

# THE INDEPENDENT COLLEGES OFFICE

Memorandum Number 301

June 21, 1979

TO: ICO and GLCA Presidents

FROM: Ida Wallace, Director

SUBJECT: Interim Report on Department of Education Legislation: An Amendment to Prevent Transfer of Science Education Programs to the Proposed Department of Education

You may wish to thank your Representative in the House for his vote to prevent transfer of any of the Science Education programs now in the National Science Foundation to the proposed Department of Education. We called several of you on short notice to reach key members. (Some of you may even choose to express disappointment so that your Congressman knows your feelings on this matter.)

The issue is not simple. It crosses party lines. Some who have virogoously objected to the Department of Education supported the amendment of Tom Harkins (Democrat of Iowa) to delete the section of the bill transferring NSF Science Education programs. Others who oppose the new Department voted in favor of the amendment so that the inclusion of the programs might weaken the chances of the new Department of Education with those who oppose the transfer.

The arguments in favor of the amendment were most persuasive -- and should be very familiar to you. Some of Tom Wenzlau's ringing phrases were quoted directly by Representative Harkin.

As this memorandum goes into the mail the latest word is that the Department of Education bill has been delayed until after the July Fourth recess. Stall tactics continue and may eventually bring about the bill's demise. In either case, all is not lost so far as the science education programs are concerned. The House and Senate versions of just which science education programs are to be transferred are very different and must be resolved in conference between the House and Senate.

We hope you will be available to state your views to those conferees unless, of course, the bill to establish the Department is defeated.

We attach the names of members of the House and their votes and leave the decision up to you on a thank-you or perhaps a "regrets-only" note.

If you request we will be delighted to send you a copy of the debate from the Congressional Record, in which Congressman Pease among others took part.

[Roll No. 233]

AYES—145

Abdnor	Gradison	Moorhead,
Addabbo	Gramm	Calif.
Albosta	Grassley	Mottl
Andrews,	Green	Myers, Ind.
N. Dak.	Guyer	Neal
Archer	Hagedorn	Obey
Asdbrook	Hammer-	Panetta
Bacham	schmidt	Paul
Bauman	Hance	Pursell
Bedell	Hansen	Quayle
Bennett	Harsha	Regress
Berube	Heckler	Regula
Broomfield	Hill	Robinson
Brown, Ohio	Holt	Roth
Broyhill	Hopkins	Rousselet
Buchanan	Hughes	Runnels
Burgener	Hyde	Sabo
Butler	Ichord	Satterfield
Campbell	Jefferies	Sawyer
Carney	Jeffkins	Schulze
Cheney	Jenkins	Sebellus
Chisholm	Jenrette	Sensenbrenner
Cleveland	Johnson, Colo.	Shuster
Clinger	Jones, Okla.	Smith, Nebr.
Coleman	Kelly	Snowe
Collins, Tex.	Kramer	Snyder
Conable	Latta	Solomon
Corcoran	Leach, Iowa	Staggers
Coughlin	Leath, Tex.	Stangeland
Cranz, Daniel	Lee	Stanton
Cranz, Phillip	Lent	Stark
Daniel, R. W.	Levitas	Stenholm
Daschle	Livingston	Stockman
de la Garza	Loeffler	Stump
Derwinski	Lungren	Symms
Devine	McClory	Tauke
Dickinson	McDonald	Taylor
Dornan	McEwen	Thomas
Downey	McKay	Trible
Emery	Madigan	Walgren
English	Maguire	Walker
Eisenborn	Marlenee	Wampler
Fenwick	Martin	Whitehurst
Flah	Michel	Whittaker
Florio	Miller, Calif.	Williams, Mont.
Frenzel	Miller, Ohio	Wyatt
Gingrich	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wylder
Glickman	Montgomery	Wyle
Goldwater	Moore	Zefaretti
Goodling		

Lederer	Nolan	Simon
Lehman	Nowak	Skelton
Leland	O'Brien	Smith, Iowa
Lewis	Okar	Solarz
Lloyd	Oberstar	Spellman
Long, La.	Ottlinger	Spence
Long, Md.	Pashayan	St. Germain
Lott	Patten	Stack
Lowry	Patterson	Steed
Lujan	Pease	Stewart
Luken	Pepper	Stokes
Lundine	Perkins	Stratton
McCloskey	Petri	Studds
McCormack	Peyster	Swift
McDade	Pickle	Synar
McHugh	Preyer	Thompson
Markay	Price	Traxler
Markus	Quillen	Ullman
Marriott	Rahall	Van Deerdin
Matsui	Rangel	Vank
Mator	Ratcliff	Vento
Mavroules	Reuss	Volkmer
Mazzoli	Rhodes	Watkins
Mica	Richmond	Waxman
Mikulski	Elinaldo	Weaver
Mikva	Ritter	Weiss
Mineta	Roberts	White
Mitch	Rodino	Whitley
Mitchell, Md.	Boe	Whitten
Moeakley	Rosenthal	Wilson, Tex.
Moffett	Rostenkowski	Winn
Mollohan	Roybak	Wirth
Moorhead, Pa.	Rudd	Wolf
Murphy, Ill.	Russo	Wolpe
Murphy, N.Y.	Santini	Wright
Murphy, Pa.	Schafer	Yates
Murtha	Schroeder	Yatron
Myers, Pa.	Seiberling	Young, Alaska
Natcher	Shannon	Young, Fla.
Nedzi	Sharp	Young, Mo.
Nelson	Shelby	Zablocki
Nichols	Shumway	

Simon	Skelton	Smith, Iowa
Solarz	Spellman	Spence
St. Germain	Stack	Steed
Stewart	Stokes	Stratton
Studds	Swift	Synar
Thompson	Traxler	Ullman
Van Deerdin	Vank	Vento
Volkmer	Watkins	Waxman
Weaver	Weiss	White
Whitley	Whitten	Wilson, Tex.
Winn	Wirth	Wolf
Wolpe	Wright	Yates
Yatron	Young, Alaska	Young, Fla.
Young, Mo.	Zablocki	

NOT VOTING—24

Anderson, Ill.	Flood	Royer
Bolling	Forsythe	Stacks
Conyers	Gilman	Treen
Davis, S.C.	Johnson, Calif.	Udall
Derrick	McKinney	Vander Jagt
Diggs	Mathis	Williams, Ohio
Early	Pritchard	Wilson, Bob
Flindley	Rose	Wilson, C.H.

Mr. HOLLENEBECK and Mr. DECKER-ARD changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1930

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARKIN

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARKIN: Page 73, beginning on line 22, strike out all of section 304 through line 21 on page 74 and redesignate the following sections and conform the table of contents accordingly.

Mr. HARKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment deletes from the bill the transfer of the science education program from the National Science Foundation to the Department of Education.

Why should we want to keep the science education program in the National Science Foundation?

First of all, I would like to ask the attention of the members of the committee who are here on the floor. I would ask for their attention because this has to do with what is going to happen to science education in our country, what is going to happen to the teaching of our young people in this country, and what will happen in teaching them science education in the future.

Basically, what we have done in this

bill is we have transferred from the National Science Foundation the science education program to the Department of Education. As I see it, what it does is further deconsolidate our science education programs.

First of all, I would be opposed if we transferred all the science education programs, but I am even further opposed to what we have done in this bill and that is that we have segmented some and transferred some to the Department of Education but left others in the National Science Foundation.

Second, the prominent place that science education has in the National Science Foundation will not be the same as it would be under the new Department of Education. For example, right now, out of six directors in the National Science Foundation, one full director is in charge of and has responsibility for science education. Almost 9 percent of the NSF budget is for science education. Just the opposite would be true under the Department of Education. Less than one-half of 1 percent of the entire budget of the Department of Education would go for science education. It would be so small and such a small part of this entire vast bureaucracy in the Department of Education that I am afraid science education would simply fall through the cracks. I do not believe we can afford that in this country at this time.

To be sure, the Department of Education will have an Office of Research and Improvement, but under this bill all research stays with the National Science Foundation and does not go with the Department of Education.

Why is this unique? Why do I feel that the program of science education is so unique and so different from the other things that are going into the Department of Education?

Basically, it is because of the interdependence between science research and science education.

I would like to read from the testimony of Dr. Thomas Wenzlau before the Committee on Government Operations. Dr. Wenzlau testified on behalf of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest and the Great Lakes Colleges Association, and I believe he really pinpoints and puts his finger on the essence of my amendment. Dr. Wenzlau said this:

Clearly the quality of a research scientist will be contingent on the quality of his or her early science education. That, in turn, depends on the opportunity for practicing researchers and science educators to have frequent and continuing contact with one another. As the level of science education advances, it becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish between science education and research. At some point in the process, scientific research actually becomes science education.

So a principal concern, one of the six principal concerns of the National Science Foundation, is research and science education. But, as I said, the Department of Education could not give science this high priority because it does not have the basic research arm, and science education will be buried in some other department.

So for this reason, because of the

NOES—265

Akaka	Chappell	Frost
Alexander	Clausen	Fuqua
Ambro	Clay	Garcia
Anderson,	Coshiba	Gaydos
Calif.	Collins, Ill.	Gephardt
Andrews, N.C.	Conte	Gialmo
Annunzio	Corman	Gibbons
Anthony	Cotter	Ginn
Applegate	Courter	Gonzales
Ashley	D'Amours	Gore
Aspin	Daniel, Dan	Gray
Atkinson	Danielson	Grisham
AuCoin	Dannemeyer	Guarini
Baflis	Davis, Mich.	Gudger
Bailey	Deckard	Hall, Ohio
Baldus	Deliums	Hall, Tex.
Barnard	Dicks	Hamilton
Barnes	Dingell	Hanley
Beard, R.L.	Dixon	Harkin
Beard, Tenn.	Dodd	Harris
Bellenson	Donnelly	Hawkins
Benjamin	Dougherty	Hefner
Bethune	Drinan	Heftel
Bevill	Duncan, Oreg.	Flightower
Blaggi	Duncan, Tenn.	Hinson
Bingham	Eckhardt	Holland
Blanchard	Edgar	Hollenbeck
Boggs	Edwards, Ala.	Holtzman
Boiland	Edwards, Calif.	Horton
Boyer	Edwards, Okla.	Howard
Bonior	Erdahl	Hubbard
Bouker	Erter	Huckaby
Bouquard	Evans, Del.	Hutto
Bowen	Evans, Ga.	Ireland
Brademas	Evans, Ind.	Jacobs
Breaux	Fary	Jones, N.C.
Brinkley	Fascell	Jones, Tenn.
Brodhead	Fazio	Kastenmeier
Brooks	Ferraro	Kazen
Brown, Calif.	Fisher	Kemp
Burlison	Fithian	Kildae
Burton, John	Filippo	Kindness
Burton, Phillip	Foley	Kogovsek
Byron	Ford, Mich.	Kostmayer
Carr	Ford, Tenn.	LaFalce
Carter	Fountain	Lagomarsino
Cavanaugh	Fowler	Leach, La.

Vote tallies on last page

uniqueness of it and because of the close correlation between science research and science education, I believe it must remain in the National Science Foundation.

Basic research is an integral part of science education. To separate them out would reduce the quality of both.

Time and time again this House has spoken out strongly, both in authorizations and in appropriations to keep a high level of basic research in this country. So this interdependence, I believe, distinguishes this science education part from all the other things we have talked about and put into the Department of Education.

One other reason why I feel so strongly that this ought to be kept in the NSF has to do with accountability. I would like to quote from a letter that I received from Dr. Lynn Glass, a constituent of mine and a teacher at Iowa State University. He speaks to the issue of accountability, which I do not believe will happen in the Department of Education.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HARKIN was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, I quote from Dr. Glass' letter as follows:

"A second area of concern is in the area of accountability. The relative size of the Science Education Directorate"—(in the National Science Foundation)—"permits the Foundation staff to become very well acquainted with all aspects of every project they fund. I have had Dr. Theodore Reid from the foundation approach me at professional science teachers meetings," for example, "national meeting of the National Science Teachers Association, and ask me how some specific aspect of my project was working. Personnel attention by Staff members to projects they are funding would not be possible in the much larger Department of Education."

So from the standpoint of accountability it ought to be kept in the National Science Foundation.

Let me point out one other thing. In the National Science Foundation Organic Act, the National Science Foundation is charged—and I quote—"to strengthen science education programs at all levels."

No proposal before the House or the Senate proposes to change that charge to the National Science Foundation, and no such charge exists in the proposed new Department of Education.

The Members may ask, who supports my amendment? If they see my hand out, practically everybody who is involved in science and who is not closely connected with the new department or with the administration.

Every previous science adviser to the President of the United States supports keeping science education in the National Science Foundation.

Finally, just to reiterate what I have said, I do not believe that science education can be segmented. It is a continuum of learning, of teaching, and of research. One feeds on the other, and each supports the other.

Especially at this time in this country, I do not believe it is wise to place the future of science education in jeopardy. We face immense scientific and technological challenges in the future. Let us keep our science education programs where they are meaningful, where they are consistent and coordinated with scientific research, where they have high visibility and support, and where they have the proper direction.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) has offered a very important amendment.

Today we have real problems with attracting the right kind of scientists and engineers with the very disciplines we need to overcome and solve many of the problems that confront this Nation.

It is very important that the dollars and the problems be coordinated together. They will get lost completely if they are transferred to the Department of Education, with this immense budget and other interests. Science and engineering, those things that are going to solve problems in this country, need to be monitored and coordinated very closely.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has raised a very important point, and I urge support of his amendment.

□ 1940

Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield to the distinguished ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLLENBECK).

Mr. HOLLENBECK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, incorporated into the provisions of H.R. 2444, is a transfer of certain National Science Foundation (NSF) programs to the newly proposed Department of Education (DOE). I believe that such a transfer would greatly hinder the quality of science education in this country and I therefore oppose the transfer of these programs to DOE.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, which has jurisdiction over NSF programs, I have seen major advancements being made in the promotion and strengthening of science education programs in recent years. However, I believe a transfer of NSF programs to DOE would greatly impede much of this recent progress.

While this transfer is not essential to DOE, the retention of science education is essential to the execution of NSF as it functions to support and strengthen scientific knowledge. Currently, science education occupies 9 percent of the NSF budget and if transferred to DOE it would occupy less than 1 percent of their budget. It is imperative that science education be handled effectively by an agency which considers it to be a major responsibility. I fear that some

worthy programs may not survive the transfer because the strengthening and promoting of science is not a primary aim of DOE. However, these are primary aims of NSF and these programs should remain under their jurisdiction.

For science education to benefit science as well as for science to benefit science education an intimate association must be maintained between the two. Science education must reflect current scientific knowledge and techniques and these in turn must be closely linked with scientific research. Furthermore, the health of science education itself demands a special association with the practitioners of science.

It should further be noted that the Committee on Science and Technology noted in its committee recommendations that no funding should be transferred from NSF to DOE. Let us not act hastily on this matter and maintain the prominent position of science and science education in this country. Progress in science education must be continued and will be if maintained within NSF. If transferred, the quality, accuracy and advancements of science will be greatly impeded or reduced. Science education does deserve the special attention it receives within NSF and I therefore urge favorable consideration of the amendment presently before us.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) has expired.

(On request of Mr. OBEY and by unanimous consent, Mr. HARKIN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say, without taking much time, that I agree with the gentleman. I think that this is perhaps substantively the most important amendment that has been offered to this bill this week.

Science is a very specialized field. It is not a generalize field. We cannot deal with it in a generalized way.

It would be terribly damaging and disruptive to the scientific programs in this country if we did not adopt the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mrs. FENWICK. As a trustee of an institute of technology, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and urge the adoption of his amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the programs included in the Department of Education are the result of the compromise worked out be-

tween the administration and the chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FRAGA), who is also a distinguished member of the Committee on Government Operations. He insisted that the transfers be limited and sharply defined and that they not include any of the basic science programs in the National Science Foundation, and that is what we have done in this legislation.

In the year or so that this legislation has been under consideration in our committee, it has been very interesting to me to see so many Members and outside witnesses come in and say:

Establish a Department of Education, but just do not put my favorite program in it.

The fact is that we are trying to do something that I think every Member really supports. I think we have all said good things about it back in our districts, and that is to reorganize the Government in order to make it more efficient, more effective, less costly. We are all for it. We have given a lot of thought in our committee, and so have a lot of other people, about what should be included in this Department to meet that goal. I hope the Members will agree that the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. PEASE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. HARKIN's amendment to retain jurisdiction over all science education programs in the National Science Foundation.

There are few Members of this House who would not agree that the scientific excellence of this country is one of our most valuable resources. The quality of this resource—based in industrial labs, Government resource centers, and universities—depends on the strength of the scientific education we offer from the elementary levels through the postdoctoral programs. More than any other discipline, the fields of mathematics and science demand that each new concept be built on a mastery of the concepts learned at the previous level. Any weak link contributes to a weakening of the program as a whole.

I firmly believe that the National Science Foundation, with its long-range perspective on the science needs of the Nation, is in a better position to promote quality science education at every level of the sequence and to emphasize the importance of each step to the larger goal of a healthy scientific community. Education has been a significant part of the Foundation's mandate and now comprises about 8 percent of the Foundation's annual authorization. However, one cannot say the same thing about the role of science in the proposed Department of Education. The entire science budget would comprise only one-half of 1 percent of their budget. Inevitably, the small but critical support programs which serve to strengthen each link in the educational chain (some of them only \$2 or \$3 million programs) will be lost in

the struggle between competing departmental goals.

I am a cosponsor of the bill to establish a Department of Education. However, I think that it is essential that we not include programs in its jurisdiction merely for the sake of convenience or in an attempt to establish an all-inclusive department. Let us, rather, seek to establish an administrative framework for the best education this Nation can provide. The concern, expertise, and perspective of the scientific community, which is readily available in the NSF, is essential to the continued development of a strong forward-looking science education program.

I urge your support of the amendment before us.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN).

Mr. Chairman, I do not support the formation of this new Department. But if this Department were to be formed, perhaps its greatest single error would have been to dismember the science education function of our Federal Government.

Many years before I came to this House I worked with the Office of Education, and I worked with the National Science Foundation. They are bureaucracies both. But I can tell you, to get to someone in the National Science Foundation, to be able to see a name on an office, to get an appointment to be able to get a result, to be able to get a program through quickly, to be able to see goals accomplished, these are features which characterize the National Science Foundation. The Office of Education, however—and I consider this department just one massive, enormous Office of Education—had just the opposite features. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BROOKS) what science institutions, what organizations dealing in science and technology have come out in favor of transferring this major share of the National Science Foundation education program into the new Department of Education.

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will yield, the President's Office of Science and Technology came out for it, the policy committee which is made up of professors, also support it.

Mr. RITTER. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Office of Science and Technology policy reflects the administration's policy and that said policy is to formulate the new Department of Education. I do not think we have to read the list which I have before me, containing many organizations related to science and technology that come from the community, not from the White House. Every single major science and technology organization—educational, professional, and industrial—is opposed to the transfer of these NSF programs.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the distinguished chairman's remarks, I would again just point out all past science advisers to the President of the United States opposed the transfer except the present occupant of that position.

Mr. RITTER. How many past science advisers opposed this?

Mr. HARKIN. The advisers of Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Nixon, and Mr. Ford.

Mr. RITTER. Four previous President's science advisers have opposed this transfer, and those four who have opposed it have no connection to the new Department and can view this amendment objectively.

I might add that the President's science adviser, Dr. Frank Press, has been out campaigning for the Department of Education. That does not sound like an objective view of this Department.

□ 1950.

I would just like to sum up and say that transferring science education to the new Department is a bad management move. It is bad for science and technology and I ask for your support in supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa against this very, very bad move.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I will just take a minute or two. I have been listening to the debate and or would believe from listening to this somewhere we are going to lose all our Nobel laureates; that in some way all postdoctoral, scientific programs will in some way be harmed. But, Mr. Chairman, what I am about to say will not require a thorough knowledge of the mathematical formula of the exponential extension of outer space.

If you read the language of the bill, it says:

There will be transferred to the Department of Education those programs which are directed to (1) precollege level, science and education.

In other words, we are talking about—at least it was when I was in high school—basic chemistry and biology and things of that nature. We are talking about precollege. We are not talking about doctoral or postdoctoral programs.

(2) Science education designed especially for minority and minority groups.

Where is there a better chance of getting a mix on that kind of operation than in precollege level programs than in a Department of Education which will have the full panoply of all educational programs.

(3) Educational activities intended to provide science information for specific citizens and public interest groups.

And then further, that whatever is done will have to be done in cooperation with the director of the National Science Foundation, so if they do want to have something to say about curricula or particular programs or particular scientific endeavors at that level, which is precol-

lege, they are still going to have the opportunity to do it.

Then the bill goes on further and says:

Nothing is intended in any way to de-limit the power or authority of the National Science Director to initiate whatever programs or conduct whatever programs he thinks are in the best interests of the scientific community and at anything above the precollege level program.

I just think that it is a very limited transfer, Mr. Chairman, in terms of authority, and I think it fits in totally with the concept of the Department of Education. We see it in our school levels now, and I cannot see where there would be any difference.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. FUQUA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I have the greatest respect for my friend from Iowa, the author of the amendment and a very valued member of the committee that I have the honor to chair, and the other members who have supported the amendment.

I would briefly like to explain what the transfer in the bill actually does.

Last year, when the bill was sent up to the House, there was a provision that transferred all of the science education from the National Science Foundation to the Department of Education.

I opposed that amendment. I opposed it for the very reasons that have been expressed here today, the breaking up of science, the breaking up of a very valued program, and probably one of the best administered departments of this Government, the National Science Foundation.

Here, we do not get into basic sciences. It is that part that is related to social issues or dissemination of science information. That part—and it was a compromise—that I was not totally pleased with, but in the interest of trying to reach an agreement, I agreed with those programs that did not fall within the scientific education programs.

The teaching of ethics and values, science information for citizens and public interest groups, precollege level science education, programs that were specifically designed for minorities and minority groups, these programs had certain social implications that could be logically transferred within the framework of the Department of Education. That was the reason that this compromise was worked out.

I might point out that I am not aware of any of the science advisers or former science advisers who have taken a position on this amendment.

The position that they took was one, and logically so, on the transfer of all of the science education programs to the Department of Education.

This does not do that. This only takes about one-fourth of those programs within science education within the Na-

tional Science Foundation and makes that transfer.

The Members are all adults. I am sure we can make up our minds. But, as for me, I plan to vote against the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. MARTIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), to remove science education in this bill from the Department of Education and return it to the National Science Foundation where it now resides and where it properly belongs.

The issue before us right now is the quality of science education in this country. That means whether it is going to be directed and controlled by educationist pedagogy or by scientists.

The Members or at least some of the Members will know that before I came to Congress, in real life, I was a mild mannered college chemistry professor until that day when, as one of my students said, trying to get even after a typically impossible exam, that I had had my head turned by lust for power in my heart.

Mr. Chairman, we also recall the days just after Sputnik when we agonized as a Nation that our science education and our science training was faltering and was inadequate. We found that that was especially true at the high schools and undergraduate levels in this country.

We found that it was waterlogged with too many teachers whose principal qualifications were that they had taken all of the required teachers courses but little or no science. They had not taken physics, and were teaching physics. They had not taken chemistry, and were teaching chemistry.

The result was we were losing the interest of bright young minds for science careers. I do not want to see us returned to that kind of program that was producing that kind of result. I do not even want us returned, as was suggested a moment ago, to providing that kind of third-rate science courses for minorities.

You see, at that time we decided we would set up a structure for reorganizing our science education, high school and college and postgraduate levels toward an emphasis on science, not under teachers' colleges, but scientists, who at that time with very hard work and innovation redesigned high school physics and chemistry courses, renewed an emphasis on subject matter rather than on how to teach. As a result of that, we benefited. I can tell you from experience that when high school physics and chemistry courses were overhauled by scientists, the achievement of high school students in those fields improved markedly. Suddenly our freshmen knew and understood basic principles of chemistry and physics whereas just a few years before our freshmen were science illiterates. The improvement was dramatic.

I would like to see us keep it that way, keep the program the way that it has

produced that kind of renewed vigor in our science at the high school level especially; and for that reason, I support the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his support. I know the gentleman's past support for science, for science education and the gentleman correctly referred to the Sputnik era.

One of the things we found out was that the research being done, for example, at the national level was not getting out into the field in a rapid manner. We set up the science education program to do just that, to get the basic knowledge, the new discoveries in mathematics, the new discoveries in physics and chemistry, to get it from the researchers out to the elementary and secondary school teachers so they would have that information right away so they could begin teaching it.

Mr. MARTIN. To further elaborate at the point the gentleman is making, the reason new developments were not getting out is because those teachers were not trained in science themselves, so it did not mean anything to them.

□ 2000

Mr. HARKIN. That is absolutely right. I am afraid if this transfer takes place even if this partial transfer we are talking about takes place there will be tremendous lag time and difficulty in getting this information from the scientists and researchers down to the teachers at the elementary and secondary school level. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. MARTIN. I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, of all of the amendments that have been offered to this bill over the past few days I would think that this is the one amendment that the gentleman from Texas would accept. Both Jack Brooks and I came to the body in the 83d Congress. His mentor and my mentor was a giant in the Congress from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. In 1953, the 83d Congress. God knows I am not that old.

Mr. BOLAND. The 83d Congress. One of the giants in the Congress at that time and before we ever came was a distinguished congressman from Texas, Albe Thomas. Under his direction and leadership in the Congress the National Science Foundation flourished. He was here at the creation of the National Science Foundation.

Dr. Norman Hackerman—one of the most distinguished educators in the Nation, the president of Rice University and the chairman of the National



Science Board—when he appeared before the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, which I have the honor to chair, expressed opposition to the transfer of any of the functions, any of the activities, as I understand it, from the National Science Foundation to the new Department of Education. He also quoted from a statement by the National Science Board as follows:

The argument . . . has been advanced that the science education component of NSF would form a natural part of the proposed Department of Education, because of a common concern with education issues. The National Science Board concludes that this would not be in the best interests of Science or the Nation, because activities in scientific research and scientific education are inextricably linked.

I know my distinguished friend from Florida, Mr. FRUQA, mentioned the fact that there are only a few programs being transferred from NSF to the DOE. But they are important programs. The total budget for the National Science Foundation in science education for fiscal year 1980 is \$34.7 million. The programs that are being transferred by this bill out of NSF and into the DOE amount to \$27.8 million.

The programs proposed for transfer are: Faculty improvement (pre-college teacher development), \$9 million; student science training, \$2,300 million; minorities, women, and the physically handicapped in science, \$2 million; information dissemination, \$1,300,000; minority institutions sciences improvement, \$5 million; resource centers for science and engineering, \$2,800 million; minority institution graduate fellowships and traineeships, \$2 million; ethics and values in science and technology, \$1,300 million; and science for citizens, \$2,100 million, making a total of almost \$28 million for terribly important programs in science that are now being administered effectively by the National Science Foundation.

As the gentleman from Iowa indicated, four previous science advisers to the President oppose this transfer. The only one who favors it is the present science adviser.

So, Mr. Chairman, from my long experience as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that has funded the NSF over the years, from my limited experience as chairman of the subcommittee that funds the NSF, I think it is an unwise decision.

I do not say it would ruin science education. I do not say that at all. What I do say is that it will harm science education and we ought not to do that.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. WYDLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Iowa would tell me whether he supports this bill or not?

Mr. HARKIN. I think so.

Mr. WYDLER. The gentleman thinks so?

Mr. HARKIN. I never commit myself on a bill, but I will see what the finished product is and make my decision then.

Mr. WYDLER. I have a great difficulty, and at the same time great interest in the amendment the gentleman has offered, but I find it raises a point that is of more interest to me and I think should be of interest to every member of this committee and of this House who is going to vote on the final passage of this bill. That is what I would like to talk about.

I think this amendment is good, although I am not sure whether it would or another. The important thing to me make a great deal of difference one way about this amendment is that it does what many amendments have been doing since we started the consideration of this legislation; that is, trying to get one group or another out of the new Department.

Now, to me that is a message. Does this not tell you something? These people, many of whom support the bill, and this gentleman from Iowa, who says he is not sure but is likely to support it, still want to get this particular set of programs out from this great new Department. This Department, we are told, is absolutely necessary; the Department we have got to have, the Department that is going to unify education programs and run everything better. In short this Department will do a better job for education in this country.

Yet what happens? The nurses come in here, and they say they want out. The Indians come in here, and they say they want out. Members know how many other groups have been taken out of this bill from the beginning, first by the administration then by committee. One after another said, "If you want our support, we want out."

They tell Members of Congress to vote for the bill because it is a great Department—"As long as we are not part of it."

Do the Members get the message? This is all a put-on. Let one or another group get out, and that group becomes a supporter of this legislation and puts its name on the list of supporters. That is what they are doing to us, and they have done it time and again. Let us think of what they are trying to do to us with this bill.

I find very little support for this legislation outside of a number of people down at the White House and some of the Members of this body who have said that they made commitments long ago to support this idea because somebody came to see them early and they do not want to go back on their commitments.

Think however what a difference exists now that it is apparent what we have done to this bill to change it from the way it was originally proposed. Measure today's bill against the commitment you have made to support it some time ago. The message is simple, "We do not want any part of that so-called great new Department of Education."

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. WYDLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. My colleague from New York makes an excellent point. It is easily understood by all of us, but I am not sure he understands that famous old American custom, the law of the prairie that says, "Anything caught in your trap is yours."

The trap is just about ready to come down, and anything they get in it they will keep. Nobody wants to get in the trap.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman. Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDLER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, I think each and every amendment that comes on this bill ought to be debated and voted on on its merits.

Mr. WYDLER. I agree.

Mr. HARKIN. That is all I am asking, and whether the gentleman is for the Department of Education or against it, I am not making that case. I am only making a case that science education ought not to be in this bill. I think that amendment ought to be voted on on its merits.

Mr. WYDLER. I understand the gentleman's position since he has just indicated that he is not really sure whether he is going to vote for this bill or not, and since he really does not want this particular aspect of education in this great new Department, maybe that would make him question what the need is for this new Department of Education. That is all I am asking the gentleman to do, and I hope he will see it and arrive at the same conclusion that I have, that we just do not need it.

□ 2010

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, no matter how we look upon the point made by the gentleman from New York just now, it is important also to consider this amendment purely on its merits. I support the Harkin amendment, and I associate myself with the remarks of the several Members who have spoken for it.

What is at stake here is the quality of science education for the students of this country. The bill as drawn would remove the National Science Foundation science education program, which has been extraordinarily successful, from the National Science Foundation. I oppose this separation, which would be extremely damaging to our scientific education program.

I differ with the gentleman from Florida. He has said that social programs would be removed from the NSF by the bill. This is not the case. The bill would remove the precollege-level science education program for teachers for our elementary and secondary students. This is not a social activity, and it is important to the quality of the education of this country's children. The Committee on Science and Technology, which the gen-

tleman chairs, voted to not allow any transfer of any part of the National Science Foundation education program to the Department of Education. That committee vote indicated its support for keeping the NSF program together. This program is working extremely well today. I know of no justification for removing it from the National Science Foundation. I know of no reason to assume that any part of it, let alone the whole program, should be transferred to a new Department. What justification could there possibly be for taking one of the most extraordinarily successful science training programs away from the scientists, which is what the bill would do?

The amendment, if it is adopted—and I hope it is adopted—would not interfere with existing programs in education which would be transferred from HEW to a new Department of Education. It would simply maintain the status quo. The National Science Foundation would go on as it is, and what programs are now under HEW would go to the new Department of Education.

The House has just accepted the Waxman amendment with respect to the nursing student loan program. One of the points made in that debate by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) was that we do not want nonprofessionals teaching nurses; that we wanted professionals teaching nurses. This same philosophy applies in this case.

I, too, have had the experience of teaching college chemistry and college mathematics, and I have worked with many secondary teachers, teaching them in subject areas in which they are teaching students. Mr. Chairman, that one can easily detect the desperate need to have science teachers qualified in the subject which they teach. This is best brought about by having scientists assist in teaching the teachers, and establishing this close relationship between science research and development and education. Accepting the Harkin amendment will maintain that strong relationship which we need, and I strongly endorse the Harkin amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(At the request of Mr. HARKIN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. McCORMACK was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Further on the topic of this being just social programs, the largest single program in scientific education, in precollege level scientific education, is being transferred. To support what the gentleman from Washington, (Mr. McCORMACK) is saying, and to show this is not a social program, here is a brochure I have from Iowa State University. It is called Energy Education for Elementary School Teachers. This is one of the programs funded by the National Science Foundation. It is a year-long program where they bring in elementary

school teachers and teach them about energy. The curricula consists of: Process approach to elementary science teaching; nuclear energy; field trip to Duane Arnold Energy Center; nuclear energy and field trip to Iowa State University nuclear reactor; solar energy—field trip to Iowa State University Solar Energy Research Center; field trip—Iowa coal research project; energy from fossil fuels; energy storage and transportation; energy use and conservation; energy in the home and school.

Nothing could be further from social programs. These are scientific programs being taught to elementary school teachers so they can go back and teach the elementary school kids all there is about energy and the various aspects of energy education and science in this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman. He has given us a single example. There are more, and many are even more important, including the teaching of physics mathematics, chemistry, and many other subjects of importance to our national strength.

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I like many others had not intended to speak on this amendment, but I think that this perhaps could be the most important amendment that has been offered on this bill for the simple reason that it points out the futility of the exercise in which we are engaged today. To imply that education is a program that exists in our country and needs Federal direction, but only as it involves busing, abortion, sex education, minorities, and the like—but cannot and must not exist for science or for medicine, or for Indians and for all of the educational goals of this country, is ludicrous. I guess from a mechanical standpoint those who are opposed to this ill-conceived legislation in the first place should vote for the Harkin amendment, because that would point out the futility of having this kind of a Department of Education that embodies only that portion of education that does not have a strong lobby, such as those involving science or medicine education. On the other hand, from the educational standpoint, if we are trying to do legislatively and philosophically that which has always been impossible, and that is to amend a bad bill to make it a good bill, then we should vote against the amendment and keep the legislation whole; that is, to preserve a bill that would encompass all education. But in the final analysis of this particular amendment we are saying what the gentleman from New York said, that it is OK to have your new department. It is OK to build a new bureaucracy. It is OK to spend more and more billions of dollars, but do not put my program, that is, science, medicine, nursing, et cetera in it. So if we are going to be honest with ourselves and honest with the people of this country, we should defeat this and get on with the essence of the bill, and that is: Do we want a new, expanded bureaucracy or not, and I do not think this Congress or the majority of the people of

this country want this new, added expense.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BADHAM. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I agree with much of what the gentleman says. If we want to clarify the purpose of this amendment, it is not to take science education out of the public schools—not by any means. The purpose of the amendment is to take control of science education out from under the Department of Education which the gentleman has characterized so incisively.

Mr. BADHAM. I understand that is the expressed intent, and I think the gentleman is clarifying that point. But if we take all of those finer aspects of the higher essence of education out of the Department of Education, there would not be anything left for the Department of Education to do. This amendment is pointing out the fact that this bill in its entirety is useless.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARKIN) there were—ayes 39, noes 33.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 240, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

AYES—165

Addabbo	• Duncan, Oreg.	Livingston
Ambro	Edwards, Okla.	Loeffler
Anderson, Calif.	Emery	Long, La.
Anderson, Ill.	• Erdahl	Long, Md.
Anthony	Evans, Del.	Lott
Applegate	Fazio	Lowry
Archer	Fenwick	Lujan
Atkinson	Ferraro	Lundine
Baflalis	Fithian	McClory
Balley	Flippo	McCormack
Barnes	Fountain	McDade
• Begett	Garcia	McHugh
Bellenson	Gialmo	McKinney
Bereuter	Gilman	Madigan
Biaggi	Gingrich	• Maguire
Bingham	Glickman	• Martin
Boland	Goldwater	Mica
Bonker	Gradison	Miller, Ohio
Broomfield	Gramm	Minish
Brown, Ohio	Green	Mitchell, Md.
Butler	Grisham	Montgomery
Byron	Guyser	Moorhead, Calif.
Carter	• Hamilton	Natcher
Cavanaugh	Hanca	Nichols
Chappell	• Harkin	Nolan
Cheney	Heckler	Nowak
Chisholm	Hefel	Obey
Cleveland	Hinson	Ottinger
Clinger	Holland	Fatten
Collins, Tex.	Hollenbeck	• Pease
Conte	Hyde	• Petri
Cotter	Jeffries	• Freyer
Courter	Jones, Okla.	Pursell
Danielson	Kastenmeier	• Railsback
Davis, Mich.	Kemp	Rangel
de la Garza	Kindness	Richmond
Derwinski	Kostmayer	Rinaldo
Devine	• Kramer	Ritter
Dickinson	LaFalce	Roberts
Dingell	Lagomarsino	Roe
Donnelly	Latta	Rosenthal
Dornan	Leach, La.	• Roth
Downey	Lee	Rudd
	Lewis	

June 13, 1979

CO

Runnels  
Sawyer  
Scheuer  
Shannon  
Shelby  
Shumway  
Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, Nebr.  
Solarz  
Solomon  
Stanton

Stenholm  
Stratton  
Stump  
Thomas  
Van Deerlin  
Walgren  
Wampler  
Watkins  
Waxman  
Weiss  
White  
Whittaker  
NOES—240

Whitten  
Wilson, C. H.  
Wirth  
Wyatt  
Wydler  
Wyllie  
Yates  
Yatron  
Young, Fla.  
Zablocki  
Zeferetti

Abdnor  
Akaka  
Albosta  
Andrews, N.C.  
Andrews,  
N. Dak.  
Annunzio  
Ashbrook  
Ashley  
Aspin  
AuCoin  
Badham  
Baldus  
Barnard  
Bauman  
Beard, R.I.  
Beard, Tenn.  
Benjamin  
Bennett  
Bethune  
Bevill  
Blanchard  
Bonar  
Bonior  
Bouquard  
Bowen  
Brademas  
Breaux  
Brinkley  
Brodhead  
Brooks  
Brown, Calif.  
Broyhill  
Euchanan  
Burgener  
Burlison  
Burton, John  
Burton, Phillip  
Campbell  
Carney  
Carr  
Clausen  
Coelho  
Coleman  
Collins, Ill.  
Conable  
Corcoran  
Corman  
Coughlin  
Crane, Daniel  
Crane, Phillip  
D'Amours  
Daniel, Dan  
Daniel, R. W.  
Dannemeyer  
Daschle  
Deckard  
Dellums  
Dicks  
Dixon  
Dodd  
Dougherty  
Drinan  
Duncan, Tenn.  
Eckhardt  
Edgar  
Edwards, Ala.  
Edwards, Calif.  
Erlenborn  
Ertel  
Evans, Ind.  
Fary  
Fascell  
Fish  
Fisher  
Florio  
Foley  
Ford, Mich.  
Ford, Tenn.  
Fowler  
Frenzel

Frost  
Fuqua  
Gaydos  
Cephardt  
Ginn  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Gore  
Grassley  
Gray  
Guarini  
Gudger  
Hall, Ohio  
Hall, Tex.  
Hammer-  
schmidt  
Hanley  
Hansen  
Harris  
Harsha  
Hawkins  
Hefner  
Hightower  
Hillis  
Holt  
Holtzman  
Hopkins  
Horton  
Howard  
Hubbard  
Huckaby  
Hughes  
Hutto  
Ichord  
Jacobs  
Jeffords  
Jenkins  
Jenrette  
Johnson, Colo.  
Jones, N.C.  
Jones, Tenn.  
Kazen  
Kelly  
Kildee  
Kogovsek  
Leach, Iowa  
Leath, Tex.  
Lederer  
Lehman  
Leland  
Lent  
Levitas  
Lloyd  
Luken  
Lungren  
McCloskey  
McDonald  
McEwen  
McKay  
Markay  
Marks  
Marlenee  
Marriott  
Mathis  
Matsui  
Mattox  
Mazzoli  
Michel  
Mikva  
Miller, Calif.  
Milner  
Mitchell, N.Y.  
Moakley  
Moffett  
Molohan  
Moore  
Moorhead, Pa.  
Mottl  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Murphy, Pa.

Murtha  
Myers, Ind.  
Myers, Pa.  
Neal  
Nedzi  
Nelson  
Oakar  
Oberstar  
Panetta  
Pashayan  
Patterson  
Paul  
Perkins  
Price  
Pritchard  
Quayle  
Quillen  
Rahall  
Ratchford  
Regula  
Reuss  
Rhodes  
Robinson  
Rodino  
Rose  
Rostenkowski  
Rousselot  
Roybal  
Sabo  
Santini  
Satterfield  
Schroeder  
Schulze  
Sebelius  
Seiberling  
Sensenbrenner  
Sharp  
Shuster  
Simon  
Skelton  
Snowe  
Snyder  
Spellman  
Spence  
St Germain  
Stack  
Staggers  
Stangeland  
Stark  
Steed  
Stewart  
Stockman  
Stokes  
Studds  
Swift  
Synms  
Synar  
Tauke  
Taylor  
Thompson  
Traxler  
Tribie  
Udall  
Ullman  
Vanik  
Vento  
Volkmer  
Walker  
Weaver  
Whitehurst  
Whitley  
Williams, Mont.  
Williams, Ohio  
Wilson, Tex.  
Winn  
Wolf  
Wolpe  
Wright  
Young, Alaska  
Young, Mo.

NOT VOTING—29

Alexander  
Boggs  
Bolling  
Clay  
Conyers  
Davis, S.C.  
Derrick  
Diggs  
Early  
English

Evans, Ga.  
Findley  
Flood  
Forsythe  
Gibbons  
Hagedorn  
Ireland  
Johnson, Calif.  
Mavroules  
Mikulski

O'Brien  
Pepper  
Peyser  
Pickle  
Royer  
Russo  
Treen  
Vander Jagt  
Wilson, Bob