

U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

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

VOLUME 116—PART 1

JANUARY 19, 1970, TO JANUARY 27, 1970

(PAGES 3 TO 1482)

**Ho Chi Minh Trail**—was "sufficient for us to express concern."

The spokesman refused to comment on what the United States would do militarily to cope with what is being described as a large-scale Communist offensive.

The policy of secrecy which has cloaked U.S. military air activities in the Laotian war, which unhappily, the Nixon administration seems to have uncritically accepted from its predecessors, thus again is being invoked to prevent the American people from knowing and understanding a war that slowly but surely is escalating in its cost of money and lives.

By hiding the extent of U.S. military activities that preceded the current Communist buildup, the administration—as its predecessors before—effectively prevented public and objective debate on the merit of these activities and the extent to which they may bring about the very response which yesterday the administration declared as its "concern."

Mr. President, I am concerned about American as well as Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese activity in Laos.

I am concerned that our Government can send U.S. citizens to drop bombs in support of a country with which we have no treaty and blithely say "No comment" when asked to disclose the extent of such activity to the public.

I am concerned over the State Department's apparent desire yesterday to focus public attention on what the Communists are doing in Laos—without telling the same public what we have done in the past, are doing now, or plan to do in the future.

Though I have stated it before, I think it worth stating again what President Nixon said last November 3:

The American people cannot and should not be asked to support a policy which involves the overriding issues of war and peace unless they know the truth about that policy.

I would hope that in his announced state of the world speech next month he drops the secrecy that has cloaked Laos, reestablishes the credibility he lost when he told the American public last month only that "we are interdicting the Ho Chi Minh Trail as it runs through Laos," and "beyond that I do not think the public interest would be served by any further discussion."

It is time the President frankly puts before the people the extent of our military activities, the reasons for them and the course for the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Tad Szulc 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, Jan. 21, 1970]  
U.S. EXPRESSES CONCERN OVER THE RISING LEVEL OF FIGHTING IN LAOS

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—The United States expressed concern today over the "rising level of activity" by North . . . Department spokesman said it appeared that North Vietnam might be preparing to launch a "dry season offensive" there.

The spokesman, Robert J. McCloskey, said

that the number of North Vietnamese troops in Laos had increased. He said the increase, together with Vietnamese and Pathet Lao forces in the strategic Plain des Jarres area recently were "sufficient for us to express concern."

The dry season in Laos, as in South Vietnam, began last November. It will end in mid-spring.

Mr. McCloskey, had only a "no comment" to questions from newsmen as to how the United States proposed to show this concern militarily or diplomatically.

The extent of United States military involvement in Laos remains a highly sensitive issue here. Last month the Congress wrote into the defense appropriations legislation a prohibition against any commitment of American ground combat troops in Laos or Thailand without specific Congressional consent.

The Senate subcommittee on United States commitments abroad and the State and Defense Departments remain deadlocked over whether to make public a transcript of the proceedings at closed hearings on American military activities in Laos. The hearings were held last October before the subcommittee, which is headed by Senator Stuart Symington, Missouri Democrat.

The two Government agencies insist on making numerous deletions in the transcript for security reasons. The affected passages touch on the degree of direct American support for the Royal Laotian Army and a clandestine army of Meo tribesmen that is believed to be financed, equipped, trained and possibly led by United States officers and men.

The acknowledgment by the State Department today that the developing situation in Laos is a matter of concern to the Nixon Administration served to raise, therefore, the questions of whether and how the United States may assist the Laotian Government to resist the expected Communist offensive.

While enemy offensives during the dry season in Laos occur annually, Mr. McCloskey said today that this year the North Vietnamese will be attacking from "more advanced positions."

United States estimates are still that there are some 50,000 regular North Vietnamese troops in Laos—there are more than 100,000 such troops in South Vietnam.

To cope with a large-scale offensive, if one indeed develops, the Laotians will require some form of United States assistance, officials here conceded. But for political reasons American help in the foreseeable future is to be confined to air and logistic support.

#### MINNEAPOLIS TRIBUNE SUPPORTS HIGHER FUNDING FOR EDUCATION

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, yesterday I was proud to vote in support of the conference committee bill on HEW appropriations which provides a desperately needed \$1¼ billion addition for education and health programs above what the President's budget requested. At that time, I summarized my reasons for supporting these added education and health funds. I pointed out that even with this needed addition the Congress had made a net reduction of \$5.6 billion in the President's total budget request, and was therefore acting responsibly to halt inflation. I pointed out that in the context of this major budget cutting in other less important programs, the additional funding for health and education represented a reordering of national priorities, not a question of inflation.

Recently an editorial and an excellent,

in-depth two-part series on Federal aid to education appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune. They underscore the importance of these additional funds, and the need for the Congress to override the President's threatened veto of this appropriation. On the question of national priorities, the editorial concludes:

The struggle between Congress and the President over the money is part of a long-needed effort to shift national priorities from spending on space and the military, to spending on urgent domestic problems. Congress did reduce other spending levels to help in the fight against inflation. The increase in the education outlays is a logical move to assist those who suffer most from this same affliction.

The conclusion reached by this editorial is supported by a thorough review of the impact of Federal aid to education in Minneapolis which appeared in two articles written by Joe Rigert. Mr. Rigert thoroughly documents the benefits that Federal assistance has brought the schools in Minneapolis in general, and to Lincoln Junior High School in particular. In addition to providing some 16,000 schoolbooks, hot lunches, opportunities in New Careers programs, Teacher Corps, and Headstart assistance, these funds have helped to produce 2-year gains in reading and arithmetic in a 1-year period for students at the Lincoln Learning Center.

While all the problems have not been solved, and some new ones have developed, Mr. Rigert's review indicates that important progress is being made.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Need for Federal Education Aid" and Mr. Rigert's two articles entitled "Lincoln Junior High: From Conflict to a Basis for New Optimism" and "Federal Aid Begins To Show Results in City Schools" be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE NEED FOR FEDERAL EDUCATION AID

The battle over federal spending on education is reaching a climax in Washington. Congress has added \$1.1 billion to President Nixon's education request after cutting back on other budget requests. The President is expected to veto the bill on grounds that it is inflationary. Congressional leaders hope to override the veto.

Our view is that the additional funds should be approved. One of the unfortunate results of the fight against inflation is that it hits so hard at low- and middle-income Americans. High interest rates raise housing costs. Deceleration of the economy increases unemployment. Cutbacks in federal spending often are applied to already-underfunded social programs.

The two-part series concluding today on this page points up the importance of one federal education program for one city. The Title I money for education of poverty pupils has enabled Minneapolis to begin to deal with what James Conant termed the "social dynamite" of educational deprivation. The improvements at Lincoln Junior High, which suffered such a crisis of confidence that it had a net loss of 215 white children in two years, would not have been possible without Title I money. Such funds also are being used to advantage in many other poverty-area schools of the city.

But the present levels of federal aid are far from adequate. Additional teachers hired

through Title I money in Minneapolis reduced average class size in poverty-area elementary schools by only one pupil, in junior highs by 2.5 and senior highs by 4.1. Now that the money is being directed more heavily at aiding pupils with the most severe learning problems, it will reach only half of the 14,000 school children of AFDC and low-income families. Some pupils will benefit less than others because of the limited funds.

The additional money voted by Congress covers much more than poverty-area education. While a \$300-million increase includes money for education of poor children, it also includes funds for supplies and innovative programs that can be used for all pupils. Among other increases for all students are \$400 million for schools in federally-impacted areas, \$209 million for vocational education, \$84 million for higher education, and lesser amounts for equipment, libraries, the handicapped and teacher-development. Minneapolis could receive up to \$1.5 million in additional funds—including \$500,000 in "federal-impact" aid, \$350,000 for poverty pupils, \$300,000 for vocational education and \$160,000 for innovative programs.

The struggle between Congress and the President over the money is part of the long-needed effort to shift national priorities from spending on space and the military, to spending on urgent domestic problems. Congress did reduce other spending levels to help in the fight against inflation. The increase in educational outlays is a logical move to assist those who suffer most from that same inflation.

#### LINCOLN JUNIOR HIGH: FROM CONFLICT TO A BASIS FOR NEW OPTIMISM

(By Joe Rigert)

The front office at Lincoln Junior High school, crowded two years ago with noisy students awaiting disciplinary action, is relatively quiet now. Principal Harvey Rucker interrupts a conversation to let a girl go through his office to see the school nurse.

"I hope we are on the upswing," Rucker says tentatively. "If the pendulum is swinging, I think it is swinging in the right direction." Two years ago Rucker, as assistant principal, was practically buried under a pile of blue discipline slips.

Upstairs, a teacher joshes with a student after class and comments to a visitor, "I'm optimistic. Things are going on that are good." Two years ago, that teacher was not optimistic.

Across town in the Minneapolis school system's central office, officials say that more parent involvement, more staff and more programs have helped Lincoln to "turn the corner." Two years ago, they were contending with racial incidents, a climate of tension and a "crisis orientation" at Lincoln—in the words of a task force study.

Lincoln revisited, after two years, is not the Lincoln that had gained a reputation for conflict and failure. Now there is a mood of hope—hope, as Rucker puts it, that the school is on the way to regaining the confidence of parents and students.

Part of that hope is based on parent interest. Half the parents turned out for an open house at the beginning of the year, nearly double the attendance of the previous year. Teachers visited parents in their homes and are making more contacts to keep them advised of student performance. Adult education has been expanded to attract hundreds of additional parents in the area.

Part of the hope is based on teachers. The staff has been increased from 61 to 71 even though enrollment has declined, and the number of black teachers has risen from 5 to 22. Average class size has been reduced from 25 to about 18 pupils. More teachers are living in the community. One teacher has turned part of his house over to a recre-

ation center where students can play pool and talk over problems with him. Another teacher is experimenting with Montessori concepts in a class for slow learners.

Part of the hope is based on a new school structure. Each of the three grades is now a school within a school, with its own floor, its own assistant principal and its own social worker and counselor. No more is there the disruptive mixture of age groups in the halls—or the deluge of "problems" at the front office. Now there is more individual attention for each student and his needs.

Part of the hope is based on programs. Each grade has a learning opportunity center for pupils with problems in basic skills. A master teacher, a teacher for pupils with special learning disabilities, and tutors work with groups of 10 to 15 students at a time. Ability groupings that segregated students by race and class have been eliminated, and individualized instruction has been emphasized. The library has been stocked with \$11,000 in new books, records and film strips.

And part of the hope is based on the students. "There is a different attitude," says Rucker, son of a hotel porter. "They are not as hung up on problems as they once were, or on what is Black Power. We still have some of the 'get honkie' bit. But they are beginning to take a look at what education is all about. There is more pride in the school. They make more comments like, 'Let's shape up.' I think they see now they have to have the tools for achievement to go with the black pride."

School officials have some limited test data now to indicate that all this is leading to gains in student performance. Pupils in 8th and 9th grade basic classes showed a two year advance, on the average, in reading comprehension in 1967-68, although they reached only a mid-6th-grade level by the end of the year. Gains also were recorded last year in school-wide testing, after the ability groupings were eliminated.

Rucker says it is too early to make any flat assertions that Lincoln has solved its problems. "All we can do is hope that we continue to improve and have no incidents, so that people can have some confidence in the school again. I think 1970-71 will be the year to take a look at it."

Lack of confidence took a big toll in the past two years. The loss of 215 white students in that time caused the school to shift from 45 percent to 65 percent black. Many black parents also lost confidence in the school, as shown by the fact that 52 black children are busing to other schools this year under the voluntary transfer program.

Some problems, in fact, have become worse. The absentee rate climbed from 10.6 percent in 1967-68 to 13.2 percent last school year. Student turnover also has increased.

Faculty losses have remained high, too. Lincoln had to hire 22 new professionals this year. One encouraging development is that only two of the 22 were rookies without experience in the inner city or as teachers elsewhere.

One teacher expressed a continued concern about absenteeism, classroom disorder, turmoil in the halls, hostility of students. "I feel so frustrated and completely disappointed. There has been nothing significant in the way of change. I think I can understand the depth of the problem. It bothers me a great deal."

Rucker does not minimize the task ahead. "We still have a long way to go to meet the educational needs of the children. We've got to make changes in educational programs, in all schools. This is what we are doing."

Much of what is being done at Lincoln, and at a detached Lincoln Learning Center, is made possible through more than \$200,000 in federal funds each year. Minneapolis school officials cite this as one example of

the impact this money is exerting on poverty-area education.

#### FEDERAL AID BEGINS TO SHOW RESULTS IN CITY SCHOOLS

(By Joe Rigert)

The Federal government has provided \$4.3 billion for the teaching of poverty pupils in the past four years under the 1965 education act—about equal to the outlay in one year for the space program.

Critics including high officials in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, contend that the money has been poorly used. One study in which the NAACP took part alleges that millions of dollars were wasted, diverted or otherwise misused by state and local authorities, thus depriving the children of the poor of another chance to close the educational gap between them and the affluent society.

Minneapolis has received \$9.6 million in Title I poverty aid in the past four years—about equal to the police budget for one year. But school officials here cite tests and otherwise observable results to support their view that the money has been put to good use in this city.

#### EXAMPLES

Students at the Lincoln Learning Center, a detached facility with a low student-teacher ratio, showed a two-year gain in reading comprehension and arithmetic in one year. A similar center now is in operation at Bryant Junior High and the concept has been carried out partially in learning centers in Lincoln Junior High.

Grades 2 and 3 in all but two poverty-area schools showed the expected growth of one year from February 1967 to February 1968. The pupils at least were not slipping behind as they have been found to do in some school systems.

Children in kindergarten classes with teacher aides improved more on a readiness test than did children in classes without aides.

Preliminary evidence indicates that pupils in a talking-typewriter program, financed in part with Title I money, gained more on word and paragraph meaning than did a comparison group not participating in the program.

Ninety-four percent of the teachers who received training for inner-city work said the training made them feel more adequately prepared to teach in a poverty-area school.

Teachers say a hot-lunch program improved afternoon attendance for elementary schools; 87 percent of the parents of children receiving hot lunches said their children benefited from the program.

Pupils in a learning disabilities resource program, also financed partly under Title I, made normal or above normal progress in five of six tested areas, while children with similar learning problems who were not enrolled in the program failed to make average gains in any of the six areas.

Minneapolis also has received another \$8.6 million in federal funds for other programs in the past four years. The money has helped the schools to buy 16,000 books, train 1,883 youths at a work opportunity center, increase the number of community resource volunteers from 100 to 900, launch low-income adults on new careers, enroll nearly 6,200 students in the neighborhood youth corps, expand adult education, operate a Head-Start project, provide human relations training for teachers, use teacher-corps interns, operate a music demonstration center and offer programs for talented youths.

Impressive as such results may be, however, the federal money has not yet produced any profound improvements in Minneapolis any more than the billions have left a deep imprint on the education of poor children nationally. Minneapolis officials concede that the money was dispersed too widely at first

to be fully effective. The amount of money is not nearly enough to meet the problems. And the problems are increasing rather than diminishing.

Hence, while achievement levels have been rising on a national basis, they have not been rising in Minneapolis and other large cities. At Lincoln Junior High, the ratio of 7th grade students reading near or below the 4th grade level rose from 25 percent in 1966 to 40 percent this year. The percentage of Lincoln 8th graders who are three or more grades behind in reading comprehension doubled in three years.

Results like these, say officials, probably reflect the fact that cities like Minneapolis are getting more and more poverty pupils who have learning problems. The number of AFDC children (in and out of school) has nearly doubled to a total of 15,000 in Minneapolis since 1962 (see chart below).

While the educational problems mount, the amount of federal money fails to keep pace. The Title I money per child, in fact, dropped from \$162 last year to \$146 this year in Minneapolis.

Minneapolis used much of its Title I money in the beginning to reduce class size in poverty-area schools. The additional teachers did reduce class size, but not enough, and tests showed no academic gains from the reduction. Money also was dispersed to a wide range of other programs—a dispersal that again lessened its impact.

Partly as a result of this experience, and because of congressional insistence, the federal money is being concentrated now on the teaching of basic skills—reading, writing and arithmetic—to those students needing it most. The hope in Minneapolis is that the measured progress at the Lincoln Learning Center, for example, can be expanded to more students—especially at the elementary level.

The Board of Education, meantime, is using local funds to support many of the programs that had been financed under Title I—the additional teachers in poverty-area schools, field trips, symphony concerts, hot lunches and closed-circuit television.

Even with the concentration of effort, the overall impact of the federal money on poverty-school education will be limited, because the funds are limited. A fourth of the Title I money is being spent on Hay-Lincoln and Mann-Bryant concentrated education centers, mostly for more teachers, counselors, psychologists and social workers. Other poverty-area pupils do not receive the benefits of such concentrated spending.

The other poverty-area schools do share in the Title I money being used for 415 teacher aides, 20 special learning disability teachers for instruction in basic skills, reading teachers to supervise 600 tutors, an instructional materials center, in-service training in use of audio-visual equipment, and personnel in the talking typewriter program.

The results so far indicate it is a beginning, but not much more.

#### Poverty up, aid down in Minneapolis

NUMBER OF AFDC CHILDREN	
1962	8,500
1967	12,600
1969	15,000
TITLE I FEDERAL AID	
1962	\$0
1966	2,500,000
1967	2,400,000
1969	2,300,000

#### IT IS TIME FOR GE MANAGEMENT TO BARGAIN

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, all Americans have noted with concern the length and scope of the strike of employees of the General Electric Corp.

The lost production, continuing unem-

ployment, and loss of wages, and the resultant loss of profits represent a tragedy for the workers, a heavy blow to stockholders, and a deepening economic setback to the Nation, especially to the communities where GE plants are located.

It is time for those who have no direct stake in the dispute to use their good offices to bring about a resumption of negotiations. The Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO, has taken a responsible and constructive step in that direction by appealing to GE and its officials, through newspaper advertising, to return to the bargaining table. The advertisements I refer to appeared in the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Schenectady Gazette. Union officials reminded GE executives that the strikers are loyal GE employees who want only to return to work on a fair and reasonable basis.

The long record of the Communications Workers of America as a responsible and civic-minded organization and of CWA President Joseph A. Beirne as a tough-minded and fair advocate of responsible trade unionism and community service makes the CWA plea especially compelling. The attempt to clear the air is all the more impressive because CWA itself has no direct stake in the strike, since it does not represent any of the striking workers.

The plea does not seek to force GE management to do anything. It merely asks GE to follow in the proven and traditional path for resolving labor-management disputes in this country: a fair and reasonable give-and-take that can produce an agreement satisfactory to both management and workers.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the CWA advertisement be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### IT'S TIME FOR GE TO SETTLE THIS STRIKE!

After nearly three months of strike at General Electric, we think it's about time that reasonable people on both sides of the GE collective bargaining table find a way to bring the dispute to a satisfactory settlement.

The unions, in our opinion, have shown a reasonable approach. Their proposals for improvement in pay and benefits are in line with the going rate in other major American manufacturing industries. The unions have even offered to arbitrate the issues in dispute.

But General Electric has refused. Obviously, the company has felt that its position is justified. In our opinion, GE should give some serious top-level review to this whole matter.

As citizens interested in economic progress, we think GE's top management should take a fresh look at the strike, the issues in the strike, and—most of all—the attitudes of the people involved in this strike.

These people, after all, are loyal employees of General Electric.

These men and women have manned the picket lines for over ten weeks.

They have been on strike during the entire holiday season, and the coldest weeks of this cold winter season.

Pretty obviously, they believe in what they're doing. Pretty obviously, they believe there's justice in their cause. Pretty obviously, the offers that have been made by General Electric so far in this strike are not enough to meet their needs and produce an end to the strike.

Isn't it time, therefore, for top management of General Electric to take a fresh new look at this whole issue?

Doesn't the fact that nearly 150,000 men and women have stayed out on strike during this freezing winter make any impression on top GE decision-making executives?

Doesn't GE's top management realize that attacking the union leaders is irrelevant . . . that it's the deeply-felt grievances of the rank-and-file workers which caused this strike and which keep it going?

Doesn't GE's top management realize that these men and women on strike are not agitators or demonstrators or radicals but skilled company employees who, under decent conditions, would far prefer working to striking?

Doesn't GE's top management realize that millions of dollars in advertising obviously haven't convinced these hard-working men and women on strike that GE understands their problems, in these days of a rapidly rising cost of living?

In other words, doesn't GE's top management appreciate that propaganda is no substitute for realistic give-and-take negotiations that will produce a mutually satisfactory settlement? That kind of fair settlement would permit General Electric to move ahead as one of the great engineering and manufacturing corporations in this country. That kind of fair settlement would permit GE's thousands of workers to do their job turning out the products that have made the GE trademark a symbol of electronic excellence throughout the entire world.

For years, General Electric has proclaimed that progress is its most important product. In recent months, General Electric hasn't been producing products and it certainly hasn't produced any progress.

As citizens who believe that economic advancement is meaningful only when it is achieved by the great majority of the American people, we say it's time GE got back to economic reality . . . back to negotiating a fair settlement on realistic 1970 terms . . . back to producing the goods that have made it famous as a great American corporation.

That's why we appeal to GE's top executives to take another look at this strike situation . . . and to apply their creative talent to a satisfactory solution. On a reasonable basis. Now.

Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO, 1925 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

Joseph A. Beirne, President.  
Glenn E. Watts, Secretary-Treasurer.

#### PROPOSED VETO OF LABOR, AND HEW APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, education groups throughout the country have been vocal in their opposition to President Nixon's threatened veto of the HEW appropriation bill which the Senate passed yesterday.

One such group, the American Council on Education, has issued a statement which expresses the various points of the controversy very well. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### STATEMENT ON THE PROPOSED VETO OF LABOR AND HEW APPROPRIATIONS

The Board of Directors of the American Council on Education is profoundly distressed by reports that the President may veto the 1970 appropriations for Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Such a veto would be a direct and severe blow to education in this country. We believe that the