

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 4

FEBRUARY 24, 1969, TO MARCH 6, 1969

(PAGES 4179 TO 5498)

We had a huge backlog of heavy maintenance checks to perform and a large flight schedule to maintain, in which we qualified pilots and crews for transpacific flights to Honolulu. Mr. Nixon assured me that there wouldn't be another officer or man in the squadron who would work harder or support our mission better than himself. His enthusiasm was overpowering. He had something special to give, but I couldn't immediately determine what it was. In about three months, my engineering officer recommended that the third shift be terminated—much to my surprise. His explanation was that the young Lieut. Nixon had been so successful in performing, not through technical competence but through the sheer weight of enthusiastic leadership, that the night shift produced so well that they were even performing checks scheduled for the day shift!

Mr. Nixon's quiet leadership techniques took hold throughout the squadron. I am sure that his leadership qualities will stand all Americans in good stead these next four years.

P. F. BOYLE,

Captain, U.S.N., retired.

A.P.O. SAN FRANCISCO.

CONTRACTS AWARDED TO CERTAIN TEXTILE COMPANIES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, after reading press accounts about the decision of the Department of Defense to award contracts totaling \$9.4 million to three textile companies whose civil rights compliance is highly doubtful, I sent the following communication to the Deputy Secretary of Defense:

DEAR MR. PACKARD: In recent days, I have taken more than a passing interest in the newspaper accounts of the action of the Department of Defense in awarding \$9.4 million in contracts to three textile companies whose civil rights compliance has been challenged. I have been left somewhat confused by what appear to be conflicting press accounts of this action.

After reading the attached article from Tuesday's Washington Post, I am even more concerned about the procedures which have been followed—or not followed—in the awarding of contracts to J. P. Stevens, Dan River Mills, and Burlington Industries. I certainly hope that the Department has secured more than "paper" assurances that the requirements of the Executive Order on contract compliance will be followed by the three companies in question.

It would be helpful if you could advise me of the extent to which the companies have met and are meeting the requirements of the Executive Order and whether the normal procedures have been followed in this case, both within the Department and in coordination with the Office of Federal Contract Compliance.

Thank you for your attention to my request.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART.

Mr. President, my concern, if anything, has been increased after having read additional articles about this action. Congressional Quarterly, in its February 14 issue, carried a brief account relating to Secretary Packard's decision to award the contracts. Excerpts from the CQ article follow:

The Department of Defense February 7 announced approval of \$9.4 million in contracts awarded to three textile companies threatened the previous week with debarment from federal contracts because of violations of federal regulations against racial discrimination.

Dan River Mills, Burlington Industries and J. P. Stevens & Co. were awarded contracts after company executives assured David Packard, Deputy Secretary of Defense, that they would take "affirmative action" to reach equal employment goals.

Packard did not disclose the details of such action plans. He said that he had received satisfactory assurance from the companies that they would end discriminatory employment practices.

This decision appears to reverse a previous finding by the Defense Department and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC) that the companies were not in compliance with federal regulations and were therefore ineligible for federal contracts.

The decision, originally set for January 31, was delayed a week. The delay was attributed to the efforts of Senator Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) to prevent the debarment of the companies, all of which have plants in South Carolina.

The OFCC, charged with supervising the equal employment policies of Government contractors, objected February 10 that it had not been consulted about the settlement which was reached with the companies. The OFCC is in the Department of Labor.

The OFCC asked Packard to specify the details of the agreement and indicated that it might convene formal hearings to bar the companies involved from bidding for any future federal contracts. . . .

Senator Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.) February 11 asked David Packard to delay award of the contracts to the three textile companies until the OFCC approved the settlement with the companies. Mondale said that he was "most disturbed . . . that these contracts were approved without even consulting OFCC" and warned Packard never again to ignore the OFCC in such matters.

Mr. President, over the weekend, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, through its distinguished chairman, Roy Wilkins, called upon the President to order a review of Mr. Packard's decision and to have him make public the details of the agreement with the three textile companies. I ask that the text of Mr. Wilkins' telegram to the President be included as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

The Defense Department's award of textile contracts to J. P. Stevens & Co., Dan River Mills and Burlington Industries, three companies with long histories of job discrimination, calls for the most searching concern. The fact that the terms of the Department's agreement with these companies are undisclosed is incompatible with the public's right to know and the pledge of an "open administration." We urge you to direct a review to determine if these firms are indeed in full compliance with the executive order on non-discrimination in employment and to direct Secretary Packard to disclose what agreement he has made.

ROY WILKINS,

Chairman, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the decision of Secretary Packard is most unfortunate. The fact that the details of the agreement with the companies have not been made public is regrettable enough, but when one considers that the Federal agency responsible for coordinating the contract compliance program, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, was not consulted about the agreement, the decision becomes even more deplorable. I

hope the President will respond affirmatively to Mr. Wilkins' telegram by ordering a complete review of the action and then by making public the details of the agreement which has been reached with the three companies.

TOWARD A SOCIAL REPORT: SOCIAL MOBILITY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I invite attention once again to the bill I introduced on January 5—the Full Opportunity Act of 1969. The bill establishes a Council of Social Advisers and a Joint Committee on the Social Report, and requires the President to submit an annual Social Report to Congress. I firmly believe that the enactment of this bill will allow us to seriously begin working toward the realization of one of the most cherished of American ideals: equal opportunity for every American.

The aspect of opportunity I want to highlight today is social mobility. It is indeed ironic that while some men are mobile enough to travel to the moon others lack the mobility to travel out of their ghetto. That we know more about extraterrestrial mobility than intrasocietal mobility is today all too evident and unfortunate. We can no longer afford—in any manner—the luxury of such relative ignorance. To say "I don't know" is not a satisfactory response to the social problems which now confront us. While knowledge is not a sufficient condition for problem solving, it is a necessary condition. We need both the desire and the competence to solve these problems associated with equal opportunity. We cannot realize our ideal of equal opportunity unless we have an open society—a society which affords and stimulates rather than denies and frustrates social mobility.

Mr. President, HEW's "Toward a Social Report" points to the fact—based on systematic analysis—that "the great majority of our citizens" do have the opportunity "to improve their relative occupational status." For the great majority of our citizens there is the opportunity for social mobility. Yet what about the minority? The report reveals that there is an income gap of \$1,400 between white citizens and black citizens of "comparable family background, educational attainment and occupational level." Plainly this does not describe a society in which every American has equality of opportunity regardless of family background. The report concludes:

Economic and social status—and hence social mobility—in our society still depend in a striking way on the color of a man's skin.

I am convinced, Mr. President, that once the American people fully understand these serious problems in our society, they will move swiftly and surely to remedy them. The Social Report is a start in the right direction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the second chapter of "Toward a Social Report," entitled "Social Mobility," be printed in the RECORD.

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

SOCIAL MOBILITY: HOW MUCH OPPORTUNITY IS THERE?—CHAPTER II

"America means opportunity." So said Ralph Waldo Emerson over a hundred years ago. Ever since our Nation began, Americans, probably more than others, have believed that the individual should have the opportunity to achieve whatever his talents can bring. They have not enjoyed complete equality of opportunity, but a belief in greater equality of opportunity has always been a part of the American creed.

Thus, any inventory of the state of American society must ask how much equality of opportunity we have, and whether there is more or less than there used to be. Complete equality of opportunity exists when the social and economic status a person has is determined by his own abilities and efforts rather than by the circumstances of his birth. If a person's family background or race, for example, affect his ability to "get ahead," then the ideal of equality of opportunity has not been realized.

An improvement throughout the society in the prospects for a high income, an advanced education, or a white collar job, however, does not necessarily mean greater equality of opportunity. Such improvements in "life chances" for the population as a whole are, of course, important, but they are largely the result of economic progress, which is considered in another chapter. Here, we focus instead on the extent to which a person's status, relative to that of others in his society, is determined by his ability and effort, rather than by his social origins. True equality of opportunity means that some families must fall in relative social or economic position if others rise. Indeed, many Americans might not want complete equality of opportunity with its extreme emphasis on individual talent, and some might question whether an aristocracy of ability is really preferable to an aristocracy of birth. A society in which the most capable people were always able to rise to positions of leadership, however fair this might seem, could prove intolerable to those who were condemned to failure because they lacked the particular talents valued in that culture. We must, then, temper our desire for more equality of opportunity with the realization that it may also be necessary for the successful and talented to share their good fortune with those less well endowed. But, in this Chapter, these issues need not concern us unduly, for no matter how much equality of opportunity there may be in our Nation, most people want more than we now have.

To assess the degree of opportunity and measure its changes over time, we have to be able to determine a man's relative "position" in society, so that we can say whether he has risen or fallen in status. Though there is no one ideal measure of social and economic position, a man's occupation is probably the best single indicator of his socio-economic level. Other characteristics, like high income, education, social standing, community influence, and membership in prestigious organizations, can also bring high socio-economic status. The man of independent means and wide influence may have a high standing in his community even if he does not work at a job, and the man in a religious or ethnic minority may be denied access to prestigious organizations in spite of his career success. Thus, occupational mobility is not a perfect indicator of social mobility, and we cannot be sure that there is more or less equality of opportunity just because a man's occupational position is more or less dependent on his family background than at some earlier point in our history. Yet, changes in occupational mobility probably tell us as much about changes in social mobility as any other single measure we could use. All of the ingredients of a high status usually vary with occupation and are roughly measured by it. In a modern society like the United States, moreover, men are admired

primarily for the work they do. Accordingly, in this Chapter, we will measure the extent of opportunity by looking at changes in occupational status from one generation to the next, asking in particular how an individual's family background bears on his chances of success. Toward the end of the Chapter, we will also consider how the color of a man's skin affects his position in our society (or at least his economic opportunities). In this first attempt toward a Social Report, it was not possible to consider other circumstances, such as sex, religion, or national origin, which may limit success in our society. The special problems facing some of these groups are also of great concern to the Nation and it is hoped that any future report can give greater attention to them.

HOW MUCH EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IS THERE?

Earlier in American history, the possibility of moving to the frontier, with its lack of established social structure, was supposed to provide at least some degree of equality of opportunity. The opportunities of the unsettled frontier have vanished, and modern American society has on-going institutions, established families, and an emphasis on educational credentials that could limit equality of opportunity. A number of observers have been understandably concerned that the extent of equality of opportunity may be decreasing as the Nation's institutions become older and the demands of modern technology place those with an inadequate educational background under an ever greater disadvantage. Among sociologists there has been a debate on the question of whether class lines, as reflected by occupational mobility, have or have not been hardening in the last several decades.

In 1962, the Bureau of the Census conducted a survey of "Occupational Changes in a Generation" which has made it possible to estimate the present extent of opportunity in this country and whether or not there is more or less than there used to be. This survey asked a representative sample of American men not only about their own first occupation, income, education, and the like, but also about their father's usual occupation. A separate survey asked a cross-section of the American public what degree of status they thought attached to each occupation, and these responses were used to derive a numerical status "score" (ranging from 0 to 96) for each of 446 detailed Census occupations.¹

As a result of these two surveys, it is possible to compare the occupational score of each man surveyed in 1962 with the score his father had, and thereby see how much influence the father's relative socio-economic position had on the ranking of his son. Since the men surveyed were of different ages, it is also possible to get some impression about whether equality of opportunity has been increasing or decreasing by comparing the father-son status relationship of the older men with that of the younger.

THE PRESENT STATE OF OPPORTUNITY

An analysis of the survey results undertaken by Professors Dudley Duncan and Peter Blau shows that the occupational

achievements of the sons were not in any large degree explained by the socio-economic levels of their fathers. To be exact, only 16 percent of the variation in the occupational scores of the men surveyed in 1962 was explained by the father's occupational status.² If the data and analyses are correct, it follows that the remaining 84 percent of the variation in socio-economic status among the sons was not related to the socio-economic status of their fathers. Since there is a probability that the men whose fathers were of high socio-economic status had on the average somewhat more ability than those whose fathers had lower socio-economic status, some relationship between status of father and son might be expected even in a society with perfect equality of opportunity. Accordingly, the findings, though extremely tentative, tend to suggest that there is a considerable degree of social mobility in America.³

TRENDS IN OPPORTUNITY

There is also some reason to suppose that the degree of equality of opportunity has not been declining in recent decades. The oldest group of men surveyed were between 55 and 64 years of age in 1962 and the youngest between 25 and 34, so the oldest group of men held their first jobs about 30 years before the youngest. As Table 1 shows, the degree of relationship between the status of father and son is roughly the same for older and younger groups. The relationship appears to be slightly less for the two younger groups than for the two older groups, but it would be a mistake to attach significance to these small changes, and infer that social mobility is increasing. The conclusion should rather be that opportunity and social mobility have shown no tendency to decline.

TABLE 1.—Degree of relationship¹ between father's occupation and respondent's first job for four age groups, men 25 to 64 years old

Age (Years) in March 1962	Correlation Coefficient
25 to 34	0.380
35 to 44	.377
45 to 54	.388
55 to 64	.384

¹ Correlation Coefficient.

Source: Blau and Duncan, p. 110.

It might seem that historical changes in the occupational structure, such as the increasing importance of white collar and other high status jobs, have invalidated the conclusions. But, in fact, the statistical analysis that was used abstracted from these changes, since it related the relative, not the absolute, occupational positions of the men in the two generations. As a result, such changes in occupational structure could not account for the findings.

There is, to be sure, the possibility of other shortcomings in the data or analysis that qualify or invalidate the conclusions. If the material wealth of the fathers of the men surveyed were known, and comparisons made with the wealth or income of the sons, the results might well have been less impressive, since material wealth is presumably easier to pass on from generation to generation than a given occupational status.

¹ The survey provided prestige ratings for 45 occupations. Census information on the income and education within each occupation was used to assign scores to all other occupations. The procedure was to assume that the relationship between the socio-economic status of an occupation and the general level of income and education in that occupation was similar to the relationship found to exist between these variables in the 45 occupations for which direct scores were available. It was also known that the relative prestige of various occupations changes very little over time, which made it possible to use the same scores to measure the occupational status of both fathers and sons.

² In the language of the statistician, the correlation coefficient relating the occupational scores of fathers and sons was .40.

³ Some Americans may also wonder whether there is more or less opportunity in the United States than in other parts of the world. At least one study has shown that occupational opportunity, as here measured, is about the same in all industrialized countries. Interestingly enough, however, there is evidence that long distance social mobility—that is, the ability to go from rags to riches in a single generation—is greater in the United States than elsewhere, so there does seem to be a grain of truth in the Horatio Alger myth.

These and other qualifications notwithstanding, it is most encouraging that the relative socio-economic status of father has only a small influence on the relative socio-economic status of the son, and that this influence is not increasing.

EDUCATION AND OPPORTUNITY

What accounts for the degree of social mobility that we enjoy? And the obstacles to opportunity that remain? Here, education plays an important but uncertain role. Education is the principal route to a high status occupation, but it is not obvious whether, on balance, it promotes social mobility. As the subsequent chapter on Learning, Science, and Art shows, socio-economic status influences not only access to higher levels of education, but also the motivation and capacity to learn. In part, then, education is a "transmission belt," whereby initial advantages stemming from the family are maintained for the fortunate, whereas initial disadvantages are perpetuated for the unfortunate. On the other hand, education allows some able people from low status families to rise to a higher relative position in the society. We must assess the extent to which education limits social mobility and also the extent to which it increases it, so that we can evaluate the effect of additional education on equality of opportunity and find educational policies that will further this objective. We look first at the evidence which tends to suggest that education is the means by which parents bequeath superior status to their children.

EDUCATION AS A BARRIER TO MOBILITY

The average person born in this century received more years of schooling than his parents did. As Table 2 shows, the average white male born between 1900 and 1934 (aged 35 to 69 in 1969) spent 11 years in school whereas his father who was educated at a much earlier point in time spent only about 8 years in school. But, whenever these men were born, the education they obtained depended to some extent on the education their father received. Thus, fathers who had above-average education for their day have tended to produce sons who were well-educated relative to their own contemporaries. Specifically, for every extra year of education the family head receives, the son tends to get an additional three-tenths or four-tenths of a year of education. It is also clear from Table 2 that this relationship between the relative educational attainment of fathers and sons has not changed much since the turn of the century.

TABLE 2.—MEAN NUMBER OF SCHOOL YEARS COMPLETED BY NATIVE WHITE MALES AND BY THE HEADS OF THEIR FAMILIES OF ORIENTATION, AND AVERAGE RELATIONSHIP OF RESPONDENT'S TO HEAD'S SCHOOLING, BY AGE, FOR MEN IN THE CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 1962

Respondent's year of birth	Family head	Respondent	Average increase in respondent's schooling for each year completed by head
All, 1900 to 1934...	7.9	11.0	0.376
1900 to 1904.....	7.4	9.4	.401
1905 to 1909.....	7.4	10.1	.398
1910 to 1914.....	7.5	10.6	.333
1915 to 1919.....	7.8	11.1	.336
1920 to 1924.....	8.0	11.4	.368
1925 to 1929.....	8.3	11.8	.337
1930 to 1934.....	8.7	12.0	.366

Source: Beverly Duncan, "Family Factors and School Dropout, 1920-60," Cooperative Research Project No. 2258, U.S. Office of Education (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, 1965), tables 3-1 and 3-2. (Based on data collected by the Bureau of the Census in the current population survey and supplementary questionnaire, "Occupational Changes in a Generation," March 1962.)

Evidently, one way in which high status parents can assure the future success of

their children is by providing them with a better than average education. The influence of socio-economic status on years of schooling is particularly notable where college and graduate education are concerned. This is true even after differences in academic ability have been taken into account, as can be shown by using previously unpublished data from *Project Talent*, and considering only those high school graduates who rank in the top one-fifth of the sample in academic aptitude. If the parents of these relatively able youth are from the top socio-economic quartile, 82 percent of them will go on to college in the first year after high school graduation. But if their parents come from the bottom socio-economic quartile, only 37 percent will go on to college in the first year after high school graduation. As Table 3 shows, even five years after high school graduation, by which the almost everyone who will ever enter college has done so, only 50 percent of these high ability but low status youth will have entered college, and by this time 95 percent of the comparable students from

high status families will have entered college. High school graduates from the top socio-economic quartile who are in the third ability group are more likely to enter college than even the top ability group from the bottom socio-economic quartile.

Differences in attendance at graduate or professional schools are even more striking. Five years after high school graduation, those high school graduates in the top fifth by ability are five times more likely to be in a graduate or professional school if their parents were in the top socio-economic quartile than if their parents were in the bottom socio-economic quartile.

There is also, as the subsequent chapter on Learning, Science, and Art will show, a tendency for children from families of low socio-economic status to perform less well on tests than other children even when they have spent the same number of years in school. This learning differential further accentuates the differences in the initial advantages of children from low and high status families.

TABLE 3.—ENTRANCE TO COLLEGE, BY ABILITY AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS (WITHIN 5 YEARS AFTER HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION)

Socioeconomic status quartile	Number of high school graduates in group	Number who enter college	Percent	Loss	Percent
Top ability group (20 percent):					
1. High.....	203,000	192,000	95	11,000	5
2.....	153,000	120,000	79	33,000	21
3.....	122,000	82,000	67	40,000	33
4. Low.....	60,000	30,000	50	30,000	50
Total.....	538,000	424,000	79	114,000	21
Ability group 2 (80-60 percent):					
1. High.....	130,000	109,000	84	21,000	16
2.....	143,000	90,000	63	53,000	37
3.....	148,000	78,000	52	70,000	48
4. Low.....	94,000	34,000	36	60,000	64
Total.....	515,000	311,000	60	204,000	40
Total (top 40 percent).....	1,053,000	735,000	70	318,000	30
Ability group 3 (60-40 percent):					
1. High.....	94,000	65,000	69	29,000	31
2.....	135,000	63,000	46	72,000	54
3.....	159,000	55,000	34	104,000	66
4. Low.....	148,000	35,000	24	113,000	76
Total.....	536,000	218,000	41	318,000	59
Subtotal (1-3 quintiles).....	1,600,000	952,000	60	648,000	40

Note: Entrance to college means degree-credit only.

Source of data: The probabilities for these tables are derived from unpublished data from Project Talent, 5-year followup survey of the 1960 12th- and 11th-grade high school students. The 1965-66 high school graduates (Digest of Educational Statistics, 1967 edition, Office of Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, table 65, "Number of public and nonpublic high school graduates, by sex and State: 1955-66") were then distributed according to the Project Talent probabilities.

HOW EDUCATION PROMOTES EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

On the other side of the ledger, we know that there are many factors independent of family socio-economic status which influence educational attainment, and in turn occupational achievement. These include native mental ability, personality traits, the influence of stimulating teachers, and the like. If educational attainment depends mostly on these and similar factors, it will promote social mobility, by allowing those with ability and ambition to rise to a higher socio-economic level than their parents. If, on the other hand, education depends mainly on family status it may simply be the means by which successful parents bequeath social and economic advantages to their children.

A statistical analysis, using again the data from the survey of "Occupational Changes in a Generation," tells us something about the role which education plays in promoting social mobility. In this analysis, which is summarized graphically in Figure 1, family background is defined to include father's occupation and education, number of siblings, nativity of birth, color, region of birth, and region of residence. It is evident from Fig-

ure 2 that some part of the variation in occupational achievement is accounted for by the family background factors we have just mentioned. This is largely because individuals born in favorable circumstances (for example, in well-educated, white families in the North) come to be better educated than those born in less favorable circumstances. But, to a great extent, the educational attainment of a child is due to factors that are independent of his family background, and this education, in turn, helps him achieve a higher occupational status even if he had a disadvantaged family background. Indeed, individual differences in educational attainment that are independent of family background explain more than half of the variation in occupational scores attributable to education.

FIGURE II.—Sources of variation in occupational achievement for men 20-64 years old in experienced civilian labor force, March 1962—Percentage of total variation in occupational achievement

	Percent
Not explained by education and/or background.....	60.7
Education, apart from background.....	18.4

FIGURE II-1.—Sources of variation in occupational achievement for men 20-64 years old in experienced civilian labor force, March 1962—Percentage of total variation in occupational achievement—Continued

	Percent
Overlapping influence of education and background	17.1
Background, ¹ apart from education....	3.8
Total	100.0

¹Background factors included: Family head's occupation, family head's education, number of siblings and sibling position, nativity, color, region of birth and region of residence.

Source: P. M. Blau and O. D. Duncan, *The American Occupational Structure*, (New York: Wiley, 1967), Appendix H.

We can then conclude that social background factors, though important determinants of educational and occupational achievements, are *not* as important as the other factors that influence educational attainment and thereby allow those of humble birth to rise to the more prestigious occupations. What might be called the democratic discovery of talent through universal education is quantitatively more important than

the educational advantages children from high status families enjoy.

Education could, to be sure, do still more to equalize opportunity. If education depended less on family background than it now does then it would give children from families with a low socio-economic position a still greater opportunity to rise to a higher level. If, for example, the chance to go on to college did not depend so much on the financial resources of one's family, education would enable many more to climb up the ladder of occupational success. Though education could contribute much more to equality of opportunity, the fact that it has already contributed a good deal may explain why we expect so much of it.

OPPORTUNITY AND RACE

There is one glaring exception to the encouraging conclusion we have drawn. The same data that show abundant opportunity for most Americans also show that Negroes have much less occupational mobility than whites. This can be seen by looking at Table 4. This table shows the occupational distributions of men whose fathers were in the same occupation, and also distinguishes the occupational distributions of Negroes from all of the others surveyed in the study of "Occupational Changes in a Generation."

TABLE 4.—MOBILITY FROM FATHER'S OCCUPATION TO 1962 OCCUPATION (PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS), BY RACE, FOR CIVILIAN MEN 25 TO 64 YEARS OLD, MARCH 1962

Race and father's occupation	1962 occupation ¹						Total Percent	Number thousands
	Higher white collar	Lower white collar	Higher manual	Lower manual	Farm	Not in experienced civilian labor force		
Negro:								
Higher white collar.....	10.4	9.7	19.4	53.0	0.0	7.5	100.0	134
Lower white collar.....	14.5	9.1	6.0	69.1	.0	7.3	100.0	55
Higher manual.....	8.8	6.8	11.2	64.1	2.8	6.4	100.0	251
Lower manual.....	8.0	7.0	11.5	63.2	1.8	8.4	100.4	973
Farm.....	3.1	3.0	6.4	59.8	16.2	11.6	100.0	1,389
Not reported.....	2.4	6.5	11.1	65.9	3.1	11.1	100.0	712
Total (percent).....	5.2	5.4	9.5	62.2	7.7	10.0	100.0	
Total (number).....	182	190	334	2,184	272	352		3,514
Nonnegro:								
Higher white collar.....	54.3	15.3	11.5	11.9	1.3	5.6	100.0	5,836
Lower white collar.....	45.1	18.3	13.5	14.6	1.5	7.1	100.0	2,652
Higher manual.....	28.1	11.8	27.9	24.0	1.0	7.3	100.0	6,512
Lower manual.....	21.3	11.5	22.5	36.0	1.7	6.9	100.0	8,798
Farm.....	16.5	7.0	19.8	28.8	20.4	7.5	100.0	9,991
Not reported.....	26.0	10.3	21.0	32.5	3.9	6.4	100.0	2,666
Total (percent).....	28.6	11.3	20.2	26.2	6.8	6.9	100.0	
Total (number).....	10,414	4,130	7,359	9,560	2,475	2,517		36,455

¹Combinations of census major occupation groups. Higher white collar: professional and kindred workers, and managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm. Lower white collar: sales, clerical, and kindred workers. Higher manual: craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers. Lower manual: operatives and kindred workers, service workers, and laborers, except farm. Farm: farmers and farm managers, farm laborers and foremen. Classification by "father's occupation" includes some men reporting on the occupation of a family head other than the father.

Source: Unpublished tables, survey of "Occupational Changes in a Generation."

The table reveals a striking result: Most Negro men, regardless of their fathers' occupations, were working at unskilled or semi-skilled jobs. Even if their fathers were in professional, managerial, or proprietary positions, they were usually operatives, service workers, or laborers. Growing up in a family of high socio-economic status was only a slight advantage for the Negro man. By contrast, the majority of white men with higher white collar backgrounds remained at their father's level and almost half of the white men whose fathers were in clerical or sales work and almost two-fifths of those with a farm or blue collar background moved up into the more prestigious professional and managerial group. But the Negroes from similar origins did not. The Negro man originating at the lower levels is likely to stay

there, the white man to move up. The Negro originating at the higher levels is likely to move down; the white man seldom does. The contrast is stark.

As we saw earlier in the chapter, education is an important source of occupational opportunity. Because most Americans can realize their highest ambitions through education, it is often assumed that Negroes can similarly overcome the handicaps of poverty and race. But this has not been so in the past. To be sure, even in minority groups, better educated individuals tend to occupy more desirable occupational positions than do the less educated. Yet, the returns on an investment in education are much lower for Negroes than for the general population. Indeed, for a Negro, educational attainment may simply mean exposure to more severe

and visible discrimination than is experienced by the dropout or the uneducated.

Thus, in addition to the handicap of being born in a family with few economic or other resources, the average Negro also appears to have less opportunity because of his race alone. Let us examine the relative importance of each of the different types of barriers to success for Negroes.

Figure 2 shows that the average Negro male completed 2.3 fewer years of school than the average white male, that his occupational score is 23.8 points lower, and that his income is \$3,790 lower. Much of the shortfall in the relative achievement of Negroes can be attributed to specific causes. One year of the educational gap arises from the fact that Negroes come from disadvantaged families while an additional 0.1 year is the result of the fact that Negroes tend to be born into larger families where resources must be spread among more children. But even with the allowance of 1.1 years of schooling traceable to these disadvantages, there remains an unexplained gap of 1.2 years. Evidently, this must be caused by something other than the initial socio-economic differences between blacks and whites. Perhaps it is the Negro's knowledge that he will be discriminated against whatever his education.

If we look at the occupational gap of 23.8 points, we see that 6.6 points can be ascribed to initial Negro-white differences in family socio-economic levels and an additional 0.6 to differences in family size. The residual educational gap, already identified, carries over into occupational achievement, lowering the Negro score relative to the white by 4.8 points on the average. There remains a gap, not otherwise accounted for, of 11.8 points. This discrepancy derives from the fact that Negro men with the same schooling and the same family background as a comparable group of white men will have jobs of appreciably lower status. It is surely attributable in part to racial discrimination in hiring, promotion, and other job-related opportunities.

All of the factors mentioned are converted into an income gap totaling \$3,790. Substantial components of this are due to socio-economic status and family size (\$1,010), lower educational attainment (\$520), and job discrimination (\$830), so that disadvantages detectable at earlier stages clearly have an important impact in lowering Negro income compared to white income. But there remains a gap of \$1,430 not otherwise accounted for, suggesting that Negro men, relative to a group of white men of comparable family background, educational attainment, and occupational level, still receive much lower wages and salaries. The specific magnitudes obtained in calculations of this kind are not to be taken as firm estimates. Nevertheless, the substantial discrepancies existing between Negro and white attainment suggest that the Negro has severely limited opportunity, not only because his social and economic background place him at a disadvantage, but also because he faces racial discrimination in the school system and in the job market.

What can we conclude about social mobility in America? We have seen that there is opportunity for the great majority of our citizens to improve their relative occupational status through their own efforts. Yet, we are far from achieving true equality of opportunity. Economic and social status in our society still depend in a striking way on the color of a man's skin. Until we can eliminate this barrier to full participation, we will not have been faithful to our historic ideals.

FIGURE 2.—DIFFERENCES IN MEANS BETWEEN WHITE (W) AND NEGRO (N) WITH RESPECT TO EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT, OCCUPATIONAL STATUS, AND INCOME, WITH COMPONENTS OF DIFFERENCES GENERATED BY CUMULATIVE EFFECTS IN A MODEL OF THE SOCIOECONOMIC LIFE CYCLE, FOR NATIVE MEN, 25 TO 64 YEARS OLD, WITH NONFARM BACKGROUND AND IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, MARCH 1962

Years of school completed	1962 occupation score	1961 income (dollars)	Component ¹
(W) 11.7	(W) 43.5	(W) 7,070	(A) [Family]
10.7	36.9	6,130	(B) [Siblings]
10.6	36.3	6,060	(C) [Education]
(N) 9.4	31.5	5,540	(D) [Occupation]
	(N) 19.7	4,710	(E) [Income]
2.3	23.8	(N) 3,280	(T) [Total]
		3,790	

¹ Difference due to: (A) Socioeconomic level of family of origin (head's education and occupation); (B) number of siblings, net of family origin level; (C) education, net of siblings and family origin level; (D) occupation, net of education, siblings, and family origin level; (E) income, net of occupation, education, siblings, and family origin level; (T) total difference, (W) minus (N) equal sum of components (A) through (E).

Source: O. D. Duncan, "Inheritance of Poverty or Inheritance of Race?" (Unpublished.)

REPORT ON THE DEMAND FOR PERSONNEL AND TRAINING IN THE FIELD OF AGING

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, Secretary Wilbur Cohen of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, before he left office, submitted to Congress a report entitled, "The Demand for Personnel and Training in the Field of Aging." He had been directed to make this report by Public Law 90-42, the "Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967." Under provision inserted at my request, the Secretary was directed: "to undertake, directly or by grant or contract, a study and evaluation of the immediate and foreseeable need for trained personnel to carry out programs related to the objectives of the Older Americans Act and of the availability and adequacy of the educational and training resources for persons preparing to work in such programs."

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal, State, and Community Services in the Senate Special Committee on Aging, I have been impressed with the importance of having an adequate number of personnel trained to work in programs for older Americans, if we are eventually to solve the problems and take advantage of the opportunities of this age group. At hearings conducted by our subcommittee, witnesses have testified that the shortage of trained personnel has handicapped efforts to provide services needed by our older compatriots.

The report submitted by Secretary Cohen was prepared on contract by the Surveys and Research Corp. The report's conclusion is that there is "an urgent and increasing need for personnel" to serve in the field of aging. In addition, it states that "a projection of future demand . . . would place requirements for trained workers in 1980 at a level two and three times above that of 1968." Twenty-three recommendations are made for relieving present shortages and preventing future shortages of personnel trained to serve in aging programs.

This report provides much food for thought in congressional consideration of this problem in the months ahead. I ask unanimous consent that a summary of this report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE DEMAND FOR PERSONNEL AND TRAINING IN THE FIELD OF AGING

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study reported in the following pages was undertaken in response to a directive from the Congress. Cognizant of the critical need for trained manpower to serve the needs of older persons, Congress included in the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967 an authorization to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to "undertake, directly or by grant or contract, a study and evaluation of the immediate and foreseeable need for trained personnel to carry out programs related to the objectives of this Act [the Older Americans Act of 1965], and of the availability and adequacy of the educational and training resources for persons preparing to work in such programs." On behalf of the Secretary, the Administration on Aging contracted with Surveys & Research Corporation to undertake the necessary research and to prepare a report of its findings and recommendations. Concurrently, the Administration on Aging made grants to the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials and the National Recreation and Park Association for studies of personnel needs in the specific fields of retirement housing and recreation for the aging. Summary data from these two studies, as well as new data for employees in State and Federal programs collected by Surveys & Research Corporation as part of its task, have been incorporated in the present report. For the most part, however, limitations of time and resources compelled the study staff to restrict its operations to information already in existence. Despite such shortcomings, the data presented in the report reveal in significant measure the major dimensions of current and future needs.

The need for trained personnel in aging

National concern for the older population has risen rapidly over the past 30 years, reflecting the phenomenal growth in the number of older people, and technological and social changes which have altered the place and roles of older adults in the economy and in society. Congress, State legislatures, and scores of national and community agencies and organizations have responded with the creation of numerous programs, facilities, and services designed to meet the needs of the older population in the areas of income maintenance, preservation of health, provision of suitable housing, and finding new activities and roles for the retirement years.

The new programs require large cadres of personnel trained in a variety of professional

fields and for supporting subprofessional and technical tasks. They must bring to their tasks, it is generally recognized, not only professional and technical skills, but also a knowledge of the processes of aging, and of the special characteristics and needs of older people. Although some progress has been made in developing appropriate training programs it is far behind the expanding need. As a result most if not all service programs are faced with critical shortages of trained personnel. The outlook is for little improvement in this regard unless drastic changes are made in the scope and character of the training effort.

At least a third of a million professional and technical workers are employed in programs serving older people exclusively or primarily. In all likelihood, fewer than 10 to 20 percent of these have had formal preparation for work with older people. A protection of future demand, if necessarily a gross one, would place requirements for trained workers in 1980 at a level two and three times above that of 1968. A few examples in specific occupational areas will illustrate trends in demand.

Teachers in Universities and Professional Schools

The report indicates a need to double the support for students preparing for teaching and research in aging in universities and professional schools within the next five years. Translated into training staff requirements, such a recommendation implies a substantial increase in the number of teachers. No data are available to estimate the need for teachers in gerontology in community colleges and vocational schools but it will have to be of major proportions if subprofessional and service personnel are to be trained in anything like adequate numbers.

Federal and State Personnel in Planning and Administration

Federal and State personnel engaged in planning, administering, and coordinating programs under the Older Americans Act—key personnel in the field—now number about 800, not counting approximately 80 vacant positions. Projected minimal needs for 1970 and 1980 are 600 and 1,100-1,200 respectively. These figures are exclusive of the supply of and demand for trained personnel for local community planning and leadership.

Management Personnel in Retirement Housing

Management personnel in governmentally assisted housing projects designed for occupancy by older people currently number about 4,900. Few have had specialized preparation for working with older people. Estimated requirements for such personnel in 1970 range from 8,000 to 13,000. Corresponding figures for 1980 are from 32,000 to 43,000.

Personnel for Nursing and Personal Care Homes

An even more compelling need for trained personnel exists in the field of nursing and personal care homes if these facilities are to provide adequate medical care, restorative services, and stimulating activity programs. Some 24,000 persons are employed in administrative capacities in such homes at the present time, most of whom will require special training if they are to meet licensing requirements now being developed in response to the Social Security Act Amendments of 1967. A special analysis made for the present report points to the strong likelihood of a doubling and tripling in the number of beds in use by 1980, with a need for corresponding increases in the number of trained personnel. The number of registered nurses and licensed practical nurses required, for example, may rise from the current 70,000 to about 200,000-300,000. Substantial increments will also be called for in the number of physical therapists, occupational ther-