

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

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

VOLUME 115—PART 23

OCTOBER 21, 1969, TO OCTOBER 28, 1969

(PAGES 30643 TO 32004)

1,000 mice from five generations after adding 3 parts per million (ppm) of DDT to their diets. Leukemia appeared in 12.4% of the DDT mice, but only 2.5% of the non-DDT mice; 28.7% of the mice getting DDT developed tumors, while only 3.8% of the mice on clean food had tumors. Most of the malignancies in the DDT group were in the later generations [Tarjan & Kemeny, *Ed. Cosmet. Toxicol.* 7, 215-22 (1969)].

In a recent, definitive, and large scale study supported by the National Cancer Institute, DDT added to the diet of mice quadrupled the frequency of tumors of the liver, lungs, and lymphoid organs. The dosage level was many times higher than that normally found in human foods, a standard procedure used to increase the sensitivity of the experiment in testing for carcinogenic activity. DDT was clearly carcinogenic to the mice because it caused cancers of the same kind and at approximately the same frequency as did known cancer-causing agents [Innes et al., *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 42, 1101-14 (1969); *Congressional Record*, S. 4412, 1 May 1969].

In studies done at the University of Miami School of Medicine, human victims of terminal cancer were found to contain more than twice as much DDT in their fat as did victims of accidental death. The accident victims carried 9.7 ppm, which is about average for Americans, while the cancer victims contained 20-25 ppm in their fat [Radomski, Delchmann, and Clizer, *Fd. Cosmet. Toxicol.* 6 209-20 (1968)]. In this study there was no way to tell whether the increased retention of pesticides caused the disease, whether the disease caused the increased pesticide retention, or whether there was no relationship between the two.

#### ADDITIONAL DEATHS OF CALIFORNIANS IN VIETNAM WAR

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, since Thursday, October 9, 1969, the Pentagon has notified 14 more California families of the death of a loved one in Vietnam. Those killed were:

Maj. Moses L. Alves, husband of Mrs. T. Mary Alves, of Highland.

Pfc. John T. Baker, son of Mr. and Mrs. Claude D. Baker, of Bakersfield.

Pfc. Domingo Y. Garcia, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jesus A. Garcia of Five Points, S/4 James H. Graham, son of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence B. Graham, of Garden Grove.

Lance Cpl. Michael L. Holtz, husband of Mrs. Sandra L. Holtz, of Redding.

Sgt. William O. Jackson, husband of Mrs. Gwendelyn Jackson, of Compton.

Pfc. Gary L. McCloud, son of Mr. and Mrs. Louis L. McCloud, of Sacramento.

S. Sgt. David L. McCombs, husband of Mrs. Diane L. McCombs, of Chula Vista.

Pfc. Elvis E. Mullen, husband of Mrs. Debra S. Mullen, of Elk Grove.

Lt. James L. Rhodes, husband of Mrs. Linda L. Rhodes, of Fallbrook.

Sgt. Harry C. Shepard, Jr., husband of Mrs. Jeanette Shepard, of Cannino.

Pfc. Gary D. Taylor, son of Mr. Clark F. Taylor, of Menlo Park.

Pvt. John E. Duarte, Jr., husband of Mrs. Inez N. Duarte, of Los Angeles.

Sgt. Tommy R. Thomas, son of Mr. and Mrs. Roy G. Thomas, of South San Gabriel.

They bring to 3,840 the total number of Californians killed in the Vietnam war.

#### SENATOR YARBOROUGH URGES INCREASED EDUCATIONAL AID FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which I am privileged to serve, has written an excellent article for the September issue of the *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. In the article, entitled "The Learning Disabilities Act of 1969, a Commentary," Senator YARBOROUGH discusses the tremendous unmet needs that exist, and our efforts to provide handicapped children with the education which they need and deserve.

In the following passage from the article, Senator YARBOROUGH illustrates the huge gap that exists between the plans Congress has made to assist in the education of the handicapped, and the unwillingness of Congress to provide the necessary funds for this effort. In addition, he relates this tremendous gap between our authorizations and appropriations for this vitally needed program to the need for our Nation to reorder its priorities. Senator YARBOROUGH writes:

It can be said that we have taken the first step toward providing all children with the education they need and deserve, but there are many steps ahead. We can be justifiably proud of the increasing national commitment to education for the handicapped, and at the same time somewhat awed by what is before us. We should be humiliated by how little has been appropriated to do what the Congress has already authorized to be done. For the current year, only \$29 million was appropriated for Title VI grants, when the authorization was \$200 million. With over 5 million handicapped children, not counting children with specific learning disabilities, the basic support program is providing only \$5-\$6 per child.

This is a time when funds are scarce, but we will spend our dollars on what our society demands. There will be money enough for whatever we feel is truly important. We must decide, individually and as a nation, just what it is that we believe to be important.

Senator YARBOROUGH has drawn upon his experiences as a member of the Subcommittee on Education for almost 12 years in introducing S. 1190, entitled the "Children With Learning Disabilities Act of 1969." The bill would provide the authority and the commitment which I believe is necessary to stimulate our Government into the kind of support which is needed in the field of education for the handicapped, and I am proud to support it and work for its passage.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE LEARNING DISABILITIES ACT OF 1969, A COMMENTARY

(By RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senator from Texas, chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare)

*Educational programs for 6 million handicapped children are needed. Only 2 million presently receive educational services. The lag between large Congressional authorizations and minimal appropriations limit funding to \$5-\$6 per handicapped child. Children with specific learning disabilities totaling between 500,000 and 1½ million are in espe-*

*cially bad plight with only 18% receiving assistance. The Federal government can and should play an influential role in the development of effective education for children with specific learning disabilities.*

In the years that I have been privileged to serve in the United States Senate, 11½ years of that time on the Senate Education Subcommittee, I have had a chance to help develop and pass many major education bills which have enhanced the educational opportunities for countless numbers of the nation's citizens, tiny children just getting their start, primary youngsters, youth, and adults. Much of the effort has been directed to children in our elementary and secondary schools for strengthening the capability of the schools of our land to provide quality education for all children. Emphasis has been on better trained teachers, use of updated instructional materials and appropriate educational technology, relevance in curriculum practices, and the provision of special counseling, health and other services to meet individual needs so that youngsters may learn. Institutions of higher education have been assisted, not only in providing more opportunity for college students through financial assistance, strengthening of the graduate and undergraduate academics, but through the expansion and strengthening of those departments which concentrate on training of educational personnel.

In addition to providing the means to improve the educational systems, Congress has, as we so well know, given special attention to those unfortunate children whose special needs the education system must satisfy if they are to develop to their potential and participate as first class citizens in our society. I am referring to our children who suffer from extreme economic or environmental deprivation, or from physical or mental handicaps. Not only have we set a goal for excellence in education, but we have made a basic commitment in our nation to provide educational opportunity to every child.

However, there are areas where we are obviously falling short of our goals. We are only beginning to meet the needs of the handicapped and our gaps must be recognized and remedied if we are to move ahead. Called to my attention are recent figures from the state education agencies which point out that only 2.1 million of approximately 6 million handicapped children are receiving the educational services they need. Among these whose needs are not presently being met are those who have been found to have specific learning disabilities.

The National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children has advised the Congress on the plight of these children and gave a conservative estimate indicating that between 500,000 and 1½ million, or 1 to 3 percent of the school age children are included in this category. Available data from federal reports indicate that less than 18 percent of children who may have been classified in this group are receiving services. This estimate is based on the annual reports received from the 50 states and the District of Columbia required by Title VI-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a program which assists handicapped children in elementary and secondary schools.

To meet the needs of these children, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has estimated that over 22,000 teachers and specialists need to be trained immediately, and put into the field. Although there has been much progress in the education of handicapped children in recent years, at the state and local levels as well as federally, the gains we have made merely emphasize the needs which still exist.

The child with a learning disability frequently has an invisible handicap; however, it can be recognized. Authorities in the field tell me that the symptoms are revealed

through the child's persistent behavior deviations and learning difficulties. While it may frequently be an organic problem in its original cause, its major treatment rests within the educational program. The prognosis for improvement is dependent upon the recognition of the symptoms and proper diagnoses at the earliest possible age, with intensive remediation directed to the learning problems.

The progress which can be made by handicapped children when their educational needs are fulfilled is very, very impressive. We have seen many formerly handicapped youth join the ranks as productive members of society with the ability to take their places along with their fellow men without any hardship because of their handicaps. They received education and career preparation. They were given special educational services; they are as adjusted as the next man to the ways of life. I have seen many, unfortunately, whose handicaps have been multiplied as they became older, who had personality problems, lacked educational skills and the ability to make personal adjustments and the ability to hold a job. While in school, no one recognized their special needs or knew how to deal with them, so they experienced persistent school failures, became discouraged, turned inward into themselves and withdrew or were excluded from school. This must not happen! It is my personal conviction that many handicapped children, with appropriate education can be helped to enter the main stream of society, and this society must not fail them!

In an effort to bring the needed assistance to learning disabled children, on February 28th of this year, I introduced a bill, S. 1190, in this 91st session of the Congress, entitled: *the Children with Learning Disabilities Act of 1969*. This bill would provide for the types of special services so necessary at this stage in the development of the field of learning disabilities. It would authorize programs of research and related activities, surveys and demonstrations related to the education of children with specific learning disabilities; professional or advanced training for educational personnel who are teaching or preparing to be teachers of children with specific learning disabilities, or to support the training for persons who are preparing to be supervisors of teachers for such personnel. It would also provide for model centers for improvement of education of children with specific learning disabilities. Model centers could provide testing and educational evaluation to identify children with specific learning disabilities; develop and conduct model programs designed to meet the special educational needs of such children; and assist the appropriate educational agencies or professional organizations and institutions in making such model programs available to other children with specific learning disabilities.

It is my belief that through expanded research efforts we can find more effective methods and materials that will improve the education of these children. Through supporting training we can provide that supply of trained personnel without which all educational programs are impossible, and by establishing model centers we can demonstrate the best of current practice and provide the means by which others can emulate these good practices.

Aside from financial assistance, the federal government can and should play an influential role in the development of effective education programs for children with specific learning disabilities. One of its most important functions is to recognize and publicize the most critical needs of the field as they arise. It would seem that the most immediate and significant need in the field of learning disabilities right now, aside from those needs of identification, diagnosis, and ultimate remediation of learning problems, is that of leadership and teacher training. The training

of leaders and advanced graduate students subsequently results in the training of researchers, the setting up of supplemental services and research centers to improve diagnostic and remedial techniques, and the training of teachers. In addition, in-service programs could be facilitated for teachers who already work with children, thereby providing immediate and direct service to school districts as well as face-to-face contact with learning disabled children across the country.

For years, children whom we now recognize as having specific learning disabilities have slipped through the cracks of educational diagnosis. They have been called by a multitude of names, or lumped into larger heterogeneous groups. Despite old definitional difficulties, however, the fact remains that the problems of these children are finally *beginning* to be explored and understood. We have stopped giving definitions, and are now defining programs. What is needed now is a comprehensive program on the national level to serve these children, and to prevent future instances of misdiagnosis as has happened all too many times in the past.

In view of these needs, the members of the National Advisory Committee suggested in their recommendations to the Commissioner of Education, that the problems of children with specific learning disabilities are so important as to justify special attention and special consideration by the Congress. While it has been possible for children with specific learning disabilities to participate to some extent in the federal programs designed in the last few years to increase educational opportunity for handicapped children, these efforts are not comprehensive enough to provide a full-scale attack on the problem.

Personally, the kind of programs to help these youngsters which I support are those which will place the emphasis where it belongs: on an analysis of the learning task, on the development of special teaching techniques and materials, on meaningful use of these materials to find the learning abilities of the child, and to determine barriers to learning which must be circumvented. Coming to terms with these children in designing educational programs is going to help us to learn more about education for every child. It is going to help us to realize that children have individual learning styles and characteristics, and that we are going to have to do more than pay lip service to these individual differences. Educators should be able and will be able to design special, individualized, approaches to the learning tasks which face children.

In examining our recent efforts, we find that in 1966, Congress passed legislation creating Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This established a program of grants to the states, the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, and the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. Title VI, also called the *Education for the Handicapped Act*, was more than a collection of several new programs. . . . it was a symbol of a national concern for handicapped children. It was a statement of policy. In effect, the Congress said . . . "We recognize that the handicapped child and his parents have not been getting the full benefit of our educational system, and we feel that it is a national priority to do something about it. We must aid the local schools and the states in meeting this challenge."

It can be said that we have taken the first step toward providing all children with the education they need and deserve, but there are many steps ahead. We can be justifiably proud of the increasing national commitment to education for the handicapped, and at the same time somewhat awed by what is before us. We should be humiliated by how little has been appropriated to do what the Congress has already authorized to be done. For the current year, only \$29 million was appropriated for Title VI grants, when the au-

thorization was \$200 million. With over 5 million handicapped children, not counting children with specific learning disabilities, the basic support program is providing only \$5-\$6 per child.

This is a time when funds are scarce, but we will spend our dollars on what our society demands. There will be money enough for whatever we feel is truly important. We must decide, individually and as a nation, just what it is that we believe to be important.

People often ask how politicians think and what it is that we value in life. The true measure of our lives is what we have done in office to improve the lot of our fellow man, to improve the quality of our civilization. To me, steps such as we have taken in the past and will continue to take in the future to aid the handicapped are an important reason for our arduous exertions to assume and retain the offices we hold. Without progress in these and other areas of greatest need, governmental service would be a bleak and gloomy life. Only by aiding others can our work earn the title of "service."

#### CONTRACTS OF AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT WITH NATIONAL LEAGUE OF INSURED SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. President, under our AID program a series of contracts involving expenditures of \$355,000 has been negotiated with the National League of Insured Savings Associations wherein this organization is supposed to furnish the services of construction inspectors and technical supervision for the inspection of housing and all other work requiring certification under the housing guarantee program in Latin America.

The National League of Insured Savings Associations, with Washington offices or Washington representatives, is a lobbyist for the U.S. savings and loan group.

Under our democratic system there is nothing wrong with American industry joining together and employing Washington representatives or lobbyists to keep them informed of legislation affecting their industry, but it is strange to find the Federal Government entering into contracts with these same Washington representatives or lobbyists and paying them to act as advisers to the Government on programs under which they as an industry could be affected.

As an example as to how this can raise questions of a potential conflict of interest, I call attention to a situation wherein one of the individuals assigned to carry out the duties under this contract was an officer and member of the board of directors of the association and also the president of a Federal savings and loan association operating in Hyattsville, Md. The Inter-American Development Bank, which was involved in financing the Latin American operations, arranged a loan for a savings and loan association in Peru, and one of the requirements of this U.S. Government loan to this Peruvian savings and loan association called for the dollar deposits in a U.S. institution. These dollar deposits by the Peruvian Savings and Loan Association, which received the loans from IDB and which were required to be deposited in American banks, were placed in the Hyattsville bank of which this offi-