to extend and improve the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The amendments I am submitting today complement an amendment I offered last week to establish a National Advisory Commission on School Finance.

COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FINANCE

That amendment, which will be considered in the executive session of the full Labor and Public Welfare committee, would amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by establishing a National Advisory Commission on School Finance to study and make recommendations regarding the severe financial crises faced by school districts throughout the Nation. It would focus attention on the tremendous educational burdens faced by rapidly growing communities, on the serious inequities within

and among States of this Nation with respect to the quality of education offered in elementary and secondary schools, and on the appropriate structure for local-State-Federal partnerships in financing education.

This Commission would pay particular attention to the problems of school construction assistance—problems that are perhaps best illustrated by fast growing suburban and isolated rural school districts in my own State of Minnesota. The suburban school district of Anoka-Hennepin, for example, faces annual enrollment increases of almost 10 percent. It is dependent upon a relatively limited tax base. The average age in this community is 14. Its public school enrollment has tripled in the past 10 years. As a result, the residents of this district have found their taxes increasing by as much as 30 percent in a single year.

On the other hand, the Aitkin school district, located in a rural area, faces financial problems typical of many communities. With much of its land either unproductive or owned by the State and, therefore tax forfeited, the district has been forced to increase the school taxes at a rate approaching 40 percent in a single year.

The tremendous financial burden placed on educational agencies trying to provide quality education in situations such as these requires serious consideration by talented individuals representing all aspects of the educational process. The amendment I offered last week would establish a qualified Commission to do this task, and I am hopeful that it will be adopted by the committee.

AUTHORIZATION INCREASES

The amendments I am submitting today were adopted yesterday by the Education Subcommittee. If they are retained by the full committee, the Senate, and the Senate-House conference, they will make increased funds available to elementary and secondary schools throughout the Nation. They recognize the need to maintain and increase the Federal Government's commitment to quality education. They are designed to insure that inflation and increased enrollments do not dilute that commitment.

These amendments will provide that the authorizations for elementary and secondary educational programs, and several of the vocational education programs being considered in this bill, are increased annually to the levels consistent with, and in some cases superior to, our existing commitments. They are based on an understanding that education must rank as a high priority item on the post-Vietnam national agenda. They are grounded in the belief that as our Nation struggles to reorder its priorities, the education of our children must receive greater attention and support. Finally, they were offered with the feeling that as the Congress is now beginning to appropriate for education at a level approaching full funding, it would be a tragic mistake to cripple future funding of education programs by leaving existing authorization levels as inflexible ceilings.

The remainder of my statement will be

devoted to a discussion of the specific authorization amendments I have offered.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these amendments be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

(See exhibit 1.)

PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was designed to make our educational programs more responsive to the special needs of children from poor families. It is estimated that 9 million disadvantaged children benefit from this program each year. Since its inception, over \$4 billion has been appropriated under title I.

While a recent report issued by the Washington research project and the NAACP legal defense and educational fund has criticized certain aspects of the administration of this program—pointing out many severe administrative difficulties which must be corrected, and which other provisions in the bill reported by the Education Subcommittee are designed to correct—few people have contested the validity of the purpose and goal of title I. The unmet needs which disadvantaged children face throughout our educational process are overwhelming. The purpose of this program is eminently sound. In my judgment, the authorization and appropriations for the title I program must be increased substantially.

The amendment to title I which I introduced yesterday seeks to improve and strengthen the programs for disadvantaged students in two very important respects. First, it increases the authorization for title I from an anticipated \$3.6 billion in fiscal year 1971 to an estimated \$4.7 billion in that year. It accomplishes this increase by changing the title I formula so that the authorization is based on the number of children from families with incomes under \$4,000, rather than on the number of children from families with incomes under \$3,000, as existing legislation provides.

This increase is necessary to improve and strengthen our ability to provide educational assistance to disadvantaged children. As Mrs. Charles Hymes, former member and vice chairman of the Minneapolis Board of Education, stated in her testimony this year before the Education Subcommittee:

Even if all the funds authorized and appropriated were available, it (the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) would not meet the needs of education today.

This comment is particularly relevant to programs for the disadvantaged. Present authorizations do not provide funds for millions of poor children. Government statistics, for example, indicate that the poverty line for a family of four is now above \$3,500 a year, and that larger families with incomes as high as \$4,000 are living in poverty. If title I is expected to provide assistance to disadvantaged children, I believe it is essen-

tial that this bill extending the program for another 4 years include an amendment raising the family income eligibility criteria for title I from \$3,000 to \$4,000. A change in the formula along the lines of my amendment will increase authorizations for title I assistance for the State of Minnesota in fiscal year 1971 from an estimated \$61 million to an estimated \$84 million.

This amendment will also strengthen existing assurances that, if the program is not fully funded, money would be allocated first to help the most deprived children. Presently, the legislation requires that money be first allocated on the basis of the number of children from families with incomes under \$2,000. However, if sufficient funds are appropriated to reach more than these children, then the entire allocation is based on the number of children from families with

incomes under \$3,000. In other words, a drastic change in allocations among districts and among States will occur as soon as there is \$1 more appropriated than is necessary to meet the requirements under this title for children from families under \$2,000.

My amendment will prevent such a drastic and sudden shift from occurring. It will provide that, no matter how much money is appropriated, it will be allocated first on the basis of the number of children from families with incomes under \$2,000, with any excess then allocated on the basis of children from families with incomes between \$2,000 and \$3,000. Similarly, if sufficient funds were available to meet the needs of all children from families with incomes under \$2,000, and all children from families with incomes under \$3,000, then any excess would be allocated on the basis of the

number of children from families with incomes between \$3,000 and \$4,000.

This portion of the amendment will maintain the program's focus on the most severely disadvantaged children. It will assure that children from school districts currently receiving assistance will not suffer large reductions under their title I assistance as a result of increased appropriations. It will help prevent the diversion of funds from the most desperately needy children.

The Office of Education has provided a table estimating the authorizations by State for fiscal year 1971 under both current formula and the formula proposed in my amendment.

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

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

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1969—ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATIONS, PUBLIC LAW 89-10, TITLE I: FISCAL YEAR 1971

	Existing law (\$3,000 income level, 50 percent Federal percentage)	Mondale amend- ment (\$4,000 income level, 50 percent Federal percentage)	Increase under Mondale amend- ment		Existing law (\$3,000 income level, 50 percent Federal percentage)	Mondale amend- ment (\$4,000 income level, 50 percent Federal percentage)	Increase under Mondale amend- ment
United States and outlying areas.....	\$3,620,543,719	\$4,683,646,105	\$1,063,102,386	Missouri.....	\$74,131,049	\$105,678,065	\$31,547,016
50 States and District of Columbia.....	3,520,946,751	4,554,880,590	1,033,933,839	Montana.....	10,240,185	15,587,035	5,346,850
Alabama.....	120,723,655	157,096,133	36,372,478	Nebaska.....	23,558,449	36,491,559	12,933,110
Alaska.....	5,182,890	6,032,035	849,145	Nevada.....	2,624,520	3,962,941	1,338,421
Arizona.....	24,269,187	34,784,292	10,515,105	New Hampshire.....	5,464,977	9,198,396	3,733,419
Arkansas.....	75,242,236	96,103,476	20,861,240	New Jersey.....	79,463,171	91,548,667	12,085,496
California.....	213,753,553	239,405,738	25,652,186	New Mexico.....	22,700,392	32,234,959	9,534,567
Colorado.....	24,837,369	35,995,846	11,158,477	New York.....	419,413,566	427,160,414	7,746,848
Connecticut.....	27,798,211	31,324,874	3,526,663	North Carolina.....	170,961,808	226,665,737	55,703,928
Delaware.....	6,239,166	9,085,856	2,846,690	North Dakota.....	15,286,471	22,739,519	7,453,048
Florida.....	96,722,568	143,622,060	46,899,492	Ohio.....	104,269,518	146,685,478	42,415,960
Georgia.....	130,982,907	173,295,437	42,312,530	Oklahoma.....	51,687,869	71,717,807	20,029,938
Hawaii.....	6,392,303	11,888,271	5,495,968	Oregon.....	21,192,115	29,564,662	8,372,547
Idaho.....	9,641,030	15,317,091	5,676,061	Pennsylvania.....	155,219,094	209,045,430	53,826,336
Illinois.....	132,369,410	160,737,108	28,367,698	Rhode Island.....	10,922,991	15,611,404	4,688,413
Indiana.....	51,159,494	81,235,363	30,075,869	South Carolina.....	102,718,077	130,913,501	28,195,424
Iowa.....	46,483,052	67,346,210	20,863,158	South Dakota.....	17,987,886	24,948,623	6,960,737
Kansas.....	30,456,244	43,957,875	13,501,631	Tennessee.....	116,167,313	154,968,343	38,801,030
Kentucky.....	97,741,893	127,233,929	29,492,036	Texas.....	236,976,705	331,884,493	94,908,188
Louisiana.....	108,592,124	143,041,970	34,449,846	Utah.....	8,842,672	13,604,525	4,761,853
Maine.....	13,825,505	24,258,299	10,432,794	Vermont.....	6,765,254	10,420,476	3,655,222
Maryland.....	46,012,318	63,642,379	17,630,061	Virginia.....	95,582,122	132,839,875	37,257,753
Massachusetts.....	52,365,779	65,677,782	13,312,003	Washington.....	33,294,281	43,601,883	10,307,602
Michigan.....	112,612,540	141,812,839	29,200,299	West Virginia.....	53,461,140	71,099,271	17,638,131
Minnesota.....	60,737,072	83,893,020	23,155,948	Wisconsin.....	52,135,057	74,136,512	22,001,455
Mississippi.....	116,266,320	139,061,636	22,795,316	Wyoming.....	3,855,996	6,385,917	2,529,921
				District of Columbia.....	15,617,246	20,329,578	4,712,332
				Outlying areas.....	99,596,968	128,765,515	29,168,547

LIBRARY ASSISTANCE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, one of the most effective programs funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been title II, which makes funds available to public and private schools for the purchase of library and audio-visual materials. This program has been a popular ESEA program because of its visible and direct effect on the schools. In modern schools, the instructional materials center has become a focal point upon which the educational program is based. Title II has enabled schools across the Nation to make dramatic advances in the quality and quantity of instructional materials available to their students and teachers.

My amendment which was adopted by the Education Subcommittee yesterday, provides that the authorization for title II be increased from its basic 1970 level of \$200 million—plus its 3 percent set aside—to \$225 million in fiscal 1971 with \$25 million annual increments through 1974. In view of potential cost increases,

these authorization levels will maintain the Federal commitment at its present level and maintain a modest, yet important, goal for our efforts to obtain full funding for these vital programs.

INNOVATIVE AND EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS

Title III has sparked major educational innovations in thousands of school districts since its inception in 1965. At a time when our educational system is facing unprecedented demands for change and renewal, title III—PACE—is one of the major sources of financial support available to the imaginative educator.

The 1968 report of the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services stated:

We believe that this title is in a unique position to serve as a catalyst for the innovative ferment that is becoming known as the "permanent revolution in education," giving direction and purpose to it. In this role, the value of PACE can extend far beyond its limited appropriations.

I recommend authorization levels which will permit us to maintain the in-

novative thrust and objective of title III which has done so much to improve the quality of education in the schools of Minnesota and the Nation. The amendment I proposed—and which was adopted—increases the basic 1970 title III authorization of \$550 million—plus the 3 percent set aside—to \$600 million for 1971, \$650 million for 1972, \$700 million for 1973, and \$750 million for 1974. We cannot afford to let inflation and increasing enrollment dilute our commitment to encouraging innovation and experimentation in our schools. The modest authorization increases in this amendment are designed to preserve these very worthy objectives.

STRENGTHENING STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

The role of the states in improving education is becoming increasingly critical. Local communities are looking to state governments for financial support and proposals are being made for shifting more discretion and responsibility to the state level for administering federal-

ly funded programs. In this context, it becomes increasingly important to provide adequate resources to state Departments of Education.

Title V of ESEA has been providing needed assistance in this area. In 1968, alone, title V funds enabled state departments of education to add one thousand staff members to broaden their consultative services to local districts and their departmental management capabilities.

The President's Task Force Report on Education stated:

The third (question) is whether the funding for Title V, under which grants are made to strengthen state departments of education, should not be substantially increased. We believe it should, because we regard an improvement in the capacity of state governments to handle their responsibilities in education as being of absolutely critical importance.

I am in complete agreement with this viewpoint, and the amendment I proposed provides that the 1970 title V authorization of \$80 million be increased to \$90 million in fiscal year 1971, \$100 million in fiscal year 1972, \$110 million in fiscal year 1973, and \$120 million in fiscal year 1974. The Education Subcommittee accepted the amendment in its action during yesterday's executive session.

I have also cosponsored an amendment introduced by Senator JAVITS extending the title V concept to provide Federal grants to strengthen local educational agencies as they attempt to improve their capacity for revitalization and sound planning.

EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. President, it is absolutely essential that the legislation now being considered be amended to include significantly increased authorizations for programs providing education for the handicapped. The barriers which confront the handicapped child as he enters and seeks to benefit from our educational system are immense. His special needs demand special attention. Our attempts to provide equality of educational opportunity will continue to be thwarted until we make a full commitment to providing necessary services to the handicapped.

The outstanding leadership which Senators YARBOROUGH, PELL, and PROUTY have given to the cause of education of the handicapped over the years has provided an important framework for progress, yet tremendous unmet needs still remain. There are, for example, nearly 6 million handicapped children in our country and only 40 percent of them receive special educational services.

We must build on the framework that exists and declare as a national commitment the provision of a full educational opportunity for every handicapped child in America.

I strongly supported amendments offered by Senator YARBOROUGH, and adopted by the Education Subcommittee, which will provide substantially increased authorizations for various programs serving the handicapped.

I look forward to supporting these necessary amendments on the floor of

the Senate, and then fighting to obtain full and adequate funding for them.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

On January 2, 1968, the Congress adopted an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide special bilingual programs for schoolchildren with limited English-speaking ability. This significant amendment—title VII of ESEA—was due in large part to the tireless efforts of the distinguished Senator from Texas, the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH, who brought public attention to our Nation's insensitive approach to the education of Spanish-speaking Americans through hearings of his Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education.

Senator YARBOROUGH's subcommittee revealed to us, for example, that: In the five-State Southwest area of Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, and California, at least 1.75 million Mexican-American schoolchildren experience academic failure in school because of linguistic, cultural and psychological handicaps; the average number of school years completed by the Mexican American in the Southwest is 7.1 years, as compared to 9 years for the Negro and 12.1 years for the "Anglo"; 50 percent of Spanish-speaking students in California drop out by the eighth grade; the language barrier is largely responsible for keeping six to seven million Spanish-speaking citizens from climbing the economic ladder; and, almost two million children—Mexican-Americans, Indians, Puerto Ricans, and others—drop out of school because of language difficulties. More than a million others who could use language assistance manage to get through school, but only under a serious handicap.

While serving as chairman of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee and as a member of the Indian Education Subcommittee I have seen firsthand how Mexican American and American Indians are educated in our Nation.

Many of these children enter school with the ability to speak only their native language. A 1967 study by the U.S. Office of Education found that more than half of all Indian children between the ages of 6 and 18 speak in their native tongue. The Smithsonian Institution reports there are nearly 300 recognizably separate American Indian languages and dialects existent today, and that 65 of these languages are spoken by more than 1,000 persons.

In most instances, the non-English child is thrown into a classroom in which the teacher speaks and understands only English.

The teacher has little, if any, knowledge about the student's language or culture. The textbooks are all in English, and often deal with ideas and concepts foreign to the student's native culture. I was shocked, for example, to find in Alaska that natives are taught to read with the "Dick and Jane" reading series, which describes a world of automobiles, cows, farms, and grass—a world totally unknown to the Alaskan native. In many schools, Alaskans and Indians are forbidden to use their native languages.

They are actually taught that the language used by their parents is undesirable and inferior.

Education experts tell us that language is the most important manifestation of the human personality. The consequences, therefore, when the school rejects a child's native tongue are grave. The child's concept of his parents, his home, his way of life, and himself, is adversely affected. The Office of Education's Coleman Report entitled "Equality of Educational Opportunity" bore this out with its findings that Indian children, more than any other group, believe themselves to be below average in intelligence, and that Indian children in the 12th grade have the poorest self-concept of all minority groups tested.

Dr. Bruce Gaarder, formerly chief of the U.S. Office of Education's modern foreign language section, and an expert in bilingual education, described the situation this way:

The official language policy has kept the Indians in the primitive status of non-literate peoples, and the constant effort to eliminate the differences, forcing each child, in greater or lesser degree, to choose between his own people and the outside world, is nothing less than attempted assimilation by alienation. The language and alienation policies together have effectively prevented the formation of an Indian intelligentsia and have systematically cut away from the tribes most of their potential leaders. The overall result has tended to keep the Indians in a condition of unleavened peasantry.

It becomes our task, therefore, to build upon the cultural strengths a child brings into the classroom, to cultivate in that child a pride in his ancestry and to reinforce, not destroy, the language he natively speaks. We must give that child the sense of personal identification so essential to his social maturation, so essential to his growth in learning.

Educators tell us that a bilingual approach to education, an approach in which the indigenous native tongue is used as a teaching medium to assure acquisition and mastery of the content of the curriculum while English is still being mastered as a vehicle of instruction, is the way to accomplish our task. This approach means the curriculum must reflect the student's cultural background, and that teachers must be trained in bilingual education and sensitive to the differences between cultures. I saw for myself the effectiveness of a bilingual program at the Rough Rock Demonstration School on the Navajo Reservation and am convinced of its value. At Rough Rock, students use bicultural materials prepared by the Navajo people themselves. Bilingual techniques are used, and the students are learning English rapidly while at the same time sustaining pride in their culture. These are the kinds of programs we need.

The bilingual education amendment submitted by the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) sought to provide such programs for the more than 3 million schoolchildren in this country who have limited capabilities in the English language. But funding for this ESEA title has been so poor that the surface of the problem has barely been scratched.

In fiscal 1969, only 76 title VII bilingual education programs were funded. Another 239 program applications were denied because of lack of funds. The fiscal 1969 appropriation was only \$7.5 million. The Office of Education reports that they would have needed \$41 million just to fill the 1969 applications.

The 76 programs presently in operation are serving 26,531 children. That means that more than 3 million children are still failing, dropping out of school and developing personality problems because their language is different from their teachers and because the school is unable to provide the special bilingual programs necessary for them to have equal educational opportunities.

Massive increases are essential in both the authorization and appropriation of title VII ESEA if we are to stop the destruction of our greatest natural resource, the citizens of our Nation. We can start by doubling the fiscal 1971 authorization for this title, raising it from its fiscal 1970 level of \$40 million to \$80 million. We must continue to increase that authorization level so that by fiscal 1974 we are providing at least \$250 million for these programs. I was pleased to be able to support Senator YARBOROUGH's amendment adopted by the subcommittee yesterday providing these necessary authorizations for bilingual education programs.

Considering the millions of dollars the Government spends annually to teach languages in the Foreign Service, the Department of Defense, the AID, the USIA, the CIA, and other agencies and departments, I do not believe it is asking too much to provide programs to help American children who speak the same languages natively—and who suffer severe educational handicaps because of that.

DROPOUT PREVENTION

One of the greatest and unnecessary wastes of our country's human resources is the tremendous number of American youth who drop out of school each year. Every year approximately one million children in this country drop out of school. Almost one quarter of the children who enter fifth grade leave school before their class reaches high school graduation.

A recent amendment, sponsored by the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) established title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This title authorizes the resources, flexibility, and commitment necessary to permit our educational institutions to prevent and reduce this tragic loss of human potential. It offers the schools in our Nation an opportunity to provide the kinds of services which are desperately needed to encourage youth to stay in school.

Unfortunately, this promising program has been severely hampered by limited funding. The amendment which I offered yesterday and which was adopted substantially increases authorization for title VIII, raising existing authorization ceilings from \$30 million to \$70 million in fiscal year 1971, \$120 million in fiscal year 1972, \$180 million in fiscal year 1973, and \$250 million in fiscal year 1974. Authorization increases of this

magnitude, coupled with fuller and more adequate appropriations, are necessary if our Nation is to fulfill its commitment to the education of its children.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 signaled an important change in emphasis for American education. In addition to making job preparation geared to the realities of a changing society one of the major goals of the public schools, this legislation paid special attention to the training of persons largely ignored in previous Federal vocational education programs—the disadvantaged, the handicapped, the potential dropout, and persons seeking training in fast growing technical specialties.

Vocational educators were provided with far greater flexibility to meet the changing needs of our population with new and imaginative approaches. I supported then and continue to support this expansion and redirection of our vocational education effort.

Amendments were adopted by the Education Subcommittee extending for 2 years a number of important vocational education programs which would have expired in 1970. I supported the extension of these programs and recommended that their authorizations be increased to insure that the intent of this legislation can be met.

My specific amendments for vocational education—which were adopted by the subcommittee—provide: First, that the work-study program authorization be increased from its 1970 level of \$35 million to \$45 million in 1971 and \$55 million in 1972; second, that the special programs for the disadvantaged be increased from the 1970 authorization level of \$40 million to \$50 million in 1970 and \$60 million in 1972; and third, that part F of the Education Professions Development Act be increased from the 1970 authorization level of \$35 million to \$40 million in 1971 and \$45 million in 1972.

I regret that the programs for the disadvantaged and the work-study program have yet to be funded. The House has, however, taken action in the HEW appropriations bill to begin these programs in fiscal 1970, and I will do all I can to insure that the House action on these programs will be preserved or improved in the Senate.

I am confident that these increased authorizations, and increased appropriations we will fight for, will be of great assistance to outstanding vocational educational efforts underway in Minnesota and the entire Nation.

The amendments (Nos. 279 through 286) were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

AMENDMENT No. 279

Insert at the appropriate place:

"LOW-INCOME FACTOR

"Sec. —. (a) Subsection (c) of section 103 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the last sentence a comma and the following: 'and for each fiscal year thereafter, they shall be 50 per centum and \$4,000, respectively'.

"(b) Paragraph (2) of section 108 of title

I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (D) and by inserting immediately above such subparagraph the following new subparagraphs:

"(B) until appropriations are sufficient to satisfy all maximum grants as computed by using a low-income factor of \$3,000, any amount remaining after allocations are computed pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be allocated by using a low-income factor of \$3,000 with respect to children described in section 103(a)(2) who are not counted for purposes of subparagraph (A); and

"(C) until appropriations are sufficient to satisfy all maximum grants as computed by using a low-income factor of \$4,000, any amount remaining after allocations are computed pursuant to subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be allocated by using a low-income factor of \$4,000 with respect to children described in section 103(a)(2) who are not counted for purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B); and."

AMENDMENT No. 280

On page 17, strike out lines 20 through 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. —. Section 201(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out 'and' where it appears after '1969,' and by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: '\$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, \$275,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and \$300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.'"

AMENDMENT No. 281

On page 19, strike out lines 12 through 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The first sentence of section 301(b) of such title is amended by striking out 'and' where it appears after '1969,' and by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: '\$600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$650,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, \$700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and \$750,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.'"

AMENDMENT No. 282

On page 24, strike out lines 13 through 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. —. Section 501(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out 'and' where it appears after '1969,' and by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: '\$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, \$110,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and \$120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.'"

AMENDMENT No. 283

On page 52, strike out lines 17 through 21 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. —. Section 807(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out 'and' where it appears after '1969,' and by inserting before the period at the end thereof, a comma and the following: '\$70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, \$180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and \$250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.'"

AMENDMENT No. 284

On page 145, strike out lines 5 through 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. —. Section 181(a) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended by inserting after '1970,' the following: '\$45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and \$55,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.'"

AMENDMENT No. 285

On page 144, strike out lines 4 through 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. —. Section 102(b) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended by inserting after '1970,' the following: '\$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.'"

AMENDMENT No. 286

On page 145, strike out lines 21 through 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. —. Section 555 of the Education Professions Development Act (title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965) is amended by striking out 'and' where it appears after '1969,' and by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: '\$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and \$45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.'"

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

William C. Black, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Texas for the term of 4 years, vice Robert I. Nash.

J. Keith Gary, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Texas for the term of 4 years, vice Tully Reynolds.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, November 20, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARING BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND GENERAL LEGISLATION, SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, ON S. 2225, THE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AND BARGAINING ACT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will hold a hearing on Thursday, November 20, on S. 2225, the Agricultural Marketing and Bargaining Act.

All persons interested in testifying should contact the committee staff as soon as possible to schedule their appearance.

PEACE DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there has been much speculation about what ef-

fect the so-called marches for peace may have on not only our country but also on the enemy in North Vietnam. To make the record perfectly clear, let me recite a wire service story of this morning which says:

North Vietnam and the Vietcong made it plain today they were counting on growing protests in the United States to speed the end of the Vietnam war on their terms.

Let me hasten to add that our Ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge, then told the North Vietnamese they were harboring "false expectations." He said:

The great majority of the American people support President Nixon as he seeks a just peace.

We can speculate and debate and discuss, pro and con, what effect the so-called march against death or the peace march might have on our role in Vietnam. But when the enemy says that it will lead to a quick end of the war on their terms, it is crystal clear what effect these activities have.

I recognize that many of those assembled in Washington today are well-intentioned young Americans who are concerned about war—concerned about all war, not just the war in Vietnam. I recognize that there are others who may not be so concerned about what is best for America.

I would only say to those who are here with a sincere desire to end the war in Vietnam that they should make certain there is no violence this weekend, because if they become the violent minority, I am not certain what response there would be from the silent majority.

Let me also add that those who are here with nothing to do might consider visiting some of our historic shrines. They might want to visit Arlington Cemetery. They might want to visit Mount Vernon. They might want to visit the Nation's Capitol. Or they might want to go back home to avoid the possibility of even remotely giving comfort to the enemy.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas on his statement, and I wish to associate myself with what he said.

Many thousands of well-intentioned people from all walks of American life are beginning to assemble in the Nation's Capital to protest and demonstrate against the war in Vietnam.

If the activities are peaceful, these young citizens will be exercising their constitutionally guaranteed right to dissent—a right which they would not enjoy if they lived under Communist domination.

There can be no quarrel with their exercise of this precious right. They should thank God they have it; and they should also thank thousands of brave young men who have fought and died in the uniform of our country to protect that right.

Since I, too, enjoy the right of free speech, I want to say, as these activities begin, that I stand firmly with my President in his dedicated pursuit of a fair and just peace in Vietnam.

In a dramatic, moving address to the Nation just 10 days ago, President Nixon

called for broad citizen support of his policies. Since then, I believe it has become more apparent to many more people that cohesion and unity in support of the President and his policies can speed the day when we will have a meaningful peace in Southeast Asia.

The great silent majority to which the President has appealed is responding. A Gallup poll taken shortly after his address indicated that at least 77 percent of the American people support the President and his policies.

In the last few days there has been an impressive outpouring of public support across the length and breadth of our great land in connection with ceremonies commemorating Veterans Day.

It is encouraging that so many citizens of this great Republic are coming to realize that by supporting the President they are taking the shortest path to a lasting and honorable peace in Southeast Asia.

As a result of the outpouring of support for President Nixon, I believe there is a better chance that the Hanoi regime and the Vietcong will not misread our intentions as a nation.

They should be on notice that the protests of a vocal minority are not a sign of national weakness.

They should avoid the false assumption that a free society, which tolerates dissent, is a weak society. The very fact that we tolerate dissent is a sign of the strength of our Nation—an indication of faith we have in the viability of our democratic institutions.

On the other hand, the enemy would do well to take serious note of the resolutions of support for President Nixon and his policies which have been introduced and are strongly backed in both Houses of Congress.

Perhaps it would be too much to expect that the enemy suddenly, or overnight, will become reasonable and willing to negotiate rationally in Paris. But in any event, the representatives of our Nation are prepared to remain at the peace table in the hope that a belligerent and intransigent foe will eventually undergo a metamorphosis.

We hope that genuine negotiations will get underway soon at Paris. And in the meantime, as one American, and as one U.S. Senator, I join in the appeal to all Americans to steadfastly support our President and his wise policies for ending the war.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time under the previous order allotted for the transaction of routine morning business be extended by an additional 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of