

*U.S. Congress / 93rd Congress / 2nd Session*

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 120—PART 10

MAY 1, 1974 TO MAY 8, 1974

(PAGES 12485 TO 13864)

other small power plants, coal and atomic energy lend themselves best to exploitation in central power plants. If advances in electric batteries or other methods of storing energy make the electric car a reality, each garage, in effect, will become a private filling station, with the car charged up there overnight for use the next day.

The U.S. energy economy is so often projected only as far as the year 2000 that people overlook the energy requirements of the next century. Whereas this century will be reckoned by energy historians as 90% fossil and 10% nuclear, the relationship will become increasingly nuclear in the future. Although it's unlikely that 21st Century Americans will be free to waste energy the way we have, many experts think that the U.S. population will grow very slowly in the next century and not exceed 400 million by the year 2100. Thus, I would expect that total energy consumption would no more than triple in the next century and that nuclear sources could maintain a viable U.S. energy economy through the 21st Century.

#### A BLEAK PICTURE

The world-wide energy picture, on the other hand, is very bleak. The "easy energy" sources of other nations should run out rather soon in the 21st Century. The proved reserve of 500 billion barrels of oil in the Persian Gulf may seem immense, but it cannot satisfy the rising energy expectations of developing countries for very long. The run-out of "easy energy" and the on-set of "tough energy" could have revolutionary consequences for the growth of the planet's population. Merely feeding the growing populations of underdeveloped nations may eventually impose energy requirements that many nations will not be able to meet. Nor will many of these nations be able to afford the U.S. solution: a highly-electric economy designed to mate with nuclear power. Result—a widening of the gap between the have and the have-not nations.

I have found that in lecturing about the subject of future energy supply people discount rather gloomy forecasts as these by saying that "scientists will come up with a solution!" There are, of course, a number of energy options already in sight, but all have their drawbacks. None qualify as "easy energy," especially if all costs are reckoned, and it is this advent of "tough energy" that has such fundamental significance to our future way of life.

#### FOLLOWTHROUGH

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a number of my colleagues in the Senate recently joined me in sponsoring an amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill to restore \$20 million to the follow-through program. As one of the most successful programs in the Office of Education, followthrough has proven itself a valuable asset for improving, through education, the life chances of low-income children. The administration's response has been to announce a nationwide phaseout of followthrough beginning next September with complete termination of the program by 1976.

The reaction to the program from parents, program directors, teachers and others connected with followthrough has been particularly impressive. They have expressed their concern for the need to retain this program and are dismayed when efforts such as followthrough, which are designed to improve opportunities for disadvantaged children, are

frustrated by elimination of the programs. Parents unanimously convey a sense of new opportunity in follow-through, emphasizing the achievement their children have shown because of the program.

I understand that the Appropriations Committee in markup session just agreed to include in the supplemental appropriations bill the amendment I proposed. I want to thank and commend all the members of the committee for taking this positive step toward restoring \$20 million to followthrough to allow the program to continue with an entry level grade class next year. And I want to especially thank the chairman of the Labor-HEW Subcommittee, the senior Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) for the special leadership he provided on this issue, and the humane and sensitive role he has played on behalf of all programs like this one that provide hope and opportunities for American families and their children.

I ask unanimous consent that appropriate background materials and correspondence be printed in the RECORD, including examples of the letters I have received from teachers and parents with children in followthrough program.

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

#### FOLLOW THROUGH

**Building on Head Start's Gains:** Follow Through was initiated seven years ago to sustain the impact of Head Start, as a response to studies which indicated that Head Start gains were often lost after the children entered elementary school. Follow Through continues through the third grade the same types of comprehensive health, education, and social services that Head Start provides in preschool, with heavy parent involvement.

**Legislation Creating Follow Through—**The Intent of Congress: An amendment to Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act launched Follow Through. The Senate report accompanying the 1967 amendment stressed that Follow Through was a service program, not a time-limited experiment. The report emphasized that Follow Through "builds on the experience of Head Start which shows that unless a systematic follow through is made with children previously enrolled in Head Start the gains made tend to fade away."

**A Comprehensive Program:** Follow Through is comprehensive in the services it offers. Instructional programs in the schools are strengthened by new, innovative teaching methods. Aides, drawn from the community, assist the teachers in the classroom as do parent volunteers. The health and nutritional well-being of disadvantaged children is improved by nutritional education and lunches provided through the program. Medical and dental care, social and psychological services are part of Follow Through. Career Development is fostered by Follow Through as low-income parents employed as aides are enabled to earn high school equivalency diplomas and take college level courses leading to degrees in teaching and other fields. Parental participation is another significant aspect of Follow Through. Classes and workshops are provided that help parents work with their children in the classroom or in the home. Parents are involved in decision-making as members of advisory committees, taking part in decisions on all phases of the program.

**Administrative Alteration of the Program:** Upon Congress' initiation of Follow Through as a comprehensive service program, the administration requested \$120 million to operate a large-scale service-type program. However, before legislation was enacted, it became known that OEO would receive less money than had been appropriated, and that Follow Through, as a new program, would receive very little funding. An administrative decision was made, and agreed to by OEO, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Office of Education and the Bureau of the Budget, that Follow Through should be an experimental program for the time being, designed to produce information which would be useful when the program was expanded to nationwide proportions.

Despite the alteration in program emphasis, the legislation was not changed and passed the Congress as originally intended. For the first several years, OE referred to Follow Through as "a research and development program in a service setting" and the appropriations justifications called it a pilot program with the objective being to capitalize on the gains made by poor children in Head Start. Since 1971, and despite the wording of the legislative authorization, Follow Through has been officially regarded as solely a research and development program.

**Results of Evaluative Studies:** National evaluation of Follow Through done by the Stanford Research Institute produced results significantly in favor of the program. The overall impact on pupil development, and on parent and teacher attitudes is positive. The effects of Follow Through become stronger as children progress through the program. Participation in Follow Through produces greater growth in children—both academic and nonacademic—than that displayed by the non-Follow Through comparison groups.

**The Phaseout:** The Administration has called for a phaseout of the Follow Through program, claiming that its so-called basic purpose as an experiment has been fulfilled, while legislative history indicates this was never intended to be just an experimental program. Follow Through has proven itself too valuable and successful to be eliminated. The phaseout will have an adverse effect on further planned evaluations. The integrity of the remaining classes will be jeopardized as key local administrators and teachers leave the program. The evaluation is being seriously compromised and the phaseout may prove to be self-justifying. Follow Through is in danger of going down as another compensatory education program that somehow turned out a failure.

**Maintaining Follow Through at Present Level:** There are currently 170 Follow Through projects throughout the nation providing new educational opportunities for more than 80,000 poor children in kindergarten through third grade. To maintain Follow Through with approximately the present number of children in grades K through 3 at the current level of funding will require approximately \$60 million annually, \$20 million in addition to the present appropriation authorization for next school year.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., April 5, 1974.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
HON. NORRIS COTTON,  
Labor-Health, Education & Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON and SENATOR COTTON: We are writing to you of our intention to introduce an amendment to the Sup-

plemental Appropriations Bill restoring \$20 million to the Follow Through Program.

As you know, this program provides special follow up services to Head Start graduates during the first three years of school. At a cost of about \$60 million annually, the Federal government has been funding about 180 Follow Through programs across the country for the past several years.

Follow Through has been one of our most successful programs for the education of the disadvantaged and we believe it must continue without reduction. Unless these funds are provided in the Supplemental, no existing program will be able to support an entering class this fall and the program will be phased out over three years.

With warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

WALTER F. MONDALE,  
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
ROBERT TAFT, JR.,  
MARK O. HATFIELD,  
JOHN V. TUNNEY,  
CLAIBORNE PELL,  
ROBERT T. STAFFORD,  
GAYLORD NELSON,  
JACOB K. JAVITS.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., April 23, 1974.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Chairman,  
Hon. NORRIS COTTON,

U.S. Senate, Labor, Health, Education &  
Welfare Subcommittee, Senate Appropriations  
Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON and SENATOR COTTON: On April 5th I wrote to you with Senators Humphrey, Taft, Williams, Hatfield, Tunney, Nelson, Javits, Pell and Stafford, indicating our hope that the Subcommittee would include in the supplemental appropriations bill for 1974, \$20 million to be restored to the Follow Through program for the current fiscal year.

Since that time, a number of other Senators have asked to be associated with this effort. Specifically, Senators Cook, McGovern, Ribicoff, McGee, Clark, Hart, Fulbright, Randolph, Stevenson, and Brooke would like to be recorded as cosponsors of this measure.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

WALTER F. MONDALE,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Children  
& Youth.

#### COSPONSORS OF MONDALE AMENDMENT

As of this time the following Senators have expressed their sponsorship of this measure: BROCK, BROOKE, CLARK, COOK, FULBRIGHT, HART, HATFIELD, HUGHES, HUMPHREY, JAVITS, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MCINTYRE, NELSON, PELL, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, STAFFORD, STEVENSON, TAFT, TUNNEY, and WILLIAMS.

SAGINAW, MINN., March 12, 1974.

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

DEAR MR. MONDALE: As a teacher in the Follow Through environment I have been able to observe many benefits to the students as a result of the the program. As you probably know, Follow Through puts a great deal of emphasis on developing a positive self concept of the child, giving emphasis to individualized instruction, and involving parents in the classroom.

Sincerely,

FRANK HELQUIST.

MOUNDS, ILL.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,  
Russell Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am writing in regard to our school program, Follow Through. We have been

informed that this year Our Kindergarten is being phased out and then each year after first through third grade until the program is gone. I have one child in Follow Through and one in the fourth grade who had Follow Through. I feel they both have benefited from this very much.

Our Community has benefited from this very much. It has increased parent, teacher and pupil relationship. I feel it is a great assist to Our Community.

I am asking for all the help and support you can give us in keeping Follow Through in Our Community.

Sincerely,

PHYLLIS BUCKLES.

#### THE 1974 CHESAPEAKE & OHIO CANAL HIKE

MR. BEALL. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute today to an intrepid band of some 33 persons, members of the C. & O. Canal Association, who on April 27 completed an 11-day, 184-mile long hike of the C. & O. Canal from Cumberland, Md. to Washington.

The purpose of the canal hike was to emphasize the unique recreational treasures which the canal offers our citizens and to call attention to the deteriorating condition of the canal as a result of tropical storm Agnes and the demands of time.

In June, 1972, Agnes caused an estimated \$34 million worth of damage to the canal. The waterway suffered some 26 major breaks, and all along the canal, locks were destroyed, banks eroded and structures damaged.

Additionally, the process of decay has begun to claim more and more historic structures along the canal. For instance, on October 31, 1973, the 140-year-old Catocin Creek Aqueduct collapsed, giving us dramatic evidence of the critical need for restoration.

Clearly, this year's hike was just as important as the first hike in 1954, which began efforts to make the canal a national historic park. That effort, of course, was culminated by the enactment of Public Law 91-664, the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Development Act, in January 1971.

This year the walkers, starting from Cumberland, moved down the towpath at a rate of approximately 17 miles a day, camping along the way. Local supporters organized dinners for the hikers in Cumberland, Williamsport, Frederick and Washington, and many people joined the walkers for short stints in their home areas.

I was able to join the hikers for one of the last legs of the journey, from Great Falls to Sycamore Island, a distance of 8 miles, and it was well worth the effort, for we were exposed to some of the best parkland America has to offer.

As I pointed out, much work remains to be done to restore the canal. Unfortunately, since the 1972 storm, only \$1.8 million has been spent to repair the damage wrought by Agnes, an amount little more than one-twentieth of the need. For fiscal year 1975, only \$3 million is included in the budget, an amount I deem greatly inadequate. It is my strong hope that the Congress this year can rectify this fiscal oversight. Should any of my colleagues have some res-

ervations on that score, I would invite them to walk the canal, as the members of the C. & O. Canal Association have done. That, I would think, would be more persuasive than any speech on the floor of the Senate.

I salute each person who walked the canal, and commend them for their dedication to this unique and irreplaceable parkland. I especially want to congratulate Mr. Bruce Wood, chairman of the C. & O. Canal Level Walkers, who more than any other was particularly responsible for organizing this most successful hike. Bruce Wood has been one of the champions of the C. & O. Canal, and by this walk he has helped immeasurable to bring attention to the need for renewed efforts to repair the canal.

Mr. President, it is my hope to translate the commitment of these people to the canal into legislative action to restore the C. & O. Canal in time for our Nation's Bicentennial.

#### THE DANGER IN A SYSTEM THAT REQUIRES FALSE REPORTING

MR. HUGHES. Mr. President, on March 27, I told the Senate that I was pursuing an investigation into one of the unresolved issues of the secret war in Cambodia—the false reporting of tactical air strikes during and after the U.S. ground attacks in 1970. That investigation is now complete, and I want to report my conclusions to my colleagues.

This matter arose in testimony before the Armed Services Committee last August, when two witnesses testified that, on strikes deep inside Cambodia, they were required to call the Tactical Air Control Center—TACC—in Saigon to get "reporting coordinates" so that the bombing could be listed as having taken place close to the South Vietnamese border.

The Defense Department white paper, issued in September, confirmed these procedures but said that—

Inquiries to date have failed to disclose the source of the orders . . .

For nearly 8 months I have tried to pin down the source of these orders and the justification, if any, for them. I raised questions of several nominees for promotion and inserted the answers from four of them in the RECORD on December 14.

The Defense Department's own investigation of this matter was grossly inadequate. General Walter T. Galligan, the Commander of the TACC during the summer and fall of 1970 was never questioned. Nor were his subordinates.

It was only in February of this year, when General Galligan's name came before the committee for promotion, that a serious inquiry began in the Pentagon. I requested and received written answers to key questions from General Galligan, but I was not satisfied with his responses. I sent two additional letters on February 28 and March 5, requesting further information.

When the committee finally acted on the nomination list on April 4, it took the unprecedented step of deferring ac-