

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91ST CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 20

JULY 30, 1970, TO AUGUST 7, 1970
(PAGES 26489 TO 27852)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Hart-Cooper amendment which will be cosponsored by other Senators, provides for an authorization of \$1.027 billion. These funds may be expended for deployment of the ABM system at Malmstrom and Grand Forks, the two sites authorized last year. Of the total, \$627.2 million is available for continuing phase I at Malmstrom and Grand Forks, the prototype deployment which was begun last year.

Also authorized was \$35 million under the amendment, as requested by the Department of Defense, for emplacement of additional sprint missiles at the two sites.

The full amount of \$365 million requested for research and development would be authorized for use for that purpose on the advanced ABM system, such as the so-called dedicated system; specifically designed for Minuteman—a

system advocated by many distinguished scientists and experts.

Last year over \$1 billion was authorized for deployment and, as of May 31, there was a \$224 million carryover.

Mr. President, a table which appears in the committee report indicates the funds requested and the funds for phase I that would be available under the Hart-Cooper amendment as compared to the amounts requested for phase I and phase II and recommended by the Armed Services Committee. The funds carried over from last year's authorization as of May 31 are indicated under table II.

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

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

TABLE 1. SAFEGUARD PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971 RELATED ONLY TO PROTECTING THE DETERRENT AND NOT AREA DEFENSE

	Phase 2					Total
	Phase 1	Due to added SPRINTS at GF & MALM	Due to the Whiteman site	Due to advance prep Warren	Due to other	
Authorization:						
R.D.T. & E.	365.0					365.0
Procurement	457.4		178.0	15.0		650.4
Family housing	8.8					8.8
Military construction	161.0	35.0	120.4	0.4	8.4	325.2
Subtotal in bill	992.2	35.0	298.4	15.4	8.4	1,349.4
Other not subject to authorization:						
Procurement	0.6					0.6
Military construction	8.0		6.1	3.0	2.9	20.0
Operations and maintenance	42.0				11.0	53.0
Military personnel	12.0				2.0	14.0
Subtotal	62.6		6.1	3.0	15.9	87.6
Total ABM program	1,054.8	35.0	304.5	18.4	24.3	1,437.0

TABLE 2

TABLE 2.—Funds from fiscal year 1970 that remain unobligated¹

[In millions]	
R.D.T. & E.	\$70
Procurement	92.3
Construction	62.3
Total	224.6

¹ Figures are as of May 31, 1970.

Mr. COOPER. The amendment, therefore, would provide ample funds—over \$1 billion—for demonstrating any necessary bargaining strength at the SALT talks.

May I say that the Senator from Michigan and I, as well as other Senators who indicate an interest in this amendment, support and want to support in every way possible the success of those talks.

In this year of difficult economic conditions, reductions in the Federal budget are of considerable importance. Our amendment would save \$322.2 million.

I point out that if the SALT talks succeed in the near future, and if the United States and the U.S.S.R. agree on what is termed zero ABM, no sites would be necessary to be deployed, including those previously authorized at Malmstrom and Grand Forks.

There are reports—and I hope that they are true—in the press that the SALT talks may result quite soon in a

preliminary agreement on the limitation on the ABM, if not a complete ban.

It has also been reported that if zero ABM is not agreed to by the United States and the Soviet Union, ABM protection of Moscow and Washington respectively is likely. In either of these events, the requested deployments at Malmstrom, Grand Forks, Whiteman or Warren Air Force Bases could not be used, and the work would not go forward at those sites.

Deployments at Malmstrom and Grand Forks, which our amendment would permit, would provide ample bargaining power that the administration states is requested.

I point out that the number of ABM missiles to be deployed at Malmstrom and Grand Forks are several times greater than those deployed by the Soviets in the Galosh system around Moscow—which is their only ABM system.

We believe that our amendment is in accord with the proposal of the Secretary of Defense to "fly before you buy" for prototype development. It will also assist the SALT talks without hindering the ability of this country to proceed with the development of an effective ABM system. For, if the Soviets proceed with the development of the SS-9's and other missiles, it may be necessary to deploy an effective missile defense system.

In fact, most of the scientists who have testified on the ABM have said that the development of an effective ABM system is of vital importance if the land based Minuteman deterrent is to be perfected. Such a system would add to the security of this Nation. But deployment of the ineffective Safeguard system would not add to the security of this country.

For this reason we believe our amendment would best meet the needs of this country at this crucial time and in the future if the Soviets proceed with the deployment of the SS-9's.

We will submit for formal printing the amendment on Monday in order to give those Senators who wish to cosponsor the amendment an opportunity to do so.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) and I have given the most sober consideration to the development of the amendment we introduce today.

Many of us believe the ABM system needs more research and development—that it is a waste of the taxpayers' money not to "fly before you buy."

But a number of Senators feel that the Senate last year gave the go-ahead to deployment at Grand Forks and Malmstrom, and that we should not replot that ground.

So, believing as we do that the important thing is to stop the momentum—the buildup, with its enormous total expense—we have decided to confine our amendment to eliminating the expansion of Safeguard to Whiteman, Mo., and Warren, Wyo.

This amendment would strike only \$322 million from the Safeguard authorization recommended by the Senate Armed Services Committee. It would leave \$1.03 billion. We would specifically authorize the \$35 million item listed by the Department of Defense and the committee under phase II for "added sprints at Grand Forks and Malmstrom" since the opponents of Safeguard have all along contended that additional Sprints were needed at Grand Forks and Malmstrom.

But more important than the money saving, in my book, is that through this amendment we offer an opportunity to halt the seeming all-out momentum to install a 12-site—or even a 14-site—Safeguard system, the benefit of which would be negligible and the cost enormous.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUPILS SCORE BELOW U.S. NORMS IN READING AND MATH

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this morning in the Washington Post there appeared an article by Lawrence Feinberg reporting on the tragic conditions in the District of Columbia schools.

The article cites recent test results released by the District of Columbia school system which indicate that student achievement in reading and mathematics is declining rather than improving or even remaining constant.

This conclusion is based on an analysis of the California testing bureau scores which compare the performance of children in the District of Columbia

schools to that of children in public schools in 11 other major cities.

The article reports that by the sixth grade, Washington students average seven-tenths of a year behind students in the other big cities, and by the ninth grade, they are 1.6 years behind their counterparts in 11 other large city systems, comparing the reading norms for the Nation as a whole, the students by the ninth grade are 2.2 years behind.

That does not, however, tell the whole story. If one looks at the table of achievement broken down by actual elementary and junior high schools, there are many elementary schools in this community in which students have such an abysmally low level of performance that it is nothing short of an utter and national disgrace.

Earlier this year the U.S. Senate created a Select Committee on Equal Education which I am privileged to chair and on which the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cook), now Presiding Officer, serves with such distinction.

I think this report states the fact that here in the Nation's Capital thousands and thousands of children are being doomed by being denied the basic tools of reading and arithmetic which are necessary for any achievement in American society.

We spend a lot of time, and rightfully, concerned about the crime rate in the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital. It is indeed awful. Perhaps we would get more action in reducing the crime rate if we were to seriously examine these kinds of statistics that indicate the tragic way in which we are denying children an adequate education and destroying thousands of school children before they ever have a chance.

It is my judgment that this kind of destruction to our schoolchildren is far more pervasive than many Americans suspect. It is a matter also that I feel deserves greater attention.

These statistics do not compare the achievement of these school children in the District of Columbia with school children generally. They compare them only with the school children in 11 other major cities which we know also have education difficulties.

Even by that standard, the District of Columbia is doing so poorly that the average student in the ninth grade is 1.6 years behind, and if we compare the Nation as a whole, he is 2.2 years behind.

The committee which I chair will shortly be holding hearings on the problems of equal educational opportunity in northern cities.

I know of no place where we could more appropriately begin than in the Nation's Capital, not only because of the tragic conditions cited in the report, but also because, of all the school systems in the country, this is the one in which Congress has a special responsibility and in which we have especially failed.

I would suggest that this report would shock the conscience of the Congress and of the Nation and that this Nation could respond in a way which would provide these children an opportunity to

be a part of the fullness of American life.

Mr. President, I plan to make a more complete statement on this matter the early part of next week.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article of Mr. Feinberg which was published in the Washington Post this morning, together with a table on District of Columbia test results broken down by elementary and junior high schools.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUPILS SCORE BELOW U.S. NORMS IN READING, MATH

(By Lawrence Feinberg)

Average reading achievement in Washington's elementary schools fell substantially this year, continuing a four-year decline that has left the school system well below national norms.

The city schools were just a few points below these norms in 1966-67.

Citywide scores on standardized mathematics tests are even lower than those in reading, but the decline in these exams has been less steep.

Results of the nationwide tests were disclosed last night at a meeting of the Washington school board. The board also received school-by-school results on a new test comparing Washington with the norms in 11 other big cities rather than with national standards that include suburban and rural school systems.

These results indicated that in only 23 of the city's 133 elementary schools is the median sixth-grade reading level equal to the norms in the big cities. Only two of Washington's 30 junior high schools matched these big-city standards.

The systemwide results on the new tests, prepared by the California Testing Bureau, show that the median score in reading for Washington's third-graders was four-tenths of a year below the big-city norm.

By sixth grade, Washington students average seven-tenths of a year behind the other big cities, and by ninth grade they are 1.6 years behind.

Compared with the higher reading norms for the nation as a whole, the Washington students are 2.2 years behind.

Because this was the first time the California tests were given in Washington, no school-by-school comparisons can be made with previous years.

However, a systemwide comparison was made by giving another examination, the Sequential Test of Educational Progress (STEP), to 10 percent of the city's students, selected at random, in the third, sixth, ninth, and 11th grades.

The STEP tests previously had been given to all students, but they are being phased out because local officials believe the California tests are better.

In the spring of 1967 both fourth- and sixth-graders in Washington had a median score in reading at the 47th percentile on the STEP test, compared to the nationwide norm of 50.

This spring the median for Washington's fourth-graders was at the 31st percentile on the test; for sixth-graders it was 35.

The median is the midpoint above which are the score of half those taking the test and below which are the scores of the other half.

For Washington ninth-graders, the median was also 35 in reading compared with the national median of 50, but it had sunk to that level one year ago. The median for

11-graders here stayed unchanged at 40. It had been at the 45th percentile in 1967.

The D.C. medians in mathematics on the STEP tests this year were 25 for fourth-graders; 29 for sixth-graders; 24 for ninth-graders, and 24 for 11th-graders.

In 1967 the medians had clustered around 35.

In the school-by-school results on the California tests, the pattern of high and low scores generally followed the socio-economic levels of the students attending the different schools.

Thus, 10 of the 23 elementary schools with average reading scores above the big-city norm of 50 were located in ward three, the prosperous area west of Rock Creek Park.

They are the only elementary schools in Washington with mainly white student enrollments. The averages at some of them—91 at Lafayette, 85 at Murch, and 79 at Stoddert—are comparable with achievement levels in Bethesda, which is part of the Montgomery County school system.

The Shepard school, in a prosperous integrated area just off upper 16th Street NW, averaged at the 82d percentile in reading. About 70 per cent of its 550 students are Negro; about 30 per cent are white.

The nearby Takoma school averaged 56.

Other schools with high scores were in Negro middle-class areas in Northeast Washington and in upper Northwest. Among them were Bunker Hill, Burroughs, Brightwood, Keene and River Terrace.

The 23 elementary schools that received Title One federal aid because they are in poverty areas generally had very low scores.

One exception was Walker-Jones, at 1st and L Streets NW, with an average reading score of 52. Walker-Jones also scored high in other standardized tests given in previous years. Its math scores were even higher than reading averaging 64. In most schools mathematics achievement scores were lower than reading.

The two junior highs whose ninth-graders averaged above the big-city norms were Deal, 80 in both reading and math, and Gordon, 52 in both subjects. Deal's ninth grade was about two-thirds white; Gordon had a small white majority. The two schools are both west of Rock Creek Park and are the only junior highs in the city with mainly white enrollments.

Five junior highs scored between the 41st and 46th percentiles. Four of them—Backus, Paul, Rabaut, and Taft—are in the semicircle of middle-class Negro neighborhoods in upper Northwest and far Northeast Washington. The fifth, Sousa, is near Fort Dupont Park in Southeast Washington.

The eight elementary schools in the Anacostia decentralization project had average reading scores slightly higher than those for the 16 elementary schools in the model schools division in Cardozo, again apparently reflecting socio-economic differences.

Among the Title One schools, half of which are in Cardozo, those in Project READ, which uses a series of programmed work books, did somewhat better than schools not in the project.

At Morgan, the city's oldest community controlled school, the results varied widely between the third and sixth grades, in contrast to most schools where the scores at the two levels were similar.

Morgan's third-graders scored at 50 in reading and 60 in mathematics. For sixth grade, the scores were 25 for reading and 27 for mathematics.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEST RESULTS

The table below gives reading and mathematics scores for District elementary and

junior high schools during the last school year. In the elementary schools, there are separate figures for third- and sixth-graders. The junior high tests were given only to ninth-graders. No senior high school scores were released yesterday.

The scores used are medians. Thus, if a school's third-grade median is 40, half the third-graders there scored above 40, half below. The numbers are percentiles but they are based on big-city norm of 50 rather than on national norms. Thus, if a school's score is 40, it is ahead of two-fifths of the big-city schools across the country, and behind three-fifths.

The big-city norms used in this compilation are lower than national norms. Against national norms, District schools would score lower than shown here.

There are citywide figures at the top of both the elementary and junior high school lists.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

	Reading		Math	
	3d	6th	3d	6th
Citywide.....	34	36	30	32
Adams.....	24	34	30	26
Aiton.....	32	29	30	30
Amidon.....	33	0	34	0
Bancroft.....	25	24	24	19
Barnard.....	51	42	48	44
Beers.....	42	54	42	41
Benning.....	68	54	61	59
Birney.....	26	28	20	23
Blow-Pierce.....	31	29	42	21
Bowen.....	0	33	0	29
Brent.....	41	40	36	31
Brightwood.....	49	50	35	46
Brookland.....	30	45	34	38
Bruce.....	30	33	26	31
Bryan.....	42	35	36	33
Buchanan.....	24	30	27	30
Bundy.....	0	18	0	20
Bunker Hill.....	53	59	40	51
Burroughs.....	71	63	59	55
Burrville.....	26	32	26	28
Carver.....	33	25	35	21
Clack.....	45	45	31	36
Cleveland.....	23	24	13	16
Congress Heights.....	42	37	43	32
Cook.....	27	0	18	0
Cooke.....	25	18	20	19
Crummell.....	27	33	24	27
Davis.....	31	42	26	36
Draper.....	37	29	35	27
Drew.....	31	28	27	23
Eaton.....	80	32	69	77
Eckington.....	27	32	23	30
Edmonds.....	24	0	16	0
Emery.....	33	30	36	26
Fillmore.....	62	75	60	83
Gage.....	28	32	49	32
Garfield.....	30	32	27	29
Garrison.....	19	31	18	23
Gibbs.....	32	28	26	25
Giddings.....	28	22	19	26
Goding.....	28	28	21	25
Grant.....	0	65	0	63
Green.....	37	37	39	29
Grimke.....	21	25	21	28
Hardy.....	59	37	70	34
Harris.....	24	30	31	31
Harrison.....	21	25	24	20
Hayes.....	55	19	59	21
Hearst.....	83	71	90	79
Hendley.....	31	36	30	30
Houston.....	23	31	22	27
Hyde.....	40	0	29	99
Jackson.....	50	43	45	35
Janney.....	77	79	87	78
Keene.....	55	65	53	58
Kenilworth.....	36	31	26	22
Ketcham.....	21	32	23	26
Key.....	48	75	61	51
Kimball.....	33	26	40	27
Kingsman.....	48	33	49	40
Lafayette.....	91	32	89	89
Langdon.....	38	37	32	34
Langston.....	0	0	0	0
LaSalle.....	62	55	50	49
Lenox.....	22	31	20	22
Lewis.....	31	40	19	38
Logan.....	30	26	33	18
Lovejoy.....	27	21	25	34
Ludlow.....	17	23	19	27
Madison.....	28	24	27	21
Mann.....	79	71	68	67
Maury.....	30	32	25	32
McGaughey.....	27	28	36	28
Merritt.....	27	20	26	22
Meyer.....	25	36	24	35
Miner.....	24	29	20	31
Monroe.....	31	27	34	23
Montgomery.....	20	18	18	13

	Reading		Math	
	3d	6th	3d	6th
Morgan.....	50	25	60	27
Morse.....	21	39	20	27
Moten.....	29	30	24	25
Mott.....	21	30	21	25
Murch.....	84	86	79	82
Nalle.....	21	33	18	31
Nichols Avenue.....	46	0	41	0
Noyes.....	33	36	38	82
Orr.....	36	33	42	33
Oyster.....	42	81	67	73
Park View.....	35	33	30	31
Patterson.....	47	51	48	45
Payne.....	27	36	22	28
Peabody.....	25	26	14	16
Perry.....	0	15	0	12
Petworth.....	45	39	52	42
Plummer.....	36	38	38	31
Powell.....	41	49	33	44
Randle Highlands.....	44	42	37	35
Raymond.....	30	30	29	34
Richardson.....	23	27	34	23
River Terrace.....	51	50	45	40
Rudolph.....	29	38	23	36
Savoy.....	27	26	26	20
Seaton.....	23	20	11	18
Shadd.....	25	19	27	21
Shepherd.....	83	80	71	77
Simmons.....	37	33	33	26
Simon.....	28	33	29	31
Slater.....	31	49	24	44
Slowe.....	43	39	46	41
Smothers.....	31	41	27	45
Stanton.....	33	31	35	30
Stevens.....	35	35	20	42
Stoddert.....	79	80	81	86
Summer.....	38	37	42	40
Takoma.....	57	54	47	45
Taylor.....	25	18	14	16
Thomas.....	27	34	24	36
Thomson.....	25	18	31	21
Truedell.....	38	36	30	35
Turner.....	27	24	25	30
Tyler.....	26	27	25	18
Van Ness.....	28	31	25	26
Walker-Jones.....	48	55	66	63
Watkins.....	32	18	30	20
Webb.....	38	35	36	31
West.....	68	57	61	47
Wheatley.....	27	33	21	30
Whittier.....	43	44	35	45
Wilson.....	24	32	19	23
Woodridge.....	45	48	40	33
Young.....	43	42	30	44

JUNIOR HIGHS

9th grade

	Reading		Math	
	3d	6th	3d	6th
Citywide.....	32	28	31	28
Backus.....	45	43	43	43
Banneker.....	24	24	24	24
Browne.....	32	28	28	28
Deal.....	80	80	80	80
Douglass.....	32	25	25	25
Eliot.....	23	20	20	20
Evans.....	21	23	23	23
Francis.....	20	19	19	19
Garnet-Patterson.....	28	21	21	21
Gordon.....	52	52	52	52
Hamilton.....	24	19	19	19
Hart.....	31	40	40	40
Hine.....	22	19	19	19
Jefferson.....	31	27	27	27
Johnson.....	None	None	None	None
Kramer.....	31	31	31	31
Langley.....	33	32	32	32
Lincoln.....	24	17	17	17
Macfarland.....	31	28	28	28
Miller.....	31	24	24	24
Paul.....	42	43	43	43
Rabaut.....	42	32	32	32
Randall.....	26	20	20	20
Roper.....	26	17	17	17
Shaw.....	20	17	17	17
Sousa.....	46	40	40	40
Stuart.....	23	21	21	21
Taft.....	41	34	34	34
Terrell.....	22	18	18	18
Webster.....	32	18	18	18
Woodson.....	36	37	37	37

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, with the understanding that the recess not extend beyond 3:30 p.m. today.

The motion was agreed to, and at 3:21

p.m. the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 3:30 p.m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Cook).

SENATOR THURMOND'S ROLE IN ASSISTING SCHOOL BOARDS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post has alleged that my staff members and I had tried to "sell" forced desegregation plans to South Carolina school districts. This allegation is totally false, and I denounce it for what it is—a malicious fabrication. My staff and I have acted only as an advocate on behalf of the school districts that have come to us for help in obtaining the relief to which they are entitled.

The Post bases its entire allegation on anonymous sources. I challenge the Washington Post to produce these anonymous informants referred to as "top administration sources." I challenge the Post to prove that I ever tried to pressure any school district to accept any HEW plan.

At the request of numerous school districts, I have fought the total destruction of our public schools at the hands of ultraliberal zealots. On many occasions these zealots disregarded the law and the President's guidelines in making totally unreasonable demands upon the school districts in my State. My staff and I made ourselves available to the districts to assist them in reminding HEW of the requirements of the law and in opposing these unreasonable demands. We did not draw up any desegregation plans but simply fought for HEW's approval of the plans submitted by the various school boards.

I have never urged any school district to accept any plan. In fact, on numerous occasions, I have suggested to school trustees that they might come closer to getting justice by going to court if HEW would not come forward with reasonable plans.

The discussions at HEW have been most trying. The HEW zealots have a narrow view of their mission, and ignore the factors involved in quality education. Every district is different, and only the local officials can understand the impact of extreme plans upon their school systems. The Supreme Court has not yet defined what it means by a unitary school system, but HEW does not hesitate to impose its own interpretation of this difficult question.

The tirade conducted by the Washington Post against the South never seems to end. It appears daily in the form of false propaganda in the news columns, bigoted editorials, and distorted cartoons. The Post will go to any length to create dissension and animosity for purely political reasons, and to drive a wedge between the administration and the South.

In the same spirit of stirring up turmoil, the Post has continued to print the story that the Justice Department intends to send lawyers to the South to enforce integration even after the President denied that there would be any