

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 121—PART 14

JUNE 6, 1975 TO JUNE 13, 1975

(PAGES 17481 TO 18944)

bill, would support 12,700 jobs for the elderly.

The \$119,800,000 for the work-study program would provide 250,000 jobs for low-income college students. An estimated 33 States have exhausted their work-study funds; without these funds, many would have to seek employment through the general labor market where one out of every ten workers is already unemployed.

For the Work Incentive program, \$70,000,000 is needed to continue providing jobs and training for welfare recipients. About 30 States have exhausted their supply of funds.

Unemployment is already at its highest level in 34 years, and must not be allowed to climb still higher. It would be a false economy, indeed, not to provide funds to create jobs, only to pay out billions more for unemployment benefits and welfare. Already, we are being compelled to appropriate a supplemental including an additional \$5 billion for mandatory aid to the jobless and \$1.7 billion for increased welfare costs.

We believe we must put our priorities in place and provide more work, not more welfare, to get our economy back on an even keel. Time is of the essence; we must act with utmost speed to pass a new Emergency Employment Appropriations bill that will be acceptable to the President.

Sincerely,

EDWARD W. BROOKE,

Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Education and Welfare,

WARREN G. MAGUSON,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare,

LAWTON CHILES,

JOHN O. PASTORE,

BIRCH BAYE,

CLIFFORD P. CASE,

RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I believe it would be a mistake to handle the urgent needs of our unemployed in a piecemeal fashion, when we can just as easily enact a bill meeting the immediate needs of our adult and elderly jobless citizens as well. None of these items can wait for consideration in the fiscal year 1976 Labor-HEW appropriations bill, since layoffs are imminent without supplemental funding.

I agree essentially with Congressman MICHEL and other cosponsors of H.R. 7612, making emergency employment appropriations for fiscal year 1975. Although far from perfect, this bill includes the most essential funds for not only summer youth programs but jobs for adults and the elderly, as well as work incentive and college work-study funds.

As a result of my amendment, it appears the House Appropriations Committee may report a continuing resolution which would specifically include all of the items agreed to by the conferees in the Labor-HEW chapter of the vetoed jobs bill. This would consist of: \$1.625 billion for public service jobs, extending for another year the current enrollment level of about 31,000 persons under several legislative authorities; \$42 million for community service employment for the elderly, including enrollees now in the Operation Mainstream/Green Thumb program; \$119,800,000 for 250,000 college work study jobs; and \$70 million for the Work Incentive program,

which provides employment and training for welfare recipients, as well as \$10 million for the Civilian Conservation Corps in the Agriculture Department. If these items are included in continuing resolution, I may consider withdrawing this amendment.

It would be a false economy, indeed, not to provide funds to create jobs, only to pay out billions more for unemployment benefits and welfare.

I agree that we must act with utmost speed to pass a new emergency employment appropriations bill. Further delay would not only prolong the tragedy for millions of Americans out of work but would be economically unsound.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the Record at this point.

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

#### AMENDMENT No. 579

On page 2, after line 10, insert the following:

#### COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS

For an additional amount for "Community service employment for older Americans", to carry out title IX of the Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments of 1973, \$30,000,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision in law, amounts contained herein, together with amounts heretofore appropriated for "Community service employment for older Americans" may be expended to continue projects now being conducted as part of the National Operation Mainstream program authorized by title III of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-203).

#### TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Temporary employment assistance", \$1,625,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1975.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

##### OFFICE OF EDUCATION

##### HIGHER EDUCATION

For an additional amount to carry out work-study programs authorized by part C of title IV of the Higher Education Act, \$119,800,000, of which \$60,000,000 shall remain available through September 30, 1975 and \$59,800,000 shall remain available through June 30, 1976: *Provided*, That funds appropriated in the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Acts for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975 (Public Laws 93-192 and 93-517) for the work-study program under part G of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which have been granted to an eligible institution whose allocation exceeds the amount needed to operate a work-study program during the period for which those funds are available, shall remain available to the Commissioner for making grants to other eligible institutions until the end of the fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year for which such funds are appropriated: *Provided further*, That any amounts appropriated for basic opportunity grants for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, which are in excess of the amount required to meet the payment schedule announced for the academic year 1974-75, shall remain available for payments under the payment schedule announced for the academic year 1975-76.

#### SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE WORK INCENTIVES

For an additional amount for "Work Incentives", \$70,000,000, for carrying out a work incentives program as authorized by part C of title IV of the Social Security Act, including registration of individuals for such program, and for related child care and supportive services, as authorized by section 402 (a) (19) (G) of the Act, including transfer to the Secretary of Labor, as authorized by section 431 of the Act, which, together with the previously authorized current year appropriation, shall be the maximum amount available for transfer to the Secretary of Labor and to which States may become entitled, pursuant to section 403(d) of such Act, for these purposes, for the current fiscal year and for any period in the prior fiscal year provided the prior fiscal year expenditures are claimed on quarterly statements of expenditures received by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare prior to February 1, 1975.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

For an additional amount for "Youth Conservation Corps", \$10,000,000, to remain available until the end of the fiscal year following the fiscal year for which appropriated: *Provided*, That \$5,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior and \$5,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture.

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the final joint hearings on the Child and Family Services Acts, S. 626 and H.R. 2966, have been scheduled by the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, the House Select Subcommittee on Education, and the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor for June 16, 17, 19, and 20.

A highly respected and impressive group of witnesses will testify at these hearings. I urge my colleagues and members of the public to attend and carefully consider the testimony that will be presented.

Because of the large number of requests our subcommittees have received for copies of the witness list, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

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

#### WITNESS LIST FOR JOINT HEARINGS ON THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACTS S. 626—H.R. 2966.

Monday, June 16, 1975, 9:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn Building.

Witnesses will include: Congresswoman Bella Abzug; Representatives of the National Governor's Conference; Anne Klein, New Jersey Commissioner of the Department of Institutions and Agencies; Representatives of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities; Ms. Frieda R. Mitchell, Chairperson, United Communities for Child Development, Inc., Frogmore, South Carolina; Honorable Hannah D. Atkins, House of Representatives, State of Oklahoma; Dr. Wilson Riles, Superintendent of Public Instruction, California Department of Education, Sacramento, California; John Himelrick, Interagency Council for Child Development Services, Office of the Governm

Charleston, West Virginia; David Flaherty, Secretary of Human Resources & Chairman of the South, Eastern Human Services Institute, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Tuesday, June 17, 1975, 9:30 am, 2175 Rayburn Building.

Witnesses will include: The Honorable Caspar W. Weinberger, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare accompanied by Stan Thomas, Assistant Secretary of Human Development, Terrel Bell, Commissioner of Education, Dr. Theodore Cooper, Assistant Secretary for Health, and Jack Young, Assistant Secretary Controller; Kenneth Kenniston, Chairman and Executive Director of the Carnegie Council on Children.

Thursday, June 19, 1975, 9:30 am, 4232 Dirksen Building.

Witnesses will include: A Panel of Congressmen including Congressman Parren J. Mitchell of Maryland, Congressman Gunn McKay of Utah and Congressman Jim Weaver from Oregon; two witnesses recommended by Senators Buckley, Taft, and Laxalt; Betty Caldwell, Director of the Center for Early Development and Education, University of Arkansas; Urle Bronfenbrenner, Professor, Department of Human Development and Family Services, Cornell University.

Friday, June 20, 1975, 9:30 am, 2175 Rayburn Building.

Witnesses will include: Joyce Hatton, President, New World, Inc., Lansing, Michigan; Representatives of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; Mr. Ben Shappard, M.D., President, Dade County School Board, Florida; Owen Peagler, Chairman, National Advisory Council for the Education of Disadvantaged Children; Donald W. Whitehead, Federal Co-Chairman, Appalachian Regional Commission; Dr. Robert Mendelsohn (Pediatrician) Assistant to the Executive Vice President, Michael Reese Hospital, Chicago; Panel of witnesses including Eileen Fox, Urban Affairs Department, Banker's Trust, New York; Carole Lubin, United Neighborhood House of New York; James Solar, Executive Director, Union Settlement Association, New York; Alleen Wittenstein, Member of United Neighborhood Houses Board of Directors; Jeanette Perkins, mother of two retarded children served by Lowe Memorial Day Care Center; Eleanor Bailey, Business Agent for Metropolitan North Postal Worker's Union, AFL-CIO; Alice Lee, Director of After-School Day Care Centers operated by Chinatown Planning Council.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. PHILIP A. HART. Mr. President, I wish to inform those who may be interested that the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee on Tuesday, June 17, will open hearings on S. 489. This bill, whose chief sponsor is the junior Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK) would prohibit petroleum producers or refiners and natural gas producers from owning an interest in other energy sources.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### BUSING, INTEGRATION, AND QUALITY EDUCATION

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I have long maintained that we have come full circle on the issue of school desegregation. It is also becoming increasingly evident that the issue has more to do with social adventurism than with promoting quality education.

In 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court held

that the Constitution forbids schoolchildren to be assigned to public schools on account of their race. Then came forced school busing, which does precisely what the Supreme Court said could not be done.

Thus, we have come full circle because the principal criteria for assigning children to schools far removed from their homes and busing them great distances across cities or school districts is race.

It has nothing to do with quality education. It has nothing to do with improving instruction in the classroom. Forced school busing is purely and simply a matter of trying to achieve some artificial racial balance conceived by some Federal court or some bureaucrat.

As William Raspberry, the Washington Post columnist, pointed out:

Busing hasn't solved anything because busing can't solve anything except transportation problems. And transportation never was the issue.

And now, the man who conceived the notion of school busing has also come full circle. In 1966, in a study which greatly influenced Federal courts and the U.S. Office of Education, Prof. James R. Coleman, of the University of Chicago, thought busing was a marvelous idea.

Professor Coleman now concedes that forced school busing has been a failure. Rather than improving education and advancing the cause of human relations between the races, according to Professor Coleman, it has been detrimental to these causes.

I suppose this gives strength to the idea that hindsight is better than foresight. This may be true, but when the Government undertakes to deal with peoples' children and to virtually revolutionize educational systems, I for one would wish that more foresight would be exercised.

The time is long overdue to stop the idiocy of forced school busing. It is time to stop using schoolchildren as pawns in sociological experimentation.

Mr. Raspberry discussed Professor Coleman's views, past and present, on school busing in a column in today's edition of the Washington Post.

I commend it to members 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:

##### BUSING, INTEGRATION, AND QUALITY EDUCATION (By William Raspberry)

With the recent capitulation of Prof. James R. Coleman (he of the celebrated Coleman Report), hardly anyone is left to defend big-scale busing for the purpose of school integration.

It was Coleman, now a sociologist at the University of Chicago, whose 1966 study, undertaken for the U.S. Office of Education, provided the rationale for the massive busing programs of the past 10 years.

The heart of the Coleman Report was its finding that black children in integrated classrooms perform better than their counterparts in all-black classrooms.

And since he also found that the performance of white children was not diminished by racial integration, it was hard to resist the conclusion that America ought to move

as quickly as it could to see to it that every black child had the benefit of integrated education. And what quicker way could there be than the instant integration of massive busing?

Well, Dr. Coleman has taken another look, and his new conclusion—expressed in an April speech before the American Educational Research Association and in a recent interview with the National Observer—is that busing is killing integration, not promoting it; that America's largest cities are becoming more rigidly segregated as a direct result of busing.

According to Coleman, it is implementation, not theory, that has gone awry.

"The theory is that children who themselves may be undisciplined, coming into classrooms that are highly disciplined, would take on the characteristics of their classmates and be governed by the norms of the classrooms, so that the middle-class values would come to govern the integrated classrooms.

"In that situation, both white and black children would learn.

"What sometimes happens, however, is that characteristics of the lower-class black classroom—namely a high degree of disorder—come to take over and constitute the values and characteristics of the integrated school. It's very much a function of the proportion of lower-class pupils in the classroom."

I do wish Coleman had taken the bother to explain that black and lower-class are no more synonymous than are white and middle-class. But, then, he might also have pointed out that in the large cities, where busing constitutes the largest problem, the lower-class populations are getting bigger and—as the cities themselves become less white—also blacker.

And because blacks are concentrated in the larger urban areas, court-ordered desegregation has tended to speed the process that sends whites fleeing to the suburbs while the central cities become blacker, Coleman said.

Nor does he believe that metropolitan-wide busing is the answer.

"I believe it's not entirely lower-class blacks that middle-class whites are fleeing," he said. "They are fleeing a school system that they see as too large, as unmanageable, as unresponsive, to find a smaller, more responsive system. If the systems is made even larger, covering the whole metropolitan area, many parents will find ways to escape it, either by moving even further out or by use of private schools."

It is principally in the very large cities that busing is having its resegregating effect, Coleman noted. "In cities smaller than the size of, say, Indianapolis, desegregation does not seem to have the same consequences."

For the big cities, with the big problem, Coleman is convinced white flight will continue, at least among those with the financial means to flee, unless solutions are devised that can attract the active cooperation of middle-class families.

But what, exactly, is it that we're seeking a solution to? If we had asked ourselves that question, and insisted on an honest answer, maybe we wouldn't be dealing with massive busing now.

Are we seeking a solution to racial segregation generally? Then, why pick on the schools instead of the neighborhoods, where the real segregation is maintained?

Is the problem inadequate education for poor children? But who could have believed—Coleman notwithstanding—that problem could be solved by transporting whole classrooms from one neighborhood to another?

It is unequal distribution of resources that we are trying to correct? Then, why don't