

U.S. Congress
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 8

APRIL 22, 1969, TO MAY 1, 1969

(PAGES 9827 TO 11208)

need and technical feasibility of modernizing our election procedures.

Towards the end of a long and uniquely productive life, a great mathematician who became a giant in the humanities, Alfred North Whitehead, said, "... the techniques of living have changed faster and more between 1861 and 1944 than they did, going backward, between 1861 and ... 61 B.C. ... Furthermore the effects of these new techniques are interactive. Their alterations in our ways of daily living affect our moral ideas, and the alterations in our ways of thinking in turn react upon the uses to which we put our new techniques. ..."

You have the power, the opportunity, and the urgent need to help turn the new techniques of our day to the highest social use known to man—the preservation and strengthening of the democratic process and, therefore, of his freedom. I know that you will achieve it.

SECRETARY FINCH SAYS GUIDELINE TO BE ENFORCED

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, as one who has been critical on occasion in the recent past about certain statements and actions with respect to the title VI school desegregation program, I am pleased today to call to the attention of my colleagues an excerpt from a press conference on Monday, April 21 by Secretary Finch. The Secretary, in response to a question, stated clearly and unequivocally that the current school desegregation guidelines are going to be enforced.

The Secretary's press conference statement is the strongest I have seen attributed to him, and I commend it to the attention of all who are interested in the school desegregation program carried out under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. So long as Secretary Finch maintains the firm position indicated in his press conference statement, he can depend upon my consistent support.

Mr. President, I congratulate the Secretary for his strong statement and ask that the excerpt from his press conference be printed in the RECORD.

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

PRESS CONFERENCE BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT H. FINCH, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, MONDAY, APRIL 21, 1969

Question: Mr. Secretary, in spite of everything that has been done by your office, there are still numerous questions about school desegregation and the guidelines, within this Administration. For the hundredth time, could we ask you what is your position on the guidelines?

Secretary FINCH. The guidelines which are in existence are going to be enforced. The only change that will be brought about is when the Court speaks, as they said, for example, they will speak in June on the question there of whether the faculty mix should reflect that of the surrounding community.

But I fail to understand why there is any question in terms of the way I have handled every case that has come before me, and I suppose the only way somebody would say I would be more sincere would be to withhold funds from more schools.

What we are trying to do is to bring the schools into compliance and keep them open, and I think we are doing a pretty good job. I am very satisfied, and indeed, I think Leon Panetta is doing an excellent job. But why there is constant discourse about wavering, I just don't understand it.

COLLEGE CAMPUS UNREST

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the course is Logic 1-A. Here is the problem: A 42-year-old man holds up a bank in Bridgeport. Therefore, all 42-year-old men in Bridgeport are bank robbers.

Right or wrong?

Wrong, of course—but all too many Americans are applying this same kind of dubious logic to another college subject.

The subject is college itself—and everybody is concerned about the unrest and division on campuses all over America.

There are irresponsible students, causing violence and discord, at colleges from Boston to Berkeley.

But we cannot—we must not—conclude that they are typical of the majority of young men and women in college today. Nor can we dismiss the grievances that responsible students express.

It does not require a Ph.D. in history to know that young America is our hope for the future.

If we despair of our young people, we, in fact, despair of ourselves—of all that we hoped for and planned for and made sacrifices for.

For years—through the 1950's, anyway—we complained of apathy on the university campus.

Now the students are apathetic no more—and we tell them to grow up and start behaving like kids again, to swallow gold fish, cram themselves into phone booths, and organize panty raids. Just leave the important questions to us grownups.

But a lot of the students do not think the grownups have handled the important questions very well.

Maybe they are right. Maybe they are wrong. That is not the point.

The point is that they have opinions and we should respect them and listen to them.

Let us look beyond the small minority who threaten violence and talk of revolution.

Let us address ourselves to the majority of students—to the best of them—and try to understand what they are saying to us.

I believe they sincerely want to improve their country and they want to begin by improving the one institution that is closest to them—the college itself.

They want the university to return to what it once was—a place where seekers after truth gather at the feet of wise men to learn and debate and find wisdom.

They want teachers who are full-time teachers, not high-priced consultants to Government and industry.

They want administrators who care about the students and their problems, who talk and confer with them about the management of the college.

They want their university, their studies, their teachers; they want to be relevant to the world they live in.

Above all, they want schools to be for students.

You know something? They may have a point.

And maybe we should be proud of them. After all, they are our kids.

CAN WE LIMIT DEFENSE SPENDING?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, every week brings new rumors and alarms about the course of future defense spending which we can expect after the end of the Vietnam conflict. We are being given to understand that the \$30 billion a year currently being spent in Vietnam will barely meet the alleged "needs" of the military for new weapons systems. And every device of the public relations man's art is being used to sell the Congress and the people of America on the rationality and justice of continuing indefinitely to devote over half our total national budget to funding Defense Department operations and procurement.

Many of us had hoped that the new administration would be able to rise above its own campaign rhetoric and move effectively to cut back on post-Vietnam military spending. Those hopes now appear to have been in vain. All indications—and most notably President Nixon's decision to deploy an ABM system—are that this administration has neither the will nor the desire to resist the budgetary claims of the Pentagon.

Consequently, Mr. President, the responsibility now rests with us in the Congress for curbing defense spending and for reallocating our national resources in such a way as to meet genuine national needs. The task will not be easy to accomplish. We have, I fear, too long evaded our constitutional mandate to check and balance the Executive in the areas of foreign and defense policymaking. But the Nation can no longer afford our comfortable evasions. We must take the initiative that is properly ours to reduce military spending to a level more consonant with our true priorities.

How Congress might most effectively act to achieve this goal was the subject of a recent newspaper article written by the brilliant young journalist, Mr. Joseph Kraft. I would hope that his recommendations will receive the most serious consideration of this body. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Kraft's essay be printed in the RECORD.

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

GOP NO BETTER THAN JOHNSON AT CURBING DEFENSE SPENDING

(By Joseph Kraft)

Hard-nosed anti-inflationary Republican skinfints turn out to be no better at controlling defense spending than the unbuttoned loose livers of the Johnson Administration. That is the basic message of the revised 1970 budget now being submitted to the Congress by the Nixon Administration.

Accordingly, even sophisticated men with an aversion to the indiscriminate must now consider the possibility that the only way to control defense spending is through the favorite crudity of the Congressional conservatives. That is by putting an arbitrary ceiling on defense spending for next year.

The Nixon budgetary revisions offer a particularly good measure of just how monstrous the defense spending monster really is. For it is possible to compare directly cuts made in non-defense projects as against cuts made in military spending.

On the non-defense side, the Nixon Administration has recommended cuts of \$2.9 billion—which is nearly three times what is