Children and Youth — 92 Congress First Session 1971

Justice For Children----------March 10

Child Advocacy Program----------June 4

Comprehensive Child Development----------Aug. 4

Day Care Centers----------July 30

Econ. Opport. Amendts. Child Development--------Sept. 8
Nat. Legal Services Corp.

Experiments in Early Childhood Develp.----------Aug. 3

Mpls. Northside Child Dev. Center----------Sept. 17

Sen Bayh on Child Dev. legislation----------June 4

Child Dev. catastrophe in East Pakistan---------May 18

Comprehensice Child Dev. Act----------April 6

Children and Youth Hearings----------April 19

Support for Comprehensive Child Dev. Bill-------Nov. 12

Child Development----------March 19

Subcommittee hearings on Child & Youth----------May 18
Manpower & Poverty

History of Legal Services Program----------Oct. 12

Legal Services under OEO Amendts. ----------Sept. 9

Child Development in Minnesota ----------Sept. 23

Comprehensive Child Development Organizations----Sept. 20

hunters who slaughtered the animals and shipped them off for commercial use.

The hunters—called mustangers—were supported by the pet industry, who, anxious to take advantage of the ready market for horse meat introduced new, mechanized methods to increase the slaughter.

Now the wild horses and burros are threatened with extinction, another vital part of our national wildlife about to be erased in the name of profit and progress.

The intent of the bill is to preserve the remaining wild horses and burros by designating them as a national heritage species and assuring that specific areas will be provided for them to roam. Under the measure, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture and State and local authorities in moving these creatures onto protected grazing areas and to set up a seven-member board to advise him on care and protection of the animals.

Importantly, the bill provides that if an animal strays onto privately owned land, the owner may not dispose of or harass the animal in any way. He must either allow the animal to roam free or inform the nearest Federal official who shall have agents of the Secretary remove the animal.

A major reason Federal legislation is needed is because the States have clearly failed in their obligation to protect these animals, under pressure from cattlemen and other groups who seek outright elimination of these creatures on the grounds that they are an outright menace to their grazing rights on Federal lands, the States have either failed to pass or have been lax in enforcement of legislation to protect wild horses and burros.

Today, through the efforts of people such as Velma Johnston, president of the International Society for the Protection of Mustangs and Burros, and Hope Ryden, author of "Last of the Wild Horses," public support is being rallied to the defense of these mistreated creatures.

I hope that this Congress, which may prove to be the last refuge of the wild horses, will respond by passing tough legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, S. 862, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 862

Be it enacted, etc. That it is the sense of the Congress that free-roaming horses and burros are living symbols of the historic and pioneer spirit of the West and it is the policy of the Congress that bands of free-roaming horses and burros shall be protected as a national heritage.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) the term "free-roaming horses or burros" means all unbranded horses or burros on public lands except those to which private owners can establish their title to the satisfaction of the Secretary.

SEC. 3. All free-roaming horses and burros are hereby declared to be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary for the purposes of management and protection under the terms of this Act. The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to establish and maintain ranges for the protection and preservation of such bands of free-roaming horses and burros which he deems susceptible and worthy of protection as a national heritage. The Secretary shall manage such ranges and such bands to achieve and maintain a thriving ecological balance among all fauna and flora on the range, and an environment within which such horses and burros may freely roam.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with private landowners and with State and local government agencies, and may issue such regulations as he deems necessary, to accomplish the purposes of the Act.

(b) In carrying out his responsibilities under this Act, the Secretary shall consult with, and seek the assistance of, the Secretary of Agriculture concerning any free-roaming horses or burros that may be found on public lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to appoint an advisory board of not more than seven members to advise him on any matter relating to free-roaming horses and burros and their management and protection. He shall select as advisers persons who are not employees of the Federal Government and whom he deems to have special knowledge about protection of horses and burros, management of wildlife, animal husbandry, or natural resource management.

(b) Members of the advisory board shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary. They shall each receive $75 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the board. In addition, they shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

SEC. 6. If free-roaming horses or burros wander onto privately owned land, the owners of such land may inform the nearest Federal official, who, in turn, shall arrange with the agents of the Secretary to have the animals removed. In no event shall such private landowner be permitted to dispose of, or harass, such free-roaming horses or burros.

SEC. 7. Any person who violates the regulations issued by the Secretary under this Act or who processes or permits to be processed, into commercial products, in whole or in part, any free-roaming horse or burro, whether lawfully acquired or not, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

SEC. 8. Any person who allows a domestic horse to run with, or any person who takes possession of, or molests, free-roaming horses or burros declared by the Secretary to be under his jurisdiction pursuant to section 3 of this Act, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year or both.

SEC. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

THE VIETNAM WAR IS ENDING

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, our entire Nation is beginning to breath a collective sigh of relief, for we can now see that the Vietnam war is ending.

I rise today to commend President Nixon for maintaining a policy aimed at the Vietnamization of the war—bringing our boys home—achieving an orderly end to the conflict—and securing a lasting peace.

Despite the badgering of critics, who choose to ignore progress to date, while second guessing every tactical maneuver, the President is moving this Nation into an era of peace.

Because he has followed a sensible course of action, the President was recently able to report, not only that war is ending, but that we have real hope for peace around the world.

Now is the time to rally behind a President who has kept his commitment to the American people in leading us out of war. Now is the time to end the second guessing and give him our undivided support so that he may complete this task as quickly as possible.

As the conflict ends, we must not allow this Nation to be lulled into accepting a position of total isolationism. We must not forsake our alliances—forget our commitments—ignore our defenses.

Instead, we must maintain our position of strength. In this way we can focus our attention on solving some of the critical problems afflicting America at home.

JUSTICE FOR CHILDREN

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I think that one of the strangest and most tragic of our many national anomalies is the reverence we pay toward youth contrasted with the terrible indiffierence we reflect in our support of programs and policies designed to bring truly free and full opportunity to every child.

I invite the attention of Senators to a remarkably vivid and succinct statement of this matter which was published as an editorial in Minnesota's North Branch Review.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Justice for Children," be printed in the RECORD.

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

JUSTICE FOR CHILDREN

Elsewhere in this edition of the Review, Senator Mondale is quoted as saying we in this country must provide "justice for children." Let us add our voice to this cause. In a land which rather guiltily thinks of itself as youth-oriented, we often brutally trample upon the rights of our children.

Ours is the only major western nation which will allow a child to be born in ill health or physically handicapped and remain that way simply because its parents are not of an economic class to pay what often are massive medical bills.

Few western nations allow its children to go through years of starvation and malnutrition with the cruel justification that parents "shouldn't have children if they can't take care of them."

Poorly housed, inadequately nourished, and in poor health, large numbers of our children have no chance to live a rewarding life. It is not difficult to see the effect these pressures have as young people develop mental and emotional problems, turn to drugs and crime, and never develop into productive members of society.

We are not a youth-oriented society. Rather we are a society of adults who wish to be young. But why, in the face of our callous attitude towards children, would we ever wish to be young again?

"Why is it so quiet?" I ask. "Is the Vietnamization program succeeding? Is the Viet Cong weaker?"

"The cities are 40% Viet Cong. The ARVN opened the roads to the countryside. But the roads are only safe during the day. At night the countryside belongs to the Viet Cong. During the day an ARVN soldier might stop you for your identification papers and regardless, should he decide that today you go into the Army, you go. At night the Viet Cong may come into your home. Perhaps they tax you or perhaps they decide you should go with them and they take you. Does this mean things have changed?"

"Why should the Viet Cong fight now? Eventually the Americans will leave. Why should the Viet Cong risk their lives for no reason now?", he continued.

"What will happen after the Americans are gone?" I asked.

"What will have to happen eventually. America has only delayed what has to be. We will have to settle our own differences. Not only the differences between the Saigon government and the Viet Cong but the differences between the Viet Cong and the Vietminh, and only the Vietnamese can do that."

"You Americans say that you must bomb while you are withdrawing to protect the remaining G.I.s How foolish! Why would the Viet Cong attack American soldiers if they know they are leaving their country? All they have to do is just do nothing until you leave."

Another Vietnamese said to me, and here is the dilemma, "I like democracy. I like what it means. But the men in power make promises they never keep and our government is not a democracy. We do not like these men. I do not like communism. But I like the men who are Viet Cong. When they promise us something they always keep their promises."

While visiting a civilian rehabilitation center a physical therapist said to me, "See that little boy with both legs gone? He was brought here by two G.I.'s."

"How did he lose his legs?" my friend asked the soldiers.

"We found him. His parents had been killed and so we took him into our platoon and told him he could be one of us. We even gave him a gun, clothed and fed him and taught him some English. We took him on patrol with us and sent him ahead, he stepped on a mine."

"You used him as a human mine-sweeper!"

"Hell. That's nothing. They all do. Why some G.I.'s use 8 and 9 year olds. Why this one is 12 years old."

"They left him some money and never came to see him again. And he thinks they are Gods!" said my friend.

Who is to blame? These American soldiers? Who *are* the guilty?

Before I came to Viet Nam I had read all about the black market. "How corrupt! How disgusting!" I had thought. As you know the official exchange is 118 piastres to the dollar. The black market value was 360. But in Singapore I was given one Singapore dollar for 100, or about 600 to the dollar. And that is the true value. Just buy some food at a market stall and find out what prices are for the people. We force people into being corrupt to survive and then we condemn them for being corrupt!

Senator, I wish you could meet the people, not the generals, the queens, the prime ministers, but the Vietnamese. They are a people who value devotion to one's family above all else, who revere scholarship, who are one with their land.

The only winning in this war is what we learn from our defeat.

Thank you for all that you have tried to do to bring peace.

Very truly yours,

SUSAN DIETRICH.

SOVIET SCIENTISTS AND POW'S

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I have written a letter to Dr. Pyotr L. Kapitsa and 13 of his colleagues at the Soviet Academy of Sciences urging them to intervene with Communist authorities on behalf of American prisoners of war held in Southeast Asia.

It will be recalled that Dr. Kapitsa and his colleagues recently appealed to President Nixon to safeguard the life and rights of Angela Davis, who faces trial in California on felony charges. In their appeal they urged President Nixon "to prevent human rights from being trampled underfoot."

It will also be recalled that the Nixon administration responded promptly with an invitation to the Soviet scientists to come to the United States and to observe the trial of Miss Davis.

In the same spirit I have suggested that these same Soviet scientists join with concerned people throughout the world who seek improvement in the lot of prisoners of war whose human rights are being trampled underfoot.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

MARCH 2, 1971.

DR. PYOTR L. KAPITSA,
Academy of Sciences,
Moscow, U.S.S.R.

DR. KAPITSA: This letter refers to an appeal to President Nixon which was made recently by you and thirteen of your colleagues at the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in connection with an American citizen, Miss Angela Davis.

Your appeal expressed deep concern about Miss Davis, who faces trial in the State of California on felony charges.

Your concern over the fate of a fellow human being is understandable.

It is my hope that you and your associates will accept the invitation extended on behalf of President Nixon, which made it clear that the United States Government stands ready to aid in gaining your entry into the U.S. for the purpose of observing the legal proceedings in the case of Miss Davis.

You would agree, I am sure, that your appeal "to prevent human rights from being trampled underfoot," was given prompt and sympathetic consideration.

As a fellow citizen of this Earth who is also concerned about human rights, I now appeal to you in the same spirit to join concerned people throughout the world who seek improvement in the lot of other human beings whose human rights are "being trampled underfoot."

I refer to American servicemen and others who are held prisoners of war in Southeast Asia by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV), the National Liberation Front (NLF), and the Pathet Lao. The captors are flagrantly violating both the letter and the spirit of the Geneva Convention on Prisoners of War.

I cite some of the Convention's requirements:

1. Immediate release of the sick and wounded. Only nine Americans have been released since the first was captured in August 1964. These men have reported that many seriously sick and wounded are among the prisoners.

2. Impartial inspection of prisoner-of-war facilities and treatment by international humanitarian organizations. Although the Republic of Vietnam cooperates fully with the International Red Cross, the DRV, NLF and Pathet Lao have refused to allow access to this or any other responsible international organization.

3. Release of information providing names and physical condition of all prisoners held. No satisfactory list has been provided.

4. Adequate medical treatment for all prisoners.

5. Regular flow of mail, food and comfort items between prisoners and their families and humanitarian organizations.

Now that you have received sympathetic consideration of your appeal relating to Angela Davis, I urge you and your associates to direct your humanitarian concern toward the leaders of the DRV, NLF and Pathet Lao on behalf of those held prisoners of war, some of whom have been held for more than six years.

I call upon you to insist that Communist authorities abide by the provisions of the Geneva Convention, which apply to both declared and undeclared wars, and to agree to the release by both sides of all prisoners.

As President Nixon observed when he proposed the immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners held by both sides: "War and imprisonment should be over for all these prisoners. They and their families have already suffered too much."

One additional request:

Last November I met in Paris with Mai Van Bo, the DRV's Delegate General. During the course of our visit, I asked permission to inspect personally the prisoner-of-war camps where American servicemen are being held. I offered to go blindfold and to accept other conditions to avoid compromising military security. Additionally, I suggested that a member of the other major political party in the United States might accompany me. I told Mr. Bo we would be believed if we could report to the American people on conditions in the camps.

He said he would pass the information to his superiors in Hanoi, but to this date I have had no response.

I ask you to appeal to leaders of the DRV to permit such a visit.

With every good wish for you and your associates, I am

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
U.S. Senator.

WILD MUSTANGS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on February 18, I introduced a bill to protect free-roaming horses and burros as a national heritage species. Briefly, the measure would bring these unique animals under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior who would be directed to set up protected areas for them on Federal lands. No one would be allowed to dispose of a wild mustang for any reason without the authorization of the Secretary.

The plight of wild horses and burros in this country is well documented. In the 1870's, 3.5 million of these creatures roamed the American West. Today, their numbers have diminished to an estimated 17,000, because these animals have been subjected to decades of the most cruel and inhumane treatment and the most ruthless commercial exploitation.

Since the early part of this century, the wild horses have been caught between the sheepmen and the cattlemen who persistently tried to drive them off the range to provide more room for domestic grazing stock, and professional

ther statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AND THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, MANPOWER, AND POVERTY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Children and Youth and the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty will hold hearings on May 25, 26, and 27.

These hearings will be a continuation of our investigation of day care and child development which began with hearings before the Subcommittee on Children and Youth on April 26 and 27, concerning the developmental day care recommendations of the White House Conference on Children. The five hearings we are announcing today will examine the need for child development programs generally as well as the developmental day care proposals included in S. 1512, which is proposed as an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act now before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGING REGARDING THE PROPOSED NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GERONTOLOGY

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Aging of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has scheduled public hearings on June 1 and 2, 1971, to consider S. 887, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Gerontology, and S. 1163, to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide grants to States for the establishment, maintenance, operations, and expansion of low-cost meal programs, nutrition training and education programs, opportunity for social contacts, and for other purposes. The major focus of the hearing on June 1 will be on S. 887, and on June 2, S. 1163. Hearings will begin at 9:30 a.m., each morning in room 4230, New Senate Office Building.

Persons interested in appearing at the hearings should notify James Murphy, staff counsel, at 225–7653.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE HISHHORN MUSEUM

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the distinguished columnist Richard Wilson has added his voice to an ever increasing number of national columnists who express reservations concerning the proposed Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. His commentary on this subject was published in the Washington Star on Monday, May 17, 1971. The observations and conclusions expressed in the column are indicative of an increased public awareness of and interest in some of the issues involved in what has been referred to as "The Hirshhorn Hassle." This public interest and concern is further reflected in an increased volume of mail which I have received on this subject by reason of an amendment—Senate Joint Resolution 45—which I introduced to modify legislation relating to the establishment of the museum and sculpture garden and upon which hearings will be held.

Mr. President, the Richard Wilson column together with a copy of a letter I received from a concerned citizen on this subject illustrate some of the reasons for public concern about continued expenditure of public funds to construct the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculputre Garden under terms and conditions upon which the proposed gifts of works of art to be housed therein are made contingent. As a matter of public interest, I ask unanimous consent that the Richard Wilson column and letter to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 17, 1971]

JOSEPH THE MAGNIFICENT ELBOWS MIGHTY ASIDE

(By Richard Wilson)

The many millions who make their pilgrimages to the national shrines in Washington should be more aware of the abomination about to be visited upon the federal city.

A memorial on the grand scale of the Johnson Library in Texas is projected to honor Joseph the Magnificent on the great Mall where now only George Washington and Abraham Lincoln—not even Thomas Jefferson—reign in marble splendor.

The memorial to Joseph the Magnificent would strike envy in Lorenzo il Magnifico, the Medici merchant prince of Florence, himself a poet and patron of the arts.

Joseph the Magnificent is not Medici, though he is bracketed in print with this rapacious family of 15th century Italy, but a Latvian-born former Canadian entrepreneur named Joseph H. Hirshhorn.

If all goes as now planned his name will be handed down to the ages as the only 20th century American worthy of joining Washington and Lincoln on the great greensward between the U.S. Capitol and the Lincoln Memorial which is ranked by many as the only truly magnificent architectural vista in the nation.

The seated, brooding and massive Lincoln can then gaze across the reflecting pool and past the shaft of the Washington Monument into Joe Hirshhorn's sunken sculpture garden, the length of two football fields transepting the Mall.

Joseph the Magnificent was wholly unknown to the average lawmaker and public official until celebrated by Abe Fortas and Lady Bird and Lyndon Johnson a few years ago in their eagerness to promote the arts. He agreed to convey to the government his art collection, of very considerable value and merit but not to be compared with that of the late Herbert Lehman given to the Metropolitan Museum, provided suitable housing which would memorialize his name were provided in Washington.

One needs to cast his mind back to 1966 when Lyndon and Lady Bird were trying to ingratiate themselves with the artistic and literary community to show that he was not a crude and tasteless cornball from Texas unfit to walk in the wake of the elegant John F. Kennedy. Hirshhorn with his willingness to contribute his art collection under certain self-satisfying conditions was, with Abe Fortas' help, their artistic hostage and prize.

The patrons produced a dazzling result which must have exceeded Hirshhorn's wildest dreams. Washington is monument-happy but Congress outdid itself in Public Law 89–788 signed by President Johnson in 1966.

This act provided a national monument for the art collection at public expense on the Mall of the U.S. Capitol rivaling those of Washington and Lincoln and in a much better location than the vast marble carbarn on the Potomac known as the John F. Kennedy Center of the Performing Arts. Jefferson, meanwhile, remains relegated in a modest rotunda at the south end of the far-away Tidal Basin.

Other journalistic colleagues have dealt with the benefactor's background, his conviction in Canada for illegal money transactions, his arrest for wartime smuggling of U.S. currency across the Canadian border, his identification as promoter of questionable stock schemes.

An editorialist in Washington snubs such disclosures as "imbecilic" in view of the generosity of his gift, admitting that Joseph the Magnificent may be no perfect angel, but neither were the Medicis. Neither are the Medicis to be memorialized on the Mall with Lincoln and Washington.

Hirshhorn's prospective request (he is still hanging onto the art until everything is buttoned down about the memorial) is certainly a desirable one and there are plenty of places it could be suitably housed other than the Mall dedicated to our most famous men and highest ideals.

There are plenty of other ways to handle the collection and make it the nucleus of a great museum of American art other than sanctifying a donor who wishes his name to ring down through history with America's greatest.

If there are those at home who do not relish the idea of bringing their children to Washington to visit the memorials to Washington, Lincoln and Hirshhorn, and thus absorb the flavor of American history, they might ask their congressmen to get interested in the matter.

It is not too late although some work has been started. The sculpture garden, at least, could be moved to a less noxious location. And the whole shebang could be moved to other locations accessible to the art-loving public. The least that could be done is a redesign of the museum so that it would not impinge on the splendor of the Mall and the dignity of American history. Hirshhorn has an opportunity for self-effacement more lasting than his name in bronze. He could just give the art to a country which gave him his opportunity and collect his reward in heaven.

BRONX, N.Y., *May 14, 1971.*

Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on Rules and Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLEN: Perhaps my "voice" is one more small cry from the wilderness anent the proposed destruction of the Mall by placing the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden in that area.

When I was a child, it was always my dream to go to Washington and live the pages of history which I learned in school. This dream did not come true until many years ago when I took my two young sons to Washington on an Easter vacation. It seemed to be such a hallowed city, where so much had taken place in years gone by. No matter where you went . . . it was historical . . . the plan of Washington itself, devised by L'Enfant, had more or less been carried out.

We were so impressed by the sweeping grandeur of the open space of the Mall—and by seeing the monuments of Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln. Now, from reading the

Washington papers, I see that Mr. Hirshhorn may not "give" his art collection to the Smithsonian Institutiton if his ugly museum and sculpture garden are not placed where his architect, Mr. Bunshaft, has made plans for it. Who is Hirshhorn to think for one moment that he is in the same class with our illustrious Presidents? Is he entitled to a "monument"—for that is what it amounts to.

Let us put it this way . . . if Mr. Hirshhorn, out of civic pride and the desire to share his art collection with his fellow Americans, really wants to "donate" his collection—why does he make the taxpayers "donate" his museum and sculpture garden to HIM . . . and maintain them in perpetuity to HIM? If he is anxious to let us share the beauty (?) of his art collection, and is really sincere about it, he would not care if the collection were put on display in the basement of the Smithsonian Institution—or an outdoor display in Lafayette Square—as long as the public has an opportunity to view it.

It seems that we, in American, do not care about preserving the past. Beautiful landmarks are destroyed for parking lots . . . and other landmarks are desecrated. What will our children have to mark the past?

Sincerely,

Mrs. Either Tiltti.

MARINE COMMENTARY ON VIETNAM COVERAGE: FIRST WITH THE WORST

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, this month's Marine Corps Gazette contains a brief article by Col. Tom D'Andrea concerning his observations of some of the news coverage of the war in Indochina.

Colonel D'Andrea commented specifically upon the lamentations of some of the media over the Laos incursion, which has been the subject of considerable discussion in the Senate. The article noted:

The press furor about the news embargo at the start of the Laotian operations has become as ridiculous as it is bitter and distorted.

A key point the article makes is that reporters are not automatically entitled to have access to classified information on pending operations when the consequences possibly could be measured in terms of American or allied lives. It further shows that the squawk over Laos was a result of the unusual circumstances of this unusual war that has set a pattern where "American and other newsmen operating in Vietnam, have enjoyed an unprecedented freedom to report news that would have seemed paradisical to their older colleagues of World War II."

Another pertinent statement is this one in the article:

To the American forces involved in the war, there seemed to be a journalistic contest to be first with the worst.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

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

TV News Reports Damaging

(By Lt. Col. Tom D'Andrea)

The press furor about the news embargo at the start of Laotian operations has become as ridiculous as it is bitter and distorted. What is wholly ignored is the fact that American and other newsmen operating in Vietnam, have enjoyed an unprecedented freedom to report news that would have seemed paradisical to their older colleagues of World War II.

Successive United States commanders in Vietnam have gotten into tighter and tighter binds by never daring to impose true military censorship on their area for the accepted reasons of security and the savings of lives. Obviously, we drifted gradually into the war, never declared formal hostilities, and presumably didn't recognize any individual event, such as the first sizable arrival of American forces, as justifying this customary precaution. On the contrary, the arrival of the Marine Expeditionary Unit on the beach near Danang was covered by a major American television network and the unit CG was presented a traditional lei of flowers by the local ladies to garnish his 782 gear.

Consequently the effort to simultaneously control and not to control the news media in Vietnam has been self-defeating. Newsmen and camera crews have wandered all over the place with ingenuity and audacity gathering information sometimes remarkably exact, sometime partial and consequently distorted, and sometimes inexpertly deduced from inaccurate rumor. To the American forces involved in the war, there seemed to be a journalistic contest to be first with the worst. At home, prize committees, Pulitzer included, made it a policy to reward the most captious of reports.

The latest fuss about an information-gap in Vietnam is essentially unjustified. It would have been idiotic to have movements of troops and supplies disclosed in too much detail ahead of time or at all, and to have precise intentions pinpointed to an enemy who might otherwise be thrown off balance. As it was, the Saigan press corps was asked to "hold" information of Dewey Canyon II, but the mass movement of South Vietnamese troops to Northern I Corps leaked prematurely and the world was aware of the Laos operation days before the troops crossed the border.

By normal standards, it would appear immoral to risk American or South Vietnamese lives simply to allow a commercially sponsored television show a play-by-play description of impending actions, news or not. But that's exactly what the rage and clamor was all about, and it was pegged on the old chestnut of "freedom of information."

The task of fighting history's greatest "non-war" is grim for everyone concerned and especially for the troops. In my opinion, we should have had the nerve to establish reasonable, effective military censorship in the Vietnam Theater. As a result, this non-war became the first in which American media, measured by weight of viewership, readership and influence have been kinder to the nation's enemies than to its friends. This has been partly inadvertent, partly not. In any case, Ho Chi Minh has come off as this war's greatest folk hero, the Viet Cong as its most admired fighters. American leaders as its most mistrusted participants and American GIs as its least appreciated warriors.

The gray issue of press freedom continues to be confused in discussions of the Indochina non-war. Of late, the accepted news policy is to charge the government with a cunning scheme to inject Americans into an expanded war rather than what it is—a bold attempt to prepare for continued removal of American forces, as directed by the President.

In whatever way history deems fit to judge our role in this non-war, it will certainly be recorded that the most crushing and severe damage to the American soldier was inflicted by commercial television news reporting and the media in general.

We are asked to accept this as a fact of life and a direct result of a free press operating in a free society. Personally, I accept the premise and seriously question the terminology. I submit it should be amended to read: "A responsible press in a free society."

THE 38TH ANNIVERSARY OF TVA

Mr. SPARKMAN. May 18, 1933 was the 75th day of Franklin Roosevelt's first administration. During these 75 days that administration had offered to Congress new programs and ideas to combat the deep economic depression that this country was enduring.

On that particular day, one of these proposals finished its journey through the legislative process when the President signed the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. Now, 38 years later, is a time to assess the service rendered by TVA.

TVA was conceived as a regional agency; therefore, the first assessment should be of its service to the region. In 1933, north Alabama, the part of the TVA region with which I am most familiar, was an agricultural area, without substantial industry, which was mired in depression. Barrett Shelton, the editor and publisher of the Decatur Daily, in a speech several years ago described the situation this way:

The one major industry we had, which had kept 2,000 men at work, closed. This railroad shop gave way to the truck and the bus and economic conditions. Decatur lost this industry completely. Another industry which in earlier years we had brought from New England with considerable subsidy in money, went bankrupt. A third industry, manufacturer of full-fashioned hosiery, went to the wall from poor management and bad times. Seven of eight banks in our County closed.

Our farm situation. We had only one crop in the Decatur area—cotton—and cotton was five cents a pound. Lands were selling for taxes, the people were ill-housed, ill-clothed and out of hope.

Today that same area around Decatur has aluminum and copper rolling mills, plants producing tire cord, plastics, chemicals, bricks, and refrigeration machinery, as well as such agriculturally related industries as flour and feed mills and fertilizer producers.

This same shift from agriculture to industry is evident throughout the Tennessee Valley region. In fact, since TVA was formed almost $2 billion has been invested by private industry along the Tennessee River waterway.

The industrial expansion continues even today. For example, during the past 2 years investment of over $170 million was announced by private industry facilities which will provide over 10,000 new jobs for the area.

The two economic statistics that flow from this expansion are impressive. Using 1929, a more normal year than 1933, as a base, we find that through 1969 per capita income in the Tennessee Valley region had increased 770 percent—as opposed to a national increase of 424 percent; that there was a 246 percent increase in the number of employees in manufacturing—as against a national increase of 88 percent. I could go on and cite further statistics in other areas, but this would be repetitive.

The real meaning of these statistics is that a region which was once economically far behind the Nation is now competitive with the rest of the country. These statistics mean that the people of the region are earning enough to provide decent homes for their families

and I will appreciate it if you will convey my very best wishes and warm personal regards to all of the members.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

OPPOSITION TO A CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the conference report on S. 575 may be taken up in the Senate on Tuesday, June 8.

I believe adoption by the Senate of this conference report could establish a precedent which would severely restrict the ability of the Senate to deal with House amendments to Senate bills. For this reason, I intend to oppose adoption of the conference report, and to ask for a record vote on it.

As passed by the Senate, the bill extended two well-established programs—the Appalachian Regional Development Act and the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. The House concurred generally in the Senate bill, but added a new title I—an accelerated public works program—and requested a conference. The Senate agreed to go to conference, where the Senate conferees unanimously offered a substitute for House title I, on the subject of emergency assistance to high unemployment areas.

The House managers, however, contended that the Senate substitute could not be accepted, nor could any substantial modification of title I as passed by the House be considered. They did so on the advice of the House Parliamentarian, citing House Rule XXVIII (3), as recently amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. Finally, the Senate conferees receded.

I did not sign the conference report, because I considered that the procedure followed raises an issue which could affect all Senate committees, and all legislative measures initiated in the Senate.

The first effect of such an application of the revised House rules, if acquiesced in by the Senate, could be to establish that House additions to legislation originated by the Senate cannot be significantly modified or reviewed by Senate conferees. It could result in major legislative proposals escaping the influence of Senate review and revision.

Second, the precedent which would be established by Senate adoption of the conference report on S. 575 could impair the right of the Senate to originate legislative measures. While the House can add such new matter as it desires to Senate bills and then ask for a conference, the Senate conferees would be known to be foreclosed from offering amendments except of very limited scope, such as deletions or reductions in amounts. Therefore, only if the House is allowed to originate the legislation, would the Senate committee having jurisdiction be able to have its proposals considered and included in the bill.

The House has the right under the Constitution to originate revenue measures. It has always asserted exclusive authority to initiate appropriations bills. Now, if the conference report on S. 575 should be adopted, the Senate may relinquish in practice its right to develop and originate authorization bills.

Of course, another way to deal with House amendments to Senate bills would be to refuse to go to conference—instead of amending the House substitute. But, third, this would have the effect of destroying the institution of the Senate-House conference, which I consider a valuable and, at least until now, constructive procedure.

If the interpretation of the House rules applied to the conference report on S. 575 is allowed to prevail, the only way the Senate could work its will on new matter added by the House to Senate bills would be for the Senate itself to act upon the House substitute without going to conference—returning the bill to the House for adoption, rejection, or modification of the Senate revision. That could well be a fruitless procedure. In any event it would be terminated by House modification of the Senate revision, an amendment in the second degree. At that point the Senate would again be confronted with a House proposal which must be accepted in whole, or the bill abandoned.

I presented this argument in the conference, and moved that the conference report in disagreement, as a means of recognizing the procedural issue and returning the House substitute to the Senate itself for decision.

It is my position now that the conference report should be rejected, to avoid a precedent which would place the Senate in a position subordinate to the House of Representatives. I should think this issue would concern the chairmen and the ranking minority members of other Senate committees, and the Senate as a whole.

Rejection of the conference report on S. 575 will place the bill as amended by the House before the Senate, for whatever action it desires. I believe that would be the proper course at this time, and would at least serve notice that the Senate is unwilling to accept this new application of the House rules to Senate bills.

I am mailing a copy of the statement to all Members of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

RULE XXVIII, CLAUSE 3

RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AS AMENDED BY SECTION 125(B)(3) OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

New matter; (deletion)

Whenever a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been committed to a conference committee it shall be in order for the Managers on the part of the House to propose a substitute which is a germane modification of the matter in disagreement, but (their report shall not include matter) *the introduction of any language in that substitute presenting a specific additional topic, question, issue, or proposition* not committed to the conference committee by either House *shall not constitute a germane modification of the matter in disagreement. Moreover, their report shall not include matter not committed to the conference committee by either House, nor shall their report include a modification of any specific topic, question, issue, or proposition committed to the conference committee by either or both Houses if that modification is beyond the scope of that specific topic, question, issue, or proposition as so committed to the conference committee.*

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I would like to add my support to the grave concern Senator COOPER has expressed with regard to the procedural dilemma that developed during the recent Senate-House conference on S. 575. The interpretation which was given rule 28, clause 3, of the House rules will, if approved by Senate adoption of the conference report, severely endanger the effectiveness of future Senate-House conferences on legislation originated by the Senate. Senator COOPER has ably defined the hazard to the institution of the conference, and to legislative initiative in the Senate.

But accepting such a narrow interpretation of the House rules will have a further and more immediate impact, to which I would call the attention of the Senate.

The accelerated public works program, proposed to be authorized for appropriations by the House-added title I of S. 575, has historically had the dignity of a separate piece of legislation. Senator RANDOLPH recently introduced a bill in the Senate which would have substantially the same effect as title I. Only in S. 575 as returned from the House has accelerated public works been appended to nonemergency economic measures.

By severely limiting the ability of the Senate conferees to deal with title I in conference, and by sending that title to the Senate floor appended to other important measures, the House has effectively precluded the Senate from reviewing this piece of legislation. Title I of S. 575 is therefore a House enactment which, for all practical purposes, has escaped the legislative influence of the Senate.

If this conference report is approved, and S. 575 as amended by the House enacted with title I included, the House of Representatives will have effectively passed a law on its own—without the Senate having ever had any real opportunity to debate, modify, or review the measure. Mr. President, that is a grave situation and a real threat to the legislative power of this body.

Measures will have to be taken to end the intolerable restrictions placed on Senate-House conferees by House Rule XXIII (3). I am confident that disapproval of this conference report will encourage action to restore the effectiveness of the conference procedure and eliminate the threat to the dignity of this body.

In response to the immediate problem, it should be noted that disapproval of the conference report would put before the Senate the bill as passed by the House, enabling this body to establish the dialog on title I which was frustrated and pretermitted in conference.

For these reasons I urge that the Senate disapprove the conference report on S. 575.

TYRONE, PA., FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, because of the extreme trouble which the town of Tyrone, Pa., is currently facing, I have

level as the registrants' court of first appeal.

Appeal boards should be colocated with the eight regional offices, although operate independently of them. The National Selective Service—Presidential—Appeal Board would remain as presently constituted.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AN AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 115

At the request of Mr. ALLOTT, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senators from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE and Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 115 to H.R. 6531, the Military Selective Service Act.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in accordance with the requirements of section 111(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, I announce that the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity will hold hearings on June 14 and 15 in room 1318 of the New Senate Office Building.

These hearings will be to examine the U.S. Supreme Court decision on the Swann against Charlotte-Mecklenburg case and the implications of recent court decisions. They will also examine the displacement and present status of black school principals in desegregated school districts.

The committee has also scheduled a field trip to New York City on June 17 and 18, 1971. The field trip will include visits to public schools in various areas of the city.

NOTICE OF HEARING IN WOONSOCKET, R.I., ON CUTBACKS IN MEDICARE AND MEDICAID COVERAGE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly of the Senate Special Committee on Aging will continue its study of the impact on older Americans of proposed cutbacks in medicare and medicaid coverage. The committee's first hearing was held in Los Angeles, Calif., on May 10.

Our next hearing on this subject will take place on June 14, 1971, in Woonsocket, R.I., at 10 a.m. at the Elks Club, 380 Social Street. Senator CLAIBORNE PELL will preside.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

AIRLINE AND PILOTS UNION AID VIETNAM POW'S AND MIA'S

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, an airline and a pilots' union last week announced a compassionate and eminently worthwhile program for veterans of the Vietnam conflict who have been prisoners of war or missing in action.

Eastern Air Lines and the Air Line Pilots Association on May 26 issued a press release on a program under which Eastern would hire returning military pilots who have been prisoners of war or have held missing-in-action status. These veterans would be offered important seniority advantages if they choose to fly with Eastern within a year of their return to American control.

At a time when the public and, indeed, the Government, feel a need to help the men who have served their country so ably and so well, it is highly commendable that private industry and a union have joined hands in arriving at a specific program to recompense POW's and MIA's for the special hardships they have endured.

I would urge that other airlines and other industries follow the splendid lead of Eastern and ALPA. I ask unanimous consent that the pilots' union press release be printed in the RECORD.

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

POW RATED PILOTS OFFERED AIRLINE PILOT ADVANTAGES

WASHINGTON, D.C.—U.S. military pilots now in Southeast Asia and carried by the Department of Defense as prisoners of war or in a missing in action status may look to immediate airline pilot careers with seniority advantages, should they choose to take up the option upon return to the United States.

The program, conceived and developed by an Eastern Air Lines pilot, was announced today by Captain J. J. O'Donnell, president of the 31,000-member Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA).

At a Washington news conference, O'Donnell praised the imagination and efforts of First Officer Charles (Chuck) Dyer in working out the complex details with Eastern Air Lines' vice president for operations, former astronaut and Air Force Colonel, Frank C. Borman. O'Donnell said: "This program represents a small but important reward for all prisoners of war and those now in missing status who may choose to take up the option within a year following their return to American control."

The plan calls for date-of-hire or seniority to be pegged to May 30, 1971. All rated military pilots, who can meet physical and training requirements within a year after release, will qualify for employment and the date-of-hire advantage.

EAL pilot Dyer, who is also a naval reserve pilot from Boston, has three friends currently believed held in North Vietnamese prison camps. He lauds his company's willingness and Colonel Borman's interest in extending the offer as "a gesture of appreciation for the ordeal these men have endured for their country."

O'Donnell pointed out: "This original and stimulating program is indicative of the progress a forward-looking management can accomplish by working in close harmony and cooperation with its pilots in seeking solutions to national as well as company problems."

He added: "The professional pilots of ALPA, who man the transports of 41 domestic and American flag carriers, look forward to working cooperatively in similar fashion with their managements." He cited recent beyond-the-cockpit programs generated by Eastern Air Lines, Trans World Airlines, Caribair and other pilot groups that are designed to assist their companies in broadening the market base, in filling empty jet seats and improving operating efficiencies where safety is not compromised.

Under the ALPA/Eastern Air Lines plan, that carrier will provide the necessary training to prepare ex-POW/MIA pilots for commercial airline operations.

Of the more than 1,500 Americans carried in missing status or known to be in enemy prison camps, several hundred are believed to be eligible candidates, should they elect to pick up the option. Following release from prison, they will have a year to decide, to regain required physical status and to enter Eastern's training program before the offer expires.

Having the retroactive date-of-hire of May 30, 1971, offers important seniority and career benefits upon successful completion of training.

Eastern Air Lines has not furloughed pilots in the current traffic slump and expects to reopen hiring action later this year.

Captain O'Donnell stated at the close of the news conference: "The Air Line Pilots Association is proud to be a partner with Eastern Air Lines in this imaginative effort and to be able to demonstrate what can be accomplished through mutual understanding and cooperation by pilots and management. Colonel Borman, Eastern Air Lines and Mr. Dyer are to be congratulated."

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S 87TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a letter from former President Harry S. Truman. It was sent to the Secretary of the Senate in acknowledgment of Senate Resolution 118, by which the Senate extended greetings to former President Truman on his 87th birthday. I think I can speak for Members of this body in saying that we welcome this word from our former colleague and President. It was a pleasure to salute this distinguished citizen. His patriotism and enthusiasm are an inspiration to all who know him. It is my hope that he will continue in good health and that we may have many more opportunities to greet him in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mr. Truman addressed to the Secretary be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

INDEPENDENCE, MO.,
May 28, 1971.

Mr. FRANCIS R. VALEO,
Secretary of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY VALEO: I wish to express my grateful thanks to the Members of the United States Senate for the Senate Resolution No. 118, adopted by the Senate on the occasion of my eighty-seventh birthday.

I am very grateful for this special honor

dren receive the services or treatment they need, and to help assess community needs for children's services—makes a good deal of sense. We should test this concept, find out how it works in actual practice, discover its strengths and weaknesses. This is precisely what Senator RIBICOFF's bill would provide—by establishing Neighborhood Offices of Child Advocacy in up to 20 communities throughout the Nation—and precisely the reason I support this proposal.

One concern that has been expressed about the concept of the child advocate, and a concern I share, is that child advocates might interfere or intervene unnecessarily into the activities of families and diminish the parent-child relationship. I am pleased to note that the legislation Senator RIBICOFF is introducing pays particular attention to this potential problem, by referring consistently to assisting families with children rather than simply children, by providing that the family or guardian of a child must have been involved in decisions to use services for a child and agree with the services chosen, and by containing specific prohibitions against any possible attempts by Neighborhood Offices of Child Advocacy to coerce any family to accept services.

Mr. President, I support the child advocacy demonstration proposal Senator RIBICOFF is introducing today. The approach he is proposing represents a reasonable and modest first step, and I am hopeful that it will receive favorable action by the Congress.

AUTHORIZATION OF MILITARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1972—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 144

(Ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

AMENDMENT TO LIMIT PENTAGON OUTLAYS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1972 TO $68 BILLION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), and the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), I submit an amendment to the military authorization bill (S. 939) to limit the amount the Pentagon can spend in fiscal year 1972 to $68 billion:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the aggregate amount that may be expended for Department of Defense—Military Functions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, shall not exceed $68,000,000,000.

We are introducing the Proxmire-Mathias proposal as an amendment to the military authorization bill due for Senate consideration in July. However, we may call it up for a vote earlier on some other bill, such as the continuing resolution for military appropriations, if that course of action appears to be more appropriate.

The Department of Defense—military functions' item in the budget which the Proxmire-Mathias amendment would cut, includes funds the Congress appropriates in three different bills—the military appropriations bill, the military construction bill, and for civil defense expenditures funded in separate legislation.

In the last 4 fiscal years, the Pentagon has spent $10.4 billion more than Congress has appropriated for these items. This year—fiscal year 1971—Congress appropriated $68.7 billion. But the Pentagon is actually spending an estimated $73.4 billion instead. Next year they propose to spend $75 billion for these purposes.

The major reason the Pentagon spends more than Congress appropriates year after year is the huge backlog of obligated and unobligated funds now on hand which total $35 billion. When Congress cuts their funds, they dip into the backlog and make up for the cuts.

We propose a ceiling of $68 billion on Pentagon spending for a variety of reasons. These include:

First, this cut is almost the precise amount Congress appropriated last year for Department of Defense military functions. If Congress is to control military spending, the military should spend what Congress appropriates instead of spending much more.

Second, the annual incremental costs of the Vietnam war have been cut back from about $24 billion at the war's peak to $8 billion in fiscal year 1972. That is a reduction of $16 billion or two-thirds. Military manpower will be down about 1 million men by the end of the year. Civilian personnel has also been cut. Even with inflation and pay raises, these huge reductions should be reflected in military outlays. For these reasons, the Pentagon budget should be coming down, instead of going up, as the Pentagon proposes.

Third, this is the only major way to reorder priorities and provide for our great domestic needs—job training, housing, health, aid to States and cities, and other desperate needs. The hard fact is that unless we cut military spending below that proposed, existing programs will eat up all added revenues generated from economic growth for the next 2 years.

Fourth, as we disengage from our military involvement in Indochina, it becomes increasingly clear that our future national security and technological world leadership is dependent upon a concentrated national investment in military and civilian research and development, and not in the nearsighted production of Edselesque weapons systems which too often turn out to be obsolescent, redunant, or cost-ineffective.

Fifth, there is ample precedent for amendments to place a ceiling on Pentagon and other types of spending. Last year a similar Proxmire-Mathis amendment was defeated by only an 11-vote margin, 42 to 31. This, year with the help of dozens of religious, business, trade union, urban, and other public interest groups, we will make every effort to win.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 144

At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. —. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the aggregate amount that may be expended for 'Department of Defense—Military Functions' for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, shall not exceed $68,000,000,000."

THE MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

AMENDMENT NO. 145

Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 6531) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 146

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am submitting today, for myself and Senator MCINTYRE and Senator JAVITS, an amendment to H.R. 6531 which would put into effect the reorganization of the Selective Service System called for by the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service.

The Commission, directed by former Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall, recommended a far-reaching restructuring of the Selective Service System. The objective was to assure that the rule of law, a concept that individuals in like circumstances should be treated alike, would apply to the Selective Service System.

In carrying out that objective, the Commission called for a process to reduce the possibility that accidents of geographical location, color or status would affect a man's rights and obligations.

The amendment I am introducing seeks to accomplish this purpose.

The organization would be as follows:

National headquarters should formulate and issue clear and binding policies concerning classifications, exemptions, and deferments to be applied uniformly throughout the country.

A structure of eight regional offices—alined for national security purposes with the eight regions of the Office of Emergency Planning—should be established to administer the policy and monitor its uniform application.

An additional structure of area offices should be established on a population basis with at least one in each State. At these offices men would be registered and classified in accordance with the policy directives disseminated from national headquarters. These area offices would be distributed on a population basis, with at least one in each State. Approximately 300 to 500 of these offices being able to answer the national need.

The use of modern data handling equipment, as well as the application of uniform rules, would facilitate processing, registration, and classification.

Under appropriate regulations, registrants would change their registration from one area office to another as they changed their permanent residence.

Local boards, composed of volunteer citizens, would operate at the area office

person by reason of the action of such individual in divulging such information.

"(c) Whenever any person has reasonable cause to believe that any individual is preparing to take any action which would, in contravention of the provisions of subsection (a), divulge information referred to in such subsection pertaining to such person, such person may bring a civil suit in the appropriate district court of the United States to enjoin such individual from taking such action.

"FEES FOR SERVICES

"SEC. 573. (a) Each Neighborhood Office of Child Advocacy shall, except as otherwise provided in this section, impose fees for services provided for children or families with children by such Office. The amount of the fee imposed for any service shall be related to the ability to pay (as determined under regulations of the Director) of the family of the person receiving such service.

"(b) Any family with an income below the level of income determined to be required, for families of the same size as such family and living in the same region (as established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) as such family, to maintain a moderate living standard shall be regarded as unable to pay any fee for services provided by any Neighborhood Office of Child Advocacy.

"(c) The ability of any family with an income above that referred to in subsection (b) shall be determined on the basis of the income of such family as related to the level of income of other families of the same size and living in the same region (as established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics).

"(d) No fee shall be charged to any person by any Neighborhood Office of Child Advocacy for or on account of any assessment of need or counseling services provided by such Office.

"(e) In no event shall the fee charged by any such Office for any service provided by it exceed the cost of such service to such Office.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 574. For purposes of this part—

"(a) The term 'neighborhood,' as used in connection with the area served by any Neighborhood Office of Child Advocacy, means an area in which there resides not less than two thousand and not more than ten thousand children, and wherever possible should coincide with the jurisdictions served by the other Federal child-serving programs.

"(b) The term 'child' means an individual who has not attained age eighteen.

"(c) The term 'children's services' means those programs which provide the educational, social health and mental health, nutritional, and physical services needed for children to achieve their full potential.

"(d) The term 'provider of children's services' means any public or private agency or institution which as part of its mission provides directly or indirectly services to children and/or their families to aid or improve the children's personal development and to protect their welfare, including health and mental health, educational, and social services and any similar or related program.

"(e) The term 'low-income family' shall be determined by regulation in a manner consistent with the definition used by other related Federal programs as established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics".

On page 46, line 14, strike out "Part E" and insert in lieu thereof "Part F".

On page 46, line 16, strike out "SEC. 561" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 581".

On page 49, line 6, strike out "SEC. 562" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 582".

On page 49, line 11, after "Development" insert "administered by a Director".

On page 49, line 19, strike out "SEC. 563" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 583".

On page 50, line 19, strike out "SEC. 564" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 584".

On page 51, line 7, strike out "SEC. 565" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 585".

On page 52, line 8, strike out "SEC. 566" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 586".

On page 52, line 14, strike out "SEC. 567" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 587".

On page 52, line 21, strike out "SEC. 568" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 588".

SECTION BY SECTION ANALYSIS

Sec. 561. Sates that the purpose of the act is to explore the feasibility of a national child advocacy system to focus the Nation's resources on the needs of our children, to coordinate, consolidate and evaluate existing programs and to propose new programs and methods to insure the healthy development of our children.

Sec. 562. (a) Gives the Director authority to establish and fund not more than 20 Neighborhood Offices of Child Advocacy (NOCA) to determine the cost-effectiveness of present programs and to test experimental programs.

The Director shall: evaluate the effectiveness of such Offices in assisting and referring children to the appropriate services; and submit after 5 years an evaluation report to the President and the Congress and a recommendation for the termination of such offices or for the transfer to an appropriate Federal agency for continued operation.

(b) Directs that the NOCA's be esablished in various geographic regions and that persons served by such offices be representative of diverse racial and socio-economic groups.

Sec. 563. Authorizes the Director to make planning grants to public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations desirous of establishing a Neighborhood Office of Child Advocacy.

Sec. 564. (a) Describes duties and functions of each Neighborhood Office of Child Advocacy (NOCA) including responsibility to: assess the needs of neighborhood children; publicize NOCA's existence and services; counsel families with children needing assistance; refer such families to appropriate agencies; purchase services, if necessary; and provide training facilities for interested professionals and para-professionals.

(b) The NOCA assessment shall include the nutritional, medical, psychological, social, educational, recreational, vocational and economic needs of neighborhood children. The counseling and referral function shall include determination of a family's needs, explaining what programs are available and directing families to these programs. The NOCA shall keep note of a child's progress and maintain adequate records of all its cases.

(b) (4) (5) If indeed services are unavailable and it is determined that the family cannot afford such services, the NOCA is authorized to purchase the services for the child. Accurate records of any such purchase must be maintained by the NOCA.

(b) (6) Any purchase shall be reviewed every six months to determine the effect of the service and its continued need. Any service purchased for more than 12 months shall be reported to the Director detailing the reason for the original purchase, how many persons need and receive similar services, and what steps are being taken by state and local authorities to relieve the need for such purchase.

Sec. 565. Details the procedure for applying for NOCA grants.

Sec. 566. (a) The agency which establishes a NOCA shall also form a Neighborhood Council on Child Development composed of neighborhood residents and qualified professionals which shall be the governing body of the NOCA.

(b) The Neighborhood Council shall select the Director of the NOCA; establish appropriate personnel policies; develop a comprehensive plan for neighborhood child services; prepare the annual budget; and act as an appeals body for parents dissatisfied with services provided by NOCA.

Sec. 567. Authorizes the Director of the Office of Child Development to give to any NOCA a special demonstration grant to allow such NOCA to establish experimental programs of comprehensive child care.

Sec. 568. States that the Director shall encourage the establishment in each state of a Governor's Council on Child Development which shall survey the needs of the state's children, serve as the state's child advocate for its children, develop a state plan for meeting the needs of its children, review action taken by appropriate state agencies, and assist NOCA's located within the state.

Sec. 569. Authorizes the Director of the Office of Child Development to make grants to any additional Councils at appropriate levels of state and federal government as may be needed to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 570. Authorizes all appropriations of $20,000,000.

Sec. 571. States that the NOCA shall encourage neighborhood families to avail themselves of its service, but shall exert no coercion on them to use the facilities.

Sec. 572. All records of the NOCA shall remain confidential and shall be open only to the concerned family and can be made available to a service agency only with the consent of the family.

Sec. 573. Each NOCA shall impose fees for its services except simple assessment and counseling services. Such fees shall be based on an "ability to pay" schedule determined by the NOCA Director. No fee shall exceed the cost of the service provided.

CHILD ADVOCACY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would like to commend the senior Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) for introducing National Child Advocacy Act, and express my support for the objectives of this legislation. The Senator has long been one of our Nation's foremost advocates for children—as Governor of Connecticut, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and a member of the Senate—and the proposal he is introducing today is another example of his commitment to America's young. I am delighted to be a cosponsor of this bill.

I share the concern of the Senator about the way in which the needs of millions of American children and youth are ignored and neglected. I share his conclusions that our present systems of child care are fragmented and uncoordinated. This lack of attention and this fragmentation is one reason the Labor and Public Welfare Committee recently established a Subcommittee on Children and Youth, which I am privileged to chair. It is my hope that this subcommittee can provide a forum for the concerns of children and youth within the Senate, view the problems of the whole child, and help overcome the fragmentation that exists in our approach to the problems and needs of children and youth.

This lack of attention and fragmentation are also reasons that the concept of a child advocate has received support: first by the joint commission on the mental health of children, chaired so ably by Dr. Reginald S. Lourie, and more recently by the delegates at the White House Conference on Children.

The concept of a child advocacy system to help assure that families and chil-

while mothers are unable to work for lack of child care and while unwanted births continue to occur.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have a time limitation here and everyone is yielding my time all over the Senate.

I want to take 1 minute for myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want to point out to my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana, that I think no one has been more careful about family planning than have the members on this committee and the Senator from Washington. We are not saying the Senator cannot have more people for what he is talking about, because he can have as many as he wants.

We are merely suggesting that through the whole warp and woof of welfare, we are asking next year for a raise of not more than 20 percent in employment and administrative expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, what the Senator from Louisiana is talking about is something that I understand. And I agree with him on it. However, there are some parts of HEW that I think have been overstaffed. They could take the amount out of any place they want. No one is questioning what the Senator is talking about at all. I did not pinpoint this. No one did.

Mr. President, I want to point out that the two Senators were not present when I made my initial remarks on this matter.

Another thing we have to start thinking about, and the Senator's committee ought to start thinking about, is the number of people employed in HEW already. How many people does the Senator think were employed in HEW as of May 1? Could the Senator hazard a guess?

Mr. LONG. The Senator should not ask me the question if the Senator does not know the answer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know the answer.

Mr. LONG. Then why does the Senator ask me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because I think the Senator would probably estimate it far below the actual figure because he does not have any particular knowledge of the growth of this thing. We have 860,000 people employed under HEW today.

We have to start looking a little bit into this question of administration. There are some people in the HEW administration—maybe not in this particular case—where I think they could get along with at least as many people as they have now. An increase of 20 percent a year is all we are talking about. Someone has to suggest a limit on this some time. Maybe we ought to send them a copy of Parkinson's law. I do not think they would read it, though.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not want the information to get abroad here that we are skimping on family planning. We are not doing so at all. We have increased those amounts. This bill is the largest bill in the history of the Senate—$21 billion. Someone has to pay for it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. MAGNUSON. In just a minute. I will yield when I am through.

I have some impression here that we are trying to shut down or hold down some of these fine organizations that we have been the champion of for a long time. This is not directed to that. Does the Senator know what the trouble is with the amendment? No Governor in any of the States in the Union wants to employ their full share under State funds. The Senate can provide for employing 100 percent more, if we want to. There is no restriction. We could provide for 200 percent on what the Senator is talking about. But no State legislature and no State Governor wants to put in this money.

That is all this is about. It does not have anything to do with these programs. We believe in welfare and in family planning and all of these things.

I remember when the Senator from New Hampshire and I tried to get family planning in the bill, we got nowhere. We increased it by about 500 percent or more. I am talking about administrative people in the offices. The Senator can go down to any one of these State welfare offices on any given day, without telling them that he is going to come there, and he will understand what I mean.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota and will then yield 2 minutes to some other Senator, whoever may wish it.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I wish to make one point. There is no question that this country is increasingly seeing the phenomenon of mothers who are working during the day. There is no question that the philosophy underlying the family assistance program, the present welfare program, is to encourage welfare mothers who live at home during the day to go to work. In addition to that question, there is the broader issue of what happens to those children while the mother is gone. These are the same children that often suffer from malnutrition and poor housing. They are often from broken homes. They live in an environment of despair and frustration. And they are often nonwhite, also.

If we really want to visit the next generation with an insoluble problem in terms of health services, let us pursue a national program of separating children from their mothers and putting them in cold, custodial day care centers where no one thinks of them for 8 hours a day, where there is no love, no affection, and no health care. There is nothing to make the child feel that he amounts to anything.

The Senator from Louisiana is saying, "Let us have decent day care centers where the child is going to have some love, some hope, and some decent care, and not just custodial care." If we do not adopt the Cranston amendment, I am very fearful that what we are doing is to drive the mothers to a job and then to drive the children some place where for 8 hours a day there is no care and no treatment. If our Subcommittee on Children and Youth, our Subcommittee on Education, and our Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Pubic Welfare have learned anything it is this. The first 5 to 8 years of life constitute the most important period in any life. That can be a period of total and massive psychological and physical destruction, or a great, powerful, magnificent period of growth. That is why the quality built into these day care centers is essential to the health of America. That is why we cannot save money in that way without destroying a good deal of the promise of America's future.

Mr. President, that is why I support the Cranston amendment and why I am opposed to the Cotton amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Before the Senator came into the Chamber and wept these great big salty tears, we called attention to the fact that in the bill before us we have increased appropriations for family care from $26 million to $78 million; and in family planning we have provided another additional $52 million.

Mr. President, the States, if they want to, can use the 20 percent increase for family care, if that is what you want to do with it, and the Federal Government has to pay 75 percent of that, or they can use the additional 20 percent under this amendment for family planning, and we have to pay 75 percent of that.

Never in my life have I listened to so much furor about a bill. We have gone to the limit and increased worthy projects that mean so much to this country.

Whatever the Senator from New Hampshire has done by being conservative, and I plead guilty to it, he has never been conservative when it comes to health, education, and welfare. He has been on this committee for 12 years, and he has supported these increases for 12 years. It was not the Senator from New Hampshire; it was the committee that voted this reasonable ceiling.

So in response to all this discussion about the dreadful Cotton amendment let me say this: Put this reasonable ceiling on and we will feel free to accept one of these amendments that are calling for an increase of $1 billion or $2 billion, for some of these worthy causes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

After we have provided increases from $26 million to $78 million for day care,

year that said that, in the area of family planning, we recognize that this requirement of 25-percent State funds is holding back on the expansion of family planning services. The bill we passed unanimously would have provided 100 percent Federal matching for family planning.

When H.R. 1 comes to the Senate floor, the Senate will have a chance to say how strong it wants to go into family planning. I am confident that the Finance Committee will have some recommendations proposing that a great deal more money be devoted to family planning, just as we provided last year, in a bill which was passed 82 to 0, on 100-percent Federal matching for family planning, because we want to get on with this program, which we think will help reduce dependence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I suggest that both sides yield back the remaining time, and I will offer my substitute. I cannot offer it unless the time is yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired, and the Senator from Washington has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which provides that in section 209 of the bill, the fifth line, the figure "115" be stricken out and "120" be inserted in place thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEICKER). The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

On page 32, line 26, after the word "exceed", strike out "115" and insert "120".

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that each Senator has on his desk a table which shows how each State would be affected if the 120-percent limitation is adopted. I do not say that we intend to spend the estimates, but they are increased by $148 million, all over the country out of the one billion and a half dollars of the moneys administered. In other words, we are paying now more than the $1 billion for administration and the other services, when the whole program, the money that goes into the pockets of the poor and for the aid of the poor and indigent is about $12 billion—we are paying about a quarter of a billion and a half dollars, for administration, and increasing it every single year, jumping it this year by more than a quarter of a billion dollars. So that this is, I think, a reasonable, temporary ceiling to put on the increase, around 20 percent this year.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, do I correctly assume that the amendment being offered by the Senator from New Hampshire does not reduce existing appropriations but merely places a ceiling of a 20-percent increase on the appropriations for administrative expenses?

Mr. COTTON. That is right. It would allow an increase over the last fiscal year—an increase in 1972 over 1971—for administration in the States where the services are performed in connection with the programs, 20 percent over last year—puts a limit there of 20 percent.

Without some kind of ceiling, it is a perfectly open-ended obligation. They can spend all they want, hire all the people they want to hire, do anything they please, and we have to pay 50–50 on a strict administration cost of 75 percent of all such costs and other costs of the programs. This attempts to put a ceiling on the increase.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. So, as I understand it, on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, if adopted, there would be no ceiling on administrative costs. What the Senator from New Hampshire feels is that by permitting the increase of 20 percent in administrative costs, Congress would be fulfilling its full obligation.

Mr. COTTON. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. If I may ask the Senator another question, as I understand it, what the Committee on Appropriations is seeking to do, and what the Senator from New Hampshire is seeking to do, is to put some reasonable restraint or some reasonable limit on the soaring welfare costs, particulary in the field of the administration of welfare.

Mr. COTTON. That is correct. Leave untouched, I suppose, the welfare funds. This is just its administration and the administration of its programs.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. If the Senator would yield me a minute or two——

Mr. COTTON. I am glad to yield the Senator 4 or 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, in the colloquy with the Senator from New Hampshire, it seems to me that the proposal brought into the Senate by the Appropriation Committee as an amendment, or proposed to be amended by the Senator from New Hampshire, is a reasonable one.

It would permit the States to increase their costs by 20 percent and the Federal Government would pick up the tab. It is only when they go beyond the 20 percent that the Federal Government would say, "No, that is unreasonable. You have got to get this thing under control a little bit."

I think, instead of condemning the Appropriations Committee, that they are heading in the right direction and should be commended.

I hope and believe that the Finance Committee, under the distinguished chairmanship of the Senator from Louisiana, will go along the same line in regard to all of the appropriations affecting welfare.

If we do not get welfare costs under control, the whole program will blow up. As a matter of fact, I believe, that if we do not do that, the whole financial situation in the country may blow up.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Richardson testified before the Finance Committee this week that in the decade of the 1960's, the way he expressed it, the number of persons on welfare increased by 146 percent and yet in one year, from August 1969 to August 1970, it increased by 50 percent.

I do not know whether that is an indictment of the way the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is being run out of Washington, but it is a startling fact. I think it is just vital that some effort be made to restrain the soaring costs of public welfare, which can be paid only by the taxpayer, which can be paid only by the wage earner—the money can come only from one place and that is out of the pockets of the man and woman who works for a living.

Therefore, I, for one, want to commend the Appropriations Committee and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) for trying to put some ceiling on the costs of administering this gigantic program.

It certainly seems to me that 20 percent in one year is not a conservative increase.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, let me show why the Cotton amendment does not make good economic sense.

Nowhere in America is anyone making any better headway in family planning programs than in Louisiana. In New Orleans, Dr. Beasley, a very fine young man, is running a program showing how we can take welfare mothers and put them to work teaching other young women about family planning so that they will not become welfare mothers.

Under the Cotton amendment, the welfare rolls could be loaded down with women who had babies as a result of unwanted pregnancies because the amendment would not limit welfare payments. But it would limit services like family planning with which we hope to control. The growth of the welfare rolls.

I must say that this is a poorly conceived economy. For every dollar that we do not spend to prevent illegitimacy, it will cost us thousands of dollars to support illegitimate children and their mothers through welfare. It is the most poorly conceived economy that I have seen since I have been a Member of the Senate.

We also know that there a lot of welfare mothers who would like to go to work but who cannot go to work unless they have someone to look after the children when they are at work. Again, the Senator's amendment says that it is all right to leave the mothers on welfare, but we should limit child care funds which will permit them to go to work.

I believe that instead we should be paying welfare mothers to help in day care centers so that they will be looking after not only their own children, but also the children of other mothers, who in turn could go to work and increase the family income to provide a better life for themselves and their dependents. The Cotton amendment is a poorly conceived economy.

When the Finance Committee looked at this matter last year, we thought it was better to increase funds for child care. We believed in it so strongly that we increased Federal matching for child care beyond the 75 percent of present law.

The Senator's amendment would limit the amount of money available for child care centers or for family planning, but the welfare rolls could keep on climbing

allowing the Nation's small businesses more direct SBA loan dollars than it has in the last 2½ years. Actually, the SBA direct loan program became practically nonexistent starting in January, 1969, with only 635 direct loans made in fiscal year 1969, 42 in 1970, and 35 up until May 31, 1971.

Many of us in the Senate believe that small business has been, and continues to be, the backbone of our economy. We have felt that it makes sense in attempting to revive the economy to pay attention to the needs of the small business community. In our view, stimulating small business could quicken the flow of new and improved goods and services which could expand our economy. Such products could be provided at lower costs in many instances, thereby combating inflation.

In Nevada, as elsewhere, our industry and commerce are overwhelmingly in the hands of small business.

There are only 14 companies out of a total of 6,294 in our State that employ more than 1,000 people. In comparison 4,389 of these firms had less than 10 employees; 627 had 10 to 19; and another 305 had 20 to 50; and 87 firms had 50 to 100 employees, according to a recent survey by Dun and Bradstreet.

To the extent information is publicly available, only 231 firms showed a sales volume of over $1 million—1,710 firms not reporting.

Some years ago we heard that "what is good for General Motors is good for the country." Now the word Lockheed has been substituted.

This slogan provoked considerable partisan political comments, but the fact is that the health and security of our Nation do go hand in hand with our economic prosperity. I would like to add the words "small business" to the formula. And I want to see it followed up by vigorous and constructive help from the White House for those of our 5½ million small businesses that need loan assistance to save them from becoming bankruptcy statistics.

COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post contains an editorial endorsing the comprehensive child development provisions in S. 2007, the bill extending the Economic Opportunity Act which was reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare last Friday.

This editorial, entitled "A New Chance for Children," lends strong support to the child-oriented, developmental day-care approach of this legislation which is drawn from the comprehensive child development bill I introduced in April with Senator JAVITS, Senator NELSON, Senator SCHWEIKER, and 29 cosponsors.

The editorial recognizes the necessity of making child development programs comprehensive, voluntary, educational and available to the middle income as well as poor families. It underscores the essential nature of meaningful parental involvement in child development efforts. Perhaps more importantly, it understands the distinction between custodial day care and real child development.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, and a similar editorial published recently in the Minneapolis Tribune be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 4, 1971]

A NEW CHANCE FOR CHILDREN

There is no way of figuring the United States Congress. Sometimes they take their own sweet time over major social legislation. The passage of Medicare took a whole generation of pressure, debate and publicity. At other times the wheels of change turn quickly and almost silently. We may witness this second phenomenon in the current session if—as now seems at least possible—Congress passes a Comprehensive Child Development Act. This piece of legislation could be as important a breakthrough for the young as Medicare was for the old.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has reported, as a new title of the Economic Opportunity Act, a Comprehensive Child Development Bill, sponsored by Senator Mondale and 29 of his colleagues from both sides of the aisle. A somewhat similar bill is being shepherded along on the House side by Congressmen Brademas and Reid.

The Mondale Bill would provide federal funds for locally administered child development programs of an extremely comprehensive sort. The emphasis would be on child development centers for pre-school children, which would be much more than day care centers. They would aim to provide a stimulating educational experience, as well as health services and attention to nutrition. Funds could also be used for infant care, after-school activities for older children, parent education programs and a variety of other activities. Parents would have a strong voice in the decision-making process through a series of local child development councils. Priority would be given to low income groups, but this is not just a program for welfare families. Services would be extended to all children, with special emphasis on children of working mothers and single parents. Families with incomes above a certain level would pay part of the cost.

Although some details might be improved, it is our view that the Mondale Bill embodies a highly constructive new approach to the well-being of children. It gets away from the dismal question of whether mothers should be *forced* to work—of course not, participation would be voluntary—and recognizes the fact that millions of mothers *do* work and more would like to if they could only make satisfactory arrangements for their children.

As every working mother knows, unless she is lucky enough to have a trusted relative down the street, it is almost impossible to find a good child care setup in most communities at any price. All-day programs for preschool children, even where available, are usually dreary, under-staffed, custodial arrangements that promise little more than to keep the child from physical harm, if that. Good nursery schools provide intellectual stimulation and creative play programs, but the private ones are expensive, the public ones are usually restricted to the very poor, and hardly any are geared to the needs of working mothers. Most nursery schools operate three to six hours a day, send the child home if he has a sniffle and close down for the whole summer. Even when the child reaches school age the average working mother is constantly worrying over makeshift arrangements for coping with after-school hours, illness and the long vacations. Those nice pictures of children learning and playing happily and safely while their mothers work always seem to be taken in Scandinavia or Israel or Eastern Europe.

The Comprehensive Child Development Bill is a recognition that good child-care arrangements are not just a concern of the poor, but of vast numbers of middle-income families. Indeed, the main reason why "day care" has such a dismal image and such inadequate support may be that it has mistakenly been regarded as just "something for the poor." A law giving the non-poor a stake in good public programs may be needed to break out of the current mold. It could also provide an opportunity for mixing children from different economic and racial groups and for genuine cooperation among diverse groups of parents. Bringing in the non-poor does not have to mean that services are free to everybody. One can have a sliding scale of fees for those who can afford them.

But the most important thing about this bill is that it is not a day-care bill; it is a child-development bill. It is not primarily intended to free mothers to work, but to provide comprehensive development services for children, whether their mothers work or not. This shift of emphasis to the child and his well-being may be the bill's most important feature. Day care of the custodial variety is probably not a good national investment even in the strict economic sense. But there is accumulating evidence that the early years of life are crucial—that stimulating the natural curiosity of children and developing their creativity and self-confidence can make a vital difference. This bill just might provide a vehicle for a new national effort to make childhood livable.

TO GIVE CHILDREN A BETTER START

The evidence has been building that millions of America's children are not happy, healthy, bright and on their way to successful adulthood. On the contrary, studies have revealed extensive hunger and malnutrition, neglected health defects and other problems of environment that impede learning. Poverty and lack of education limit many parents in what they can do for their children. Increasing numbers of mothers go to work, and many are unable to obtain proper care for the children while away.

These conditions are not new, but in the last few years they have been described with more facts, figures and interpretation by experts, and therefore with greater impact. At the same time, active interest in social problems has arisen. Consequently, the climate seems promising within both Congress and the Nixon administration for new legislation to help children. The child-development cause is bringing together lay organizations with interests ranging from women's liberation to civil rights, as well as professionals working on all aspects of children's growth.

As a result, Sen. Mondale's child-development bill, and its counterpart in the House, which a few months ago seemed like a long-range dream, are rapidly gaining sponsors, and the administration is pushing its more limited program for children. The congressional child-development plan would offer comprehensive services to children in both poor and more affluent families. This plan, starting at $2 billion the first year, would cost as much as $13 billion for the first four years. The administration proposal, which puts emphasis on expansion of day-care services, would double present sepnding for children, to a total of $1.2 billion a year.

We like the thoroughness and flexibility of the Mondale bill—its recognition of interlocking factors that hamper or help a child in physical, mental, emotional and social development. Thus far the administration proposal seems lacking in specific objectives beyond the day-care provision, which relates to a goal of getting more welfare mothers

As a result, state officials anticipate an angry reaction from car owners and face expensive repair costs.

EXTENT OF REDUCTION

What it will mean for the average car owner whose car is not passed Mr. Elston said, is a $20 service station or garage repair bill for a partial motor tuneup. But he emphasized that better engine performance would offset the repair cost.

All told, the state expects to remove about 20 per cent of the 4.5 million tons of carbon monoxide gas and 32 per cent of the 750,000 tons of smog-producing hydrocarbons produced by cars during the first year of the program's operation. Because inspections are spread throughout the year, with each vehicle assigned to a certain month, the effect of the program is not expected to be felt until late in the first year.

In the second year of operation, the state estimates that about 45 per cent of the cars now on the road will fail still higher antipollution standards that will be implemented.

The major impact will be felt by car owners with low incomes who generally operate the oldest and most rundown cars in the state.

Included in Chapter 15 of the New Jersey Air Pollution Control Code, the program will be the subject of a public hearing on Monday at the Teaneck campus of Fairleigh Dickinson University.

After the hearing, Commissioner Richard J. Sullivan of the Department of Environmental Protection plans to promulgate the new inspection code under the power granted him by the Legislature in 1966. The new regulations will take effect six months after Commissioner Sullivan signs the order.

According to Mr. Elston, the inspection will be carried out in 30 seconds by a machine—about the size of a gas pump—that will check a car's exhaust as it goes through an inspection lane for other, usual tests, for such things as brakes and lights.

BASES FOR REJECTION

The department has formulated three standards. Cars built in 1967 or before will be rejected if their exhaust emission is 7.5 per cent carbon monoxide or 1,200 parts for each million parts of hydrocarbons.

Visible smoke will mean automatic failure.

For cars made in 1968 and 1969—the years when federally mandated antipollution devices were first installed by car makers—the standards will be 5 per cent carbon monoxide and 600 hydrocarbon parts for each million parts.

For 1970 models and later, the standards will be 4 per cent carbon monoxide and 400 parts for each million parts of hydrocarbon.

In 1973, the standards will be toughened.

The department says 38 per cent of the 1967 and older models and 36 per cent of the 1968 and 1969 models will fail. Eighteen per cent failure is expected for the 1970 and 1971 cars.

GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, few issues have generated more heat than the Lockheed financial crisis and the administrations proposals for dealing with it. An interesting aspect of the Senate debate on the subject—and one of special interest to me as chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business—was the question: If the Federal Government is going to mount a program to bail big business out of its financial difficulties, what about small business? What about the real backbone of the American free enterprise system—the 5½ million small business firms that account for 40 percent of all our jobs and more than one-third of our gross national product?

My feeling throughout the "great debate" was—and still is—that the public interest would not be served by permiting the Lockheed case to degenerate into a contest between big business and small business for the favor of their Government. Nor did I feel it helpful to an understanding of the issues to be bantering about old chestnuts such as the charge that a guarantee program would be a "dangerous precedent."

Let us face it. There is plenty of precedent for Federal assistance to business. It all began at least as far back as the days of the land grants that enabled and encouraged the Nation's railroads to push westward. Agriculture, airlines, the maritime industry, and the housing industry—to mention a few—have all been the object of Federal assistance programs for many years. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation kept thousands of big, middle-sized, and small businesses afloat from the time it came into existence in 1932 until it closed its books in 1953. The Small Business Administration has provided financial support for thousands of small concerns over the years.

And our Government's assistance to business has not been limited to this side of the ocean. Following World War II numerous foreign countries, including West Germany and Japan, two of today's toughest international business competitors, received massive economic assistance from our Government.

Cutting through the mass of verbiage that attended the Lockheed proposal, the stark facts were that the Congress was confronted with a major business emergency involving the possible loss of some 60,000 jobs, more than a billion dollars in past investment, the prospect of hundreds of millions of dollars in tax losses, and because of Lockheed's deep involvement in our satellite and missile systems possibly serious detriment to essential national defense programs.

The issue was thoroughly and painstakingly considered. As evidenced by the length of the debate and the closeness of the vote in both the Senate and the House, there was a reluctance to interfere with the normal competitive forces at work in our economy, but in view of the magnitude of Lockheed's problems, and the already unacceptable level of unemployment across the country, the Congress deemed Federal action warranted in this instance.

To repeat, I do not think it serves the public interest to pit big business against small business. However, I do think the Lockheed case provides a good vehicle for making comparisons. Throughout the debate I was frequently asked about the similarities and differences between big business and small business when it comes to invoking the necessary assistance of their Government.

Probably the biggest difference is that big business speaks with a much louder voice that can be heard in more places. Others are that the national interest is heavily involved; serious unemployment would result if most of the 60,000 employees hired by Lockheed and its suppliers, some of them small businesses, were turned out on the streets.

The major similarity is that regardless whether a business is big or small when financing is unavailable—when the bank either cannot or will not help—when banks take the position that they would rather be in the no-risk Government-guaranteed loan business than in the old fashioned kind of risk-taking free enterprise type of lending operation—then the business, be it large or small, is likely to become a bankruptcy statistic. But, with its weaker voice and smaller staying power, the regrettable fact is that the small businessman can end up in the graveyard a lot sooner.

There must be hundreds if not thousands of present or former small businesses which have been denied Government loan assistance, which must have watched the congressional debate on the Lockheed loan question and wondered why the Federal Government chose not to bail them out of their financial difficulties.

Last year a total of 10,174 businesses, most of them small, failed, many of them undoubtedly because they could not get loan dollars from private financial institutions or from the Small Business Administration because of tight money, record high bank interest rates or the absence of Government loan dollars.

It seems to me that looking back a year or two, we may serve a useful purpose for the future by keeping the record straight. Two years ago, some of us interested in the Small Business Administration's direct loan program appealed to the White House to permit $170 million in loan authority to go to needy small businesses. This was not done and the loan authority expired. At that time, our letter to the President pointed out that:

> A cut in the public lending program of last resort in the order of 58.5 percent is creating a massive squeeze on our 5½ million small businessmen.

We stressed that:

> Immediate action is required if small business is not to bear a disproportionate part of the sacrifices necessary to curtail inflation.

Again, last December, I made an appeal to the President urging that the fiscal year 1972 budget be restored to the higher fiscal year 1968 level of $307 million for direct and participation small business loan funds. Instead, the administration cut the SBA loan budget further to $99 million, climaxing a reduction of more than two-thirds over the past 4 fiscal years.

If there is one lesson we hope that the White House credit and loan planners will learn from their recent push to get the Congress to save the Nation's largest defense contractor from bankruptcy, it is that the Nation's small businesses are also entitled to more meaningful Government loan assistance.

It is true that the Small Business Administration in fiscal year 1971 made 12,000 Government-guaranteed business loans nationwide for a total of $836 million. But there is a glaring difference between the ground rules applied in those cases and the new rule devised for Lockheed. If a small business had been on the verge of bankruptcy, the small business would never have received its loan.

With this Lockheed experience behind it, I hope that the Nixon administration will now see the economic desirability of

Minnesota Historical Society

www.mnhs.org