

the standing order on Monday the following Senators be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes and in the order stated: Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. BAYH, Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, and Mr. SCOTT.

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

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1972, AND FOR H.R. 1 TO BE LAID BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the orders recognizing Senators on Monday there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements limited therein to 3 minutes, at the conclusion of which the Chair lay before the Senate H.R. 1.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for Monday is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 9 o'clock a.m. After the two leaders have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes, and in the order stated: Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. BAYH, Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, and Mr. SCOTT, at the conclusion of which orders there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements limited therein to 3 minutes. Following the morning business, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1. It is hoped that Senators who have amendments to H.R. 1 will call them up. Yea-and-nay votes, of course, may occur thereon. The pending question on H.R. 1 will be on the adoption of amendment No. 1663 by the senior Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.).

When no further progress is possible on H.R. 1, the Senate will return to the consideration of the defense appropriations bill. The pending question at that time will be on the adoption of amendment No. 1666 by Mr. PROXMIER. There is a time limitation agreement on the Defense appropriation bill, the agreement to be effective on Monday at such time as the Senate resumes consideration of the defense appropriation bill.

The agreement calls for 2 hours on the bill, 1 hour on any amendment—excepting any end-the-war amendment or any across-the-board funds reduction—one-half hour on any amendment to an

amendment or amendment in the second degree, one-half hour on any debatable motion or appeal. Yea-and-nay votes will occur on amendment, and a yea-and-nay vote will occur on final passage, if final passage is reached on Monday, and I would anticipate, hopefully, that such will be the case.

If the defense appropriation bill is disposed of at a reasonable hour on Monday, it shall be in order for the distinguished majority leader or his designee to proceed to take up the military construction appropriation bill.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, AT 9 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 o'clock a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 3:34 p.m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 2, 1972, at 9 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, September 30, 1972:

PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGIONAL COMMISSION

Jack O. Padrick, of Virginia, to be Federal Cochairman of the Pacific Northwest Regional Commission.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

William Lewis Jenkins, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring May 18, 1981.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NOTHING TO SHARE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 30, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, captioned "Nothing To Share," the Greensburg Tribune-Review, on September 22, published a provocative editorial dealing with revenue sharing.

Like the Greensburg Tribune-Review, I ask, "How can the Government give away something it does not have?"

I was pleased to note that the Tribune-Review quoted the able Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) in regard to revenue sharing. Senator JORDAN has served as the Governor of his State. In my judgment, he is an outstanding Senator, and I concur in his view, which is quoted by the Tribune-Review, that one reason why States and cities are in financial trouble is that they have wasted their tax money on unessential projects, simply to qualify for Federal funds.

Senator JORDAN pointed out, also, that the Federal Government, itself, is insolvent. We have a smashing deficit of \$430 billion, and we are running a Federal funds deficit this year of \$38 billion.

The Government is deeply in debt, and its annual deficits are smashing. It is

important that public attention be focused on the disastrous condition of the Federal Treasury, and the Greensburg Tribune-Review is helping greatly in this regard.

I ask unanimous consent that the Tribune-Review editorial be published in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NOTHING TO SHARE

One of President Nixon's first major legislative proposals was to overhaul federal distribution of funds through general revenue-sharing, distorted versions of which have passed the House and Senate.

In 1969 Nixon suggested that the federal government scrap its multitude of specific grant-in-aid programs (which Sen. Len Jordan, R-Idaho, estimates total 500) and replace them with large allocations for general purposes. It was the President's intention to reduce Washington's intrusion into local and state matters by eliminating conflicting and restrictive federal regulations.

Congress, as is its habit, has expanded on Nixon's proposal, offering \$30 billion in handouts in a five year period without either increasing taxation to pay for them or eliminating the various grant-in-aid programs. As presently conceived, revenue-sharing is not a reform but just another bloated program piled on top of other federal programs.

The primary objection to revenue-sharing is that there is no money to share. The federal government is not just broke; it's deeply

in debt. Subsequently, without new taxes, revenue-sharing would be highly inflationary.

Sen. Jordan reminded his colleagues, regrettably without effect, that Washington has run up deficits of almost \$60 billion in the last two fiscal years "and the administration estimates that the deficit for the current fiscal year will be at least \$38 billion." The senator also warned that "general revenue-sharing promotes unsound government because it separates the responsibility for raising revenue from that of spending, thus encouraging reckless spending and discouraging thrift. Some restraint may be expected when a governmental unit has to raise in taxes at least a part of the money that it spends."

The purpose of revenue-sharing is to bail out insolvent governments. Jordan pointed out, however, that one reason states and cities are in financial trouble is because they have wasted their tax money on unessential projects simply to qualify for federal funds. Further, the federal government itself is insolvent.

Sen. Harry Byrd Jr., Ind-Va., noted that revenue-sharing rewards more waste because "if a state or local government were to economize, and reduce its local taxes the federal contribution would be decreased. Under the formula, the way a state or local government would obtain greater dividends from the federal government would be to increase its own taxes."

Revenue-sharing, as it has evolved in Congress, can only share a larger debt with state and local governments. Further, it can only drive up the cost of government on all levels by paying state and local agencies to increase taxation.

The congressional versions of revenue-

sharing do not reflect Nixon's original concept. We hope the President displays the same political courage he has toward other legislative extravaganzas and vetoes this latest election-year vote-buying gimmick.

IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHWEIKER ETHNIC STUDIES BILL

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 30, 1972

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, on June 23, 1972, the President signed the Ethnic Heritage Studies Programs Act, which was part of the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1972, now Public Law 92-318.

I was proud to have been the sponsor of the Ethnic Heritage Studies Programs Act. I feel that with passage of this important legislation, Congress is for the first time providing official national recognition of ethnicity as a positive, constructive force in our society today.

As it currently stands in the law, it is a small program, and the funds for curriculum materials and heritage projects for the various ethnic, minority, religious, and cultural groups that are designed to participate in the overall program will be limited. However, I am hopeful that with a carefully planned beginning, this small pilot program can grow into a strong, valuable national resource.

The ethnic studies act was designated to be administered by the U.S. Office of Education. The Office of Special Concerns in the Office of Education has been working on implementation of the bill, and in August prepared a fact sheet describing the status of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the fact sheet be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

In addition, it is important that funds be quickly appropriated by Congress. An amount of \$15 million was authorized for the ethnic studies program, and action must be taken in the HEW appropriations bill for fiscal year 1973, or in a supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1973. Earlier this summer, I wrote the Senate Appropriations Committee to urge full funding of the \$15 million authorized for the program. I ask unanimous consent that my letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

FACT SHEET ON ETHNIC HERITAGE STUDIES PROGRAM, TITLE IX, ELEMENTARY AND SEC- ONDARY EDUCATION ACT, 1965

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1972.

ENABLING LEGISLATION

On June 23, 1972, President Nixon signed Public Law 92-318 also known as the Education Amendments of 1972. Section 504 of these Amendments provides for the establishment of an Ethnic Heritage Studies Program as Title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The purpose of this legislation is clearly stated in its preamble, "... to provide assistance designed to afford to students opportunities to learn about the nature of their own cultural heri-

tage, and to study the contributions of the cultural heritages of other ethnic groups in the Nation."

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

The Ethnic Heritage Studies Program authorizes the Commissioner of Education to make grants to and contracts with non-profit and public educational agencies, institutions, and organizations to assist them in planning, developing, establishing and operating ethnic heritage studies programs. Such programs will include the development and dissemination of instructional curriculum materials, training of teachers and operation of programs of ethnic heritage studies. For fiscal year 1973 (July 1, 1972-June 30, 1973) \$15,000,000 are authorized for carrying out this Title. However, the actual amount to be appropriated has not yet been determined.

TENTATIVE TIMETABLE

Actual program implementation is contingent upon Federal appropriations, and we will probably have no final word on them until October. Assuming enactment of appropriations of the program, the preliminary schedule for program establishment and implementation is as follows:

- a) Establishment of Ethnic Heritage Studies Program in OE organizational structure—October-November 1972;
- b) Distribution of final guidelines, regulations and applicational materials—January 1973;
- c) Acceptance of proposals developed in accordance with program regulations—February 1973 onward;
- d) Grants awarded under Ethnic Heritage Studies Program—May 1973 onward.

CONSULTATION FROM COMMUNITY

As you know, ethnic studies and their impact on education are highly subjective and complex issues and we are attempting to approach the issues rationally to insure that the program fulfills the original intent of the legislation, i.e., to foster greater understanding and appreciation of one's own and the heritages of others. In order to accomplish this, we will be calling on and consulting with interested individuals and groups who have experience and expertise in ethnic education.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

The Ethnic Heritage Studies legislation calls for the establishment of a National Advisory Council on Ethnic Studies. The Council will shortly be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It will consist of 15 members, including persons representative of the substantial and discernable ethnic and racial groups in our population, those knowledgeable about ethnic studies research, those experienced in operating ethnic studies programs and those familiar with national and local ethnic populations. The Council will advise the Commissioner on important aspects of program policy.

PLANNING GRANT TO AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

A small grant has been awarded to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities to plan a conference on Ethnic Studies. Prior to the conference, groups of experts will be requested to prepare papers on various issues, such as the dimension of ethnic groups, association representation, educational levels, disciplinary areas and societal needs. These papers will be distributed for analytical review, and the conference will be the occasion for discussion. We hope that topical areas involving all aspects of ethnicity will be covered.

CURRENT POINT OF CONTACT

The Office of Special Concerns in the Office of Education has been given the responsibility to develop implementation plans for the legislation. We are considering plans for administrative organization, funding priori-

ties, regulations, and guidelines. Because organizational placement for this program has yet to be decided, and regulations and guidelines are only in their preliminary drafts, we request you to refrain from submitting proposals until applicational materials are available.

For further information, including requests to be placed on the mailing list for regulations, guidelines, and applicational materials, please address inquiries to:

Mrs. Carol J. Smith, Deputy Assistant Commissioner for Special Concerns or Ms. Margaret Franck, Special Assistant, Office of Special Concerns, U.S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Room 4033, Washington, D.C. 20202.

JULY 13, 1972.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor and Housing, Education, and Welfare, Senate Appropriations Committee, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: As you know, Section 504 of S. 659, the Higher Education Amendments of 1972, (signed into law June 23, 1972) authorized a new pilot program for ethnic studies programs. Originally introduced by me as S. 23, this section authorizes the Commissioner of Education to make grants for programs, development of curriculum materials, and dissemination of information and materials relating to the history, cultures and traditions of the various ethnic and minority groups in our country.

The purpose is to provide federal recognition, coordination and support for the growing emphasis on ethnic identity throughout our country as a positive, constructive force in bringing people together. The "melting pot" theory of assimilation into a homogeneous American culture has not worked, and too many people today have lost the important values of community, self-identity, tradition, and family solidarity. Through ethnic studies programs, individuals, particularly children, can begin to have greater pride in their own backgrounds, and can gain greater understanding of the backgrounds and cultures of others. This can help break down prejudice and intergroup tension, and lead to greater positive communication and cooperation in all our communities.

I understand the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is already at work to select the National Advisory Council on Ethnic Heritage Studies, which will provide advice and counsel to the U.S. Office of Education in implementing the new programs. In addition, the Office of Education has given preliminary attention to coordinating and implementing the grant program.

The section authorized \$15 million for Fiscal Year 1973 for the Ethnic Heritage Studies Programs, and I respectfully urge that this amount be appropriated as part of the Fiscal Year 1973 supplemental appropriations bill.

Many groups and individuals will be working together to insure that the ethnic studies programs begin in a positive harmonious atmosphere, and I feel it is essential that we provide adequate initial funding. Development of curriculum materials relating to ethnic studies to be made available to schools and community groups, distribution of these materials on demand throughout the country, and development of model plans for community, regional, and national coordination of ethnic studies projects and activities are among the initial projects to be conducted under the new ethnic studies law.

Your consideration of this law, and its important implications for the nation as a whole, will be deeply appreciated. I hope you will share my feeling that the full \$15 million should be appropriated for the first year program. Many thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
U.S. Senator.