

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

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

VOLUME 116—PART 27

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

in the United States, or approximately 44 million pelts, were foreign produced.

The problems of the mink rancher due to inadequate quotas are not new. Already in 1967, I had pointed out that more than 40 percent of the nation's mink ranchers had been forced out of business since 1960. According to Walter Taylor, a past President of the Emba Mink Ranchers Association, there were 7,200 mink ranches in 1962 compared with 2,600 in 1970.

Thousands of Americans are dependent upon the mink industry for their livelihood. Yet, in 1970, pelt prices reached disaster levels. 90 percent of the 1969 crop sold as of September 1, at an average gross sales price of \$11.14 which is 27.3 percent less than the auction average of \$15.33 in 1969, and 42.8 percent less than the \$19.48 average realized in 1968. While these prices have skidded, there has been no control over the importation of minks.

If the mink industry is to survive, then realistic and reasonable limits on mink imports are necessary. The House trade bill does not provide sufficient relief. It sets the duty-free limit at 4.6 million pelts which is one million greater than the quantity of pelts imported in 1969, and two million greater than the Department of Agriculture's projected figure for 1970. The National Board of Fur Farm Organizations has estimated that there would have to be a 77 percent increase in the present rate of imports before American mink ranchers would get any relief through the quota provision of the House bill.

Legislation that I have previously authored and am presently cosponsoring, would set reasonable limitations on mink importation. This legislation would allow foreign mink pelts to continue entering the United States duty free until the annual total equals 40 percent of the domestic consumption in our country. All pelts imported after that point would be subject to a duty equal to 50 percent of their value.

Two further recommendations are appropriate. First, no more than one-third of the total pelts permitted in duty-free should be admitted in any calendar quarter. This requirement is necessary because foreign mink producers often flood the American market in December. Second, the Committee should seriously consider retention of the 1952 provision concerning the embargo on pelts directly competitive to mink or include such pelts in the mink quota.

The lack of a realistic limit on the importation of footwear has been a major cause of the current financial problems facing the domestic shoe industry.

In 1969, foreign-made footwear, amounting to approximately 200 million pairs, took over 25 percent of the American market. While domestic production in 1969 had declined by 52.3 million pairs compared with 1968, imports had increased by 20 million pairs.

Based on the first 8 months of 1970 (where shoe imports increased by 21.3 percent over the same period last year), the American Footwear Manufacturers Association has projected a total import of 237,200,000 pairs for 1970, which is a 35,200,000 increase over the 1969 level of imports. The significance of this increase can be seen when one realizes that in 1950, domestic production of shoes amounted to 522.5 million while imports amounted only to 6.1 million or barely one percent of the domestic market. Ten years ago, imported footwear amounted only to 26.6 million or under 4 percent of the American market. Even five years ago, shoe imports of 87.6 million occupied less than 14 percent of the domestic market.

Because the shoe industry is very dependent on labor costs, our American firms have not been able to compete fairly with foreign footwear firms. They have not been able to compete fairly because the American firm pays an average of \$2.74 an hour while chil-

dren, ages 12-14, are putting in 60-hour work weeks at footwear plants in Taiwan and Hong Kong, for as little as 12 cents an hour.

The time for setting reasonable limits on shoe imports is at hand. The Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. McIntyre, has offered legislation which I am co-sponsoring which would set realistic quotas. This bill would set the years 1967-1969 as the base period for imports. It would reduce imports from 200 million a year to approximately 150 million, or a fair percentage of the domestic market. It is time to achieve a fair trade balance—it is time to save the American shoe industry from being run out of business.

A third major industry that is being adversely affected by current import quotas is the dairy industry. Increasing dairy imports is one of the major factors contributing to the mounting pressure that is forcing farmers to leave dairying to seek a better return on their investment of capital and labor in other phases of farming and business.

Farmers have been told that if they seek better balance between supply and demand, the result will be improved prices. Yet, over the past five years, the number of dairy cows has dropped from 17.6 million to 13.8 million. During the same period, dairy farmers reduced milk production by 11 billion pounds, from 127 billion in 1964, to an estimated 116 billion in 1969. During that same period of time, imports of dairy products, heavily subsidized by foreign governments, increased by more than 6 billion pounds. This increase along with inflated production costs, have wiped out any real price improvement for dairy farmers.

The answer that best suits the needs of the American dairy farmer would be the establishment of an overall quota for the total of all dairy imports based on the average imports in 1961-65, before massive dairy imports began. Only import quotas covering the whole range of dairy products will afford relief to the domestic dairy farmer.

The actions that I have suggested are not simply protectionist. Several domestic industries are faced with critical problems which in part can be relieved through the enactment of reasonable limitations on certain imported commodities. Hopefully, trade legislation that comes to the floor will contain the provision that the restrictions in the bill will be superseded by any voluntary agreements that may be negotiated. While there must be increased efforts towards expansion of international trade and the dismantling of barriers to free trade, there must also be increased efforts to set fair trade levels to relieve those domestic industries which are suffering economic hardship due to the current unfair trade situation.

#### SCHOOL FUNDS WITHHELD BY SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has withheld some of the funds which were appropriated for this school year by the Congress and which have even been released by the Office of Management and Budget.

I have received desperate letters from school districts in my State whose title I funds have been held up. The result of this action to date has been extreme frustration and hardship for schools which are not yet sure of their entitlements for this year.

The effect on many of the programs which depend upon title I funds may soon be abandonment or severe cutbacks in services.

And the result for our children will be to once more be made victims of this administration's distorted priorities and their concern for bookkeeping over the education and welfare of our most needy children.

Mr. President, I cannot urge strongly enough the need to immediately release these appropriated funds and to allow the schools to go on with their work.

For the first time in the 5-year history of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act the Congress completed its educational appropriations work well before the beginning of the school year. This is all to be undone now by the delaying tactics of the administration.

The economic waste and the inefficiency of abandoned programs—not to mention the almost incalculable waste upon the children themselves—is absolutely intolerable.

I urge, once again, the immediate release of these funds so that our schools can return to their task of educating our neediest children.

Mr. President, to further illustrate the gravity of this situation, I would like to submit for the RECORD a few of the letters I have received on this crisis. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

JANESVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
IND. DISTRICT 830,

Janesville, Minn., October 12, 1970.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We, as school people, appreciate the fact that Congress passed the Appropriations Bill for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act prior to the beginning of the fall term. Planning now should be more meaningful.

It is my understanding that the administration has not allowed the allocation of education funds. Thus we are still not able to effectively plan our program for the year.

I urge you to make our needs and wants known immediately to those who are holding back the funds.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

DARWIN LOCHNER,  
Superintendent.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 318,  
Grand Rapids, Minn., October 12, 1970.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Thank you for your positive assistance in passing the August, 1970 Appropriations Bill. You are to be commended on your action and we wish you to know that your support of the bill is appreciated.

We are now in the second month of the school year since the passage of the Appropriations Bill. Apparently, since the passage initially, little has been accomplished in releasing information and funds to the various state agencies. As a result of the delay of allocating monies there is an increased concern because a local educational agency is charged with the responsibility of maintaining and improving existing educational programs. A slow release of funds places additional pressure on us and puts us in a somewhat precarious position.

In essence we are asking you to make known to the proper sources a pressing need

to release the monies already passed to assist in fulfilling the educational objectives of the existing programs.

Thank you for your time and again your efforts will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

DONALD J. GORNOWICH,  
Administrative Assistant,  
Federal Programs.

MAYNARD PUBLIC SCHOOLS,  
Maynard, Minn., October 8, 1970.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: As you are aware, the public school districts of Minnesota need the Title I and Title II funds to carry on their Educational programs for the 1970-71 school year.

We realize that the H.E.W. was without an administrator for sometime, but now that the position has been filled we believe the funds should be released immediately.

Most school districts in Minnesota are without sufficient funds to carry on their normal activity. Without the Federal program's monies we must write warrants and they do cost us money. Some schools may have to curtail Federal program activities.

The 89th Congress blessed us with these programs. This Congress must see that we get the money to carry out our present Federal programs.

Your usual prompt action will be greatly appreciated by all public school districts in Minnesota.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

MILTON L. ANDERSON,  
Superintendent.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT 583,  
Pipestone, Minn., October 9, 1970.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: Shocking news has just reached my desk that I find extremely disturbing. Minnesota's (and I'm sure other states) Department of Education indicates that the Federal Government is withholding ESEA Title I money that Congress appropriated for this year's program. Specifically, only \$4 million has been received of \$23 million appropriated. We are led to believe that projects now operating must be curtailed or eliminated if the additional funds are not soon forth coming.

If this is allowed to happen, faith in our Congress and even in our President will decline sharply in the eyes of educators.

The Title I program at Pipestone is small, only \$50,000, but it's \$50,000 we can't find in our local budget if we are forced to either eliminate Title I activities or support them with local tax dollars.

Isn't there something that can be done about this?

Respectfully,

WM. BURKHOLDER,  
Admin. Assistant.

MENTOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS,  
INDEPENDENT DISTRICT 604,  
Mentor, Minn., October 8, 1970.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The U.S. Congress passed the appropriation bill for Federal funds to finance our Title programs. However, the release of the major portion of the funds has been delayed by the administration for an unknown reason. The Federal government seems quite rapid when sending our numerous regulations and red tape which plague school administrators in trying to implement the programs. However, they are extremely slow at producing the money for adequate funding. This situation of uncertainty about funds, when we have already

obligated them, and have programs in action, really panics school administrators. After all, Federal money belongs to the people. They are well aware of it when they pay their Federal income tax and all other federal taxes of the so-called hidden variety.

The Federal government must do more to finance education—especially on the elementary and secondary levels. The property tax payers are really "crying" and put a good deal of pressure on the school administrators to cut the budget.

Inflation is the real culprit. If we add nothing to the program, the budget rises rapidly anyway, due to nothing but inflated prices. Inflation is causing most of our problems. Many are to blame, but the Federal government must shoulder most of the responsibility. Thus the Federal government should hasten to help finance the public schools.

It is very important that the Federal funds for the Title program be released in full—and without delay. The pressure on school administrators is rising almost daily. We are calling for help!

Sincerely yours,

E. P. NEUBAUER, Supt.

St. LOUIS COUNTY, OFFICE OF THE  
BOARD OF EDUCATION,  
October 8, 1970.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,  
Old Senate Office Building  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WALTER, As Director of Title I of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act for the St. Louis County Schools, I am writing to you urgently appealing for your assistance to implore the administration to release the education funds as appropriated by the Congress in August for fiscal 71's federally aided programs for our schools.

Statistics show that \$4,000,000 was granted to the State of Minnesota contrasted to \$16,000,000 in approved projects and the Minnesota total share is \$23,000,000 as passed by Congress. This means that practically every school in Minnesota will have to make emergency decisions as to whether they can afford to continue these federally funded projects because of the serious need for funds which were allocated and expected as promised by Congress.

Another serious consequence in the delay of funds is that valuable materials geared to special needs currently needed in these programs cannot be purchased unless current funds are available.

It appears that the administration is playing politics and this charge should be relayed to him and his administration, because there is no valid reason for denying funds so critically needed. Since passage of ESEA school districts have projected programs which cost considerably in excess of the amount funded by Congress in the anticipation of receiving the federal portion to meet current requirements. As a result of so projecting programs school district have not only currently funded costs with local monies but have found it necessary to borrow money to meet the additional current costs of approved projects which included federal monies.

It is my information that funds are also being held up for Public Law 89-10, as amended, Title III, V and VI and the newer, Vocational-Technical Education Act, as well. Because of arbitrary holdbacks the administration in Washington should be charged with maneuvering public funds for political intent.

I would appreciate all efforts which you may exert to properly inform the administration authorities responsible for this delay.

Thank you kindly for your help.

Sincerely,

PETER X. FUGINA,  
Supervisor.

ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,  
Alexandria, Minn., October 8, 1970.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Our school district is very concerned that Title I funds have not been released to the State and, in turn, to the local school district. Our school has already made commitments to personnel and, more important, to the child; and it is unbelievable that the appropriations have been authorized but not released.

The Federally funded education programs have had a tremendous impact on our schools. I hope that we can continue to plan for the benefit of the disadvantaged child, but this can only be accomplished if the funds are made available now.

I am fully aware of the strong support you give education, and I am asking that you make the administration recognize the urgency in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

A. A. PACIOTTI,  
Director, Adult Education.

McINTOSH, MINN.,  
October 9, 1970.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: Elementary and secondary school children who are entitled to the benefits of Federally funded educational programs may be seriously shortchanged this year unless the funds that are being delayed in the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare are released soon.

For example: the four million dollars of Title I Funds granted to the State of Minnesota contrasts with sixteen million dollars in approved projects and a twenty-three million dollar share of appropriations passed by Congress. If the balance of the money due for Minnesota is not made available soon, schools operating programs will be faced with out-go and no income.

The school system in which I am teaching at present has been receiving Title I Funds for the past four years. I am personally interested in this educational program as I have seven pupils who are receiving special help and who are desperately in need of this. Please help us out in this situation by informing the Office of the President to instruct the HEW Secretary to release and distribute these educational funds immediately.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GLADYS SCHLEICHER.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 535,  
Rochester, Minn., October 9, 1970.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: Are you aware of the plight of the Title I programs?

We have just gotten our Title I Program well underway for this year but have learned from the State Department of Education that funds are being delayed in the office of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. I hope you will exercise all of your influence to encourage President Nixon to release the funds which were voted by Congress.

The educational accountability stressed by the United States Office of Education cannot be maintained by state and local school districts if fiscal responsibility by the Federal Government is not accepted.

Wouldn't it be disastrous if we had to discontinue programs we have just begun?

Children's welfare is at stake! Your help is needed.

Yours truly,

WARREN W. ZIMMERMAN,  
Principal.

COTTONWOOD, MINN.,  
October 12, 1970.

Re Federal Aid to Education Program.  
Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,  
Washington,  
District of Columbia.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Recent actions by the Administration seem to show that President Nixon is not aware of the necessity for immediately releasing all of the Education funds for this year's Federally aided program for the nation's elementary and secondary school children.

The United States Congress passed the Appropriations Bill before the beginning of the fall school term for the first time in the five-year history of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This action was much appreciated as it would have provided school districts and State agencies with several weeks for preparation of programs and employment of personnel. However, the President has allowed the allocation of funds to be delayed, and school administrators have been unable to plan for the most effective use of Federal funds.

I am certain that President Nixon will instruct HEW Secretary Richardson to release and distribute the education funds if he is apprised of the need.

I would like to thank you for your support in passing the Appropriations Bill and for any aid you can give me in passing this information to the Office of the President of the United States.

Yours truly,

Mrs. ARDITH REISHUS.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: I have been informed by the Minnesota Department of Education that only 20% of the funds allotted to Title I ESEA by Congress has been released to schools in Minnesota and that 80% is being withheld by HEW.

Bejou Ind. School Dist. No. 431 of which I am principal, was allotted \$3624.00 for a project "Improving Reading Ability of 13 Title I Children". These children are one or more grades below the reading ability of their grade through grades 1, 2, 3, and 4.

If the remaining 80% allotted to this reading project is withheld, this project will have to be dropped leaving 13 children deprived of the instruction they need to compete in this age.

Therefore, I am appealing to you to influence HEW to release the funds necessary to complete this necessary project.

Sincerely,

MAURICE C. BURSHEIM,  
Principal.

SLANTED NEWS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I had the honor of being present at Kansas State University for President Nixon's address to the student body in the Alf Landon lecture series. I have previously expressed my pride and approval of both the President's remarks and the reception accorded him by the K-State students, so I shall not dwell on that point.

Frank Edmondson, a young newsman from station KLEO in Wichita, Kans., brought the content of the initial UPI bulletin on the President's appearance to the attention of his listeners and the president of UPI. However, in a colloquy shortly after the President's appearance, the distinguished minority leader (Mr. SCOTT) commented on the somewhat slanted coverage given the event by one of the major television networks. Ap-

parently, that network was not alone among the news media in presenting an inaccurate view of the President's appearance.

I believe Mr. Edmondson's criticisms are fair and reflect a responsible approach to news coverage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this KLEO editorial by Mr. Edmondson and his letter to the president of UPI be printed in the RECORD.

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

EDITORIAL

President Nixon spoke in Manhattan today. Those who listened to the speech on radio, on television and in person—witnessed a strong speech delivered by him. Hecklers tried to drown out the President—there were about fifty in all—but the spontaneous ovation by the majority of the 15,000 plus persons at the Ahearn Fieldhouse on Kansas State's campus drowned out the fifty easily. The enthusiasm was shared so much by the President, that at one time during the speech, he said this:

The destructive activists at our colleges and universities are a small minority . . . My text at this point reads: ". . . their voices have been allowed to drown out the responsible majority." That may be true in some places but not at Kansas State.

The comment was followed by a standing ovation.

However, the first national story on the speech released by United Press International showed quite a different side to the scene. Here is the story in its entirety:

MANHATTAN, KANS.—About 50 dissidents interrupted his speech with shouted questions and obscenities as President Nixon warned today that American colleges risk losing public support unless they curb violence by "destructive activists". Mr. Nixon made his strongest remarks so far about radical student dissent in a speech at Kansas State University. As the dissenters tried to shout him down, Mr. Nixon called on responsible students and faculty members to "stand up and be counted." And he urged the hecklers to be willing to listen to someone without trying to shout him down.

That United Press International news story didn't make this particular KLEO Newsman happy. A letter has been written by this reporter to be sent to the President of the United Press International, with copies also to be sent to President Richard M. Nixon, Governor Robert B. Docking, Senator Bob Dole, Senator James Pearson, Congressman Garner Shriver and other dignitaries in public office.

WICHITA, KANS.,  
September 16, 1970.

Mr. A. MIMS THOMASON,  
President,  
United Press International,  
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. THOMASON: Today President Nixon spoke at the Kansas State University Campus in Manhattan. I listened to the speech while driving to my job as newsman for KLEO Radio in Wichita. When I got to the station I wrote a news story concerning the President's speech. Enclosed is a copy of the story. I was very much enthused personally to hear: a) The President take a much firmer stand on campus violence and disrespect; b) the audience support him by numerous outbreaks of applause; and c) the audience purposely drown out the estimated 50 hecklers, who illegally brought a banner into the fieldhouse and rudely shouted obscenities at the Chief Executive. I commented on this in my news release, trying to remain un-opinionated at the same time. I feel the story is factual enough.

Then, in the next hour or so the United Press International's Ninth World in Brief (096 UPR) came over the wire. The lead story, which is also enclosed and which was to be read by stations all over America, was on the President's speech. In that nine-line story not one word was mentioned about the tremendous support the majority of the students and audience gave the President. Not one word was mentioned about the fact that they, by a ratio of 300 to 1, outnumbered the few boisterous, vociferous, rude dissidents. Not one word mentioned about the fact that the President was so impressed with the majority of the audience that he broke from the prepared text long enough to comment on the conduct. Not one word was mentioned that the hecklers quieted down considerably and that conversely, the President's enthusiasm increased toward the end just as considerably. Not one word was mentioned that there was but one other demonstration evident in the environs of the Fieldhouse where President Nixon spoke.

I fully realize that the UPI story was short. But I also realize that that story is just the type that gives those "dissidents" the fuel they need. The way the story came across made the whole speech sound like a verbal, shouting battle between Nixon and the hecklers, with the hecklers making a jackass of our President. That simply was not the case.

I am 24. I have long hair. I dig raucous music as well as Lawrence Welk as well as Grand Funk as well as Mantovani. I am a student. I have served three years in the Army. I hated the Army. I don't like the War. But you won't find me out-shouting a public speaker. You won't find me using every obscenity possible in public for shock value. You won't find me protesting illegally. You won't find me bombing buildings. You will find me in church, worshipping the God I love. You won't find me mixing my God's name with obscenities. But, you will find me a cross-section of a heck of a lot of students and young Americans who are fed up with the "dissidents" being given lead stories which falsely give them the victories in confrontations with police and public dignitaries. More and more in the future, you will be hearing from students like myself who are tired of the immature cacophonous, simpering, overgrown problem children being given every hand they need in undermining the very freedoms I believe in. This letter is my first. I promise, it shan't be the last if news leads as that in today's UPI log continue.

Sincerely,

FRANK M. EDMONDSON, JR.,  
KLEO News.

EDITORIAL

President Nixon, speaking at Kansas State University this noon, has spoken out against campus violence in America's universities. The President was harassed by a group of about 50 student hecklers, who managed to smuggle in a banner despite the rules against signs in the Ahearn Fieldhouse. The banner stated "How many more will you kill?" However, Nixon's most frequent interruptions were enthusiastic ones which encouraged the President notably in the latter pages of his speech. The President was interrupted several times by the audiences ovation supporting his criticism of the small group of hecklers. At one point the President was so encouraged by the support of the audience that he broke from the prepared text to add this comment.

"The destructive activists at our colleges and universities are a small minority . . . My text at this point reads: '. . . their voices have been allowed to drown out the responsible majority.' That may be true in some places but not at Kansas State."

The comment was followed by a standing ovation.