The enrolled bill and joint resolution were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on August 6, 1971, presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 581. An act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, to eliminate certain export credit controls, and for other purposes; and
S. 2296. An act to amend sections 107 and 709 of title 32, United States Code, relating to appropriations for the National Guard and to National Guard technicians, respectively.

EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1971

The Senate continued the consideration of the bill, S. 659, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and related acts, and for other purposes.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following bills be granted the privilege of the floor during the consideration of the pending bill: Roy Millenson, Sidney Johnson, Kevin McKenna, Stephen Wexler, Richard Smith, Nik Eides, Robert Nagel, and Bertram Carp.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado if he would take the time to answer a few questions.

Mr. DOMINICK. I shall be glad to do so, but I will yield myself 10 minutes of my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I must say that I have never heard such a parade of horrors as he has recited. The Senator's interpretation indicates that we are trying to overturn the whole educational system of the country.

This is very interesting, because I have worked with the educators all the way through in developing the bill. A great number of the provisions which they suggest have been incorporated in the bill. My desire, instead of trying to centralize International education programs, is to disperse it to all eligible institutions throughout the country.

My previous citations of support from educators and foreign affairs experts indicates the breadth of support my amendment enjoys.

As previously pointed out there are 118 eligible institutions around the country, in the District of Columbia and in Puerto Rico, all offering courses in international relations, foreign service and diplomacy.

All the Board has to do is to approve the institutions as the bill states.

So, instead of the education being centralized and standardized, it is dispersed and varied. Instead of trying to maintain control of the source of our foreign service personnel, my amendment provides for geographical dispersion through a nomination procedure in which the Senator, the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of State make nominations of the people who will be eligible for the scholarship examination.

Therefore, it is not a patronage situation except insofar as the original nomination is concerned. After that selection is based on a purely competitive basis. It is similar to the Navy ROTC plan.

I cannot visualize for the life of me, when we are dealing with 118 diverse institutions, and a very limited authority in that regard, how this will create a federally controlled course of instruction. In fact, the university people say exactly the opposite. Because of the concern of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas, and the Secretary of the Navy's opposition to the bill, the Foreign Service Institute. We further eliminated from the bill the words "approved by the board" after the words "curricula and courses of study."

What we have tried to do from the very beginning, and the characterization that have been heaped upon us is to maintain a scholarship program which will give young men and women interested in foreign affairs the opportunity to get an education in those fields as are given to lawyers, doctors, and other scientists, all of which is at Federal expense, and none of which I have ever heard the Senator from Arkansas complain about prior to this time. I cannot understand the objections he is raising at this time. I do not think they are valid.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe the Senator has stated that the Board has no power. Is it not a fact that the Board has the power to approve the allocation of the funds to be made available?

Mr. DOMINICK. The Board picks the institutions that will be available. Then, when the young men and women take the competitive examinations—and they are similar to the admissions test in the ROTC—they apply for the institution. And it is approved if they have any available room. That is where they can go.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe the Senator has just said that there are 77 approved programs.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct and they will be given degrees in international affairs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does that mean that an institution which does not give a degree is automatically ineligible for this money?

Mr. DOMINICK. Probably originally it would be, if anyone wanted to go there, but—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. There are also 21 institutions in 21 States giving foreign service diplomas and curriculums. We have a wide range of institutions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are over 1,500 or 2,000 institutions.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the fact remains that the Board has the discretion of determining whether the institution is worthy of it.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct. I would say to the distinguished Senator that if a young man or woman who is going to go in the Foreign Service, from the State Department viewpoint, they would want to send them to an institution of that kind. If the person is going to be in agriculture, they may want to send the person to an agricultural university, or to a land-grant university.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have about 8,000 applications for 100 or 200 places from these same institutions. There is no dearth of student graduates from the institutions to which the Senator referred.

I cannot see what possible advantage this is other than to give the Board—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will Senators please be seated. The Senate is not in order.

The Senator from Arkansas may proceed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not see at all what the object is other than to give the Board the power to influence the kind of training, and so forth, that the institution shall give. This is what I meant by centralization. If the Board has the power to make the selection of the students, it has the power, therefore, to make the selection of the curriculum that is appropriate.

I come back again to the members of the Board and the members to be appointed by the Vice President. Since the Vice President is appointed by the President, for all practical effects, it might be said that seven out of the nine would fit into that category leaving only two members appointed by the Speaker. But these men obviously cannot give attention to this kind of matter. There will be a staff and these programs will go on.

Does the Senator think the decision to determine what institutions are eligible, which means the judgment of the curriculums, will not finally devolve upon the staff of the Board?

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not agree with the Senator just as I do not agree with most of the argument he has made.

This is what would happen in this situation. The university would like to accept the person on this kind of scholarship. Some will say that they want one or two and some will say we do not want any. It is not the Board on the ROTC and in all kinds of programs. They might say, "No, we do not want to take that kind of program."
Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is seeking the right to make assignments on the Island he holds as his staff grad­u­ate. They have previously the figures we had in the book is inappropriate and objectionable with the interference of an agency head.

The State Department is primarily interested in this area. HEW has said it is wrong. I shall read one paragraph from a letter from the Civil Service Commission Chairman:

In addition to training people greatly in excess of need, the Commission finds that the bill is inappropriate and objectionable with respect to the provisions of section 1209(a), (b), and (c) granting the Board of Trustees a vague kind of assignment authority to place students and graduates in Government agencies. The Commission believes these provisions conflict with the proper appointment authority of each agency head. This authority and related management control should not be sub­jected to the interference of an outside body with no responsibil­ity for the achievement of the agency mission. The provisions for consultation do not cure this basic flaw and conflict of authority.

He is referring to that provision which would seem to give the Commission a right which has been received for assignment to him by a Gover­nment agency.

Is that the way the Senator interprets the bill?

Mr. DOMINICK. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator hear the part I read from the letter of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. DOMINICK. I was there when he testified.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is his letter to me.

Mr. DOMINICK. What date?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. June 3, 1971. He stated:

In addition to training people greatly in excess of need, the Commission finds that the bill is inappropriate and objectionable with respect to the provi­sions of section 1209(a), (b), and (c) granting the Board of Trustees a vague kind of assignment authority to place students and graduates in Government agencies. The Commission believes these provisions conflict with the proper appointment authority of each agency head.

He has a reference to section 1209 in the bill which is on pages 17 and 18. At the top of page 18 where it is stated:

Except as otherwise provided by any other law of the United States or regulation prescribed by the Board, each student admitted to the program under section 1209 shall, upon satisfactory completion of his course of study leading to an undergraduate or graduate degree, or within such period of time thereafter as the Board may find to be reasonable to prepare and submit any thesis or dissertation related to his course of study, be available for assignment in the discretion of and by the board.

Then, it is stated on page 18:

(1) for hiring or appointment by the United States in connection with any program of the government relating to the field of foreign affairs conducted by any department or agency of the government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senate is 3:45 p.m.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes; then, if the Senator wants to continue, he can do it on the other time.

I am going to answer what the Senator is saying.

On page 18(c) it states:

Prior to making any assignments under this section, the board shall consult with interested departments and agencies of the government to determine the personnel requirements of their programs relating to the field of foreign affairs.

So we are not trying to shove anybody at anybody's throat or overfill the positions. We are trying to give young men and women an opportunity to have a career in international relations. I cannot understand what is so horrible about that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Civil Service Commission has responsibility. They interpret this language. I have placed in the RECORD what they say about this matter of assignment authority. They interpret this to mean the Board has the authority to assign.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator is 3:50 p.m.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Civil Service Commission has responsibility. They interpret this language. I have placed in the RECORD what they say about this matter of assignment authority. They interpret this to mean the Board has the authority to assign.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, as I look at the program it is more or less comparable to the program we have for our military academies—more or less. The only thing that puzzles me is this, and I hope someone will explain it. If a person attends West Point, when he graduates he is given a commission. He is guaranteed a commission in the Army.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. When one goes to the Air Academy he automatically gets a commission in the Air Force.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. And when a person goes to Annapolis to the Naval Academy he gets a commission in the Navy.

If a boy or girl is trained for the Foreign Service, does that boy or girl automatically get a commission in the Foreign Service?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the very point, and it is a vague point. This assignment power is given to the Board of nine men, appointed by the Presi­dent and the Vice President, together with two Congressmen.

The Senator knows what will happen to that Board. The Senator knows how busy he is. There would be the staff that has the responsibility for assignment. But apparently the Civil Service Commission thinks it will work as I stated earlier.

They have 50,000 on the waiting list or on the eligible list, but the Board has the authority to say, "You take this man or this woman." This is the letter which raised the question about the assignment. In the letter they pointed out the great excess of applicants.

Mr. PASTORE. I did not understand it that way. I understand the objection of the Civil Service Commission to be while they might have the right to assign, there would be nothing to assign them to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On both grounds. There is a great excess of applicants. I read previously the figures we had in the report. I think it said 50,000 people qualified for employment under civil service examination. There were 8,000 applicants for the State Department.

Mr. PASTORE. The only reason why I raised the question, if the Senator will yield to me, is that I have received letters from young people who have been trained for Foreign Service and they cannot get jobs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. I wrote to the Secretary of State, and he said there were no jobs for them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. If we spend a lot of money to train people in the hope that those people will get jobs, and then they cannot get jobs, does not that lead to frustration?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. What guarantee is there that after we spend this money to train them for Foreign Service they will get jobs there?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is one aspect of the problem. There are only a little over 3,000 in the Foreign Service. There are one or two in the Service in the foreign field. When I say "Foreign Service" I mean those in the Foreign Service who are accredited by the Department of State. There are people in the Department of Agriculture who go to the Embassy in Rome, for example, for work in the field of agriculture. Such persons are trained in agriculture, not foreign policy.

The original proposal was not to train a man in agriculture, but to train him to be a diplomat. It was to train such persons in diplomacy to fight communism. This is the original of the proposal. Because that was objectionable, it has been changed into this form at the present time.

As I have said, there is no need for it. A further point is, are we, in this real­ly very casual way, going to delegate to the President the right to make an assignment in X agency, HEW, Agriculture, or what have you, and say to the Secretary of Agriculture, "You have to take Mr. Jones. He has a degree from a university on our scholarship"?

A further question is raised: Is that going to be done without overriding his authority? That is one aspect of it.

There is one rather curious provision
with regard to scholarships on page 13 of the amendment which reads:

Where both a husband and wife member are students under the Program and are cohabiting, their joint subsistence pay shall be $300.

I suppose the board is going to have to go around and inspect them to make sure they are cohabiting before they give them $300. We have one portion of the law—that it would be illegal for them to get the $300 if they were not cohabiting. Who is going to be inspecting the students who are in the various universities to be sure they comply with that provision? It would be a rather curious provision. You see, Mr. President, they have to cohabit in order to get the $300. If they are not, they get $250.

Mr. PASTORE. And they have to go to the same university in order to cohabit; do they not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. They cannot go to different universities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They cannot go to different universities. Talk about supervision of the lives of students. And then the proponents say that this is free and there is diversity. This is Big Brother in a university.

What is going to happen when they approach a professor in a school—all of those who are in bad shape financially. That is what the purpose of the bill is—to help finance them. But if they approach a dean and he is asked, "How would you like a program that will give you some money?" Of course, he is going to be in favor of it. I will wager that the deans have not studied the bill. The bill has been changed, from time to time, has been changed since it was originally introduced. It will be easy to approach a professor and offer him this program, especially if it is in his field; and they can go to practically any school, because they are all overcrowded. There are many proposals of a very controversial subject. Due to the efforts of the Senator from Wisconsin, the subject was discussed to the point where Senators knew what they were voting on, at least. They had it talked about long enough to be sure whether the Russians have gone so far as to require their foreign service people to take the same kind of training. They may have, but that would at least be more consistent with their concept of how to organize a society. I do not believe the Federal Government can have the concept of the way to have the most effective society.

What do we have in big business? We had a big argument the other day—and it was a close decision—about whether the Labor Department should subsidize big business schools through the Federal Government. It was a very controversial subject. Due to the efforts of the Senator from Wisconsin, the subject was discussed to the point where Senators knew what they were voting on, at least. They had it talked about long enough to be sure whether the Russians have gone so far as to require their foreign service people to take the same kind of training. They may have, but that would at least be more consistent with their concept of how to organize a society. I do not believe the Federal Government can have the concept of the way to have the most effective society.
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defer this matter. I would like to suggest, Mr. President, that it go over, but I sup
pose the manager of the bill would not
be willing to do that. Would he support a
motion to lay on the table, so that this
matter could have further consideration
at a time more propitious, when more
Senators are present?
Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as manager of the
bill, I would like to go ahead with a
vote, as the Senator from Arkansas can
well imagine. On the other hand, a mo-
tion to lay on the table is always in order,
and the Senator can make the motion.
Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the
Senator yield so that I can ask several
questions?
Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.
Mr. PASTORE. I am referring now to page
30484 of the amendment. I do not see
anything wrong with this program,
really, if we have the places to put these
people once we educate them, because
I think when it comes to international
affairs, we ought to have the best edu-
cated people in the world.
But what puzzles me here is the fact
that we may spend a lot of money to
train a certain individual in the hope
that he will get a certain assignment in
the Federal Government in a particular
job for which he has studied so hard. But
as I read page 18, all it amounts to is
that once you are graduated, you become
eligible for assignment. Is there a guar-
tee here that you will have a job? And
who determines the giving of that guar-
tee?
Mr. PELL. My understanding is that
there is no such guarantee, but the auth-
or of the amendment could reply more
accurately.
Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator from
Rhode Island is correct; there is no such
guarantee, but the Secretary may deter-
mine who is going to do these various
scholarships he is going to give out. He can determine whether to
make it a thousand a year, or 500.
Mr. PASTORE. The only trouble is this:
The period of time from the deter-
mination of the number of scholarships to
graduation by the course is 4 years.
If it is a graduate course, it may
be 6 or 7 years. This is the thing that
bothers me, because we have so many
young people today who are encouraged,
for example, to take a premedical course,
and after they have taken the premedical
course, there is no medical school for
them to go to.
I am telling you, that is about the worst
thing we could do to a young man or
young woman. We have given them the
encouragement that they take a pre-
medical course, they are going to enter the
Federal Government in a particular
job for which they have studied so hard.
But as I read page 18, all it amounts to is
that once you are graduated, you become
eligible for assignment. Is there a guar-
tee here that you will have a job? And
who determines the giving of that guar-
tee?
Mr. PELL. My understanding is that
there is no such guarantee, but the auth-
or of the amendment could reply more
accurately.
Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator from
Rhode Island is correct; there is no such
guarantee, but the Secretary may deter-
mine who is going to do these various
scholarships he is going to give out. He can determine whether to
make it a thousand a year, or 500.
Mr. PASTORE. The only trouble is this:
The period of time from the deter-
mination of the number of scholarships to
graduation by the course is 4 years.
If it is a graduate course, it may
be 6 or 7 years. This is the thing that
bothers me, because we have so many
young people today who are encouraged,
for example, to take a premedical course,
and after they have taken the premedical
course, there is no medical school for
them to go to.
I am telling you, that is about the worst
thing we could do to a young man or
young woman. We have given them the
encouragement that they take a pre-
medical course, they are going to enter the
Federal Government in a particular
job for which they have studied so hard.
But as I read page 18, all it amounts to is
that once you are graduated, you become
eligible for assignment. Is there a guar-
tee here that you will have a job? And
who determines the giving of that guar-
tee?
Mr. PELL. My understanding is that
there is no such guarantee, but the auth-
or of the amendment could reply more
accurately.
Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator from
Rhode Island is correct; there is no such
guarantee, but the Secretary may deter-
mine who is going to do these various
scholarships he is going to give out. He can determine whether to
make it a thousand a year, or 500.
your bet and we give you a chance." At the moment, they are shipped off into the scientific field, into the medical field, into the teaching field, into all the other fields that are being funded by the Federal Government. This is not being funded, and we are waiting until we get through.

This result has been, as a task force of the State Department has pointed out, as I stated in my prepared statement, that they have had great difficulty in getting any minorities into the Foreign Service. We need a great many of these people with the world as small as it is today.

I read from their report:

For example, college recruiters were sent to 19 predominantly black colleges in the fall of 1969 to encourage black students to take the Foreign Service Officer written examination. Only 13 minority students took the FSO written examination. Only 13 minority students took the FSO written examination.

Highly capable minority candidates are difficult to recruit because few have had any exposure to the Foreign Service as career possibility.

This is the point I make.

And because the best of such candidates receive job offers from other employers who have aggressive minority programs and who offer better salaries and at least comparable responsibility.

If we start the type of program I am proposing, we will get the career possibilities opening up early, so that they can assess this as against whatever else they may be able to do and decide that if this is what their career desires are, they can move forward in that field. I think it is of great significance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a clarification?

Mr. DOMINICK. On the time of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought the Senator said a moment ago he was prepared to yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas to table the amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. HUBBARD), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCCOVERY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE), the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCCOVERY) would vote "aye."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senators from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER and Mr. BROCK), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. FEENY) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUND) is absent because of illness.

Mr. DONNICK. On the time of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WERCHEK), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would vote "aye."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 38, as follows:
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YEAS—21

Allen

Bentsen

Burkett

Byrd, W. Va.

Case

Chamberlain

Fulbright

Magnuson

Mansfield

McClellan

McGee

Proxmire

Spong

Symington

NAYS—38

Aiken

Allott

Bellmon

Brooke

Byrd, Va.

Capito

Dole

Dominick

Eastland

Fannin

Fong

Pell

Gurney

Hansen

Humphrey

Javits

Jennings

Mondale

Nelson

Packwood

Not voting—41

Anderson

Allard

Bayh

Bennett

Bible

Boggs

Brown

Cannon

Chiles

Chambliss

Cheatham

Cotton

Cranston

Eastland

Mundt

Miskie

Percy

Pendleton

Perry

Preddy

Ricci

Sparkman

Talmadge

Tunney

Weicker

Young

So the motion to table Mr. DOMINICK's amendment was rejected.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President's Officer (Mr. BEALL) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry
nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of Senate proceedings.)

EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1971

The Senate continued the consideration of the bill (S. 659) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and related acts, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to strike subsection 3 of section 1205, appearing on page 13, lines 3 to 8, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas withhold so that I may yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there have been a great many meetings yesterday and today relative to a unanimous-consent agreement which I am about to propose. It has been discussed with all interested parties, and with the distinguished Republican leader and the distinguished deputy Republican leader, as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate strike S. 659, now pending before the Senate be stricken, and that the said language of title IV be introduced as a bill, and that the bill be jointly referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions that the bill be reported back to the Senate not later than October 1, 1971. I ask further that when the bill is reported it be in order to proceed to its consideration at the discretion of the majority and minority leaders with time for the debate thereon to be limited to 3 hours, and that the bill be placed on the Senate schedule of business not later than October 1, 1971.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 659 be reprinted at the end of Senate proceedings for the convenience of Members of the Senate.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is absolutely correct. But I would add: The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is not ceding any of its jurisdiction making an arrangement arrived at for the convenience of the Senate—specifically with respect to the bill. In other words, there will be no change in jurisdiction.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. This is very important. I will not object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the amendment that Senator MANSFIELD and I have introduced to the education bill (S. 659) is to aid the most neglected of Indian children. I have here, Mr. President, a long list of Indian reservations in the Nation, and programs for teacher training, scholarships, and other matters relating to the education of their children, which have been successful. The enrollment and number less than 10. The total enrollment in these isolated Indian schools ranges from a low of 15 to a high of 178 students. These are the children who attend small schools along with non-Indian children, whose homes are adjacent to the reservation. These are the children who attend small schools along with non-Indian children whose homes are adjacent to the reservation. In these small schools the Indian children constitute less than 50 percent of the enrollment and number less than 10. Our amendment would make it possible to provide the benefits of title IV of S. 659 to most of these isolated schools. It would have a minimal effect on the overall purposes of title IV of S. 659, but it is of immense importance to these isolated Indian children. I have here, Mr. President, as examples, a list of seven of these schools. The total enrollment in each of these schools ranges from a low of 10 to a high of 178 students. In each case, the number of Indian students is less than 10, ranging from three through nine. As the bill is presently drafted, none of these schools will be eligible to participate in the special programs provided by title IV, for title IV,
section 303(a) (2) (b) requires that the Indian enrollment consists of at least 10 children or constitutes more than 50 percent of the total enrollment. I ask that this list of schools be inserted in the Record at this point.

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

**Some Examples of Montana Schools Adjacent to or on Indian Reservations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total Indian Enrollment</th>
<th>Indian Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edgar Elementary School</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashua Elementary School</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashua High School</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carteret High School</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlo High School</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Elementary School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton Elementary School</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. METCALF. The report of the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education indicates the large numbers of Indian children who are high school dropouts. The Indian dropout rate is twice the national average—in some schools it approaches 100 percent. Senator MANSFIELD and I believe that if the schools listed above and similar schools in other States are able to provide the special Indian education programs contemplated by this bill, the dropout problem will be greatly reduced. The schools will be attractive to the Indian youth, who now find the curriculum irrelevant to their interests.

Mr. President, our amendment will affect very few Indian youths, but they are the very ones most apt to become the leaders on the reservations if they are encouraged to stay in school. The effect of our amendment is minor in terms of dollars, but major in terms of human life.

Mr. President, I have a telegram from the National Education Association endorsing our amendment, which I ask to insert in the Record at this point, together with the text of our amendment.

There being no objection, the telegram and amendment were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**[Telegram]**

**Hon. Lee Metcalf,**
**Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:**

The National Education Association urges the adoption of your amendment to revise the eligibility for entitlement for aid to Indian children under Title IV of S. 659. This is of major importance to rural isolated schools of the type mentioned in this amendment which enroll Indian pupils along with non-Indian children. Special Indian education programs in these schools will motivate more Indian pupils to attend high school.

Sincerely,

**Stanley J. McFarland,**
**Assistant Executive Secretary, Government Relations and Citizenship.**

**S. 659**

On page 334, line 8, before the period insert a comma and the following: “except that the requirements of this subparagraph shall not apply to any programs in a school which is on or adjacent to an Indian reservation”.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I want to make doubly sure that when the bill is referred to the committees, if I do not succeed in getting these amendments in committee, I will have an opportunity to offer them on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed; we will do it together.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I believe that the dual referral of title IV to the Labor and Interior Committees presents us with a unique opportunity of recent times: two committees, both with longstanding interest and involvement in Indian education, will be working together to provide a comprehensive Indian education package.

I am, of course, deeply disappointed that we could not act on this legislation today. We have had excellent support and interest on the part of many Indian tribes, and organizations in title IV to S. 659. I think the record ought to show some of the recent indications of support on this, and I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams received on title IV this week be included in the Record.

There being no objection the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**ST. PAUL, MINN., August 4, 1971.**
**Senator Walter Mondale,**
**U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.,**

The National Indian Education Association urges the Senate passage of the Kennedy-Mondale bill of Indian education as revised under title four of higher education. NIEA urges the Congress of the United States to provide reform for Indian education. The bill before the Senate today begins an era of Indian education reform for both reservation and nonreservation citizens. NIEA urges passage of this bill.

**Will Antell, President.**
**Ketchikan, Alaska, August 5, 1971.**

**Senator Edward Kennedy,**
**Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.,**

Dear Senator Kennedy: This is to reemphasize our support of Senate Bill 659, the Higher Education Act, Title IV, with its emphasis on special Indian education programs to public schools where Indians are enrolled in special demonstration projects in curriculum development, Indian language courses, teacher training, handicapped programs, and adult education programs. A special office of education to administer these programs with an advisory council appointed by the President are all in agreement with United Southeastern Tribes, self-determination policy.

We feel that Senate Bill 659, Title IV, will fill the void in Indian Education and go a long way toward improved educational opportunities for our American Indian youth throughout the Nation.

Very truly yours,

**Wayne V. Zuniga,**
**Executive Director, United Southeastern Tribes, Inc.**
The text appears to be a collection of letters and statements advocating for Senate Bill S.659, titled "Indian Education Act," which would provide an opportunity for the American Indian to better prepare themselves for their role in self-determination. The letters are from various individuals representing different tribes and organizations. The text includes names of senators, representatives, and other influential figures, with calls to action urging support for the bill. The letters are dated from various locations, including Washington, D.C., Albuquerque, New Mexico, and other locations across the United States.

The text is a call to action for the Senate to pass Senate Bill S.659, which would provide federal funding for Indian education programs. The letters express support from diverse groups, including tribes, educational institutions, and legal organizations, emphasizing the importance of Indian education and the need for the Senate to act promptly on the bill.

The letters are written to various recipients, including U.S. Senators, Representatives, and other officials, with specific requests to support the bill and to urge swift action. The letters are dated from different times, ranging from August 5, 1971, to August 1971, emphasizing the urgency of the matter.

The text also includes calls for the Senate to consider the importance of Indian education and to act in the best interest of the American Indian community. The letters are a testament to the continued advocacy and support for Indian education, highlighting the ongoing struggle for equal educational opportunities for Native Americans.

Overall, the text is a powerful expression of the sentiments of those dedicated to improving Indian education and the need for the Senate to pass Senate Bill S.659, titled "Indian Education Act."
Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, in referring to the deletion of title IV from S. 659 I wish to comment.

The Chairman stands on the threshold of opening new doors for the Indian people. The administration and Congress have both espoused a new policy in Indian affairs—"self-determination without termination." We stand ready to deliver Indian legislation this session which will implement this new policy. A new policy which will open opportunities heretofore denied our Indian people—a policy which should cross and eliminate bureaucratic inroads—a policy, Mr. President, which will bring the American Indian into his own. This policy is based on the fact that there are Indian people who are sophisticated and intelligent so as to be capable of directing Indian affairs. Now as we prepare to move forward to implement this policy we are being asked to act on a $185 million Indian education reform bill and object to the action contemplated.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it is hard to ask the Indian people to wait again before Congress takes action on legislation to benefit their children. But I am clear and when the Senate committees working together will effect a doubled commitment and a doubled effort on the part of the U.S. Senate to bring excellence to Indian education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.
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Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it is hard to ask the Indian people to wait again before Congress takes action on legislation to benefit their children. But I am clear and when the Senate committees working together will effect a doubled commitment and a doubled effort on the part of the U.S. Senate to bring excellence to Indian education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it is hard to ask the Indian people to wait again before Congress takes action on legislation to benefit their children. But I am clear and when the Senate committees working together will effect a doubled commitment and a doubled effort on the part of the U.S. Senate to bring excellence to Indian education.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it is hard to ask the Indian people to wait again before Congress takes action on legislation to benefit their children. But I am clear and when the Senate committees working together will effect a doubled commitment and a doubled effort on the part of the U.S. Senate to bring excellence to Indian education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it is hard to ask the Indian people to wait again before Congress takes action on legislation to benefit their children. But I am clear and when the Senate committees working together will effect a doubled commitment and a doubled effort on the part of the U.S. Senate to bring excellence to Indian education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it is hard to ask the Indian people to wait again before Congress takes action on legislation to benefit their children. But I am clear and when the Senate committees working together will effect a doubled commitment and a doubled effort on the part of the U.S. Senate to bring excellence to Indian education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it is hard to ask the Indian people to wait again before Congress takes action on legislation to benefit their children. But I am clear and when the Senate committees working together will effect a doubled commitment and a doubled effort on the part of the U.S. Senate to bring excellence to Indian education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it is hard to ask the Indian people to wait again before Congress takes action on legislation to benefit their children. But I am clear and when the Senate committees working together will effect a doubled commitment and a doubled effort on the part of the U.S. Senate to bring excellence to Indian education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.
60 people qualified. The Senator is going to have to find them jobs. Where are Senators going to find jobs for them?

When we nominate people to the Naval Academy, for example, a Senator does not have to worry; but after he nomin­ates people to the Foreign Service Academy, he can find that person graduates, a Senator is going to have to worry about where he is going to be assigned. That person will say to him, “Look, you have to find me a job.” That will put a Senator in a difficult position.

When a Senator nominates someone to West Point, for example, we do not have to worry about getting him a job; he is automatically given a commission.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Some years ago some of us thought it would be a good idea to have a Foreign Service Academy. The basis was that if we can afford three academies to train our youth for the hot war of the modern age, surely we can afford one academy to train our youth for the cold war we are now in. Of course, that would have included an opportunity for women to go into the Foreign Service.

For many reasons, that bill—which, incidentally, was backed by what I consider the finest group of citizens, from all walks of life, that ever backed a bill presented to the Congress—was defeated. One of the reasons why it was defeated was that some of the Foreign Service of­ficers of the old guard were able to reverse the position of the Secretaries of State and influence Congress, and the bill went down the drain.

They said the primary reason they did not like it was that it was not going to be run by the State Department; in other words, it would be outside their influ­ence, like any other university.

With respect to this particular type and character of suggested academy, I would ask the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee who is going to be responsible for this academy, as to what these students will study and what their curricula will be, and so forth?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This would not create an academy. It would create a board, so-called.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is what I am getting at. Who appoints the board?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The board will be nine of them on the board. Four will be appointed by the President, then the Secre­tary of State, and two Members of the Senate and two Members of the House, all without confirmation by the Senate. In other words, the Secretary of State will be one member, four members will be appointed by the President, and then there will be two Senators and two Mem­bers of the House.

I think the very idea of creating a board of this kind, putting it Sena­torial control, and not让它 states and the University of the State, it is dressed up a little differently. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem­porum, the Senator from Arkansas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I will use that 1 minute to conclude by emphasizing again that this measure is unnecessary. It is uncalled for, and I think it is obviously contrary to the policy of the present administration, as it was to that of previous administra­tions. Every time a similar idea has been presented, it has been disapproved by the executive agencies, not just this time but going back some 10 or 12 years.

So this is not a new attitude on their part. It is dressed up a little differently. This proposal of having Senators able to appoint 15 candidates was thought to be attractive. I think it would prove to be a great problem for Senators and Members of the House of Representa­tives, if they take that responsibility and then are unable to place the men who have been given these scholarships.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem­porum. The time of the Senator from Ar­kansas has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I gather that the Senator from Arkansas is not too concerned about the specifics of the subject matter, because his amend­ment is not concerned with that at all. The provision he would strike would add $50 for a married couple each month, so that they could both be together.

But as far as the rest of it is concerned,
I would also like to add this—could I have the attention of the Senator from Missouri? If I just want to say to the Senator from Missouri that when we originally put this bill together, we did not have the Secretary of State in it, and the first objection I got from the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations was that they had no business. We did not have the Secretary of State in it. We agreed that this was probably a reasonable idea, so we put him back in again.

It seems to me that if we are going to have a program which involves the various agencies, but also involves foreign affairs, we are going to have some role for the Secretary of State, regardless of who he is or what party he is. So now what we have is a nonoperating board; all they do is say "these are the places where the fellows can go, and after they have taken the competition, and they happen to applied, we will let them get in." As I say, it is a nonoperating board; that is what I want to be perfectly clear.

We have a board consisting of two Representatives, two Senators, the Secretary of State, and four very highly qualified educators in the field, and these people serve, and obviously all they have to do is set the program up and it runs more or less by itself, and it does not need a lot of expense.

So far as the money is concerned, the first year's authorization—and all we are talking about here is authorizations—is only $15 million. It goes to $30 million the second year, $45 million the third year, and $60 million the last, but if they do not need that many scholarships, we do not spend that much money.

The board is the entity that determines what the flow in and flow out of the agencies is, so that they can determine how many are needed. That is their main function.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. PELL. Excuse me. The time is mine, I think. This is the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Fullbright), and I am told by the Presiding Officer that time of the Senator from Arkansas on the amendment has expired.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island is in charge of time in opposition of the amendment.

Mr. PELL. How much time does the Senator require?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Just enough to make an observation and ask a question.

Mr. PELL. I yield the Senator 2 minutes, and then I hope we can come to a vote.

Mr. SYMINGTON. My question to the Senator from Colorado is, if the President appoints five and the Vice President two out of the nine-man board, will it or will it not be possible for that board to set standards of curricula comparable to the standards that have been set by the Department of Defense at various universities, where a great deal more money is involved?

Mr. PELL. I think the question is that time and time again, when weapons systems come to Congress for approval, the people who back those weapons systems—some of which I think have merit and some of which do not—are the people who would control the curriculums which are given these gigantic sums of money every year, far greater than what we are talking about today.

If that is true, my question is, will it not also be true that this board, which would have to control whether these students, would get jobs. Only the Secretary of State, would control the curriculums that would be specified in order for the institutions to get the money?

Mr. DOMINICK. The answer is, no; they would not.

Mr. FULLBRIGHT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. FULLBRIGHT. Will the Senator from Rhode Island yield so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. PELL. I yield the Senator 2 minutes.

Mr. FULLBRIGHT. On the motion to strike, does not the Senator think it a little odd to put in the language that where both husband and wife are students under the program, they are required to be cohabiting? Would that not seem to put upon the board the duty of investigating before they dispense the $300 a month for 36 months, $60 million? Is this actually cohabitating? Why is it this in the bill, and why is not the Senator willing to strike that provision?

Mr. PELL. I would defer to the Senator from Colorado to explain that part of his amendment.

Mr. FULLBRIGHT. I wonder if the committee really read the bill before they reported it.

Mr. DOMINICK. The impetus for this was from the educators. They said that in order to get the extra money, often, times people would say they were married when in fact they were not. I do not think the words "and are cohabiting" mean a thing, really. It is just designed to mean, technically, that they are living at the same place together.

Mr. FULLBRIGHT. I had always thought the words had some meaning.

Mr. DOMINICK. At least that they are living at the same place together.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULLBRIGHT. I yield back my time, and I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Fullbright). On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Anderson), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bayh), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Bible), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Burdick), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Cannon), the Senator from Florida (Mr. Chiles), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Church), the Senator from California (Mr. Cranston), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Eastland), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. East), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Ervin), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Gambrill), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Harris), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Hollings), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Inouye), the Senator from California (Mr. Tunney), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Montoya), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), the Senator from Maine (Mr. Muskie), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Ribicoff), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Pearson), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Talmadge), are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Hartke), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McIntyre), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Stevenson), are absent on official business.

I further announce that present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. Jackson), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Stevenson) would each vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senators from Tennessee (Mr. Baker and Mr. Brock), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Bellman), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Bennett), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Boggs), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cook), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Goldwater), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Hatfield), the Senator from Washington (Mr. McGee), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Prouty), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Saxe), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Weicker) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Young) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Cotton), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Hruska), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Jordan), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Percy) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Mundt) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. McGee) would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 32, as follows:
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YEAS—22

Allen

Allen

Byrd, Va.

Byrd, W. Va.

Cooper

Fulbright

Gravel

Hart

NAYS—32

Allison

Allott

Beall

Brooke

Buckley

Case

Grinnell

Jordan, N.C.

Dominick

Eagleton

Fannin

Fong

Gurney

Nelson

Pastore

Proxmire

Spong

Stennis

Symington

Javits

Kennedy
Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be printed.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I am unanimous consent that the amendment may be offered by the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment may be offered by the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is to extend for 3 years those provisions of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, where authorizations expire at the end of the current fiscal year. The bill now before the Senate, S. 659, provides for a 1-year extension. This amendment simply extends this authorization for an additional 2 years.

The Vocational Education Amendment of 1968 not only increased the basic grant to the States, but also provided for a variety of new approaches and created new programs to aid State and local school systems in their efforts to provide access to vocational education for more students, both youth and adults. As a result of the comprehensive planning for vocational education at State and local levels, we are now witnessing almost unprecedented expansion and demands for vocational education programs.

With the late funding which occurred in the first fiscal year under the 1968 act, work has begun on the actual operation of some of these new programs in vocational education. With enactment of this year's appropriation bill, several of these important programs have now been funded for the last time. The Congress was new in authorizing language this year, or we stand to lose much momentum that is now underway in vocational education. If we approve only a 1-year extension at this time, we will be back next January faced with the necessity to again legislate new authorizations. If these important and vital programs are to be included in the budgeting process in an orderly fashion. As a matter of fact, the budget for fiscal year 1973 is now being prepared; therefore, there is some urgency for us to act on this important matter to the end that these vital programs of education be continued.

Mr. President, this amendment will extend for 3 years—all fiscal years—fiscal years 1973-1975. These sections of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968: Section 152(b)—Authorization for each of the 3 fiscal years to provide vocational education programs for disadvantaged students. These grants to State education agencies are for the purpose of meeting the special needs of disadvantaged students. The States have estimated that in fiscal year 1971 some 1,148,533 students can be helped through the special assistance made available under these programs. This specialized help provided through our regular school system should prevent some of the high costs of remediation that surely will be necessary if we allow the continual flow of thousands of our citizens into the pools of unemployment and welfare. The sums provided in this amendment are meager in absolute terms, but when compared to the amounts we appropriate to train the hard-core unemployed or to maintain our welfare system, this educational program is preventive in nature, and I believe it is worthy of the support of every member of the Senate.

The amendment authorizes a 3-year extension of section 142(a)—part D—of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.

Funds under this section of the act have been used very effectively in elementary and junior high schools to acquaint students with the world of work. Career guidance, work experience, and occupational exploration have been developed so that students can be made aware of the wide range of occupational choices available to them. Through work experience, students have an opportunity to learn about their own aptitudes and special abilities, and these experiences form the basis for taking additional vocational training at the secondary and postsecondary levels. Such programs also recognize career development as a major emphasis in education, and they are helping to bring about needed changes in school curriculum. We must continue this vital support for those school systems that are already implementing the career education concept about which the U.S. Commissioner of Education speaks so eloquently. Consequently, the amendment will provide an additional priority to career education and my amendment gives financial support for this purpose.

My amendment renews section 151(b) and section 152(a)(1) of the act to provide assistance to the States for vocational education programs for disadvantaged students. Although there is some urgency for us to act on this important matter to the end that these vital programs of education be continued. My amendment will extend for 3 years—all fiscal years—fiscal years 1973-1975. These sections of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968: Section 152(b)—Authorization for each of the 3 fiscal years to provide vocational education programs for disadvantaged students. These grants to State education agencies are for the purpose of meeting the special needs of disadvantaged students. These provisions will make it possible for existing training facilities to add dormitories, expand facilities, and open up entirely new facilities. A nation that can afford to build residential facilities for millions of college students can surely afford one residential vocational education facility in every State of this Nation. We simply must have these facilities sometime soon. My amendment authorizes funding for this program for each of 3 fiscal years.

My amendment will also extend for 3 years the programs of consumer and homemaking education—part F. Although the economics education has been a part of vocational education for many years. Through this educational activity, parents, students and teachers have worked together to create a curriculum to focus on preparing students for their roles as homemakers and members of families. The 1968 amendments, through part F, have made it possible to give greater emphasis to consumer education and also stressed that priority be given to the needs of disadvantaged youth and adults.

At the present time approximately 40 percent of our high school students enroll in home economics. While the vast majority of these are girls, I believe that this program is one that should be available to all students. Family roles and
structures are changing. More often than not, the mother ender father both work outside the home. If we do not contribute economic support for the family; they likewise both contribute to the work of the home. Boys and girls need adequate preparation for these roles and home economics teachers have both the content and educational process to accomplish this purpose. It is important that in preparing persons for jobs, it is just as important to give students opportunities through organized educational programs to acquire those personal values and skills necessary for homemakers of the future.

One of the outstanding activities developed as an integral part of the program of instruction in home economics is Future Homemakers of America. In 1971 some 538,727 students joined this organization which gives them the opportunity to develop their abilities as leaders. Through a program of work developed by the students, they make many contributions to their homes, their schools, and their communities. I was very pleased to note that at the recent National F.H.A. Convention in Kansas City, Mo., through the efforts of Mrs. C. W. Egers, Ala., was elected as a national officer of F.H.A. This outstanding national organization can continue its activities if the Senate adopts my amendment to extend funding authorizations for consumer and homemaking education.

My proposed amendment to S. 659 will also extend cooperative vocational education programs—Part G—for an additional 3 years. This program last year enrolled 166,664 students throughout the Nation. Without question, it is one of the most successful programs in vocational education. Students are placed in jobs where they receive training. A teacher-coordinator provides related classroom instruction. Job placement is almost assured for every student in the program. While receiving education and training, students also earn money for their work. Studies have shown that taxes paid on the earnings of cooperative vocational education students exceed the amount invested in the program by taxpayers. In short, this program pays its way and it has built-in factors that make it highly successful. Its potential for serving many more students is virtually untapped.

The vocational education work study program—Part H—is designed to give financial aid to students who need assistance in order to stay in school. This amendment extends this program for 3 years. Work study programs help students help themselves. Although funding is at a minimum, the work study program last year enabled 89,434 students to continue their studies in vocational education. In return for financial assistance, students performed some type of useful and productive work.

A final provision of my amendment extends for 3 years the provisions of the 1968 act—Part I—relating to curriculum development. Curriculum funds should enable the U.S. Office of Education to develop materials to aid State and local communities in implementing programs of vocational education to meet the changes in technology and the needs of emerging occupational fields. Curriculum development in vocational education is a continuing and ever increasing necessity. The U.S. Office of Education must have the necessary resources to provide assistance on a National basis and coordinate an overall effort to assist vocational educators in keeping their programs up-to-date.

Mr. President, the legislative history of vocational education shows already strong support in the U.S. Congress. The 1968 amendments were approved unanimously by this body as well as by our colleagues in the House of Representatives. I believe Congress supports vocational education because it gives reality to our belief in the importance of work; to our belief that every American citizen must have access to educational training that will prepare him for entry into and advancement in employment; and to our belief that education should prepare us of our roles as citizens and as family members. All these goals, as well as others, are accomplished through vocational education.

The latest figures available from the U.S. Office of Education show that in 1971 some 9.7 million youth and adults were enrolled in vocational education. Since enactment of the 1968 amendments, vocational education enrollments have increased by almost 23 percent. This is encouraging, but we have not yet made the dramatic breakthrough that must come if education is to become more relevant for the majority of students. A statistic that should be constantly in the forefront of our thinking while we are considering S. 659 is this: Twenty percent of our population will continue to graduate from colleges and universities; the other 80 percent must, therefore, be prepared for jobs through programs of vocational education.

There is another statistic that confronts me as a Senator and I find it somewhat alarming. The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education has reported that the Federal Government invests $14 in higher education—colleges and universities—for every $1 that it invests in vocational education. I say that the time is here for a corrective force to be applied and my amendment strikes in this direction. I also remind my colleagues that unemployment among college graduates is increasing at a faster pace. We are turning out college graduates at a faster rate than professional jobs are developed in our economic system. At the same time, we face manpower shortages in the health fields, in the service occupations, and in many other essential areas.

I conclude. Mr. President, by urging support for this important amendment to S. 659. We must continue the authorizations for these vital programs. By acting now, we can give some assurance to State and local educational agencies that the programs they need to help young people both work and stay in school can be both continued and implemented.

I have discussed the amendment with the manager of the bill and I hope that it will be acceptable.
tion is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to make a suggestion which I hope will be acceptable to the Senator from Colorado and to the Senate as a whole.

The Senate from Colorado has a bill on the calendar at time 259 S 399, which the leadership has not called up.

I have not called it up because I had not received a request that it be considered. However, in view of the situation which has developed, and after discussing it with the distinguished minority leader, I would like to agree to a request that the Senator from Colorado would withdraw his amendment, it would be the desire of the leadership to call up the bill on the calendar at time mutually agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Colorado and the joint leadership.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me some time on the bill?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I find myself in the embarrassing position of not being able to say anything because the Senator from Colorado has a bill on the calendar at time mutually agreeable to the Senator from Colorado and the joint leadership.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had the distinguished majority leader I would like to have 3 or 4 minutes. I would like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question now occurs on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me some time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to make a suggestion which I hope will be acceptable to the Senator from Colorado and to the Senate as a whole.

The Senate from Colorado has a bill on the calendar at time mutually agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Colorado and the joint leadership.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had the distinguished majority leader I would like to have 3 or 4 minutes. I would like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question now occurs on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TARR). Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had the distinguished majority leader I would like to have 3 or 4 minutes. I would like to ask the Senator from Washington.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, what is the situation with the bill?

Mr. JAVITS. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then, the full fund­

Mr. JAVITS. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then, the full fund­

Mr. JAVITS. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then, the full fund­

Mr. JAVITS. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then, the full fund­

Mr. JAVITS. The bill is open to further amendment.
of S. 659, the "Education Amendments of 1971."

The legislative form of this idea is not important, but the concept of official Federal recognition of the importance of the studies of the ethnic heritages of the many various peoples that make up our Nation is crucial. It has been a privilege for me to work closely with many leaders of ethnic, racial, and religious groups, and with many educators and sociologists, in developing the language which has been adopted today to authorize Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers. I believe that we have approved a workable bill which can grow into a most significant educational and social program.

As the committee report, 92-346 states, passage of this measure alone will not guarantee the success of this program. The active cooperation and coordination of the many individuals and groups who will be pursuing studies and ethnic programs through the Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers authorized by this bill will be necessary, and I urge all such interested individuals and groups to begin the implementation of these centers in their regions.

I feel strongly that a deep national resource which has not been effectively utilized in America is the strong feeling of self-pride surrounding each individual's ethnic heritage and background. The purpose of this bill is to help provide the resources that must be generated in a positive and constructive fashion throughout our Nation. The self-assurance, the dignity, the community solidarity, and the mutual cooperation that can result can be a significant step in helping us truly achieve the goals of social communication and justice which have been the guiding light of America since the days of the American Revolution. In just 5 years, we will be celebrating the 200th anniversary of our country, our goals, and our liberty, and it is my fervent hope that the cooperative, constructive approach on ethnic heritages can help us fully realize these goals by 1976.

Mr. President, I appreciate the cooperation of the chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Mr. Williams, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, Mr. Pell, and the ranking minority member of this committee, Mr. Javits, in approving this important measure in committee, as well as the approval of this bill by the full Senate today, and am confident that the Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers will play a significant role in American society.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished and able chairman of the Education Subcommittee, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL). S. 659, the Education Amendments of 1971, which I introduced and guided through the committee, embodies exceedingly progressive, and thoughtful new educational initiatives.

In the area of student assistance for higher education, for example, this bill authorizes a new financial aid program of basic educational opportunity grants—and a strengthened program of supplementary educational opportunity grants—that, if fully funded, would go far toward providing every high school graduate with full opportunity to continue his education in college or vocational school. The bill also includes an innovative and long overdue cost-of-living allowance that will provide desperately needed financial help to the colleges and universities these students attend.

In addition, the bill would establish a student loan marketing association—or a secondary market for student loans—to provide the variability needed for banks to increase their participation in student loan programs.

The major new initiatives in the areas of student assistance and institutional aid offer real promise of reducing the financial crisis that colleges and universities, as well as students and their parents, are facing.

Among its other important provisions, the bill would establish a National Institute of Education to coordinate and carry out the full range of experimentation and development essential to improving our educational system; continue the broad range of successful existing higher education programs—including Education Professions Development, Strengthening Developing Institutions, College Library Assistance, Higher Education Facilities, and Law School Clinical Education—and expand and extend authority under the Vocational Educational Education Act.

The Senator from Rhode Island deserves the appreciation of all of us, as well as millions of American students and their families, for his creative and tireless leadership on this bill. I personally want to express my gratitude for his patient and constructive work.

Mr. JAVITIS. Mr. President, as ranking minority member of the committee, I would be remiss if appreciation were not extended to the majority member for their cooperation and hard work on the complex 360-page text before us, particularly Steve Wexler, counsel of the Education Subcommittee, and Richard Smith, associate counsel of the subcommittee and Roy Millenson, minority staff—these gentlemen are master legislative craftsmen. I should also wish to express appreciation to Steve Rand, legislative assistant for education to the ranking member of the Education Subcommittee, Senator Faoxry, who was most helpful in finding solutions to particularly nettling difficulties which beset the subcommittee during its deliberations. His predecessor in the education post, Judith Miller, is now in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of HEW for Legislation—to her also goes our thanks.

Next, I should particularly like to note the efforts of others of the executive department staff whose technical skills and patience were most helpful; namely, Chris Cross, Deputy Assistant Secretary of HEW; Charles Saunders, now Deputy Commissioner of Education; Mrs. John Frohlicher, a gifted attorney in the Office of Education; Richard Hastings, whose aid in obtaining statistics and other data was invaluable; and their associates.

Finally, I wish to mention the minority staff, Roy Millenson, minority staff director, and Paul Haklish, a summer intern who is a student at Williams College and a resident of Rye, N.Y., who devoted many hours to the tedious labors of helping produce the lengthy section of the report devoted to changes in the law. Another intern, Dr. Elisabeth Hansot, an assistant professor of political science at Columbia University, was very helpful, especially in the preparation of the legislation and report dealing with the National Institute of Education.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as we close debate on S. 659, I again wish to point to the Senate the great good that will accrue to each individual in our land should S. 659 become law.

For the first time in the history of our Nation, there will be established the right to a postsecondary education. An individual will be able to develop fully his intellectual abilities, something which up to now has been limited by his economic circumstances. I am often struck by the pride which everyone gives to the Second World War GI bill. To my mind, S. 659 is a GI bill for all Americans.

It should also be pointed out to the Senate that this legislation is not only concerned with students, but also seeks to provide a measure of institutional support. Indeed, it has gathered the support of institutions of higher education around the country, and I ask, at this point, that copies of letters to me be printed in the Record.

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


Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: I have just read a summary of your generous Bill for higher education and feel that you certainly are on the right track to provide the strong support of higher education in America for the future.

We will be watching with much interest the development of this Bill in the next few weeks.

Sincerely, L. H. Foster, President.


Hon. Claiborne Pell, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: I have just read a summary of your generous Bill for higher education and feel that you certainly are on the right track to provide the strong support of higher education in America for the future.

We will be watching with much interest the development of this Bill in the next few weeks.

Sincerely, R. W. Wylie, President.


Hon. Claiborne Pell, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: I am pleased to see the progress made on S.659, which I believe to be of critical importance for the preservation of private higher education in this country.
I hope the Senate will support the action of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Sincerely,
HOMER GRANT,
President.

AUGUSTA COLLEGE,
Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: It was a distinct pleasure for me to be present last Tuesday when you met with the ACPRA to discuss Senate Bill 659. I commend you on your willingness to participate in such legislation and I thank you for your sincere interest in education.

Your bill is a valuable milestone in the development of educational opportunities, and we, together, are grateful for your efforts.

Respectfully yours,
GERALD A. RADFORD, Assistant to the President.

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY,
Senator CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: I want to commend you and the Senate Subcommittee for the outstanding Senate Education Bill which was reported out recently. It is a thoughtful and creative approach to the problems plaguing higher education in this country. Its enactment would be of great assistance to Roosevelt University and to the students in the Chicago area served by this University. The proposed student assistance program and the cost-of-instruction allowance would provide a means of giving general support to institutions of higher education and at the same time serves the important need of helping to provide a college or university education for a greater number of economically disadvantaged students.

Roosevelt University has served economically and culturally disadvantaged students since its inception in 1945. We are keenly aware of the problems connected with education for the disadvantaged. The Senate Bill goes a long way towards resolving these problems since it provides for general financial assistance to the individual students, including (importantly) part-time students, and it also recognizes that an institution attempting to provide higher education for low-income students incurs greater instructional and administrative costs. This is the case with students from middle- and upper-income families.

I sincerely hope that the Senate Bill will be enacted and that funds will be appropriated for its Implementation.

Sincerely yours,
ROLF A. WEIL, President.

ST. AMBROSE COLLEGE,
Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: I want to express my appreciation and thanks for your efforts and understanding for the cause of education as expressed in the Pell Bill, "S659 as Reported".

Sincerely yours,
RT. REV. S. G. MENKE, President.

SAINT JOSEPH'S COLLEGE,
Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Pell: I have just read a brief summary of "S659 As Reported" and wished to commend you for the work that you put forth in bringing about the Bill.

It is a comprehensive piece of legislation which touches so many of the needs of higher education in this country. Hopefully your colleagues will see the same merit in the Bill.

Sincerely,
REV. ROMAN S. GALBARDI, President.

SACRED HEART COLLEGE,
Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: I want to commend you and the Senate Subcommittee for the outstanding Senate Education Bill which was reported out recently. It is a thoughtful and creative approach to the problems plaguing higher education in this country. Its enactment would be of great assistance to many disadvantaged students.

The proposed student assistance program and the cost-of-instruction allowance would provide a means of giving general financial support to institutions of higher education and at the same time serves the important need of helping to provide a college or university education for a greater number of economically disadvantaged students.

Roosevelt University has served economically and culturally disadvantaged students since its inception in 1945. We are keenly aware of the problems connected with education for the disadvantaged. The Senate Bill goes a long way towards resolving these problems since it provides for general financial assistance to the individual students, including (importantly) part-time students, and it also recognizes that an institution attempting to provide higher education for low-income students incurs greater instructional and administrative costs. This is the case with students from middle- and upper-income families.

I sincerely hope that the Senate Bill will be enacted and that funds will be appropriated for its Implementation.

Sincerely yours,
ROLF A. WEIL, President.

SISTER MARY JANET.
Hon. Claiborne Pell, U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: I write to express my personal appreciation, and that of my institution, for the devoted consideration which you have given to the problems of higher education during the current session. S. 659 will be enormously helpful to us, and I hope that the Senate, and later the House, can agree upon it.

We shall be watching the progress of the bill with great interest and support.

Sincerely,

R. W. Fleming.

Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich., August 2, 1971.

Hon. Robert P. Griffin, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Griffin: I wish to express my strong support for the "Education Amendments of 1971" (S. 659), recently reported favorably by the Senate Labor and Education Committee. While we do not agree with every detail of the law, Wayne State University feels there is great merit to the sum total of this legislative package. There is no question in our minds about the need to expand the range of activities in this educational opportunity areas. I hope you will seek to move this legislation through the Senate as quickly as seems appropriate in view of the magnitude of the bill and its importance to the nation.

Sincerely,

George E. Gullen, Jr., Acting President.


Hon. Claiborne Pell, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: The higher education bill which your Committee has voted out of committee, S. 659, is the culmination of the basic matching proposal, for which you and the members of your committee deserve great credit. It has in it many features which are of educational value to our nation, its educational community, many of them breaking new ground.

In particular the proposal for basic opportunity grants as the first block in the financial aid structure, to which other financial aid may be added, I am sure reflects your own judgment and initiative in a particular way. All of us are indebted to you for it.

The utilization of federal financial aid to students to stimulate state programs of student aid is very important and will have the effect of equalizing educational opportunity through the states. I am also for the acceptance of a measure of public responsibility for the financial viability of educational institutions, institutions which are in the business of financing educational institutions that are in financial difficulty.

We have been much impressed with the various components of S. 659 with proposals that will emerge in the House bill we are greatly encouraged by the positive and original proposals which your Committee has made.

May I again express my appreciation for the privilege of appearing before your Committee as a part of the Minnesota delegation. It is gratifying to have had even so small a part in the development of such a significant piece of legislation.

Sincerely yours,

Edgar M. Carlson, Executive Director.

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., July 21, 1971.

Hon. Walter F. Mondale, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I have received a summary of S. 659 recently reported by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. I am pleased and I was pleased, too, with the hearing on the necessity of postsecondary legislation and the passing of this legislation to the House. I believe S. 659 recognizes that the next critical commitment, if we are to realize our goals, is for the federal government to help both the individual and the state in meeting these rising costs. I hope it passes.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to give these judgments both in writing and on behalf of Senator Pell's subcommittee last winter.

Sincerely yours,

Donald K. Smith, Vice President, Administration.


Hon. Claiborne Pell, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: I have just received in excellent conditions Education Bill 659, as reported out of committee. I am most appreciative of the generosity and concern which is manifested in this bill. Prepared in truth and understanding, and another, and also the acceptance of a measure of public responsibility for the financial viability of educational institutions, the institution which is in the business of financing educational institutions that are in financial difficulty.

While I am sure we will want to examine the various components of S. 659 with proposals that will emerge in the House bill we are greatly encouraged by the positive and original proposals which your Committee has made.

May I again express my appreciation for the privilege of appearing before your Committee as a part of the Minnesota delegation. It is gratifying to have had even so small a part in the development of such a significant piece of legislation.

Sincerely yours,

Sister M. Joyce Rowland, O.S.F., President.
College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, Minn., July 28, 1971.
Hon. Claiborne Pell, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: Higher education is fortunate in having a friend like you. I am sure you know how much we appreciate your exceptional efforts in our behalf, but it won’t hurt to repeat that we are deeply and genuinely grateful for your support.

We think S659 is a generous bill. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rex Hudson, Vice President for Development.


Senator Claiborne Pell, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: Congratulations on your hard work on behalf of higher education! The work that you and your Subcommittee on Education have done has developed provocative alternatives and suggestions for higher education.

Please send me a copy of the Senate Education Bill—S659.

Sincerely yours,

Charles F. Pierce, Jr., Executive Assistant.


Hon. Claiborne Pell, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: I have seen a summary of Education Bill S659 and am very favorably impressed concerning it. It has the desired objectives of perpetuating on-going, proven programs as well as plowing new ground, especially with respect to student assistance and the post-construction allowance. As far as Clarkson College is concerned, these last two areas are of vital importance for our survival as an independent, vital institution.

We hope the Senate will act on the Bill favorably, and that the House Bill, when it comes out of committee, will be equally comprehensive and far-seeing.

Sincerely,

John W. Graham, Jr.

Colgate University, Hamilton, N.Y., August 3, 1971.

Senator Claiborne Pell, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: I should like to express my appreciation of your efforts and leadership in devising and reporting out the Senate Education Bill S659. The understanding and foresight of members of the Subcommittee with regard to the financial problems of college students and the institutions which they attend is heartening to all of us in higher education.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Bartlett.

Dowling College, Oakdale, N.Y., August 2, 1971.

Senator Claiborne Pell, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: This letter is to indicate my support for the Senate Bill S659 as reported. The bill has many outstanding features which are important for Dowling College as we continue to serve the higher education needs of Western Suffolk County.

The bill has many features which are very important for our private institutions of higher education. The bill indicates a lot of thoughtful consideration of the problems that colleges have in many areas and the bill is very comprehensive in its approach toward meeting these problems. In particular, I am impressed with the Title I—Higher Education Revisions of the Bill—in the areas of continuing education (Part A), College Library Program (Part B), strengthening developing institutions (Part C), and student assistance (Part D). It is particularly important that the bill includes cost of education allowance for institutions of higher education. This is particularly needed by all institutions of higher education.

Congratulations for your work on this excellent bill, and I wish you success as the bill goes through the process of becoming final legislation.

Sincerely,

Allyn P. Robinson, President.


Senator Pell, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Urge continued and strong support for S. 659. Community college most effective institution for bringing higher education to all citizens at minimum expense to student and taxpayer. Erie Community College embarking on a three campus system to better serve all persons of Erie County.

James E. Shenton, President.

Edward J. Wegman, Chairman, Board of Trustees.


Senator Claiborne Pell, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: I would like to thank you for the work you have done and the part you played in bringing Education Bill S659 to its present status. The passage of this bill vital to the continuation of a healthy and effective dual system of education in our country.

I feel sure that you are committed to the educational traditions of America or you would not have expended the efforts you have in working for this bill.

Best wishes for your continued success.

Sincerely,

Sister de la Galle Mahler, President.


Hon. Claiborne Pell, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen: Would you be kind enough to send me a copy of Bill S 659 as soon as it is available, as well as any other material pertinent to the bill.

May I take this opportunity to thank you for the passage of the bill which you gave members of the American College Public Relations Association last week.

Yours truly,

Peggy Rice, New Director.


Senator Claiborne Pell, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: Thank you for your thoughtful letter with respect to the task force report to the Subcommittee on Education. I was happy to join Glenn Ferguson and Jim Hester in this project in any capacity as President-elect of Reed College.

My colleagues and I appreciate your interest in higher education and your pioneering proposals to keep our colleges and universities strong to serve the nation and our citizens. Please feel free to call upon me at any time you think I can be helpful.

Sincerely,

Paul E. Bragonon.


Hon. Claiborne Pell, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: This is just to inform you that all of us here at NCCC are immensely interested in supporting the Title X—Improvement of Educational Opportunities through Community Colleges legislation which you, Senator Williams and Senator Javits are sponsoring. We also wish to commend you for your interest and support of this legislation.

We believe it is the only real answer for the future of these colleges which, as you well know, are doing a tremendously important job in higher education in the country. They need coordinated help such as this bill offers, however, to be able to continue to do that job.

If we can do anything to help in its promotion, please let us know.

Yours sincerely,

George Hudson, President.


Hon. Claiborne Pell, U.S. Senator, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: Let me commend you for your role in the drafting and working out of S659. Federal programs which directly or indirectly aid higher education are of critical importance. We at Otterbein College will continue our efforts to justify your confidence in higher education through programs which meet the needs of our students and society.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas J. Kerr, President.


Hon. Claiborne Pell, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: Please accept my sincere commendation with regard to the Senate Education Bill "S659 As Reported." The assistance which we will receive for higher education is badly needed.

May I wish you continued success with this and similar Bills.

Sincerely yours,

Mary Angela Cahaya, O.S.F., President.


Hon. Claiborne Pell, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: Recent communications received from the Association of American Colleges included a brief summary of Bill S659 which is designed to assist higher education.

On behalf of Rosemont College, I am writing to commend you for this bill and to express appreciation for the provisions for institutional aid so essential in this time of serious financial difficulty for institutions of higher education.

Sincerely yours,

Mary George O’Reilly, S.H.C.J., President.


Senator Claiborne Pell, Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: I have just read with keen interest and deep appreciation a brief summary of the Pell bill. I want to thank you for leading your thought, energy, and effort to such a fine piece of legislation.
Recent years have found many Americans "up tight" about higher education. This tension has caused some state legislators and many individual supporters of higher education to pull back. Thank goodness our national congress has continued to support higher education.

All of us are indebted to you and to your colleagues on the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee.

Sincerely,

PAUL HARRIN III,
President.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: Thank you for your leadership in developing S. 659 as reported. These are critical times for our education, both public and private. We need all the help you can give.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. MESSER.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY,

DEAR SENATOR PELL: I have just had the opportunity to read a brief summary of "The Higher Education Bill As Reported". It looks like a fine bill and I commend your Committee on the proposal. May I have a copy of the completed bill for further study?

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. SANDERSON,
Vice President and Dean of Students.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: Congratulations on your leadership in developing S. 659 as reported. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BUTCHER), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMMELL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMAGE), and the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) are absent on official business.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMMELL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMAGE), and the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BOSWELL) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELL) are present.

Mr. BROOKS of Georgia. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.
Arizona (Mr. Goldwater), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Hatfield), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Pearson and Mr. Dole), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Proutty), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Saxbe), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Weicker), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Young) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Musgrave) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Hatfield), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Percy), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Weicker) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 212 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Aiken  Gravel  Packwood
Allen  Griffin  Pastore
Allott  Gurney  Pell
Beall  Hart  Knowland
Bentsen  Hart  Randolph
Brockett  Hughes  Road
Buckley  Humphrey  Schweiker
Case  Long  Spong
Cooper  Magnuson  Stennis
Currie  Mandelfield  Stevens
Dominick  Mathias  Symington
Eagleton  McClellan  Taft
Pannell  McIntosh  Thurmond
Pong  Miller  Tower
Fullbright  Nelson  Williams

NAYS—49

NOR VOTING—49

Anderson  Ellender  Montoya
Baker  Ervin  Moss
Bayh  Gambrell  Mundt
Bellmon  Goldwater  Muskie
Bennett  Harris  Pearson
Bibbs  Hartke  Percy
Boggs  Hatfield  Pryor
Brook  Hollings  Ribicoff
Burdick  Hruska  Saxby
Cannon  Inouye  Sparkman
Chiles  Jackson  Stevenson
Church  Jordan, Idaho  Talmadge
Cockrell  Kennedy  Tunney
Cooper  Cotter  Weicker
Cranston  McGovern  Young
Dole  McIntyre  Wyche
Eastland  Mondale

So the bill (S. 659) was passed, as follows:

S. 659


Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act, with the following table of contents, may be cited as the "Education Amendments of 1971."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sec. 2. General provisions.

TITLE I—HIGHER EDUCATION

PART A—COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAM
Sec. 101. Extension of authorization of appropriations.

PART B—COLLEGE LIBRARY PROGRAMS
Sec. 111. Authorization of appropriations.

PART C—DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS: EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Sec. 121. Extension of authorization for title III.

PART D—STUDENT ASSISTANCE
Sec. 131. Revision of Part A of title IV (educational opportunity grants).

PART E—EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT
Sec. 141. Extension of authorization of appropriations.

PART F—INSTRUCTIONAL, EQUIPMENT
Sec. 151. Extension of authorization of appropriations.

PART G—ACADEMIC FACILITIES

PART H—NETWORKS FOR KNOWLEDGE EXTENSION
Sec. 171. Extension of authorization of appropriations.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 2. (a) As used in this Act—

(1) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and