

statistics . . . indicate that almost half of the Negroes in predominantly white state universities are freshmen."

CIVIL RIGHTS

(Mr. STOKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleague, Mr. WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY, in his remarks regarding this important subject. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I, along with many other Americans, had the breathtaking experience of personally witnessing the historic launching of Apollo 11. As an American, I, too, shared the exhilaration which raced through the hearts of all others as the sky burst open in a cloud of fire and Apollo 11 was launched.

The events of the next few days established our Nation as the world leader in scientific and technological advancement. This Nation, by placing man on the moon had conquered space, a feat never before achieved.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that the first step on the moon represented the step that divided history. Therein the sands of time will record for posterity man's greatest achievement.

It is now—while we are jubilant, while we exalt in this step that for a moment made time stand still—that we ought to take time to reexamine our claim of greatness.

Mr. Speaker, in the short span of 10 years, this Nation set as its goal to send a man to the moon and bring him back safely again. In pursuit of this goal, we spared neither manpower nor finances. This Nation utilized all of its great resources in a collective venture which culminated in a successful bridging of the 238,000 mile gap between earth and the moon.

Now as we stand at the center of stage and take our bows, can we, on a day like this, continue to forget about those Americans who stand offstage—those who have never heard the plaudits of the crowd?

Today is a good day for us to reexamine our national priorities, to evaluate the posture of the President of the United States and the goals which he has set for people here on earth.

As Apollo started its historic trek to the moon, all of us recalled the commitment made by this Nation at the call of our late President, John F. Kennedy, in 1961. How, Mr. Speaker, for instance, does this Nation justify sending a man to the moon while we are still studying hunger. Just think of the difficulty we have had just discovering hunger—not on another planet—but right here in America.

Sharing equal time with our achievement in space is our underachievement on earth—our joblessness, homelessness, poverty, ignorance, blight, pollution, racism, discrimination, and a myriad of unsolved domestic problems which make life on earth miserable for many Americans. Let us examine whether goals have been set by our President to eradicate these ills from our society. Let us see what goal or goals he has set to commit

this Nation to its unfulfilled promise of equality of opportunity for every American regardless of race, creed, or previous condition of servitude.

Numerous blemishes are discernible when one reviews the administration's 6-month record on civil rights. Some are readily apparent, like the absence of nonwhites from the Cabinet, the shabby treatment of former Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Chairman Alexander, or the easing of the school desegregation deadlines. Others, such as the early abandonment of the war on hunger, the budget cuts in the aid to education program, the failure to fight against similar slashes in low-income housing programs, and the unwavering devotion to military spending were only slightly less obvious. I have spoken out on many of these subjects previously. Today, however, I would like to review two particular instances when the administration not only managed to perform a disservice to the cause of a united America, but actually attempted to convince the country that they were striking a blow in behalf of that goal. I refer to Mr. Nixon's failure to request an extension of the 1965 voting rights bill and his earlier emasculation of the Job Corps program.

Everyone in this Chamber knows why the Voting Rights Bill of 1965 was passed. It is no secret, and I see no reason to resurrect the infinite numbers of incidents of bigotry and cruelty which finally convinced the Congress that black American citizens in the South were systematically being denied the primary right of their citizenship. On June 26, however, Attorney General John Mitchell announced on behalf of the administration that this law had outlived its usefulness and recommended that Congress allow it to lapse in August of next year. His reasons—and I attempt to state them as objectively as possible—were—

First, that the 1965 law is "regional legislation" and that voting rights was a national problem;

Second, that the substitute bill be proposed would "strengthen and extend existing coverage in order to protect voting rights in all parts of the Nation"; and,

Third, that the old law had achieved its objectives since more than 50 percent of the eligible black voters were registered in every Southern State.

I have studied the Attorney General's reasons, Mr. Speaker, and have found them not to be persuasive. Let us examine them in the order in which they were stated.

The "regional legislation" argument is absolutely ridiculous, first, because the law does indeed apply to the whole country. While only two counties outside the Deep South have, thus far, been affected, all jurisdictions are theoretically subject to its requirements. More importantly, however, it conveniently overlooks the fact that much of the legislation passed by this body can be termed "regional" by Mr. Mitchell's definition—that is, predominately affecting only certain States. Are the oil depletion allowances and import controls aimed at the New England or Pacific Northwest States? Or the cotton subsidies for the Midwest?

Hardly. Our complex set of fishing laws have little direct impact between the coasts, yet no one, to my knowledge, has indicated that these are in any way unfair. How about the plethora of public works bills we pass every session? The point is, Mr. Speaker, that very often the Congress is viewing only a particular part of the Nation when it adopts a law. There is nothing whatsoever wrong with this, because obviously any problem should and can be solved where, and only where, it exists. Moreover, just as the cotton subsidy program, the fishing laws, or a new dam are only directly concerned with a given number of States, they are nevertheless important to consumers all across the country. And if we can admit this, it seems no logical jump at all to say that the denial of the right to vote to any American is of nationwide importance in our supposed democracy.

Mr. Mitchell's second argument, that stronger national laws are needed against literacy tests and State residency laws, is no argument at all. One can only respond, "Wonderful, I am all for it, but what does this have to do with discrimination practices in the South?" I have urged several times during the past year that legislation encompassing these points be enacted, and would be more than happy to support an administration bill of this nature. I cannot, however, perceive how the need for one kind of legislation in any way vitiates the need for another. The administration bill does not even purport to deal with racial discrimination other than that effected through the use of literacy tests. Therefore, it seems a bit incredible that it pretends to be a substitute for the 1965 law.

The administration's final reason for not recommending extension, that the need for the law has ceased to exist, would be a persuasive one if it were only true. Unhappily, it is not. While we all share the Attorney General's enthusiasm about the 800,000 Negroes registered to vote in the seven States to which the law has primarily applied, it nevertheless seems a bit naive to stop the investigation at the statistical level and not explore the substance of what is currently happening in the South.

I would like to refer to a report compiled by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights concerning irregularities in municipal elections in the State of Mississippi. The report delineates the numerous problems which the black voters faced when attempting to participate in those elections. Many did not register because of bombing threats. Others could not because of intentionally shortened registration hours or deceptive practices which gave the voters the impression they were registering when they were not. Many potential black candidates were purposely given false information on how to file. On election day, black poll watchers were not allowed near the polling places, the token number of black election officials were not permitted to assist the blind or the handicapped, and white election officials attempted to influence illiterates not to vote for black candidates. In one town, an armed deputy harassed black citizens until many

gave up without voting. The report summarized the day in this way:

Most of the Black candidates interviewed, regardless of whether they won or lost and regardless of whether they believed the election has been fair, believed that there would not have been as fair an election had it not been for the presence of Federal Observers and the presence of numerous lawyers and others serving as poll watchers. Although there were criticisms of the manner in which the Federal Observers carried out their duties, not one Black candidate in a county where Federal Observers were present believed the election would have been run in an honest manner were it not for the presence of these observers.

And when did this all-too-familiar parade of horrors occur? Not in 1965, 1966, or 1967, but on May 13, 1969. In fact, the Commission report to which I have alluded was issued on June 16, just 10 days before Mr. Mitchell indicated that all was now well in the Southland. In light of this kind of evidence, and there are stacks upon stacks more of a similar nature, I have a very difficult time understanding the Attorney General's rationale.

So why was this epitaph written for this vital legislation on such flimsy reasoning? That, Mr. Speaker, is the key question. Only two possibilities come to mind. Either the administration simply did not do its homework—which is very difficult to believe since Mr. Mitchell canceled five appearances before the Judiciary Committee spanning a 6-week period before showing up—or this was but another rebate by Mr. Nixon to Senator THURMOND and other participants in the southern strategy. If the latter is the case, and it indeed appears so, then the President has intentionally alined himself with the forces of reaction and bigotry, and deserves the shame of all of his countrymen who sincerely believe in the concept of equal rights for all Americans.

The earlier administration decision to shut down 59 of the 109 Job Corps centers, thus eliminating 17,000 slots from the program, was one which superficially, and to some degree actually, affected all youth without regard to color. Certainly, many of those turned out of the centers to return to lives of misery, ignorance, and property were white. But an analysis of the administration's stated rationale for ordering the cutbacks lends strong credence to those who have found racial overtones in this action.

To understand this, one must juxtapose the Job Corps concept of vocational preparedness with those of the other major Federal manpower programs to which the evicted and potential Job Corps trainees will henceforth be referred: Concentrated employment program—CEP—job opportunity in the business sector—JOBS—manpower development and training—MDTA—and the on-the-job training program—OJT. All of these projects have great merit, and are potentially vital steps toward achieving the goal of jobs for all who want them. All have some provision of counseling and other minor services as well as simple training. And all will receive funding increases in fiscal year 1970. For these rea-

sons, the administration decided that the Job Corps could be sacrificed, and announced to the country that this was being done to promote efficiency in the Federal manpower effort.

But again, Mr. Speaker, the decision was either carelessly or malevolently conceived, and will operate to deprive many young people, especially urban blacks, of the only possible avenue of escape from a life of uselessness and destruction.

The Job Corps, as opposed to CEP, JOBS, MDTA, or OJT, is much more than a job training program. It is, as one writer has noted, "a human reclamation program." Some figures on the enrollees reflect the source of this title. Sixty-four percent of its enrollees are dropouts from schools. Over 60 percent are from broken homes. Almost 40 percent are from welfare families. Eighty percent had not seen a doctor or dentist in 10 years. And while they averaged 9 years of schooling, they read at a fifth-grade level. Many are blacks from our inner cities, and they bring 16 to 21 years of bitterness, resentment, and anger with them to the centers. They are the true outcasts from our educated, healthy, and affluent society—the harvest of decades of discrimination and neglect. Their recent backgrounds are replete with various forms of antisocial activity, and few have any real hope of ever changing that life style. They are, in sum, the youthful incorrigibles.

To combat these enormous difficulties, the Job Corps was instituted to provide not only job training, but physical rehabilitation, remedial education, and counseling services as well. All trainees are given round-the-clock attention and help by full-time staffs with great expertise in dealing with the enrollees' problems. Moreover, the urban trainees are physically removed from the mentally and spiritually debilitating environment of the central city. Thus, the Job Corps program has become our first attempt to virtually reconstruct the hardest-core unemployables into productive individuals—individuals who would not only be equipped with the mechanical skills of a trainee, but also with the equally essential attitudes and abilities to cope with the often alien world of punctuality, responsibility, and teamwork. Years of studies and research clearly dictated that this approach was the only one with possibilities of success. And the Job Corps has had pronounced success with these youngsters. Seventy percent of all trainees either got a job, entered military service or even went back to school. That to me is an outstanding record when one considers the incredible barriers which accompany the trainee to the center.

Why, then, Mr. Speaker, are we abandoning, or at least hamstringing, this program when every indication is that it is the only major Federal manpower program which can successfully reach the very toughest and most resentful segments of our society? Has Mr. Nixon just decided to forget the hate-filled youngsters of the ghettos? This I cannot believe. No, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we have negligence and pride at work here,

not outright bigotry or callousness. The President promised over and over again during the campaign that the Job Corps would be absolutely eliminated. He said it again on national television the night of November 4. And he did this, I believe, without having sufficient information of the kind I have offered above. By the time he took office, he apparently had different thoughts, for absolute elimination became a 35-percent cutback. In short, the President seems to have painted himself into a corner.

What I ask vis-a-vis the Job Corps program, therefore, is that the President swallow a bit of pride and once again examine the facts, looking not only at the cold, hard statistics, but also at the human needs of some of the desperate young people in the inner city. I think he will find that these needs cannot be solved by a 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. job, a hot lunch, an armful of junior high textbooks, and the rest of the day back in the grim caverns of the ghetto. Only a total rehumanization process like that offered exclusively by the Job Corps can rescue these men and women. Indeed, if the President does not choose to make this reexamination, I fear we must all be prepared to suffer the consequences of another generation of young people who have grown up completely antipathetic to all the ideals we hold to be of value.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if the first 6 months of this administration is any criteria of what the poor, the uneducated, and the black citizen of this Nation can expect, then an opportunity for greatness will have eluded this President. A nation which has set foot on the moon can no longer explain to the world why some Americans do not have shoes. A nation which now talks of building satellite stations in space can no longer explain to the world, why some Americans do not have a home to live in. A nation which can provide oxygen and water for men to live on on a planet where the gravitational change would occasion death within 3 minutes, can no longer explain why air and water remains polluted here on earth. A nation which possesses the engineering, scientific, and technological expertise to place a man on the moon can no longer explain why every American does not have an opportunity to be educated.

No, Mr. Speaker, our going to the moon did not settle for once and all time, the greatness of America. Our chance at greatness lies here on earth. One does not need months of laboratory testing to determine that our going to the moon points up our inadequacies on earth. Mr. Nixon, as leader of this Nation, the challenge is yours. How you answer it will, in a large measure, determine whether it is better to have gone to the moon or to have stayed on earth.

BLACK AMERICA IS GIVING UP ON NIXON

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)
Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues, Mr. Stokes and Mr.

CLAY in an examination of the Nixon administration 6 months from its inception. I must begin by noting that his promise to end the war, made during last year's campaign, is still unfulfilled.

Black Americans are deeply concerned about this war, not only because of the young men who fight and die there, but because of their relatives who suffer at home because we do not have the money so desperately needed for domestic programs. Black Americans voice grave concern about the United States continuing military, economic, and moral support of a repressive, dictatorial government in South Vietnam which has caused some to wonder whether similar tactics might be used in the United States. If this administration truly believes in freedom and democracy, it is doing a poor job of proving it, not only to black America, but to the world, by continuing its support of a foreign government which has shown little or no interest in freedom, justice, or democracy.

Black Americans continue to be greatly disturbed by the Nixon administration's seemingly endless efforts to appease the South—watering down the desegregation guidelines, the proposed dismantling of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the closing of Job Corps Centers that provided some small amount of training to ghetto youngsters, and a Small Business Administration that has moved so far away from any notion of developing black capitalism that even Republicans are demanding removal of its Administrator.

The Nixon administration has done little in positive terms to guarantee equality to black Americans, in fact, it has made some backward steps, notably the forced resignation of the former Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission who sought only to effectively point out the bias and racism which is still pervasive in private industry and government alike.

The latest Labor Department statistics tell the story all too clearly, the unemployment rate in the black urban poverty areas continues to rise, while the rate in white areas goes down. The quality of inner city schools deteriorates even more as Federal funds become more difficult to come by. Housing segregation worsens in every major city in America. The stockpile of hard-core unemployables mounts in a nation whose gross national product continues to rise. The urban crisis and the race problem have yet to command the attention of President Nixon and his administration. This administration studies and re-studies the problem of hunger in America while millions continue to starve.

Professor Robert Lekachman, in the June 1969 issue of *Commentary*, made the following statement which reflects the concerns of black America:

Race and the cities: we cannot avoid as a nation the confrontation, which they impose upon us. As a people we have faltered before the choice of a full integrationist strategy designed to open white suburbs and white schools to black families and, in the inner-city ghettos, a strategy calculated to make life humanly tolerable and financially viable. Both approaches require very large quantities of resources for any hope of success, and although we all know by now that

money alone does not resolve racial tensions deeply rooted in human prejudice and American history, we should be equally aware that these problems are highly unlikely to be ameliorated in the absence of a very large national commitment of public funds.

As for myself, any hope of reporting to black America that the Federal Government will move with more commitment or more speed to overcoming the inequality in this country is rapidly fading; and this point of view, I am sorry to note, is increasingly being shown across the country. The New Republic, July 12, 1969, made the following assessment which I hope will be reflected upon by those of my colleagues who seek to understand the dilemma of black Americans and who will join in the all important struggle against racism in America:

THE NATIONAL MOOD

Mr. Nixon figures that most Americans are fed "right up to here" with a lot more than the crime he mentioned when he thrust a hand under his chin and said at his press conference that dissatisfaction with public disorder explained the defeats of liberal candidates for city office in New York, Los Angeles, and Minneapolis. He figures that enough people to place Republican majorities in control of Congress next year and to reelect him in 1972 are fed up with, among other things effective federal measures to guarantee black southerners the right to vote and black children the right to attend the public schools that white children attend.

Evidence that the President figures this way is to be found in the voting rights legislation recommended to Congress by Attorney General John N. Mitchell. More evidence to the same effect will be apparent when the Administration comes up with the revision of school policy that Nixon officials and the Departments of Justice and Health, Education, and Welfare are concocting. A common interpretation is that the voting-rights proposal and the pending school statement represent necessary payoffs to the white Southerners to whom Mr. Nixon is so largely indebted for his nomination and election last year. They are payoffs, and crude ones at that. But they also signify something of greater significance, and that is Mr. Nixon's reading of the predominant American temper. His assistants at the White House have been saying for many weeks that the kind of people who see in his concessions to the white South a retreat from nationally accepted standards of social and political decency do not understand what is really cooking in this country, and that Mr. Nixon does. What he perceives and is gambling upon is a national mood that is fundamentally identical with the Southern mood to which he catered last year and to which he is catering now in the hopes of national rewards at the polls in 1970 and 1972. He was not speaking idly last year when he included his Southern supporters in "the solid majority . . . the new coalition" of conservatively minded Americans that he then saw in the making. The coalition proved large enough to give him only 41 percent of the popular vote last November. But, with Southern help, it also gave him his electoral majority and that, quite plainly, is what he remembers and is undertaking to improve upon.

Only this line of calculation can explain the Administration's initial proposal to let the Voting Rights Act of 1965 lapse next year. It has worked quite well in the eight Southern states where it was intended to work. The Administration complaint that it is "regional legislation" and therefore unacceptable is so much rot. It is regional

legislation because it deals with and has partially corrected a form of deliberate political denial that prevailed in 1965 and, if allowed to do so, would again prevail only in the Southern states and counties at which it was aimed. The Administration's "national" substitute for it is, even if it is not enacted, notice to Mr. Nixon's Southern white supporters and to his "silent majority" everywhere that he sympathizes with their reluctance to underwrite the political rights of black Americans with the full power and energies of the federal government. Some of his officials suggest that it is a signal flashed only for the record, that he and his Attorney General knew that Congress wouldn't let the '65 Act die, wouldn't replace it with the Nixon-Mitchell version. If so, the Administration proposal was political cynicism of the basest sort.

It is possible, perhaps even likely, that the forthcoming statement of school policy will not be quite so crass. We may expect that, like the Voting Rights proposal, it will be padded with claims of intent to continue enforcing the rights that it in fact impairs. The one conceivable reason for issuing it is to assure white Southerners, falsely, if the accompanying assertions of decent purpose are intended to be believed, that in this matter, too, they have the sympathy of the Nixon Administration, and have all the time to comply with the United States Constitution that Mr. Nixon and his officialdom can procure for them.

"CINDY" EDWARDS SPEAKS OUT

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. Speaker, with the summer well underway, many of us are privileged to have young people from our respective congressional districts serving in our Washington offices as interns.

In this regard, I am extremely fortunate this year to have Cynthia Edwards, from Santa Rosa, Calif., serving on my staff. Recently "Cindy" and I were discussing some of the issues and problems facing the Nation and our district. What this young lady had to say on the question of campus disturbances was so thought provoking and penetrating, that I could not help but feel that I had just heard some things articulated, that, to my knowledge, had never been publicized on the question. So, I inquired of "Cindy" if she would put the thoughts she had just expressed to me down on paper so that I might share them with some of my colleagues and record them permanently in the official records of Congress because I believe the points expressed are very timely.

Here then, are the thoughts of a young college student who attends the University of California at Davis, on some of the problems and challenges facing young people today. I do not suggest or pretend that "Cindy's" views represent those of any majority of college students. But, they are her views and, as such, they merit the attention of every Member of Congress and every person in this country who cares about how young people really feel and think about current issues and, more specifically, the so-called campus unrest question.

"Cindy" Edwards is reasonable, responsible, rational and very balanced