

U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 1

JANUARY 19, 1970, TO JANUARY 27, 1970

(PAGES 3 TO 1482)

expeditiously and favorably on either H.R. 11651 or S. 2548 or a combination of the two. We must not risk permanent damages to a child because of inadequate nutrition.

Sincerely,

FRED R. HARRIS

TWO GREAT LOSSES FOR CONNECTICUT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the State of Connecticut lost two outstanding leaders and fine citizens on Sunday, January 18, with the deaths of the Honorable Leroy D. Downs of Norwalk and the Honorable Alfred N. Phillips, Jr., of Darien.

Mr. Downs was elected to the U.S. Congress in 1940 and represented Connecticut's Fourth District for one term.

Born in Danbury, he began his career as a reporter with the South Norwalk Sentinel, of which he eventually became the publisher. He was also active in the American Legion, and he served as chairman of the State veterans home commission.

Mr. Phillips served for three terms as mayor of Stamford, and he represented Fairfield County in the House of Representatives for one term, which began in 1936. He was also publisher of the Darien Review and past president of the Connecticut League of Municipal Executives.

I knew Al Phillips and Leroy Downs well. They were good public servants, and they made a good record for themselves and for the people they represented.

All who remember them are saddened by their deaths.

MINNESOTA ENCOURAGES INNOVATION IN EDUCATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the December issue of American Education contains an excellent article entitled "Swinging With Mini-Projects," written by Mr. Edwin Cain and Miss Anne St. Pierre.

In their article, the authors describe an exciting program in the Bloomington, Minn., public school system which encourages the teachers to develop and experiment with innovative approaches to education.

I believe experimentation in educational matters is terribly important. We simply must devote more of our time and resources to finding new and more effective ways to educate our children and ourselves. Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides funds to encourage this type of innovation and experimentation. I am very proud that the town of Bloomington has developed its own "little title III" to supplement and reinforce the national goal of promoting educational innovation.

I commend this thoughtful article to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

SWINGING WITH MINI-PROJECTS

(By Edwin Cain and Anne St. Pierre)

A chance to try . . . even to try and to fail. This is what the Bloomington, Minn., public school system gives its teachers through a "little title III" program. Like title III of

the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the program encourages educators to develop ideas for innovative practices. But in contrast to the Federal title III program, Bloomington's version is run by the local board of education. Teachers need only have the board's approval to get money to put their best ideas into practice.

The miniature title III program is Bloomington's assurance that a teacher with a good idea for a new educational program or technique will have the resources to develop that idea, even if it serves only a relatively small group of students. Thus, classroom teachers can become initiators of educational change.

"We know that innovation costs money," explains Bloomington superintendent Fred M. Atkinson, "and because Federal funds are so competitive, we couldn't risk the chance that projects of value to our students would not be funded. We believe that if an idea is worthwhile then we should do it—if only on a limited basis."

Since the school system established a special projects office to handle the little title III program in 1967, ideas have been submitted for innovations at every grade level. Educators have thought up schemes for such things as individualizing math instruction, modifying the school-year structures, starting an artists-in-residence program, and adapting physical education exercises for handicapped youngsters.

When a teacher gets an idea for an innovative program he drops in to see Wallace Kennedy, coordinator of special projects for the school system. The two of them brainstorm the idea, making sure that it has a good chance of working as planned. Then the teacher sets out his ideas in a formal proposal which goes to a special projects committee composed of teachers, administrators, and other educators, who further develop and sometimes revise it.

Once past the special projects committee, the proposal must be recommended to the board of education by school administration officials. If the board approves it, the educator who thought up the idea gets the money he needs to carry it out, usually in time to start his project the following school year.

To finance the special projects, the board of education draws on a combination of Federal, local, and private foundation monies. Federal funds make up the bulk of the financial resources—\$744,735 so far—but Bloomington has invested over \$169,000 of local money in special projects during the last four years.

The school system treats the special projects as trial balloons. New techniques or programs are tried on small groups of students to see if they are feasible on a larger scale. "The main thing is to give teachers an opportunity to try," says Stanley Gilbertson, assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and one of the originators of the special projects program. "They know that we want to learn with them and from them, and this program makes almost anything possible on a limited basis."

Reaction to the program has been enthusiastic. Of 22 special projects operating last year, 10 were originated by teachers, four by curriculum staff members, and eight by school administrators. By far the majority of all special projects funded have been started by persons who work directly with students.

Several projects initiated on an experimental basis have been so successful that they have been expanded to include additional students at various grade levels. Some that started out as pilot projects now have been established as a permanent part of the school system's curriculum. A family life education curriculum is a case in point.

With the ambitious aim of developing a kindergarten to grade 12 family life education program, the project was funded in 1966 with \$3,500 of local money and some funds from the Elementary and Secondary Educa-

tion Act for instructional materials. In the pilot project, 48 class groups were given family life education. Now, the materials are being taught to about 650 classes, K through 12, and have been integrated into the school system's entire curriculum.

As Bloomington's first attempt at interdisciplinary curriculum development for grades K-12, the family life education project involved science, social studies, and health education teachers. Several members of the community also helped plan the new curriculum. In fact, the idea for the program came from a physician and school board member, Harley Racer, who presented it to a board meeting in 1966.

As the family life education program took shape and demonstrated its value as part of the curriculum, the school system began looking for a means to guarantee that other innovative ideas could be put into practice. In 1967 the special projects office was established under Wallace Kennedy, and Bloomington became one of the first school systems in the Nation to run its own little title III program.

As coordinator of special projects, Kennedy is responsible for seeing that teachers have a channel for presenting their ideas. In addition he helps the teachers manage projects, once they are under way, and makes certain there are adequate provisions for evaluation. He encourages all staff members of the school system to submit proposals.

Of course, not all the proposals win board of education approval, and those that are approved don't always work out exactly as planned. "Nothing has been a total failure, though," says Kennedy. "Sometimes things don't turn out according to our expectations, but nevertheless, we still learn something from all the projects."

Enough special projects have succeeded to convince the school system of the value of the program. For example, an individualized math program, which started as an experiment in one school, is doing so well on the junior high level that its authors have been asked to write materials for grades four through 12.

The math program was the idea of Louis Cohen, mathematics coordinator, and Roger Nelson, teacher and mathematics department chairman at Portland Junior High School. They felt that even though the school was using curriculum materials and strategies based on the new math, a new teaching approach was needed. "We were teaching with the same approach that was used 30 years ago, and still didn't take into account that the student proceeds in understanding at his own pace, fast or slow, no matter what pace the teacher sets," Nelson explains.

Nelson, along with the whole math department at Portland, prepared individual institutional packets suitable for children at various levels of achievement. Each child starts at his own "packet level" as determined by pretests, and moves along at his own speed. The pretests also help teachers group together the children who have similar problems.

Students who finish the individualized instruction packets for their course in less than the allotted time are encouraged to try more advanced noncredit courses—slide rule techniques, vector problems, and exercises in the metric system. Next year the math program will include computer-assisted instruction.

The Portland teachers also converted a school hallway into a satellite educational resource-learning center just for math students.

The students can use the area for viewing film strips and other audiovisual math materials. The center is always staffed by someone who teaches on the grade level of those students using the center at a particular time.

Has the math project been a success? "We think so," Nelson asserts. "We haven't had any superdramatic success stories—like

a kid who couldn't add suddenly solving trigonometry problems—but for the first time over half the ninth-grade students finished the whole algebra book."

The special projects may take a few weeks—or a few years—to complete. In one project, physical education specialist Jerry Molosky spent three years developing courses that would permit students with physical handicaps to participate in recreational activities.

Molosky adapted exercises so that children with asthma, cardiac conditions, or orthopedic handicaps can do them despite their physical problems. For example, a child who is crippled from the waist down learns to play table tennis or wheelchair basketball. Youngsters with less severe handicaps often join in the regular physical education classes. When the activities get too difficult for them, a teacher takes them aside for small group instruction in feats they can perform.

The physical education project cost \$139,383 in Federal funds, making it one of the most expensive special projects undertaken at Bloomington. Much of the money went to pay for the specialized equipment the handicapped children must have for physical education.

But the projects don't have to cost a lot of money to be successful, as Wallace Kennedy quickly points out. "One of the most interesting and satisfying projects we ever funded had a total cost of about \$100," he explains.

"A local composer was commissioned to write an original musical composition for the all-city elementary school orchestra. He wrote the piece, rehearsed it with the children, and gave them instruction in composition and musicology. At the concert he personally conducted the orchestra for the first public performance of his composition. The kids loved it."

Of the projects operating last year, six cost more than \$5,000, 13 cost between \$1,000 and \$5,000, one cost between \$500 and \$1,000, and two required less than \$500. Previously there had been two special projects that cost nothing at all: Teachers donated their time for the extra activities and used materials already available in the school system. Youngsters also undertook "goodwill" projects of their own: Teenagers used scraps from shop class recently to make wooden toys for handicapped children.

Two of the major expenses that the special projects incur are for materials and equipment. The rest of the money usually goes to pay teachers and other project staff who often spend their weekends, afterschool time, and summer vacations developing their pet ideas.

Funds for the projects come from a wide variety of sources. Last year 16 projects were paid for with local money, and two of these were partially assisted by the Minnesota State Arts Council. Most of the Federal share for Bloomington's special projects comes from title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, although support has also come from title II ESEA, title III of the National Defense Education Act, the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities, the provisions for assistance to federally impacted areas, and the Upper Midwest Region Educational Laboratory, a USOE-supported organization.

Bloomington has also explored private sources of money with some success. One of its major special projects was begun recently with support from the C. F. Kettering Foundation, which was interested in financing a human relations program that would create a more "humane" school climate, thus cultivating a positive attitude toward school on the part of the students.

With assistance from the special projects office, the staff at Penn Junior High School planned and put into operation a program that attempted to create this more humane school climate by generating understanding and empathy among teachers, students, and

even parents. In one part of the program, teachers and parents meet together for classes in adolescent behavior. Another feature has students getting a 15-minute break every day to gather in a courtyard, the lunchroom, or some other place and talk—with no adults looking over their shoulders.

In another project, the Bloomington schools, nearby Augsburg College, and the Minneapolis public schools are cooperating to prepare teachers who are qualified to cope with the problems of race and poverty. Currently, Bloomington is helping prepare six young black men for the teaching profession. The men are enrolled in classes at the college, but their course work in education consists of on-the-job experience in Bloomington classrooms.

The Bloomington special projects illustrate how local, Federal, and private funds can be used cooperatively to provide the best possible education for children. "The projects are a manifestation of involvement and cooperation—involvement of the local community, the school system, the Federal Government, and private organizations," says Gilbertson.

For teachers, the small experimental projects are open doors to individuality: They allow teachers to be initiators—not passive observers—of educational change. "Change will come whether or not we are prepared for it," says superintendent Atkinson. "If we want to influence the direction of change, we have to create the best possible climate for it."

CONSTRUCTION FUNDS FOR THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, shortly before the adjournment of the Congress last month, I was privileged to attend and be a part of one of the most unusual meetings ever to take place at the Bureau of the Budget. In an unprecedented, open-to-the-press meeting, an array of Senators, Representatives, Governors, and other interested officials from the States of Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Florida met with Budget Director Robert Mayo in behalf of the inclusion of funds in the new budget to begin the construction of the long-awaited Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. The meeting was the subject of wide television, radio, and newspaper and editorial comment throughout the South. I ask unanimous consent that several articles and editorials representative of the news media interest in the meeting and the Tennessee-Tombigbee project be printed in the Record at the completion of my remarks.

Mr. President, of all the waterways and rivers that pulse the lifeblood of commerce through our Nation, few share the vibrant excitement and promise of the Tennessee-Tombigbee. This project has been the objective of far-sighted men for more than a century. From a look at a map, one is impressed by the fact that from the point where the Tennessee River turns north, the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers together form an almost direct line between the Port of Mobile and Paducah, Ky., where the Tennessee joins the Ohio River: It is as if Providence had pre-ordained a connecting link between the two rivers.

For decades, however, a manmade link, consisting of a canal and locks to enable boats and barges to pass over the strip of high ground which separates the

Tennessee River from the headwaters of the Tombigbee River was considered by the Army Engineers as economically unsound. It was not until the Tennessee Valley Authority built the Pickwick Landing Dam, which raised the water level in the Tennessee River by 55 feet, that the Army Engineers determined that the benefits to shippers and receivers on the two river systems and the benefits to industry, business, and agriculture in the regions would exceed the cost of constructing a waterway link to connect the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers.

Having won a favorable report from the Army Engineers, Congress subsequently authorized the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1946. Through the years the project has been confronted with many obstacles and hostile opposition. It has been deferred for restudy and subjected to numerous economic restudies and reevaluations in the hope of its opponents that the waterway would be killed. Yet, to their chagrin, every survey has produced the same result; to wit, that the project is economically feasible and that its development will contribute mightily to the continued economic growth and progress of our Nation, both at home and in the world market. In recent testimony, officials of the Corps of Engineers estimated the latest ratio of benefits to cost for the project at 1.6 to 1.

Mr. President, Congress has long recognized the importance of our inland waterways to the internal and foreign commerce and economic well-being of the United States and to our national defense effort. The development of our great waterways has returned rich dividends to our people from water transportation, electric power production, flood control protection, water supplies for municipalities and industrial use, from fish and wildlife programs, and from recreation developments.

When the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is completed, it is abundantly clear that the benefits to the people of the Nation will be incalculable. This waterway will tie together in one protected inland waterway system the Tennessee, the Cumberland, the Ohio, the Illinois, the Monongahela, the Allegheny, the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the Tombigbee, the Warrior, the Alabama-Coosa, and the Chattahoochee-Apalachicola-Flint Rivers. All will be connected by the Intracoastal Canal with such great gulf ports as Mobile, New Orleans, Galveston, and other port cities along the gulf coast from Texas to Florida. All will be tied to the Great Lakes.

Barge trains descending south to such cities as Mobile and New Orleans, carrying the products of midwestern farms and such midwestern cities as Minneapolis, Chicago, Detroit, St. Louis, Cincinnati, and Kansas City, may take advantage of the swift current of the Mississippi River.

Such barge trains may, along with other ascending traffic, return with the products of southern farms, forests, mines, factories, and oil fields, via the slack water route of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.

The new route will shorten the dis-