

OREGON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
MARCH 31, 1984

BILL MOSHOFSKY

I admire your dedication on a nice day like this to close off the outside world. I want to thank you all, the leaders of your organization for giving me this particular opportunity to share some of the concerns I have. Especially on Oregon's economy and education in Oregon and they're very closely related.

I am a candidate for Congress from Oregon's First Congressional district, I came very close to winning in 1982, we ran the third best challenger race in the country, we didn't win, but we did build a tremendous launching pad for 1984.

I'm more concerned than ever about the future of Oregon and the nation. And I'm more committed than ever to helping shape that future as a member of Congress. We can have a great future, I'm excited and optimistic about it, we have tremendous technology, ample resources, we have the greatest resources--people, and we have the potential for preparing our young people, educationally for that great future.

And all of you and those you represent have the critical job of teaching and guiding our young people, enabling them to take the lead and making our future all it can be. The biggest stumbling block, I believe, to our great future is the Congress of the United States. The decisions the Congress makes determine the direction of the country and especially the economic direction, just like the rudder on a ship. In my 23 years of doing liaison work between business and government, I became keenly aware of the need for decisionmakers in the Congress who had a lot of hands on experience in the real world and I've had a life time of that kind of experience, in work of all kinds going back to the beginning a small dairy farm north of Beaverton, doing farm work and field work and mill work and carpentry as I worked my way through school, practicing law in Klamath Falls and Portland, and then in management in good businesses large and small, that operated not only throughout the United States, but in foreign countries as well.

And also I have a lot of volunteer work in community efforts to improve education, to reduce crime and delinquency, and to improve local government. I've been deeply committed to improve cooperation between schools, business, government to enhance the quality of education, especially through using community resource people in the classroom. I've learned to experience who really creates jobs. I've learned to experience where our food and shelter, clothing, all things important to us really come from. And also, the crucial role of volunteer efforts, in our way of life in keeping with the great traditions that saved America. And I learned by direct involvement what government can do, and perhaps more importantly what it can't and what it shouldn't do.

I learned by direct involvement where the lines ought to be drawn between the government and the people, and between some various levels of government. And I learned from that experience and involvement, that after the 1980 election it would take time to recover from the flawed policies of the preceding years, it would take more than a new President to get the country going in the right direction and to keep it going that way. Fortunately, the country is moving generally in the right direction, and the country is in better shape than it was in 1980. Interest rates have dropped by a half, approximately, housing starts have nearly doubled, inflation is down dramatically, from 17% of basic necessity to 3, 4, 5%, employment is up.

But we have \$200 billion deficits, grim prospects of an aborted recovery, runaway inflation and destroyed jobs. To give you some idea of the magnitude of these \$200 billion deficits, if you take every penny of all of the profits of all the corporations in the entire country, and applied them against the deficit, you'd still be \$50 billion short. And those deficits are only a symptom, I believe, of the underlying problems, and that is the flawed policies of the Congress.

There's a critical linkage between those huge deficits, interest rates, Oregon's economy, and the future of your careers, and education in Oregon. Without a strong economy, education is in trouble. And of course the Congress is too, without education the economy is in trouble. We need Congressmen with the know how, experience, courage, and commitment to tackle those deficits and the underlying problems head on.

We also need a Congressman who can meet Oregon's special economic needs. The Congress controls 70% of Oregon's timber, that's 70% of Oregon's primary industry. And we need better management of this huge resource, to provide more jobs, better more stable communities, and more revenues for our schools. No one in the Oregon delegation, in fact, no one in the entire Congress has the kind of expertise and experience that I've had in timber and forest products over many years.

Another example, the people of Oregon need leadership to help Oregon seize the enormous opportunities that we have in foreign trade. No one in the Oregon delegation in Congress has the kind of background and expertise that I have in ocean transportation, dealing with foreign companies, and coping with foreign governments on a first hand basis. Its a complicated business.

Also, the people of Oregon need someone with my credentials in business and industry to help improve Oregon's image and its ability to attract and keep jobs in Oregon such as high-tech. My primary mission in Congress will be providing leadership and action to insure a strong economic underpinning in Oregon. And that's what I believe will do the most for education in Oregon. Quite frankly, I do not believe in more federal involvement in education. First, the federal government's broke. Second, the federal government doesn't have the expertise or the ability to intervene or help effectively.

And third, injecting the federal government in education complicates management of education--and I also think about management because its tough enough to manage schools without a federal layer on top. I've long been impressed with the expertise and talent and dedication of the educators in Oregon. And I'm convinced that the problems and short-comings we have can best be dealt with by cooperative efforts of educators, parents, business, labor, and the community generally. And I hate to see such local and state efforts stifled by federal involvement. Teachers need to have the freedom to teach, and administrators need to have the freedom to manage. And to the extent the federal government gets involved through mandates, I believe the federal government should foot the bill for what it requires.

I care deeply about the quality of education in Oregon and pledge to you that I will do everything I can to assure quality education not by holding out false hopes that I will bring more federal dollars, but by providing an economic climate that will produce the revenue base here in Oregon that you'll need for quality education. Thank you.

Q & A:

1. Gary Sackly, North Clackamas: Mr. Moshofsky, what are your positions on federal collective bargaining for teachers, a constitutional amendment for school prayer, and tuition tax credits and vouchers?

A: On tax credits, I'm opposed to federal tax credits, because if there is an inequity between those who send their students to private and public schools, the federal government didn't create the inequity. I'm opposed to a constitutional amendment that requires prayer in schools. On the voucher system, I think its unlikely to be an issue I'd rather not to respond to that. On collective bargaining for teachers, I'm for collective bargaining outside government, I have some reservations about it within because its a different situation in the private sector.

2. Margie Huff, Beaverton: Mr. Moshofsky, do you support the recommendations of the Kissinger commission calling for giving \$8.4 billion for economic and military aid to Central America in the next four years?

A: I certainly believe we have a stake in Central America, although my criteria for involvement of this country in foreign affairs is very basic. I feel that we have to limit our involvement as to what's in our interest that is the interest of our people. We can't solve all the problems in the world, we can't right every wrong in other parts of the world. In the extent that we do have the risk in those countries dominated by the communists and becoming a threat to our borders, I think we have to have limited involvement. I'm not sure whether \$8.4 billion is the right number, that's an enormous amount of money, and having dealt with South American countries, I spent a lot of time in Ecuador and know a lot of people there, I'm uneasy about our ability to intervene with a lot of money.

3. Janice Craig, Sandy Elementary: Mr. Moshofsky, I'm a little confused. I'm pretty sure that in one breath I heard you say that we didn't need any more federal funding and in the next I'm pretty sure I heard you say that if there's a federally mandated program it should be funded federally. I'm trying to see exactly how that makes sense, the only thing I can come up with is are you advocating dismantling mandated programs that are in effect now?

A: First of all, I'm in favor of less federal involvement than more in education because they don't have the money, and secondly they don't have the expertise and I know both sides, and third it complicates the management. And then I said that to the extent that there is, and I didn't say how much I wanted to mandate, to the extent that they do, I favor the federal government carrying the cost, rather than saddling the districts with something that Congress thinks local government ought to do.

4. Rick Dowdy, Hillsboro HS: Mr. Moshofsky, would you support a proposed requirement to keep the military in El Salvador tied to progress in the area of human rights.?

A: Certainly we should be concerned about human rights and what's happening there. However, as I indicated to the previous answer that our primary concern needs to be what's in the best interests of our people. We can't right every wrong, we can't even protect in some cases the human rights in this country. So I think we have to have an even handed approach there, and weigh everything we do primarily on the basis of what's in the best interests to this country.

5. Dean Wilken, Molalla HS: You put a great deal of emphasis on the deficit on the present Congress. What is your position on Reagan's massive military buildup and cutting taxes at the same time?

A: Why I think the President's better able to defend himself than I am. I believe we've got to attack the budget across the board and that includes military spending, I recognize the number one job of the federal government is to defend us. And we want to be sure we have an adequate defense, but I believe we can do that and we must do that with less increase than he proposes.

Also I want to make it very clear that I think it's the Congress that has the primary responsibility on that deficit. The President can't spend a dime, he can't tax a dollar, without the approval of Congress. I think there's been too much finger-pointing back there, I think it's time for people to recognize that the problem is the Congress, that you aren't going to get improvement there until they change their ways, or we change who's there.

LES AuCOIN

I want to say two things at the outset. First, these \$200 billion deficits that some would have you believe are caused by education and people programs, have not been caused by people and education programs at all. What they have been caused by is a policy that has called for \$1 1/2 trillion in new military spending over the next five years, and a tax cut for the most powerful interests in this country, which drain out of the treasury, \$750 billion each year. I opposed that program when it was unpopular to do so, my opponent favored, and I want to lay it on the table at the outset of my remarks.

Secondly, I want to pull any punches on something that may not be subject to classroom education, but has a very great deal to do with priorities in this country. I happen to think education is a priority, I happen to think that the federal government has a responsibility--not just a commitment--to be a working partner in educating the young people of this country to face the future. We are not going to be able to do that as long as we have false priorities in which upwards of \$8 billion are sent off to right wing, neo-fascist dictatorships in the isthmus of Central America or elsewhere around the world, where the funds we use are not used to fight wars, but frequently to make wars against their own people. It is our business to stand up for human rights, because if we fail to do so, we are going to find those governments overthrown that we protected and then the people are going to come back and blame us, the treasury will be drained, we will have lost friends, our priorities will be skewed, and this world will be a less safe world rather than a more safe world. I feel I need to lay that on the table this afternoon as well.

Now I want to say a couple of other things. I listened very carefully to my opponent's comments in his efforts to win your support in this convention. It's not the first time he has spoken about education in the First Congressional district or for that matter around the state of Oregon. In fact, he's been speaking about education all over the district, all over Oregon, particularly down at the state legislature. He did leave a few standard lines out of his stump speech which he's used elsewhere that I feel you need to have in order to understand the context of his education platform. Let me fix that omission.

Last year, when his campaign committee, which at that time was known as the campaign coalition for responsible spending, lobbying the legislature, when it put out a fundraising mailing, it tried to exploit the worst public stereotypes about public school teachers in an effort to gain funds for the operation of that organization. In a mailing, his committee referred approvingly to "widespread dissatisfaction with the quality and the cost of secondary and primary education and concern on the part of Oregonians over the political power of the Oregon education Association, which generates the feelings that teacher interests supercede the interests of the students and the public."

I think I can understand why he forgot to mention that today. You know I've always had the strongest support from educators in Oregon, its been because of the record, its been because I believe economic development starts with the full development of resources. Among those resources are the human mind. Anyone who says that we can divert resources from the education and the nurturing and the expansion of the human mind, put it into missile silos, put it into star wars space war technology, put it into tax breaks for people who don't need those tax breaks, is mistaken. I think those people are out of touch with not only today's world, but more importantly it out of touch with the kind of world we need to prepare this country and this state for in facing an ever increasing difficulty economically as the world becomes more and more of an international marketplace.

What are the Japanese doing today in education. In Japan, 95% of all teenagers graduate from high school, while only 74% of American teenagers do. In Russia--sometimes I wish Casper Weinberger was the Secretary of Education, you'd have no problems whatsoever in terms of getting the kinds of budgets you need, you could talk about the teacher or education gap and the window of vulnerability on trained minds--in Russia, all students complete chemistry as a requirement, 38% of our students take one year of chemistry. And how many school districts across our state or across the country, particularly the small ones can afford to beef up and provide that kind of capability, particularly if the federal government has no role in meeting those needs.

In Japan, all students take four years of math and three years of science as a requirement. In our country, students in two-thirds of our high school districts are required to take only one year of math and science. And what are the results, are we simply punishing teachers in way that shows them that they shouldn't be so upedy when they ask for budget requests. We're not punishing teachers, we're punishing the next generation of Americans when we make those ballots when we fail to reach those standards, when we fail to exceed those standards, and we're short-changing our society's ability to fully compete economically, politically, socially in an international world.

What are the results? Today, because of what we've failed to have done, already, Japan now produces cars and computers more effectively and efficiently than we do in this country. Its just beaten us to the punch in the development of a new fifth generation computer. South Korea has just built the most efficient steel mill on the face of the earth. West Germany is replacing the United States as the top producer of machine tools. You tell me that starving funds from a commitment or an investment in the classroom is in some way going to make this country more secure either economically or militarily and I'll tell you that you haven't read the facts. And I tell Mr. Moshofsky today as we gather at this convention, that he hasn't understood the facts, his priorities are mistaken priorities.

I have devoted my career in the Congress of the United States to a simple principle. I am a product of the public schools. If it hadn't been for teachers who had given me what I needed in the public schools, I would not have been able to succeed at life myself. Those institutions and those people who man those institutions are deserving of our respect. I had the GI Bill and so did Mr. Moshofsky. I want the next generation to have student financial aid and we need to make that commitment to give students that financial aid so they can have a similar chance to succeed in their lives as well. I can't understand Mr. Moshofsky when he says after lobbying the Oregon legislature for \$80 million cuts in higher education, at a time when this state is 42nd in the nation in its commitment to higher education, that we don't have to worry about children who defer their education. He said that a lot of people have had to wait and when you wait and finally finish school, you appreciate it a great deal more.

That's something for someone who got the GI Bill to put himself through school in part because of the GI Bill with Uncle Sam being there because Uncle Sam wanted to make that kind of an investment.

More importantly, America can't wait my friends, America can't wait for the full training of the minds we need for the professions, for medicine, for the sciences, for the humanities, for computer technology, to be an excellent society once more, we can't wait.

I am so proud that you named me as education citizen of the year a year ago. I don't know why my opponent has made this out to be a liability. One recent fundraiser said the Congressman receives heavy backing from teachers' unions, and extreme environmentalists, you're keeping bad company. And he supports a bigger role for the federal government, especially increased aid to education. GUILTY!

Working in partnership, we can build this country and it depends on education along with all the other commitments to an excellent society. You're playing a key role and I enjoy working with you. Thank you.

Q & A:

1. Congressman AuCoin, would explain your position on merit pay for teachers?

A: I oppose merit pay. I see merit pay as a way, though good in concept, merit pay is a way of punishing teachers who may challenge existing orthodoxies within certain schools. And its been my experience, having been a product of public schools, that many teachers testing the orthodoxies are the very ones who contribute the most to the young minds who are eager to learn. And so I think that ought to be encouraged and so I oppose merit pay.

2. Nancy Lewis, Tigard: Congressman, how do you feel about equitable pay for equitable work between men and women?

A: I support that. One of the issues before the whole Congress is equal treatment under insurance, pension programs, comparability on wages and salaries, that I believe that the federal government ought to insure. I say this as a supporter of the equal rights amendment who helped ratify it in the Oregon legislature and as a cosponsor of the ERA in the Congress when we extended the ratification period. I believe that when we have a comparable worth job it ought to be compensated on that same basis. Women in this country have been denied much too long, and I cannot agree with my opponent who said recently that comparable pay is something we ought to leave to the private sector.

I get tired about all this stuff that we're going to leave that one to the private sector. Everything that a civilization ought to be committed to, to make it a civilization: equality, justice, commitment, investments, education, and all the rest, so many people these days back in Washington say, we'll leave that to the private sector/volunteerism, why don't they leave chemical warfare to the private sector.

3. Bill Bordeaux, McMinnville: muffled question on deficit.

A: What are we to make of a President who submits a budget that is \$180 billion out of wack, unbalanced, submits it to the Congress and then starts blaming the Congress for the budget being unbalanced. What do we make of the candidate who runs in this Congressional district against this incumbent, calls this incumbent a big spender, when this incumbent has voted to spend some \$50 billion less than Ronald Reagan has asked Congress to spend, when this incumbent has asked for less than Mark Hatfield has supervised over in the Senate. Bill I don't know what you have against Mark Hatfield, but I know Margie Hendrickson will be very pleased to hear your views on his record. Here's the issue. The issue on the spending question is two arguments. One is over how much is going to be spent, the other argument is where we spend. And the biggest difference between myself and my opponent is over those priorities. I don't believe we ought to be funding star wars. Star Wars, according to my estimate a member of the House Defense Appropriations Committee is going to cost this government \$1 trillion. For a candidate to say we can't have a federal commitment to education because the government's broke, and then to support a \$1 trillion price tag for a star wars program strikes me as being somewhat contradictory. Maybe it's the new math, you know more about that. But the question is priorities, and what I want to do is restrain military spending, hold the line in the aggregate in domestic spending, but make adjustments so we can have an increased commitment to education in these key programs for investing in human resources which I consider education to be.