

U.S. Congress
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 3

FEBRUARY 5, 1969, TO FEBRUARY 21, 1969

(PAGES 2775 TO 4178)

part of the blame for this dereliction. Our attack against both has been more verbal than active. We hope we now have the skills, the knowledge, and the experience to deal with them successfully in order to raise the quality of our public and private practice to its highest level to bring the benefits more economically to every citizen. One of our most serious faults is failure to follow through effectively on the ideas and recommendations which have come out of most of our planning in the past. We now recognize that if our planning efforts are to have any meaning they must be continuous in nature and must be equipped with built-in mechanisms for coordinating all the elements for effectively implementing any recommendations and proposals which the planners make.

HOW NOT TO PLAN

Certainly, we have learned how planning should not be done. It should not be limited to crisis situations which have characterized it in the past; it should not be restricted to limited segments of health problems. It should not be attempted by groups composed entirely of persons representing categorical approaches rather than the wide-angled view of health; and it should not result in reports which only gather dust on obscure shelves.

Professor Herman E. Hilleboe, of the Columbia School of Public Health, places many of these thoughts in proper context. He recognizes that the federal agencies have been most aggressive and could dominate the health picture because of the relative power of the federal revenues available to them. However, he believes the health planning legislation goes a long way to provide the states and local areas with motivation and fiscal resources to revitalize leadership roles at the state and local levels in meeting the needs of the American people. He recognizes that the needs of the various states have varied greatly over the years and that at the present time, there is no evidence that any state has achieved a high level of statewide health planning, or, for that matter, a high degree of coordination of health services as implied in the legislation under discussion.

No state or municipality has developed a rationalized system of health services that can serve as a model for what P.L. 89-749 envisages. There is an enormous diffusion of sponsorship and organization of health services, maldistribution of resources, and increasing imbalance between expectations and the availabilities of health services. In addition, great differences exist among federal, state, and local governments in their relationship to the voluntary and private sectors of the health industry. Without denying the substantial contributions by a variety of governmental and non-governmental agencies to the health of the American people, a better coordination of these and related efforts is urgent if we hope to make progress toward obtainable goals of quality, efficiency, and equality of health services.

CRITICAL QUESTIONS

Another matter that is taking place in many areas is a mighty health battle between hospital administrators and health agency administrators on the leadership role in planning for health care. Should the hospital be the focal point with neighborhood health centers the satellites? Or should the comprehensive health centers, located where the people live and work, be the headquarters and the hospitals serve as ancillary units? Where do the private health agencies and their community services fit into the picture? These are some of the critical questions facing the health planners in many communities in our country.

The health planner recognizes that beyond certain minimal requirements of organization and submission of plans, the act displays few sharp teeth. On the other

hand, the law's strong invitation to the varied elements of the health industry to find ways and means to seek out mutual advantages, while serving the common good, distinctively keeps within the realities of the American political and social system.

SUMMARY

The Comprehensive Health Planning Law and its amendments appear to be a definite expression of past inadequacies and present and future health needs. Although the planning council has no operational powers and no authority except its influence and the authority to allocate within the state the PHS formula grants for public health programs, this constitutes a powerful beginning and stimulus for more effective coordination and cooperation of all the segments of the health care industry. It now seems fairly well established that good health is not the exclusive property of those who can afford to purchase it, but is an inherent basic right of all of our citizens. Past experience shows that if the providers of medical care fail to accept the responsibility of providing such care, the public through its government is quite likely to seek other means of solving the health care problems. This is the challenge that is offered to us, and the hope that if we accept our responsibilities and act in a manner to fulfill our responsibilities, total quality comprehensive health care can be made available to all our citizens.

SENATOR HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., SCORES LACK OF RELEVANCE IN EDUCATION AND OFFERS A COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROPOSAL

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) recently spoke before the New Jersey State Federation of District Boards of Education. Citing the "lethargy of traditionalism and the security of the status quo," he said that this country must provide a new level of educational experience for all. He was talking about the need for comprehensive community colleges to meet the new educational requirements of this country. Since his speech, he has acted by introducing legislation which is designed to meet this need: The Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969, which he introduced this past Monday. If enacted, it would be a significant milestone in the effort to provide full educational opportunities to all Americans. I was pleased to join him in sponsoring this important proposed legislation, and I hope that it will be acted upon soon.

The need for this legislation is obvious. The level of expertise required by employers has risen so rapidly the last few years that secondary school training is no longer adequate to prepare its graduates for the work force.

As Senator WILLIAMS put it:

The three "Rs" must give way to a new "R"—relevancy. The lethargy of traditionalism and the security of the status quo have produced failures in our education experience. It shows up in the eyes of a neglected infant in a slum house. It is apparent in the aimless course of a man's life wasting away in the wrong job. It sits heavy in the heart of an elderly woman with only loneliness in her remaining years. And it is evident in the vacant gaze of a runaway youth in a hippie haven. We must find a better way to seek out and develop our best resource. . . . Then we must provide the opportunity for that talent to develop and express itself. Simply doing something for

tradition's sake has no place in this picture. . . . Too many teachers, principals, superintendents, and boards of education members have not recognized that the pace of knowledge has accelerated so quickly in the past few years that a high school education carries its own dead-end guarantee. They still insist on the three "Rs"; they are still teaching kids what to think and not *how* to think.

Mr. President, this important speech sets the framework for the Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969. We should take this opportunity to join in Senator WILLIAMS' education sensitivities.

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

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

THE OUTLOOK FOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION IN 1969

(Address by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., before the New Jersey State Federation of District Boards of Education, Rider College, Feb. 8, 1969)

Last Sunday on "Meet the Press", Robert Finch, Secretary of H.E.W. was asked to name his Department's most urgent problem. He responded by citing the needs of elementary and secondary education—"particularly in terms of bringing the disadvantaged into the mainstream."

It is unlikely that Secretary Finch's remarks were intended as a slur on his predecessors. Nor were they meant to downgrade the enormous progress (55% of the more than 75 programs administered by the Office of Education were enacted in the 88th and 89th Congress—a period from 1963 to 1966) made in the past few years toward an intelligent Federal involvement in all levels of education. I believe he meant to indicate what our first priority should be.

The civil rights, poverty and education legislation of the Kennedy-Johnson years, taken together with a heightened interest on the part of Washington in the condition of the schools, has transformed the Office of Education from a tired and marginal office to a center of action and controversy. It is this office—which is at the disposal of President Nixon—and the education subcommittees in Congress that hold the key to the direction that education will take in the next four years.

What can we expect from this new administration? Certainly more than we heard last fall.

I was interested in the conclusions of Mr. Nixon's own task force on education which is reported to have said that he is not regarded as a particularly "education-minded president." The report criticized him for coming "perilously close" to reopening the church-state issue by supporting general versus categorical aid to education; and creating the impression during the campaign that he would go slow on school desegregation.

These are all issues we have settled, and I for one will have no part in going over these matters again. The crisis in education today demands that we move ahead and move ahead swiftly—each of us doing this thing.

The problems that you *must* tackle—and I will support you at the federal level—are bureaucratic inflexibility, outdated curriculums, and the rigidity of poorly trained teachers.

The three "R's" must give way to a new "R"—relevancy. The lethargy of traditionalism and the security of the status quo have produced failures in our education experience. It shows up in the eyes of a neglected infant in a slum house. It is apparent in the aimless course of a man's life wasting away

in the wrong job. It sits heavy in the heart of an elderly woman with only loneliness in her remaining years. And it is evident in the vacant gaze of a runaway youth in a hippie haven.

We must find a better way to seek out and develop our best resource, whether it be in Newark or Ridgewood, in Short Hills or Bridgeton. Then we must provide the opportunity for that talent to develop and express itself. Simply doing something for tradition's sake has no place in this picture.

Elementary and secondary schools have failed for two reasons. First, there is no room for relevancy. Too many teachers, principals, superintendents, and board of education members have not recognized that the pace of knowledge has accelerated so quickly in the past few years that a high school education carries its own dead-end guarantee. They still insist on the three "R's"; they are still teaching kids *what* to think and not *how* to think.

Not only is relevancy missing in the curriculum, but also in your responsibilities as board members to the community. When was the last time your public meetings were not "cut and dry"; when was the last time you sold your school budget to a community in terms of effect on children rather than dollars and cents; when was the last time teachers and students were part of your decision-making process; when was the last time a teacher could come to you as an individual without fear of reprisals; when was the last time you stopped to listen to a student; and when was the last time you communicated your education problems to your local, State and national representatives?

My mail is heavier on humane treatment of animals than it is on education of our children.

The 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act is up for extension this year. This bill directly affects your school program, yet how many of you know what title I is? (Curriculum and program development for economically and socially deprived). Has title II met your needs? (Support for library materials, books, film strips, records, etc.). If you have applied for title III (innovation grants for supplemental education centers), how does it relate to your total school program—or do you really care?

Education is *one* of my responsibilities. Education is *your* responsibility. When am I going to hear from you?

We will fail to improve education programs for two reasons: Political and budgetary realities, and failure of groups like yours to participate in improving them. Starting in a couple of weeks, you will be receiving a special education report from me on a regular basis to help you do just that. These reports will contain budget items, new program descriptions and education philosophy. I hope you will react to them and let me hear from you.

The second reason elementary and secondary schools have failed is the excessive demands society is making on the education process. 100 years ago we assigned the responsibility to secondary schools to produce a finished product. Today, 12 years of learning is at best only a stepping stone for many. But too often a millstone for those who have been neglected in high school and left behind in the arbitrary college admissions procedure.

Fortunately, there is a new level of education emerging in the country. It is a level quite different from secondary education and higher education. It is a level of education which is developing an environment to meet those demands through occupational, adult, technical, community service and remedial programs. It is the comprehensive community colleges.

Last week the fourth "R" we've been talking about took the shape of an informal workshop in my office to discuss the philo-

sophy, movement, programs and Federal role in the comprehensive community college. Ten experts in post-secondary education helped crystallize my thinking in this area. What emerged from this meeting is not completely clear, but two themes clearly developed—and each of you is part of these developments. First, whether as presidents of universities, volunteers in headstart, members of boards of education, or legislators, our first responsibility is to the total network of education in our country. We are educators first, then university presidents, teachers, principals, headstart volunteers. Anyone who doesn't believe that doesn't belong in education—as a policy-maker, as a teacher, as a critic, or as a community representative on an education board.

The second development is that the Federal Government is not now addressing itself in an official capacity to this new level of education. The office of education has a bureau of elementary and secondary education, a bureau of adult vocational and library programs, a bureau of higher education, a bureau of research, and a bureau of education for the handicapped—but there isn't even a single office or individual to handle the specific needs of community colleges.

The need for a new look at the role of higher education at this new stage of educational growth in our country is imperative, from the conclusions of the recent Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. No less than 500 new two-year community colleges are recommended within the next five years to meet the growing demand for this continuing form of education. Thirteen major cities in our country do not have a public community college within the city limits. Twenty-five major cities only have one community college, and the evidence is overwhelming that a major segment of our population is being denied the benefits of a quality education.

As I plan to work for the improvement in elementary and secondary schools when legislation comes before our subcommittee, I plan to do something for community colleges. At the next opportunity I have in Washington, I plan to introduce a comprehensive community college bill which will address itself to the Federal responsibility in this area of education. My bill will isolate this level of education from the responsibilities of the secondary schools and higher education. We will then be able to serve more equitably the needs of all aspects of our society.

DANGER OF COMMUNIST SUBVERSION AT HOME

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, recently I received a particularly poignant and moving letter from Mr. and Mrs. Harold Cole of Oakland, Ore. The Coles, who lost their only child fighting in Vietnam, ask a question posed by so many Americans today: What can an individual citizen do to fight constructively against Communist subversion here at home?

They write that the tragic death of their son, Jerry, "brought the terrible realization that, while he was dying thousands of miles away from us, the same enemy he was fighting is right here in the United States."

The Coles say they want to help in the fight against communism. They ask only where they can start, what they can do.

Mr. President, I have received many letters asking these same questions. I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record my answer to Mr. and Mrs. Cole

in the hope that it will be of value to other similarly concerned Americans.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., February 19, 1969.
Mr. and Mrs. HAROLD COLE,
Oakland, Ore.

DEAR MR. and MRS. COLE: Thank you for your recent letter. Permit me first to express my deep sympathy to you in your bereavement. The loss of a son is a great tragedy, but the loss of an only child is especially difficult to bear.

I believe that our first duty is to preserve our own country and its institutions. Thomas Jefferson once stated, "The laws of necessity, of self-preservation, of saving our country when in danger are a higher obligation (than strict observance of the written law)." The war in Vietnam is justified as an action that is necessary for the security or self-preservation of the United States. I agree with this judgment, and I believe that your son and all the other brave young men who have given their lives there have done so in a noble cause.

However, I can appreciate your wondering how seriously our government takes the struggle for which it asked your son to give his life. You are by no means alone in calling attention to the paradox of our sending boys thousands of miles to fight communism in Vietnam while we seemingly do very little to combat the subversion of the communists here at home.

The government is not, of course, completely indifferent to the subversive activities of the communists and their allies here at home. The Federal Bureau of Investigation remains under the leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, who is second to none in his understanding of the danger that subversion poses for our country. Please rest assured that the FBI keeps the subversives under close surveillance. Mr. Hoover is very active in writing, speaking and testifying to alert Congress and the public to the need to keep our guard up.

Congress is very much interested in combating communist subversive activities. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee under Senator James Eastland and the House Committee on Un-American Activities have carried out extensive investigations and published excellent reports and studies which expose the activities of subversives here at home. They have also published studies on the structure and operations of the international communist conspiracy. Some of the more important publications are on sale to the general public at nominal prices at the Government Printing Office. The most recent of these are *The New Left*, a memorandum by Allan C. Brownfeld, and *Aspects of Intellectual Ferment and Dissent in the Soviet Union*, both published in recent months by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and *Subversive Influence in Riots, Lootings and Burnings*, published in four parts by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I would recommend study of these publications to every American who wishes to combat communism. To be effective, we must be well-informed.

Congress has also demonstrated its interest in safeguarding our internal security by passing appropriate legislation. However, it must be admitted that for the past several years the Supreme Court has been steadily pulling the teeth from our internal security legislation. The Court has ruled that it is unconstitutional to require teachers to sign loyalty oaths, that it is unconstitutional to prohibit Communist Party members from working in designated defense plants, that it is unconstitutional to require party members to be registered with the Subversive Activities Control Board, etc. These and other