

UNITED STATES

U.S. Congress.



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 22

AUGUST 3, 1973 TO SEPTEMBER 10, 1973

(PAGES 27779 TO 29102)

the program as possible should be returned to the states as soon as possible, despite the fact that it was the states' incompetence in this field which prompted the Federal Act. Congress must assert its power to reverse these priorities through its appropriations authority, and demand that the Act be implemented in the most efficient and comprehensive manner possible.

An additional issue which must receive legislative consideration is that of economic dislocation—both the threat and the actuality—resulting from safety and health implementation. In recent years of environmental activity, we have seen how workers can often be caught as pawns in a showdown atmosphere. We are now beginning to witness the same pressures in the occupational safety and health field. Environmental and labor groups have worked together in making strides toward the enactment of legislation which provides for required public verification of any environmental dislocation threats, and special economic compensation for any actual environmental dislocation. Similar actions must also take place with regard to the occupational environment.

Compensation of another form is also in need of legislative action—workmen's compensation for occupational diseases. The delivery of workmen's compensation benefits is a function of the individual states' laws; some states provide no compensation for occupational diseases, while many states provide compensation for only a very limited range of diseases. Resultantly, in most states it is, relatively speaking, easy for a worker to obtain benefits for a lost hand, but nearly impossible for him to get compensation for lungs which have been devastated by long years of exposure to toxic fumes. Needed is uniform and full coverage, without time limitations, of all occupational diseases.

Therefore, the Urban Environmental Conference supports the following legislative positions:

(1) Opposition to "consultative services" to small businesses by the Department of Labor as a substitute to first instance sanctions for violations of the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

(2) Opposition to the exclusion of small employers from coverage by the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

(3) Support of adequate appropriations for a vigorous and expanded implementation of the Federal Occupational Safety and Health program.

(4) Support of worker protection provisions for occupational safety and health in terms of economic dislocation assistance and anti-blackmail procedures.

(5) Support of full coverage of all occupational diseases by Workmen's Compensation.

URBAN ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE

Groups which support both general and legislative policy:

National Association of Social Workers.
 Movement for Economic Justice.
 National Welfare Rights Organization.
 National Tenants Organization.
 United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO.
 Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO.
 Americans for Democratic Action.
 National Recreation and Parks Association.
 Zero Population Growth.
 United Auto Workers.
 Environmental Action.
 Friends of the Earth.
 Health Research Group.
 Environmental Policy Center.
 Fisherman's Clean Water Action Project.
 Baltimore Urban Environment Center,
 Izaak Walton League.

Oil Chemical and Atomic Workers, AFL-CIO.

Sierra Club.

Groups which endorse only general policy section:

National Parks and Conservation Association.

Center for Science in the Public Interest.
 National Committee for Household Employees.

Environmental Defense Fund.
 National Wildlife Federation.

MINNESOTA EDUCATORS CRITICAL OF PROPOSED BETTER SCHOOLS ACT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, at my request, Howard B. Casmev, our excellent commissioner of education for the State of Minnesota, contacted several Minnesota school superintendents to ask for their reactions to the so-called Better Schools Act. It was my hope to obtain from these superintendents a clear view of exactly how Minnesota schools would be affected by this proposed legislation.

I have now received an answer. According to Mr. Casmev and the eight superintendents he contacted, the public schools in Minnesota would be adversely affected by this measure. He writes, in part, that—

The reaction on the part of these administrators to the BSA has been total disagreement with the Administration bills on Special Education Revenue Sharing. In each case the districts have repeatedly expressed the fear of losing funding support for programs that have experienced success. The districts regard such legislation as having a disastrous effect on continued educational progress in Minnesota as well as their individual school districts.

All of the superintendents questioned raised serious questions and concern about this proposed legislation. According to George P. Young, superintendent of the St. Paul Public Schools, they will lose approximately \$600,000 in that district alone. In Bloomington, Minn., according to Superintendent Fred M. Atkinson, they will be required to cut back their staffs and support services.

Mr. President, for the benefit of my colleagues and the public, I ask unanimous consent that these letters appear in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA
 DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
 St. Paul, Minn., July 5, 1973.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
 Old Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: In response to your inquiry concerning the Better Schools Act and its impact on Minnesota, I have solicited the advice of a representative sample of school superintendents throughout the State. The sample includes urban, rural and suburban superintendents.

The reaction on the part of these administrators to the BSA has been total disagreement with the Administration bills on Special Education Revenue Sharing. In each case the districts have repeatedly expressed the fear of losing funding support for programs that have experienced success. The district regard such legislation as having a disastrous effect on continued educational progress in Minnesota as well as their individual school districts. The St. Paul School District, for example, estimates that it would lose approximately \$600,000 in the first year under the BSA. In addition to the monetary losses that would occur, the school districts sampled indicate that it would be nearly impossible to conduct viable planning activities for succeeding years because of the tenuousness of projected funding possibilities.

While an effort at consolidation may be a noble concept, there is a strong feeling that the consolidation effort under the BSA is arbitrary and comes in too short a period of time.

The loss of funding, of course, would have a detrimental effect on personnel. Staffs which were hired with the use of federal funds would be seriously depleted. For school districts this would mean the loss of some excellent personnel.

These are just a few of the sentiments expressed by leading school superintendents in Minnesota. I am attaching copies of their responses with this letter for your examination. If there is anything further that I can do to be of help, please let me know.

Sincerely,

HOWARD B. CASMEV,
 Commissioner of Education.

THE SAINT PAUL PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
 Saint Paul, Minn., June 20, 1973.

Mr. HOWARD B. CASMEV,
 Commissioner, State Department of Education,
 St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR COMMISSIONER CASMEV: In reply to your letter of June 12 seeking St. Paul's reaction to President Nixon's Education Revenue Sharing Bill, we wish to make the following observations.

Should the "Better Schools Act" pass, our best estimates indicate a first year loss of approximately \$600,000 in the St. Paul School District. The reductions would occur in those areas noted below.

1. The St. Paul Open School would lose \$76,500 formerly received under ESEA Title III.

2. We would lose \$90,000 for library books and audio-visual materials funded under ESEA Title II.

3. Under NDEA Title III the District would lose \$50,000 for instructional equipment, such as overhead projectors, microphones and tape recorders.

4. The biggest reduction suffered would be in impact aid where failure to fund the "B" category could cost the District about \$300,000.

5. Two special projects, one for visually impaired pre-school and one called a home and family living laboratory would be lost as funds would be withheld under ESEA Title III.

As regards Title I, aids for disadvantaged children, the District would be protected for the first year under the hold-harmless provision. "Better Schools Act" national levels of funding coupled with increased District costs, however, makes the future of Title I appear bleak.

While the District agrees with the rhetoric regarding simplification of grants and reduction of bureaucratic red tape, it fears that the proposed legislation does not accomplish these missions, but instead sets the nation on a course of diminished federal funding for education. We join the Minnesota Department of Education in their opposition to the "Better Schools Act."

Sincerely,

GEORGE P. YOUNG,
 Superintendent of Schools.

BLOOMINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
 Bloomington, Minn., June 21, 1973.

Mr. HOWARD B. CASMEV,
 Commissioner of Education, State Department of Education,
 St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR Mr. CASMEV: The termination of any of the various Federal programs to school districts in the State of Minnesota will have adverse effect on the entire state's educational system. It is evident to me that our Minnesota Legislature has responded to the best of its ability to provide adequate general funds, along with special funding, with the full knowledge of the Federal contributions in special areas. Hence, the termina-

tion of Federal funding in specific areas will cause a severe imbalance of financial support within our state.

To be more specific concerning District 271, Bloomington, any reductions of our Federal support, which was \$443,750 this year, will result in further cutbacks in our staff and/or support services. We have had to reduce our present budget \$1,200,000 in preparing our 1973-74 expenditure budget. Under our present levy limitations, we cannot keep even with inflation, salary increases, and Legislative mandates such as increased retirement contributions.

It is obvious that the revenue sharing proposals result in reducing Federal support under the guise of consolidation.

Sincerely,

FRED M. ATKINSON,
Superintendent.

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Minneapolis, Minn., June 22, 1973.

Mr. HOWARD B. CASMEY,
Commissioner of Education, State Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR COMMISSIONER CASMEY: I am responding to your letter of June 12, 1973, requesting LEA reactions to the Better Schools Act.

Our basic position in regard to the controversy between revenue sharing and categorical grants remains focused on the issue of which system or plan permits the best allocation of funds for essential educational services. Our focus, of course, is with respect to the City and Minneapolis in particular. In that respect our priorities are similar to many of the existing categorical programs: i.e. education of the disadvantaged, services to the handicapped, vocational and career education, improvement of media, services to Indian students, support of desegregation/integration and a limited ability to test creative and innovative approaches in competition with other school districts.

We have reviewed the material accompanying your letter and at the present time find no reason to endorse the Better Schools Act because of a lack of clarity as to the amount of monies available to LEA under the five sections which are present after the consolidation of the various categorical programs. Our comments at this time can only be general in nature.

The section on Education for the Disadvantaged, which brings together all parts of Title I, could well result in severe cuts in programs unless there is adequate funding. Section C of the current Title I of ESEA, while limited, has given us funds to initiate experimental programs for gaps that are found in the range of existing Title I services. Parent involvement has been exemplary in identifying these gaps and every component under Part C has been built into the Title I Part A program. The funds from Section C have been used exclusively to upgrade Title I reading and math programs.

The section on Education of the Handicapped, which combines several current programs, shows expanded funds; but the law takes away funds historically used under Title III and in vocational education. We are again at a loss to know if there is potential to sustain existing valid programs to say nothing of expanded programs. The ideas stated in much of the literature about the "flexibility" of the Better Schools Act become difficult to comprehend when you find several categorical grants consolidated and the total of available funds less than the total of the previous parts.

The large number of individual titles, which have been brought together under the Vocational Education section, are such that a district may have to revamp its total approach to vocational education and drop services to many youngsters. A number of valid programs already operational under

vocational education categorical aids will have to be dropped.

The reduction of "B" students under the Impact Aid (P.L. 874) again hits at a number of districts that have parents of students working on property that does not pay its share of local taxes. It would seem that the "B" student should be redefined rather than dropped categorically. Some of the smaller districts in our state, which have a significant number of students whose parents work in "B type installations" will be seriously hurt by this modification.

The section on Support Services combines sections of a number of acts and would place school districts throughout the state and the State Department of Education itself in a difficult position. The loss of ESEA Title II funds takes away the source of monies that have helped a number of districts upgrade their total range of media services. LEAs and the state itself will be forced to fund a wide range of services and programs which have been brought together in one support service section. We are particularly concerned about not having categorical funds for adult basic education. The person who needs adult basic education comes from a section of the community that has the least powerful political voice, and in many districts they will not be served at all.

We are concerned about the exclusion of Title V of ESEA. The State Department of Education staff in our state, engaged under Title V, has been very supportive of districts throughout the state in expanding and sharpening the quality of services to educationally disadvantaged, low-income, handicapped and minority youngsters.

Even if the State Department of Education were able to provide some services to local districts through an indirect cost approach, the whole aspect of priorities of state services would remain in a state of confusion.

The section on School Lunches combines several titles. It is confusing, and funds are limited. The rapid increase in the costs of foodstuffs, the lack of products through the various federal programs, and the vital importance of the School Lunch Program—particularly to low-income youngsters—are such that a reduction of support in this area will harm those who are least able to afford the harm. The youngster in the inner city or from a low-income rural area, who does not have an adequate school lunch is penalized in educational as well as in physical and psychological ways.

We recognize the need to review the considerable number of categorical programs and to look at some possible combinations. We feel the Better School Act has moved to accomplish the consolidation process in too short a period of time. It has not given enough recognition to the needs of those segments of the community which would not be able to lobby for their own educational services.

The lack of any kind of a formula below the state level for distribution of federal educational funds to support children with high need, makes it difficult to endorse such an Act. Local districts will find it difficult to set priorities because they will not know what the distribution pattern or process will be from the state agency. Not knowing what funds are available and what programs are eligible will lead to confusion and competition between and among districts for funds, and students will be lost in the battle.

The Better Schools Act seems to point to more local planning. This is almost impossible unless the local educators have an idea of what amounts of funds are available to their districts. It is ironic that local districts are being asked to develop creative plans when the national government apparently still does not have adequate census data from the 1970 census to provide firm program allocations at the LEA level.

Thank you for the opportunity to share concerns relative to this key issue and know that we stand ready to work with you and your associates to the end that the best federal-state system be established in order that local education authorities be able to provide service as needed.

Very sincerely,

JOHN B. DAVIS, Jr.,
Superintendent of Schools.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 274,
Hopkins, Minn., June 20, 1973.

Mr. PETE PETRAFESO,
Consultant, State Department of Education,
Division of Planning and Development,
St. Paul, Minn.

SPECIAL EDUCATION REVENUE SHARING BILL

Dr. Greenwalt requested that I respond to the Commissioner's letter regarding the revenue sharing bill.

First, let me state that I am not able to determine the specific impact of the proposed bill for School District No. 274. This is because I am not able to calculate revenues under the formulas provided in the bill and I'm sure I do not have enough data available at the district level if I was able to understand the formulas. On the surface the bill appears to be much too complicated. I think we should try harder to make these programs less complicated. I would hope that when revenue sharing is actually accomplished that funds would be allocated to the states based on their evaluation of program needs. We have spent far too much time in the past documenting needs for federal government officials and then demonstrating that the money has been spent in the specified manner. These tasks are better handled at the state and local level.

In general, I see the proposed legislation as detrimental to our school district. Less dollars will be available to the state and this means less dollars to support programs already operating. The net result would be that we must eliminate the program or eliminate another program or programs in order to fund the program. A number of excellent programs for handicapped, vocational, and education as well as the food service program would be faced with severe curtailment or even elimination due to this bill. It does not seem to be appropriate to withdraw funds from tried and proven programs based on formulas that fail to recognize needs at the local level.

I cannot support the proposed revenue sharing bill (S. 1319) and would urge you to continue your efforts in opposing the bill. I do favor some form of revenue sharing but not by sacrificing funding for programs in the manner proposed by this bill.

E. J. YOUNG,
Director of Business Affairs.

BLUE EARTH PUBLIC SCHOOL,
Blue Earth, Minn., June 19, 1973.

Mr. HOWARD B. CASMEY,
Commissioner of Education, Minnesota Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR COMMISSIONER CASMEY: This letter is intended to show my reaction and judgment concerning proposed Federal legislation for elementary and secondary schools. In part my judgments are based on the figures submitted from your office showing comparisons of the Federally funded programs now in existence as compared to the proposed special education revenue sharing.

I would like to share my judgments on just four of the categories now covered with Federal funding assistance. The first of these is Vocation Education. Our district is in a high school cooperative educational venture that includes nine high schools. The enrollments curriculum and staffing have expanded in each of the four years that the Vocational

Center has been in existence. In spite of another increased enrollment anticipated for next year, the Vocational Board has decided not to expand the vocational offerings. The major reason is the uncertainty and lack of government funds. The cutback in Federal funds can certainly prevent the progress and possibly even force a cutback in our vocational programs.

ESEA, Title I, has provided us with the greatest source of funds from Federal legislation. With a decline in funds anticipated we have cut back on our staffing for supplemental reading and mathematics instruction in grades 4 through 6 for next year. We feel the position is still necessary but funds have forced this decision.

ESEA, Title II, has been a tremendous help in both the elementary and secondary library services. Funds from this source have been used to expand our resources for English and social studies. Local funds would not be available to pick up this need if the Federal Program is abolished.

Under the Title III, NDEA, we have acquired a significant number of materials and equipment that has been a boost to learning experience in foreign language, science, mathematics, English and industrial arts. I feel that the original purpose of NDEA has been accomplished. However, to continue the subject areas at their highest level supplemental funds from some source will be necessary.

While I like the idea of revenue sharing which should permit decisions closer to the home level, I could not support the revenue sharing plan if it meant a decrease in the amount of funds we would have available for educating the students in this community.

Sincerely,

KENNETH QUEENSLAND,
Superintendent.

WINONA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Winona, Minn., July 3, 1973.

Mr. HOWARD B. CASMEY,
Commissioner of Education, State Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR COMMISSIONER CASMEY: Last year the Winona schools received approximately the following amounts from federal funds:

Title I.....	\$112,000
Title II.....	15,000
Title III.....	58,000
Title III NDEA.....	12,000

In addition we received a substantial amount of vocational aid for our secondary vocational programs and for our area vocational school where it is not easy to separate out the amount of federal support and the amount which is furnished by our own state.

Because of the uncertainty about the future of Title I we have terminated the contracts of seven teachers who worked in this area last year. We felt that last year the Title I money that we spent on disadvantaged children produced the best results that we have had since the program started. Both the administration and the board are very disturbed by the possibility of losing this very valuable part of our overall educational program.

The Title II program over the past years has enabled us to build up the content of our school libraries to the point where we were hopeful that in the next two or three years our book count in these libraries would be up to state minimum standards. We have not depended entirely on federal money to accomplish this but we have increased our locally funded library budget each year for the past five years.

We have a Title III project operating in our school district. We have just completed the second year of the project and we fully expected to be funded for \$45,000 for the 1973-1974 school year. The project is such that it cannot be discontinued so it means

that we will have to raise these funds locally to replace federal funds if they are not forthcoming. We think the federal government is morally responsible for continuing Title III projects that were originally scheduled to be in operation for a three-year period. We think it is unconscionable to terminate a program in mid-stream.

Over the years we have been able to improve markedly the equipment in our science department and in more recent years in other departments with Title III NDEA funds. We feel, however, that if any program is being discontinued this one would have the least impact on our educational program.

Revenue sharing in itself has many things to commend it in that it brings the decisions on how the money is to be spent closer to the people who are involved with the programs to which the money is allocated. It appears to us, however, that revenue sharing is being used as a subterfuge to reduce the federal governments commitment to education and we are somewhat appalled at the brazen way in which it is being forced on Congress and on the country.

Partly through the efforts of Title V funds Minnesota has developed a very excellent staff in the State Department of Education to administer federal programs. If Title V funds are eliminated the State Department will be left without leadership in many areas and we can see nothing but chaos resulting from this action.

I support the Commissioner wholeheartedly in his opposition to revenue sharing as it has been proposed in the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. NELSON,
Superintendent of Schools.

SCHOOL DISTRICT 742,
St. Cloud, Minn., July 3, 1973.

Mr. HOWARD CASMEY,
Commissioner of Education,
Minnesota Department of Education,
St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR COMMISSIONER CASMEY: In spite of the lack of lead time constantly changing philosophies, guidelines and regulations, congressional and administration impasse, etc., local school districts have made the "Elementary-Secondary Education Act" an effective educational instrument for compensatory programs, educational media and change to produce quality education.

Several exemplary programs have been developed in District No. 742. The "Area Learning Center" for drop-outs and for pregnant teenagers has served as a pilot for 18 other schools just in Minnesota.

For the first time parochial schools have received practical, effective support and enjoyed a new working relationship with the public schools.

A cursory examination of the implementation of the "Elementary Education Act" would disclose obvious administration errors at the national level. We really need some practical modifications that would permit local districts to do effective planning and more effective implementation. The last thing we need is a new idealistic dream that is beyond the scope of practical reality.

Unfortunately, very few people have recognized that a shift in educational leadership has taken place. Change for quality education is emerging at the local level in Title III.

If Congress and the Administration must have a new program; hopefully, it would be practical rather than traditionally idealistic. It should involve short and long term strategic planning with plenty of lead time and stable funding.

We in District 742 are unequivocally opposed to "Revenue Sharing" as set forth in the present so called "Better Schools Act".

Sincerely,

KERMIT L. EASTMAN,
Superintendent of Schools.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BRIDGE, STRUCTURAL, AND ORNAMENTAL IRON WORKERS CITES NEED FOR TRANS-ALASKA PIPE-LINE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, in the June 1973 issue of the *Ironworker*, the official magazine of the International Association of Bridge, Structural, and Ornamental Iron Workers, President John H. Lyons devoted his monthly message to the energy crisis, particularly the need for the trans-Alaska pipeline. As he indicated—

The simple fact is this nation needs the Alaska oil and needs it now and the pipeline is the method to use.

Mr. Lyons urged the immediate approval of the trans-Alaska pipeline. He said this will mean jobs for Americans—jobs that will be vitally necessary—

Jobs for American workers would be generated not only in building the pipeline and related plant construction (an estimated 28,000 construction jobs), but also in maintaining it and in manning the transshipment facility at Valdez. Also, an estimated 33 new U.S. flag tankers would be needed to carry the oil, thus stimulating employment in U.S. shipyards and for U.S. shipboard workers.

All these facts make the Trans-Alaskan pipeline the logical step to take.

Not only did Mr. Lyons urge the building of the trans-Alaska pipeline, but also he urged Congress to take other measures to ease the current energy crisis. He stated that—

The future stability of this nation's economy, without a doubt, requires a series of immediate measures to insure our nation's self-sufficiency in all forms of energy, not just petroleum.

Mr. President, Mr. Lyons' message makes a lot of sense. It is one that is, I believe, reflective of most American workers.

We need Alaskan oil, and we need it now.

I request unanimous consent to print Mr. Lyons' article in the RECORD.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S PAGE

(By John H. Lyons)

On two occasions in the past two years the subject of this page has been the energy crisis in our nation. Indeed, it is a subject worthy of our consideration, for the effects of not solving the energy crisis will touch us all.

It is ironic that while the United States is facing a general energy crisis, with petroleum products being in particularly acute short supply, one of the largest reserves of petroleum—Alaska's North Slope—remains undeveloped.

At a time when the United States is being forced to increasingly rely on oil imports to meet demand, the tapping of the Alaskan oil makes a great deal of sense. The fastest, most economically feasible and most secure method of transporting Alaskan oil to American markets is by pipelines to Valdez and by tankers to the West Coast ports. And this is where the project is now bogged down.

The entire history of attempts to get construction started on the Alaska pipeline is a long chronicle of frustration and pressure created by special interest groups to delay the job, if not kill it entirely. If construction had been started three years ago, when originally hoped, the nation might not be going