

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 27

NOVEMBER 26, 1969, TO DECEMBER 4, 1969

(PAGES 35895 TO 37182)

a form of volunteer service in the armed forces is now under consideration by another Presidential commission.

³ As suggested by Joseph A. Califano, Jr., in his book *The Student Revolution*, W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., New York, 1970. The Marshall Commission found that the average aged local board members was 58. One fifth of all the nearly 17,000 board members were over 70. While twelve were over 90, only one was under 30.

⁴ One considerable virtue of the approach to youth service suggested here is that it involves a "market strategy" rather than a "monopoly service" strategy: the multitude of public and private agencies would have to compete for the services of the federally-supported youth workers by offering them meaningful, satisfying opportunities for achievement of desired goals; less successful, unrewarding programs would fail to attract volunteers and hence would not waste the public funds being committed to youth service. Cf. the discussion of the importance of market-type incentives for success in public programs in Moyinhan, "Toward a National Urban Policy," *The Public Interest* (No. 17, fall 1969).

⁵ Depending on the availability of funds, educational assistance could be limited on the basis of demonstrated need.

⁶ Despite these criminogenic forces, studies show that a large number of ghetto youth never have a police arrest and only a small percentage become repeated offenders.

⁷ A felony is a serious crime usually punishable by imprisonment for an extended period (under federal law for a year or more); a misdemeanor is a lesser offense punishable by fine or imprisonment of less than a year. In many states, a felony conviction results in a loss of voting rights, jury service, and the right to enter various professional occupations; a misdemeanor conviction does not.

⁸ Addiction is a physiological and psychological dependence on a drug, with definite symptoms occurring when the drug is withdrawn.

⁹ In testimony on October 14, 1969 before the House of Representatives Select Committee on Crime, Dr. Robert O. Egeberg, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare for Health and Scientific Affairs, stated that "there is no scientific evidence to demonstrate that the use of marijuana *in itself* predisposes an individual to progress to 'hard' drugs."

¹⁰ A similar provision is contained in H.R. 10019 by Rep. Edward Koch, N.Y.

¹¹ This statement is largely the work of W. Walter Menninger, M.D.

UNMET EDUCATIONAL NEEDS: THE REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development issued an urgent report to Congress. The report documents and supports the belief which many Members of Congress have expressed about the Federal Government's failure to meet its responsibilities and commitments to education. This report makes a strong case to Congress to re-order our national priorities. I commend it to the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the Record.

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

LEADERSHIP AND THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE NATION

(Report of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development to the President and the Congress of the United States, October, 1969)

The National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development is charged with reviewing and evaluating programs of the Federal government which support the training and development of educational personnel. We come to Washington several times each year to review with those responsible for the administration of these programs the progress they are making in their efforts to provide the best teachers for our schools and colleges. We have just concluded one such meeting. We are deeply disturbed about what we find.

Everywhere the mood appears to be one of cutting back—withdrawing—seeing how little we can get along with; in short, a steady retreat from the bold plans the nation launched several years ago.

Specifics are not hard to come by. Only last week the U.S. Commissioner of Education pronounced the "right to read" for every youngster in the nation. At that very time, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was directing the Office of Education to cut \$8 million of a \$13 million program, a substantial portion of which was designed to improve the preparation of teachers of reading!

Just two months ago, the House of Representatives cut appropriations supporting the chief program of the Federal government for the preparation of college teachers. The 1969 appropriation of \$70 million was reduced by \$14 million.

In neither case has there been offered any compelling evidence to warrant such reductions.

But it is not only a matter of reduction in funds. There is also an absence of any bold planning to meet the problems of tomorrow. We have reviewed a recently-completed report recommending programs related to the training of educational personnel that should be undertaken by the Federal government. This report, a plan for the next five years, was prepared by one of several sub-groups of a Task Force on Education appointed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There are many worthy programs in this plan. We commend the Department for taking this kind of initiative in looking ahead. But we find the conception and scale of the plans no match for the needs. In fact, the so-called plans are timid and token. It would appear that instead of taking as a point of departure a searching inquiry into the needs of education and concluding with a determination of the resources required to meet these needs, this group was faced with an assumption of severe financial constraints and the necessity to fit its planning into this assumption.

In dramatic fashion, these decisions and actions add up to default on the proclaimed responsibility of the Federal government to act as a partner with the other levels of government in supporting the nation's educational enterprise. The Council believes strongly in this notion of partnership. We reject any suggestion of domination of the Federal government. But each partner must do its *share*. And when we find that the States have, in the last two years, increased their expenditures for higher education by 38% and for elementary and secondary education by 28%, and when we find that at the same time the Federal government is cutting back, we can conclude only that there is, in fact, a default of responsibility on the part of the Federal government.

Recently the House of Representatives voted a substantial increase in appropriations for education. We commend the leader-

ship of both parties in this effort. But apart from this action—which has yet to be voted by the Senate and signed by the President—retrenchment is the only signal coming out of the Federal government at the present time. This signal creates a mood—a mood that is affecting the thinking and actions of those in the Federal agencies responsible for administering educational programs and of those in the field who are trying to provide new prospects for the young.

While we sit for two days as members of a Federal Advisory Council and read this signal and sense this mood, we bring with us a sense of another reality "out there"—as the principal of an elementary school in a ghetto, as a school board member in Oregon, as president of a university in Appalachia, as a graduate dean in a private university in New England, as a superintendent of schools in the fourth largest city in the nation, as a professor of physics in a Midwest university, as a guidance counselor in Arizona—as people from a variety of educational settings and various parts of the country. Here we read a different set of signals, sense a different mood.

Above all, we sense a worsening climate in American schools and colleges. While increased controls by school and university authorities may be necessary to check the activities of certain small destructive groups, we assert that present national conditions are deleteriously affecting the studies, the hopes, and the convictions of a wide and responsible segment of the educational community. A new and ugly cynicism and anti-intellectualism is infecting American education. Repressive measures will not arrest this trend, and may even accelerate it; positive and affirmative leadership promptly to end the war and to address forthrightly our domestic problems *can* do so. While these attitudes stem from the war and the disparity between the ideals of the nation and present realities, it is the judgment of this Council that, as Representative Brock and his colleagues so sensitively discerned, the source of much of the disquiet can be traced to fundamental inadequacies of education itself. The needed improvements and reforms will come about only if appropriate leadership is offered, leadership in the educational community and leadership in government, particularly—as we have noted earlier—from the national government.

Too many of our young are concerned by what they are *against*—the war, racism, poverty, corruption. They need, as have all youth in all times, to be *for* things, to have a star, a dream. While we recognize that such affirmative leadership is subtle, and will require politically difficult action, we feel that the growing dismay and cynicism of our youth could develop into a calamity of devastating proportions. The future college and school teachers—the *people of greatest concern to this Council*—are a centrally important group among our youth, and their disaffection can have serious effects in future years.

It would be unfortunate if our political leadership were to take the position that a response to the dissatisfactions of the past—or the yearnings for a different kind of future—must await the ending of the war, or some other development. It is now we must plan. It is now we must act. It is now that we must demonstrate, *mainly to ourselves*, that a nation which can take such just pride in its extraordinary achievements in the material realm is no less resourceful, no less vigorous, no less sacrificing in dealing with matters of the spirit.

Competent observers have noted a growing sense of purposelessness on the part of an influential segment of our student population—a feeling of these young people that it is not possible for our social institutions to cope with an increasing complexity.

If politics is the art of the possible, then our political leaders have a special opportunity to demonstrate to the young that the nation can envision a future of hope and that we can translate that vision to tangible policies and sensible priorities. We could do no better in this than to start with the field of education itself. More policemen in the schools is not a policy; it is an admission of failure.

If the Executive Branch feels that Congress has not moved in a fashion appropriate to the time, let it take leadership. If the Congress feels that the Executive Branch has not sensed the urgent need for a bold educational policy for the nation, let it provide the leadership. But let us have leadership.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

Adron Doran, President, Morehead State University, Morehead, Kentucky.

Annette Engel, Director of Special Education, Roosevelt School District, Phoenix, Arizona.

Rupert N. Evans, Professor of Vocational and Technical Education, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

Susan W. Gray, Director, Demonstration and Research Center for Early Education, George Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee.

Laurence D. Haskew (Chairman), Professor of Educational Administration, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

E. Leonard Jossem, Chairman, Department of Physics, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Marjorie S. Lerner, Principal, George T. Donoghue Elementary School, Chicago, Illinois.

Kathryn W. Lumley, Director, Reading Clinic, Public Schools of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

Carl L. Marburger, Commissioner of Education, State Department of Education, Trenton, New Jersey.

Edward V. Moreno, Executive Secretary of the Mexican-American Commission, Los Angeles City School Districts, Los Angeles, California.

Lloyd N. Morrisett, President, Markle Foundation, New York, New York.

Mary Rieke, Member, Board of Education, Portland, Oregon.

Theodore R. Sizer, Dean, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Bernard C. Watson (Vice Chairman), Deputy Superintendent for Planning Philadelphia School System, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Joseph Young, Executive Director.

THE BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I want to call to your attention a transportation crisis in the State of Kansas. The boxcar shortage is even more acute this fall than at any time since I have been a Member of the U.S. Senate.

My office has received personal visits and dozens and dozens of telephone calls and letters about this crisis. I am advised by the Kansas City Board of Trade that in the States of Kansas and Nebraska there are some 22 million bushels on the ground, notwithstanding hundreds of elevators that are plugged and closed down. It would take some 11,000 cars to move the grain that is on the ground at this time. The harvest of corn, milo, and soybeans is creating a demand that the transportation industry has been and is unable to handle.

Recently, the Department of Transportation has awarded a research contract to develop methods, assessing the economical impact of railroad freight car shortages and for forecasting freight car demand on specific commodities.

We have studied this situation to death. We know every year we are going to have a grain harvest. We are going to have a severe economic loss to the farmers and the dealers in the entire Midwest. These shortages affect other industries such as agriculture, livestock, mining, and lumber, and cause widespread unemployment, impede trade and commerce and cause fluctuations in supply, which impose added burdens on consumers.

The situation results from insufficient equipment of various types, improper utilization of the freight car fleet and the diminishing number of overall inventory. Also there is inadequate maintenance of those boxcars that are available.

The eastern roads retain cars in their service that are desperately needed in my State. Some of the other reasons that there are shortages is the overordering, particularly by eastern shippers, using boxcars for warehouses and the reluctance by the carriers to release the car as they believe that they are going to be able to utilize it for a more profitable run. These excuses by the carriers are not new, neither do they solve the problem. Almost 2 years to the date, November 16, 1967, I reported to you, Mr. President, that—

This country has been plagued with a chronic freight car shortage. At one time or another all areas of the country have been affected by the problem and it has been more persistent and more serious for the grain and lumber producers and shippers of the midwest and northwest. . . .

At the same time that this statement was made, there was an additional statement made by the railroad industry that it was doing all it could to improve freight car utilization.

The regular shippers have been complaining about this problem for years. The matter that seems to bother me is not only the severe economic loss that we may have this year, but it appears I will be back at this time again next year making a similar statement to you.

The transportation industry needs to be stimulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission so that these peak period demands can be met. Certainly, I have heard the rebuttal that few industries can afford to equip for these peaks and that the financial position of the railroad does not allow it to acquire needed equipment. The fall of the year is a peak period in the Midwest. The crop harvests are difficult to schedule because they do depend on unknown elements, such as the weather. Volume shipments of stored grains are sometimes not made at times that might be convenient because of such things as market, price, and similar consideration. More and more grain is moving by truck at a higher cost of about 5 cents a bushel.

This appears to be a case where everybody is talking about it, but nobody is doing anything about it.

When hearings were held before the Freight Car Shortage Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce on April 23, 1965, in Kansas City, Kans. We had the same song. We stated at that time:

The precipitous decline in our national freight car supply, especially in the number of plain boxcars, has reached alarming proportions. Not only is the inadequate supply of freight cars constricting the growth of important industries and causing severe nationwide losses to producers, shippers and consumers, but also it is eroding our transportation capability to move essential military traffic during emergencies.

This statement could be applied today, at this place, and at the rate we are going; we could make the same statement next year at the same time, at the same place.

This month the railroads requested another rate increase of 6 percent, and this increase was granted by the ICC. The industry states that they will be coming in shortly to request another rate increase. It has been estimated that the 6-percent rate increase would result in additional revenues to the industry of \$600,000,000. Mr. President, the railroads of this Nation play a vital role in its commerce. In 1968 the railroads moved about 745 billion ton miles of freight or almost 41 percent of all intercity freight in the United States. With the additional \$600 million, it would appear to me that investments could be made by the industry in additional equipment.

The specter of a nationwide railroad strike is hanging over our heads the first part of next week. Needless to say, this will further compound our problem.

Mr. President, we must insist that the Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and railroad management and labor cooperate so that the number of freight cars essential to the Nation's needs be increased without further delay.

TOWARD MORE ADEQUATE SOCIAL SECURITY—VII

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, much lipservice is given in this Nation to the so-called golden years of senior citizens and yet there is ample evidence to show that the later years in the lives of millions of Americans are bitter, poverty-ridden, and demoralizing.

In its forthcoming debate on social security legislation, Congress should be fully informed as to the consequences of inadequate income for most of the 65 plus people of this Nation.

The U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging—in its publications and hearings this year on "The Economics of Aging"—is doing much to provide such information to individuals of all ages in this Nation.

But, helpful as testimony by "the experts" can be, there is no substitute for direct commentary by those Americans most directly affected by our national failure to assure adequate retirement income for most of our elderly citizens.

For that reason, I have conducted several informal sessions in my own home State of New Jersey to hear from the elderly and from those who work with them.