

for yielding to me to make these comments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not care to go into any great detail on the position of the distinguished Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES). I certainly believe that all of us on the committee are deeply concerned with the problem of alcoholism and drug addiction.

The question is whether there should be an earmarking for these programs under the OEO Act to the exclusion of almost any other program, because that is what the effect could be.

I have not yet had answered the question I put to the chairman of the subcommittee some time ago, as to whether it was not a question of the appropriation not coming up but whether this would not result automatically in a cut in research and development and some of these other efforts made to deal with alcoholism and drug addiction, and that there was nothing to exclude OEO under the various programs from accepting a program dealing with alcoholism and drug addiction. It is a question of earmarking one thing to the exclusion of others.

I take some issue with the Senator from Iowa, without having the statistics available at hand, as to the problem of alcoholism and drug addiction being really exclusively or not exclusively intended to be importantly related to a particular income level. There is much evidence with regard to this program that is quite the contrary, that the percentage of youth involved in drugs and alcohol runs the whole gamut of all income levels. What is true of the problem of alcoholism is true of drug addiction. It has a definite relationship to poverty, but more to solving the problems, whether we can really solve them under OEO or under the massive program departments of HEW, or by State and local efforts in this connection, or in the comprehensive and broad, I hope, continuing private efforts to deal with the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEICKER). Do the Senators from Wisconsin and Ohio now yield back their time?

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT).

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Sena-

tor from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), and the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), would each vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELL-MON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. CORTON), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK) is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 216 Leg.]

YEAS—17

Beall	Goldwater	Pearson
Boggs	Griffin	Roth
Buckley	Gurney	Taft
Cook	Hruska	Thurmond
Dole	Miller	Tower
Fannin	Packwood	

NAYS—47

Allen	Hatfield	Pastore
Baker	Hughes	Percy
Bentsen	Inouye	Proxmire
Brooke	Jackson	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy	Schweiker
Cannon	Long	Spong
Case	Mathias	Stennis
Chiles	McClellan	Stevens
Church	McGee	Stevenson
Cranston	McGovern	Symington
Eagleton	McIntyre	Talmadge
Ellender	Metcalfe	Tunney
Ervin	Mondale	Weicker
Gambrell	Montoya	Williams
Hart	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—36

Aiken	Bennett	Cotton
Allott	Bible	Curtis
Anderson	Brook	Dominick
Bayh	Burdick	Eastland
Belmont	Cooper	Fong

Fulbright	Javits	Pell
Gravel	Jordan, Idaho	Prouty
Hansen	Magnuson	Saxbe
Harris	Mansfield	Scott
Hartke	Moss	Smith
Hollings	Mundt	Sparkman
Humphrey	Muskie	Young

So Mr. TAFT's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) for his wise and patient leadership in the development of the pending bill.

S. 2007, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971, extends the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for 2 years through fiscal year 1973. This extension reflects the national consensus that OEO programs have materially assisted in removing substantial numbers of people from poverty. I believe the programs operated by OEO itself could well use more than the \$950 million authorized for fiscal 1972 and for 1973. However, these sums and the earmarking provisions, should assure the continuation of a number of effective efforts now underway.

I have long supported OEO's neighborhood health centers, emergency food and medical services, community action programs, alcoholic and drug treatment, family planning, older workers programs, and migrant assistance. I shall turn in a moment to the greater strengthened child development and legal services programs which the bill also includes.

I am pleased to support the bill's expanded and strengthened programs for community economic development and for employment and training of young people. I also welcome the specific authority to offer financial assistance to community-based organizations which will furnish professional design and planning assistance to people in urban and rural poverty areas who want to improve the physical development of their communities.

I am especially proud that the bill incorporates the basic provisions of two bills which I have had the privilege to sponsor, with bipartisan support—S. 1512, the Child Development Act of 1971, and S. 1305, the National Legal Services Corporation Act.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT

The major provisions of S. 1512, the comprehensive child development bill of 1971, are incorporated in section 6 of the pending bill. This section creates a new title V in the Economic Opportunity Act, which expands the existing and highly successful Headstart program. It is designed to meet the rising need of families from all economic levels for quality comprehensive child development services.

Joint hearings of the Subcommittee on Manpower and Poverty and Children and Youth clearly demonstrate that need. Half of all mothers of children under 14, and one-third of all mothers of children under 6, are working today. Yet less than 700,000 licensed day care opportunities are currently available to serve the nearly 6 million preschool children whose mothers work. And the need for child development services is increasing—an additional 1.5 million mothers

will enter the work force during the remainder of this decade.

The report to the President by the White House Conference on Children and Youth states:

To discuss at length whether day care is an economic luxury, a political right, or a social tool ignores the tremendous need for supplementary care which exists today, a need which parents will continue to meet the best they can with whatever resources are available. The question is not whether America "should" have day care, but rather whether the day care which we do have and will have, will be good—good for the child, good for the family, and good for the nation.

Children from all economic backgrounds share the need for developmental day care services while their parents work. In addition, children who live in poverty often need supplemental nutritional services, health care, and learning opportunities if they are to avoid falling hopelessly behind, perpetuating the endless cycle of poverty and despair.

Today there are 3.2 million preschool children from impoverished families, and perhaps as many from families slightly above the poverty line. Too many of these children suffer needless damage in early childhood, damage which schools will attempt to repair in later years at untold cost, and often with little success. Yet existing Headstart programs reach only one-tenth of impoverished preschool children.

Early in his administration, President Nixon called the Nation's attention to the urgent need for expanded child development services. In his economic opportunity message of 1969 he stated:

So critical is this matter of early growth that we must make a national commitment to provide all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life.

The committee bill seeks to fulfill this national commitment, and begin to meet the urgent need for expanded quality child development services—a need emphasized by the President, underscored by the White House Conference on Children, and documented in hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Section 6 contains the basic elements of the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971 (S. 1512) which I introduced in April with Senators JAVITS, NELSON, SCHWEIKER, and 28 cosponsors. This bill was developed in large part, through the exhaustive efforts of a broad coalition of organizations interested in child development, including:

AFL-CIO; Americans for Democratic Action; Americans for Indian Opportunity Action Council; Black Child Development Institute; Committee for Community Affairs; Common Cause; Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Interstate Research Associates; International Ladies Garment Workers Union; League of Women Voters; Leadership Conference on Civil Rights; National Council of Churches; National Council of Negro Women; National Education Association; National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors; National Organization of Women, president, and vice president for Legislation; National Welfare Rights Organization; United Auto Workers, U.S. Catholic Conference, Family Life Division and Washington Research Project Action Council.

Like Headstart, the new comprehensive program would be administered by the Office of Child Development in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Units of local government, States and nonprofit agencies and organizations would be eligible for prime sponsorship of child development programs.

This bill maintains Headstart's priority on economically disadvantaged children, but also extends child development services to families above the poverty level, especially children of working mothers and single parents. Families with incomes above the Bureau of Labor Statistics minimum family budget would pay part of the cost for services according to a sliding scale established by the Secretary of HEW.

We need this expanded scope of service for several reasons. The facts I have cited earlier reveal quite clearly that the need for quality day care programs is not exclusively or even primarily felt by the poor. Mothers in all income levels are working and are unable to find the creative day care opportunities their children need and deserve. And testimony indicates that the expansion of services beyond the poverty line—which permits socioeconomic diversity within the programs—makes good educational sense.

As Dr. Edward Zigler, now Director of the Office of Child Development, testified in 1969 advocating socioeconomic diversity in child development programs stated:

Another important reason for guaranteeing a good socio-economic mix in Headstart centers is a growing body of evidence that children learn a great deal from one another. The middle-class child does have a number of attributes that the poor child can profitably model. By the same token we often find in poor children particular strength and characteristics worthy of emulation by the middle-class child. We must see to it that Headstart centers are institutions, where our Nation's children, regardless of economic status, can enrich one another.

The bill places priority on preschool programs continues, but also authorizes infant care and before and after school services for children in school, as well as prenatal services and child development training for parents and prospective parents.

The committee bill reflects our belief that quality, developmental programs must be firmly grounded on four essential and interrelated principles.

First, we believe parents must have an integral role in planning and operating child development programs affecting their children. The most recent Headstart guidelines, published in August of 1970, support this conclusion:

The success of Head Start in bringing about substantial changes demands the fullest involvement of the parent, parental-substitutes, and families enrolled in its program. This involvement begins when a Head Start program begins and should gain vigor and vitality as planning and activities go forward.

Closely paralleling the structure established in the Headstart guidelines, the committee bill requires each prime sponsor of child development programs, and each child development project, to establish a committee at least half composed

of parent representatives to approve policy decisions and actions.

The second fundamental ingredient in our approach, and one which is closely related to our concern for parental involvement, is the principle of local control. The committee bill places priority on prime sponsorship by local governmental units, whenever it is administratively feasible.

The committee considered and rejected a proposal to limit prime sponsorship to States and cities of over 100,000 persons. We felt that the necessity of making programs responsive to parents and local communities far outweigh any considerations of administrative convenience, to HEW which might result from limiting prime sponsorship to States and large cities.

Although we rejected a population limitation on prime sponsorship, the committee bill does include requirements that prime sponsor applicants must provide assurances: First, of a capacity to enter into necessary linkage arrangements with related health, education, nutrition and social service programs, and; second, that prime administrative expenses of its Child Development Council will not exceed 5 percent of the total cost of programs it administered.

The committee bill attempts to assure balanced and cooperative participants of State and local governments, with primary responsibility for training and programs coordination resting with the State, and priority for program operation resting with units of local government.

The primary role of the States is to provide training, technical assistance, coordination, and experimentation resources for programs within their borders and 5 percent of the funds allotted for grants in each State is reserved for this purpose. In addition, the Governor of each State, or his designee, is asked to comment on all prime sponsorship applications from within the State, and for areas for which a locality has not qualified to serve as prime sponsor, or has not applied, States may become prime sponsors of child development programs.

The third major element in our proposal concerns the availability of child development services to children from all income levels. The committee bill reserves two-thirds of the funds for services, without charge, to children from families with incomes below the Bureau of Labor Statistics' lower family budget—adjusted for regional and metropolitan, urban and rural differences and for family size. Up to one-third of the funds are available to provide services to children from families with incomes above that level who would pay part of the cost, according to ability to pay on a sliding scale to be established by the Secretary of HEW.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the BLS lower family budget for a family of four in an urban metropolitan environment be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Food	\$1,905
Housing	1,420
Transportation	505
Clothing and personal care items	807
Medical care, hospital insurance	562
Other family consumption:	
Recreation, school expenses, tobacco, miscellaneous items	345
Contributions, gifts	165
Life insurance	120
Occupational expenses	58
Social security	345
Personal taxes	719
Total	6,960

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, families below this level, as adjusted for regional, and metropolitan, urban and rural differences, and family size, cannot afford significant additional expenditures for child care. The committee rejected an effort to reduce the level at which free services are provided, on the grounds that this would effectively bar many working families from participating by imposing fees on those who cannot afford them and by raising fees all along the sliding scale. We feared that such a change would have the effect of limiting these child development programs to children of the very wealthy and the very poor.

Our fourth and most basic requirement concerns program quality. The committee bill requires that child development programs must, in fact, be developmental—centered on the needs of the child—and not simply custodial in nature.

This requirement is not just rhetoric. It reflects the experiences and findings of many countries; that purely custodial day care is not simply a neutral experience for children, but often a damaging one.

The report of the White House Conference on Children made this point well:

Quality services geared to the needs and abilities of each child can be an enormously constructive influence. But a poorly funded program, where children are left with few challenging activities and have little relationship to or guidance from adults, can seriously jeopardize development.

The committee report emphasizes that "programs which do not provide developmental services may in fact have a stunting effect on the intellectual and emotional growth of the child."

We cannot afford to overlook or downplay the significance of these findings. As increasing numbers of children from all backgrounds enter child care programs in the next few years, failure to provide quality services could have truly tragic consequences for the Nation as a whole. But sensitive and comprehensive child development services can enrich the lives of millions of children and their families. The committee bill is a thoughtful and well-considered beginning toward making those services available.

I sincerely hope it receives the support of the Senate and the House, and adequate funding, so that the dream of the recent White House Conference on Children—reflected in the fact that the delegates of the Conference voted developmental day care as their first priority—can become a reality.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "A New Chance for Children," published in the

Washington Post of August 4, 1971, be inserted at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, title IX of S. 2007 establishes a private, non-profit National Legal Services Corporation to carry out the activities of the present legal services program now administered by OEO. Funded by Congress, the Corporation will be authorized to make grants and contracts to provide comprehensive legal services and assistance to low-income persons.

The Corporation will be administered by a 15-member board of directors. One director will be appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States after consultation with the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Nine directors will be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate in the following manner:

Four directors shall be appointed as representatives of the general public.

Three Directors shall be appointed solely from a list of 10 persons submitted by the Clients Advisory Council—established by the legislation—and the list shall consist of persons eligible for assistance under the act.

Two directors shall be appointed solely from a list of 10 persons submitted by the Project Attorneys Advisory Council—established by the legislation.

Five directors or their designees will serve on the Board by virtue of their office: The president of the American Bar Association; president of the National Bar Association; president of the American Trial Lawyers Association; president of the Association of American Law Schools; and the president of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association.

The Corporation is authorized to provide financial assistance to qualified programs furnishing legal services; to carry out research, training, technical assistance, experimental education programs; and to assist disadvantaged persons in obtaining a legal education.

Title IX represents a fair and reasonable compromise between the two bills calling for a private corporation to administer legal services: S. 1305, introduced by a broad bipartisan coalition in both the Senate and the House, and S. 1769, the administration bill. It is a compromise which adapts certain features of the administration bill, while preserving the Corporation's integrity and independence from political attack.

On the crucial issue of the composition of the Corporation's Board of Directors, the committee's bill strikes a balance between the approaches taken by S. 1305 and the administration bill. S. 1305 called for a 19-member Board, with five members appointed by the President; the administration's bill proposed an 11-member Board, all of whom would be appointed by the President.

The committee approved a 15-member Board, with nine members being appointed by the President. While five of these Presidential appointments must

come from lists submitted by the Clients Advisory Council and the Project Attorneys Advisory Council, the President will, nevertheless, have the final say in choosing particular individuals from these lists.

In other important areas, the committee adopted certain concepts advocated by the administration. For example, activities of Legal Services attorneys will be governed by guidelines issued by the corporation—consistent with professional ethical obligations—in the areas of legislative advocacy, appeals, criminal representation, and the outside practice of law. Furthermore, these lawyers will be prohibited from engaging in partisan political activities in their capacity as legal services attorneys.

The committee also adopted the user's fee called for in the administration's bill. Title IX requires the Corporation to establish a graduated fee schedule for clients able to pay some portion of the cost of service whose income is over the poverty level.

The fact that the committee was able to reach agreement on this legislation—and the fact that title IX is strongly supported by both Republican and Democratic members of the committee—clearly demonstrates that legal services is not a partisan issue.

This type of bipartisan support is based on the recognition that free and open access to the legal system is not a matter of partisan politics. And when this access has been challenged, support for the legal services program has cut across party and ideological lines.

Despite the strong support Legal Services has enjoyed in the past—not only in Congress, but also from the organized bar and client groups—the time has come to insulate this program from harmful political pressures. For as a result of these pressures, the provision of legal services has become an issue to be considered politically at every level of government. The poor are beginning to surmise that this program—in which they have developed such great confidence—will be subjected to a political litmus test.

Most of the opposition to the program has arisen because of the so-called law reform cases which these attorneys have won. The program's critics somehow consider these cases a form of legal agitation.

But the landmark cases won by Legal Services lawyers were based on real problems experienced by individual clients seeking legal assistance. When a California court prevented the Governor of California from drastically reducing payments under the State's Medicaid program, it did so because a CRLA lawyer was pressing the legitimate claim of his client—a man unable to obtain a badly needed operation without Medicaid.

In all of these cases, legal services attorneys were merely fulfilling the clear mandates of their profession. Canon 7 of the code of professional responsibility states that "A lawyer should represent a client zealously within the bounds of the law." Ethical consideration 7-1 elabo-

rates on this canon in the following manner:

The duty of a lawyer, both to his client and to the legal system, is to represent his client zealously within the bounds of the law, which includes Disciplinary Rules and enforceable professional regulations. The professional responsibility of a lawyer derives from his membership in a profession which has the duty of assisting members of the public to secure and protect available legal rights and benefits. In our government of laws and not of men, each member of our society is entitled to have his conduct judged and regulated in accordance with the law; to seek any lawful objective through legally permissible means; and to present for adjudication any lawful claim, issue or defense.

In light of these ethical requirements, a legal-services attorney—like any other lawyer—cannot stop and weigh the political consequences of contemplated legal action. But those who have attempted to curtail this program are not overly concerned with the ethics of the legal profession.

Despite the impressive accomplishments of legal services, there can be no doubt that constant political interference has taken its toll. For once political pressure is apparent, legal services attorneys inevitably begin to consider the consequences of bringing certain types of legal actions.

There are many kinds of reprisals against a program whose attorneys are considered too aggressive in representing their clients. The next grant can be vetoed by the Governor; debilitating restrictions can be placed on the grant; and the program's funds can be reduced by cautious officials unwilling to offend powerful local interests.

These are serious and substantial fears—which many attorneys in the field have experienced at one time or another. And even if these fears do not materialize, the perception of pressure and reprisals can hamper an attorney's ability to fully and effectively represent his client.

While the legal services program has survived past attacks on its independence, its integrity, and its capacity to provide full legal representation to the poor, each challenge has drained the program's energy and diverted its resources. As long as the program remains vulnerable to political attack or manipulation, the damage will grow worse until it could be fatal.

That is why the committee concluded that a new structure for legal services was necessary—a structure which would insure the program's independence and which would insure that its attorneys would be able to represent their clients as required by the mandates of the legal profession.

These mandates reflect the fact that our system of justice is based on the adversary process, which in turn depends upon effective advocacy. A dilution of the lawyer's independence threatens this adversary process. As former Chief Justice Warren has stated:

A right without an advocate is as useless as a blueprint without a builder or materials.

No attorney can meet his professional responsibilities to a client if there are outside restraints on the types of cases

in which he can act or the kinds of issues he can raise. No large corporation would tolerate outside interference with the retained attorneys. Certainly the poor should not be expected to tolerate such interference.

The National Legal Services Corporation will do far more, however, than protect the professional integrity of Legal Services attorneys. It will help protect the integrity of our entire system of government.

Under our system, the courts are the forum of last redress. We understand, as a people, that we must respect the supremacy of law—and the inviolability of recourse to the courts for those who are disenfranchised and for those who have been dealt with unfairly and arbitrarily.

In this decade, it is a singularly small but visible effort which has come to symbolize the possibility of a new period of maturity, of conscience, of self assurance, for our Nation—the legal services program.

I believe that our Government has reached the point where it can admit that it is capable of error, that it no longer need claim infallibility or hide behind sovereign immunity. We are ready to set up mechanisms whereby the people can hold the Government accountable—not only every 2 or 4 years—but can challenge individual acts and specific policies as contrary to law.

This is the genius and historic significance of the legal services program—that a government can offer to the powerless the opportunity and the resources needed to challenge improper acts by both private and public bodies.

If the poor and the powerless do not have free access to our legal system, government by law is a failure.

The creation of a National Legal Services Corporation is designed to insure that access. In this basic respect, it represents a traditional and time-honored means of achieving orderly change.

EXHIBIT 1

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 preschool 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' participation would be voluntary—and recognizes the fact that millions of mothers should be forced to work—of course not, 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 will 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.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States has gone on record in full support of the Economic Opportunity programs year after year since we passed the original Economic

lost faith in his belief in America's qualities or in the teachings of that Sunday School teacher, John Crewson, who set him the course to West Point.

Of all that's been said and written of Omar Nelson Bradley, perhaps a paragraph from an essay penned in 1962 by a Moberly seventh grader, Debbie Shirvin, sums it up best:

"He was a Missouri boy from our very own community. His rise to military fame was spectacular, even in our country of great opportunities. His plainness and his human touch have protected him from enemies that often destroy good men."

MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR ISRAEL

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, last week Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Sisco arrived in Israel for consultations with the Israeli Government on the Middle East situation. The political stalemate in that part of the world has now reached a critical stage. Frustrations are growing on both sides, and in a situation of such great tension there is always the possibility of another tragic conflict.

Since the founding of Israel, our foreign policy with respect to the Arab-Israeli conflict has rested on two fundamental positions: First, there is our commitment to Israel's survival. We have stood unalterably opposed to the position that the Arabs took for many years that Israel has no right to exist. This position persists even today in the political rhetoric of the Arab world—despite three costly wars which have served only to divert the efforts of the Middle Eastern peoples from more urgent tasks of national development.

Second—and partly as a means of implementing our basic goal of protecting Israel's security—we have attempted to preserve a balance of power in the Middle East. We have hoped thereby to deter the war in the area and preserve stability in a situation of high tension and great emotion. At the same time, we have also tried to do everything possible to prevent a senseless and dangerous arms race between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

For some time, Israel has been requesting from the United States additional shipments of Phantom jet fighter-bombers. Our Government has not fulfilled this latest request, apparently on the assumption that such actions might render a political settlement more difficult.

In view of recent evidence of increased Soviet shipments of fighter aircraft to Egypt and Syria, I do not agree with the administration's apparent position that delivery of Phantom jets to Israel must still be delayed. Two weeks ago it was reported in the New York Times that U.S. intelligence specialists had revealed that since last September the Soviet Union had shipped nearly 100 Mig-21's to Egypt, including eight delivered in June. This total was said to compare with only 90 Mig-21's delivered to Egypt from the end of the 1967 war to the middle of 1970.

Moreover, it was reported that Syria had received from the Soviet Union in the last 3 months 21 all-weather Mig-21 fighters, probably of the latest model, nine older-model Mig-17's, five Sukhoi-7 fighter-bombers, and 22 MI-8 helicop-

ters. Especially significant are the high number of the most up-to-date Mig-21's and the first known delivery of the big MI-8 helicopters, which are designed to carry combat troops. These deliveries have apparently resulted from the Syrian-Soviet military pact signed last February.

I wish to express my own view in the strongest possible terms that Israel must have the arms she needs to defend herself and to maintain a balance of power with her adversaries. I hope that we will respond positively to the Israeli request for more assistance. We are committed to Israel's survival, and we are pledged to maintain a balance of military power in the Middle East. By either measure, it is imperative that we delay no longer in shipping the additional aircraft she requires.

We all pray for a political settlement in the Middle East that will leave Israel secure and will permit our friends in the Arab world to turn to the great task of national development. But prospects for a political settlement are surely not advanced by a military balance that shifts dangerously in favor of the Arabs. Neither are these prospects increased by a zigzag diplomacy on the part of the United States which, on the theory of gaining political leverage over Israel by delaying needed military assistance, serves only to raise doubts among all parties to the conflict that the United States is truly committed to preserving Israel's security. Such doubts will encourage the Arabs not to negotiate seriously with Israel, and make Israel more reluctant to negotiate territorial questions bearing upon her security.

Now is the time to reemphasize our commitment to Israel's security, and to restore the balance of power in the Middle East as the best means of furthering the goal of a negotiated settlement.

EXPERIMENT IN EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a fascinating article appeared in the July 1971, issue of American Education regarding an experiment in early childhood development done by the University of Wisconsin.

After extensive surveys, the team of educator-scholars observed that mentally retarded mothers create a social environment for their offspring that is distinctly different from that created by mothers of normal intelligence.

For the last 4 years some 40 mentally retarded mothers have taken part in the Infant Education Center project with their newborn children. When offered this opportunity, the mothers quickly seized it.

In this project, now in its 5th year, children from the Milwaukee slums, whose parents were both poor and illiterate, have excelled as a result of the specialized treatment. Many of the children, whose mothers had IQ's of 70 points have achieved intelligence quotients as high as 135.

Mr. President, I think this is an extremely encouraging report. Since the Senate will soon be considering proposed legislation—which I introduced with

Senator JAVITS, Senator NELSON, and Senator SCHWEIKER and 28 cosponsors, and whose major provisions are included in S. 2007, recently reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—dealing with the need for early childhood development, I respectfully request that the entire text of the American Education article be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

Mr. President, in the Washington Post of July 12, William Raspberry reviewed the article and its implications in a sensitive column. The Milwaukee Journal of July 12 included a similar review.

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent articles by Mr. William Raspberry, of the Washington Post, and Cynthia Williams, of the Milwaukee Journal, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, July 12, 1971]

FIRST HURDLE IS MONEY

(By William Raspberry)

Rick Heber, professor of education and child psychology at the University of Wisconsin, has demonstrated that it is possible to prevent the intellectual crippling that is the curse of slum children.

But there are two huge hurdles between proving that it can be done and actually doing it.

Heber used highly trained specialists and a very small pupil to teacher ratio—1 to 1 for the first two years and never more than 11 to 1. He also had ample supplies and equipment. The first and obvious hurdle, than, is money.

The second hurdle stems from the fact that although Heber's youngsters showed near-miraculous advances in IQ scores, the results depend on intervention at a very early age. (Heber's enrollees included 40 mothers and their newborn children.)

This is well before the state traditionally has intervened with compulsory education laws, and three to four years earlier than even such preschool programs as Project Head Start.

Furthermore, as Heber discovered, such retardation—even in the slums—is not randomly distributed but tends to occur in children whose mothers are of low intelligence. (This, he found, is not because of genetics but because low-IQ mothers fail to provide a stimulating environment for their offspring.)

In any case, any effort to prevent the most predictable retardation has to involve the mothers, who are themselves backward, which is to say mothers who may not know what is best for their children.

So having made the discovery that much intellectual retardation is both predictable and preventable, what do we do? Do we give the state the authority to force mothers to enroll their infant children in special preschool classes? Do we force mothers themselves to take the kind of training that will help them to provide a proper home environment?

The questions are important because intervention of the sort that is working so successfully in Milwaukee entails intrusion of a sort that Americans are disposed to resist. In addition, any such intervention attempted on a large scale would be certain to provoke shouts that the government was trying to brainwash and standardize innocent black children.

It is easy enough to dismiss such objections as charlatanry. But would it be as easy to persuade large numbers of ghetto parents to let their infant children be set apart for special treatment?

Omar was encouraged to consider West Point by his Campbellite Sunday School teacher who felt an Army career would sustain the young man's love of the outdoors.

At the Point, Bradley ranked 44th in the 1915 class of 164 that produced several World War II generals. He played football, hit .385 on the baseball team and rated sixth in conduct. The West Point yearbook's summation of Bradley's chief characteristic—"getting there"—was prophetic as German armies later would vouchsafe. The high school annual, too, had hit the mark with its one-word description of him: "Calculative."

Bradley spent most of World War I commanding a guard company in the copper mines of Butte, Mont. When the war ended, Bradley predicted another would erupt in 20 years or so and began preparing for it. Interview by Jules Loh of the Associated Press on his 78th birthday anniversary, the 5-star general had this to say on what World War II had meant to him.

"I certainly did not welcome war. That goes without saying. I would have preferred to have served out my years in a peacetime army and retired quietly as a colonel. Once war came, I welcomed the opportunity to do what I was trained to do and paid to do."

Bradley draws this distinction between military men and militarists: "Those who serve their country professionally, under civilian control, as opposed to those who put themselves in a separate caste above their government with a code of their own."

Bradley saw little glory in war. Shortly after World War II he spoke at a Memorial Day ceremony at the grave of a Medal of Honor winner. The script called for bravado, but Bradley said: "For every man in whom war has inspired sacrifice, courage and love, there are many more whom it has degraded, with brutality, callousness and greed."

In his book, "A Soldier's Story," he wrote: "War has neither the time nor the heart to concern itself with the dignity of man. Men must be subordinated to the effort that comes with fighting a war and as a consequence men must die that objectives be taken. For a commander the agony of war is not its dangers, deprivations or the fear of defeat but in the knowledge that with each new day men's lives must be spent to pay the costs of the day's objectives."

"Because war is as much a conflict of passion as it is of force, no commander can become a strategist until first he knows his men. Far from being a handicap to command, compassion is the measure of it. For unless one values the lives of soldiers and is tormented by their ordeals, he is unfit to command."

Before the invasion of France, despondency was sweeping American troops infected by talks that few would survive D-Day. In an off-the-cuff talk to them, Bradley called such fears "tommy-rot" and predicted casualties would be far less than expected. (They ranged to 10% of the attacking force.) Bradley's words got out, to his chagrin, and he considered firing the censor. But after the war Bradley met a GI's mother who told him how much his "tommyrot" speech had meant to her and others. "Let this be a footnote of justice to the censor," Bradley said.

His career is sprinkled with incidents that suggest why the GI's called him their general. He was least affected by position. While Ike had his jacket, Patton his jodphurs and MacArthur his hat, Bradley was content with GI issue. Later, when he headed the Veterans Administration, he forbade use of military titles in correspondence to discharged soldiers.

Those close to Bradley seldom knew him to raise his voice. "When your position is such that no one can answer back," he has said, "why shout."

Bradley's first combat action came in North Africa when he commanded a corps of four divisions and helped draw the noose

on Axis forces at Bizerte and Tunis. Of this first experience in combat command, he later wrote:

"To command a corps toughness alone isn't enough. You must know your division commanders, thoroughly understand their problems, respect their judgment and be tolerant of their limitations. There are few distinguishing characteristics of a successful division commander. Success comes from a well-balanced combination of good judgment, self-confidence, leadership and boldness."

After Africa, Bradley served under Gen. George S. Patton in Sicily. While his philosophy of war differed sharply from Patton's, Bradley's respect for the storybook general was great.

"To George," Bradley wrote in his book, "the war was not so much an ordeal as it was fulfillment of a destiny to which he shaped his life. He believed war to be a chronic ailment of mankind, destined to pursue civilization to its grave. . . . Since conflict was to be the inevitable lot of all mankind, George reasoned that man should resign himself to it and indeed welcome it as a manly challenge. Exhilarated by conflict, he found it inconceivable that men, other than cowards, should want no part of war."

Such a philosophy explains the "slapping incident" when Patton struck a soldier hospitalized with "nerves" in Sicily, accused him of cowardice and sent him back to the front.

The chief reason Bradley was popular with the troops was his human quality and lack of put-on. In contrast to Patton's glory view of war, Bradley considered it a "wretched debasement of all the thin pretensions of civilization. In the rear areas war may sometime assume the mask of an adventure. On the front it seldom lapses far from what General Sherman declared it to be."

Bradley's favorite soldier was the rifleman. "The rifleman," he said "trudges into battle knowing the statistics are stacked against his survival. He fights without promise of either reward or relief. Behind every river, there's another hill—and behind that hill, another river. After weeks or months in the line only a wound can offer him the comfort of safety, shelter and a bed. Those who are left to fight, fight on, evading death but knowing that with each day of evasion they have exhausted one more chance of survival. Sooner or later, unless victory comes, the chase must end on the litter or in the grave."

When the Allies got bogged down on the Western Front after the Normandy breakout, Bradley saw his casualties in a 5-week period reach 64,000. Obtaining replacements became difficult as the War in the Pacific demanded its share of America's young men.

An underling proposed to Bradley that the term "replacement" be changed to specialist to avoid the cannon fodder connotation and improve morale among those waiting to go to the front. Bradley would have no part of the word game.

"The remedy for improving morale among replacements," he said, "lies not in changing the name but in taking every possible step to see that they are properly taken care of and that they get the feeling someone is interested in their welfare."

There was a time, however, when the slow-to-anger Bradley was ready to quit and go home. It came after the German counter-attack that developed into the Battle of the Bulge. For tactical reasons Eisenhower shifted two American armies from Bradley's command to the British General Montgomery. Bradley and Montgomery had had equal billing under Ike, Montgomery commanding British and Canadian forces on the northern prong and Bradley the American on the southern thrust.

When Montgomery exploited the situation to flatter his ego at Bradley's expense, the Missourian told Ike that unless the American troops were returned to his command, once

the German drive was blunted, that he would resign. Bradley believed that if he were to become subordinate to Montgomery—when the Americans had far more troops in the field than the British—his effectiveness would be impaired. The troops of General Hodges and Simpson were returned to Bradley by Ike with the bitter comment: "Well—I thought you were the one person I could count on for doing anything I asked you to."

But of his choice of Bradley to lead the American armies in Europe, Ike would later say in his book, "Crusade in Europe":

"General Bradley displayed qualities of steadfastness, drive, professional skill, and a capacity for human understanding which became so obvious to his subordinates and his superiors alike that the American teamwork forged on the many battlefields of the Normandy beachhead was never thereafter seriously threatened."

In the closing days of the European war, the allies had to decide whether to go for Berlin or choose other targets. The nature of Berlin's occupation already had been decided by the Four Powers and Bradley advised Ike against racing the Russians for the capital. He predicted it would mean an additional 100,000 casualties, a price too great for a prize they could not keep.

With the allies to be dependent on Russian good will for access to Berlin, Bradley had misgivings. He had learned as a farm boy in Missouri that "dependence did not make for good neighbors."

America honors its 5-star officers (there have been only nine) with active duty status while permitting them to pursue their own interests. Bradley is chairman of the Bulova Watch Company, highly interested in a North Dakota Indian work project financed by Bulova, and now lives in Beverly Hills, Calif., with his second wife. His first wife died in 1965. A daughter lives in the Washington area.

In the Jules Loh interview, Bradley expressed thoughts on youth today and the problems of modern living.

"My boyhood experience gave me a sense of responsibility," he said. "If I didn't cut firewood we didn't have firewood. If I didn't clean the lamps, we didn't have clean lamps. One trouble with modern living is that children don't have the opportunity. The furnace goes on automatically and you flip a switch to get light. If a child doesn't learn responsibility by having responsibility, first of all to his own family, how will he ever develop a sense of responsibility to his community and country?"

But Bradley doesn't brand technology as a villain. Machines, he says, have expanded human opportunities and he sees "no reason people should worry about losing their individuality."

Bradley returned to Moberly in May of 1971 to visit the wooded hills where he once hunted with his father and to commemorate a Boy Scout trail named for him.

Farmland visited him there and asked if it worried him that the shrinking number of farms meant fewer boys were getting the chance to experience an outdoors upbringing such as he had enjoyed. Standing under the trees and appearing fit enough to hike the 15-mile Scout trail, Bradley spoke of machinery and technology. They've got equipment now, he noted, that eliminates the need for a lot of people on farms, and this is a fact we must accept. Then, too, others have gone to cities as a matter of choice, "and this is their right."

As for the rash of criticism of the Army today, Bradley said this was nothing new. "The only time the Army is appreciated," he said, is when it is called on to correct the mistake made by our diplomats and politicians."

Those who know him best say Bradley's success represents the triumph of simple, absolute honesty and good will. He has never

When Heber approached mothers of newborn children about participating in his Infant Education Center Project, they eagerly seized the opportunity. This may mean that ghetto mothers across the country would "so be enthusiastic participants. Or it may mean only that a group of Milwaukee mothers had a good deal of confidence in a certain professor from the University of Wisconsin.

But even assuming the willingness of most parents, where would the money come from?

To begin with, there is virtually no chance that there will ever be enough money to give every slum child his own teacher.

But it isn't unreasonable to suppose that some things could be done to compensate for the stultifying home environment that condemns so many slum youngsters to a severe limitation of mental development.

If you care to dream a little, it might be that substantial parts of Heber's early education program could become an adjunct to the President's Family Assistance Plan.

Since Congress seems determined to write a work/training requirement into the legislation, something will have to be done with the children while mothers are on the job in training.

This obviously entails day-care centers of some sort. Now if, instead of centers that are little more than storage bins, the government would finance well staffed, well equipped centers capable of supplying the intellectual stimulation that Heber found missing in many ghetto homes . . .

But that's almost too much to hope.

What is far more likely to that low-income families will go right on producing more than their share of functional retardates, even though Prof. Heber has told us that it doesn't have to be that way.

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

STUDY MIGHT PROVE POVERTY AFFECTS IQ'S (By Cynthia Williams)

The Milwaukee Project, a five-year study of infant education, has recently presented data indicating that the children of the illiterate poor are not inherently inferior intellectually to other children.

The project team reported that children from Milwaukee's inner city consistently scored high on a variety of tests administered from infancy through their fourth year.

During this period, the youngsters' intelligence quotients jumped by more than 50%, with some of them achieving as high as 135.

LEARN FROM BIRTH

The study provided evidence that children start learning virtually from birth, according to F. Rick Heber, director of the project and professor of education and psychology at the University of Wisconsin. Heber also reported that if the educational process was begun soon enough, it could prevent or reduce retardation caused by a child's environment.

For the last four years about 40 mothers with IQs less than 70, with their newborn children, have voluntarily participated in the Milwaukee Project's Infant Education Center. Normal IQs range from about 90 to 110.

The newborn babies were put into two groups—two-thirds of them in the experimental program and one-third in a control group. Initially, the project workers, who consisted of psychologists, sociologists and teachers from the University of Wisconsin and others, worked on a one-to-one basis with the children.

TOGETHER IN GROUPS

As the children grew older, they were brought together in small groups, then in larger groups.

For six hours a day, five days a week, the children attend "stimulation" centers where they are cared for, talked to, read to, played

with and taught numerical concepts and words.

"When the children in the experimental group reached 19 to 25 months of age, their vocabulary production began to accelerate rapidly," reported the July issue of "American Education."

"For those in the control group, vocabulary production did not begin in any instance until the child was 28 months old, and a number of the control group children still could not speak at that age," the magazine reported.

STARTED IN 1964

Heber and his team of researchers in 1964 began a series of surveys designed to learn more about the relationship of poverty to mental retardation.

In these first surveys they found that a mother's IQ was the most reliable single indicator of the level and character of a child's intellectual development.

The survey data showed that the lower the mother's IQ, the greater the possibility of the children's scoring low on intelligence tests.

From this and other information the researchers surmised that the unusually high concentration of mental retardation in the slum was not caused merely by the slum environment, but by the retarded parent living in that environment.

DIFFERENT ENVIRONMENT

After repeated visits with hundreds of families, the researchers found "that the mentally retarded mother creates a social environment for her offspring that is distinctly different from that created by her neighbor of normal intelligence level."

Under the direction of the university and supported by a grant from the Social and Rehabilitation Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Heber established the Infant Education Center at 2014 W. North Ave. The surveys were conducted in the surrounding area.

"Knowing that only children of mothers with IQs less than 80 show a progressive decline in mean intelligence as they grow older, the Wisconsin group decided to focus their attention and their efforts on such youngsters," the magazine said.

PREVENTION SOUGHT

"They wanted to work with children who, according to the record, were virtually certain to show characteristics of mental retardation as they grew older."

"The challenge was to see whether intellectual deficiency might be prevented—as opposed to cured or remedied later—by introducing an array of positive factors in the children's early life, displacing factors that appeared to be negative or adverse."

CAN SLUM CHILDREN LEARN?

(By Stephen P. Strickland)

Disadvantaged children may be capable of educational achievements far beyond anything heretofore imagined if a remarkable project in Milwaukee is the guide it clearly seems to be.

In the project, now in its fifth year, children from poor, illiterate parents living in the city's most depressed section have shown sustained high performance on a variety of tests administered from infancy through their fourth year. During that period the youngsters' intelligence quotients jumped by better than 50 percent, with some of them achieving as high as 135.

This and other evidence gathered during the project seems to demonstrate that while early environmental circumstances have a powerful impact on a child's intellectual growth, the slum environment in and of itself does not necessarily form a lifetime trap for the disadvantaged.

Taken alone, that finding may not seem

novel—although convictions about the success of various educational "intervention strategies" sometimes have appeared to be based more on hope and sympathy than on scientific evidence. The Milwaukee Project provides hard data to support the belief that, under the right circumstances, intervention can be successful even in the most difficult situations. Beyond that, the project suggests that some factors affecting learning capability and intelligence quotients which at first glance could be interpreted as matters of inheritance are instead matters of environment.

The implication of the latter finding is one of the things that makes the Milwaukee Project important. In fact, the project's implications relate to several educational concerns from compensatory education to mental retardation. Broadly, they justify our paying greater attention to the availability, the kind, and the quality of education programs for the very young child.

The Milwaukee Project was launched in 1964 when a multidisciplinary team from the University of Wisconsin under the direction of Rick Heber, Professor of Education and Child Psychology, began a series of surveys designed to learn more about the relationship of poverty to mental retardation. The team included professionals from the fields of psychology, psychiatry, sociology, and speech therapy as well as education.

The Wisconsin group knew that by some estimates more than six million persons in the United States are considered to be mentally retarded and that, although the great majority of them have no identifiable pathology of the nervous system, all have exceptionally low I.Q.'s and are functionally if not physiologically retarded. They also knew that mentally retarded persons are found in particularly large numbers among the populations of economically distressed urban and rural areas. What had not been documented was a view that was nevertheless gaining increasing acceptance: that the retardation so frequently encountered in the slum was produced by the overall environment characteristically found there—a combination of ignorance, illiteracy, malnutrition, and economic, mental and psychological depression.

That view overlooked two rather obvious facts: by far the great majority of disadvantaged persons living in slum areas are not retarded, and the majority of children reared by economically disadvantaged families develop and learn in a relatively normal fashion. These facts suggested that the heavy concentrations of mentally retarded persons in slum areas were related to certain specific factors rather than the general environment, and the Wisconsin group set out to find them.

The area selected for the surveys was that residential section of Milwaukee which, according to census data had the lowest median family income, the greatest population density per housing unit, and the most dilapidated housing in the city. It was, in short, a classic urban slum. And predictably, it yielded a much higher rate of mental retardation among school children than any other area of the city.

The first survey was conducted in 1964, with all families in the area whose children included a newborn child being invited to participate. The most important finding to emerge from that initial study was that maternal intelligence was the most reliable single indicator of the level and character of intellectual development of the children. Although mothers with an I.Q. below 80 made up less than half the total group of mothers in the study, they accounted for about four-fifths of the children with I.Q.'s below 80. The survey data further showed that the lower the mothers' I.Q., the greater the possibility of their children's scoring low on intelligence tests.

Fathers were not valued in the first survey. In a second survey, focused on 519 newborn infants in the area, intelligence tests were given to fathers, mothers, and children over two years of age. While the results showed that the father's intelligence level tended to be strikingly close to that of the mother, members of the team felt that the constant proximity of infant and mother and the fact that often the father did not reside in the home made maternal I.Q. a more dependable gauge.

As a result of their surveys and analysis, the University of Wisconsin group became convinced that the exceptional prevalence of mental retardation in the slums of American cities is not randomly distributed or randomly caused. Rather, it is concentrated within individual families that can be identified on the basis of maternal intelligence. In other words, the reason for the unusually high concentration of mental retardation in slum areas is not the slum environment generally, but the retarded parent residing in that environment.

Examined superficially, the population survey data from the Milwaukee study could be taken as suggestive evidence that "cultural-familial" mental retardation is more a matter of heredity than of environment. But what the team of educator-scholars actually observed in their repeated visits with hundreds of families was that the mentally retarded mother creates a social environment for her offspring that is distinctly different from that created by her neighbor of normal intelligence level.

Challenged by that observation, Heber and his associates determined to discover whether the kind of retardation that perpetuates itself from parent to child in the slum-dwelling family could be prevented, and if so, how.

Under the auspices of the university and with grant support from the Social and Rehabilitation Service of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the multidisciplinary team established an Infant Education Center in 1966 in the area where their surveys had been conducted. Knowing that only children of mothers with I.Q.'s less than 80 show a progressive decline in mean intelligence as they grow older, the Wisconsin group decided to focus their attention and their efforts on such youngsters. They wanted to work with children who, according to the record, were virtually certain to show characteristics of mental retardation as they grew older.

The challenge was to see whether intellectual deficiency might be prevented—as opposed to cured or remediated later—by introducing an array of positive factors in the children's early life, displacing factors that appeared to be negative or adverse. The Wisconsin team knew that any sound conclusions would have to be based on data developed over a period of years and for a relatively stable population group.

The teachers in the Milwaukee Project are both men and women and come from many different backgrounds. Not all of them are teachers by training. Indeed, not all of them have college degrees. They are chosen by the project directors from many applicants on the basis of personal interviews as well as comprehensive written information. What is sought is an ability for sensitive interaction with infants and small children and an ability to work within a system of special instruction that is both structured and flexible, requiring both discipline and initiative. Each teacher undergoes eight months of training before beginning work at the Infant Education Center. At present, six of the nine teachers teaching the two-to-four-year-olds have been with the program from its early days.

In the last four years some 40 mothers with I.Q.'s of less than 70 have, with their newborn children, participated in the Infant Education Center Project. When asked if they wished to have their children take

part in such a program, all mothers who were offered the opportunity seized it quickly. The newborn babies of these mothers were divided into two groups, with two-thirds of them being placed in the experimental program and the remaining one-third in a control group. Beginning in the first few weeks of life, the project team launched a comprehensive "intervention" into the lives of those infants in the experimental program.

Shortly after the mother returned from the hospital, teachers began visiting the home for several hours each day, focusing most of their attention on the baby. Some weeks later, as soon as the mother and the teacher together decided that the time was right, mother and child joined programs at the Infant Education Center. The infant child, usually three to four months old, was exposed to mental stimulation of a wide variety for several hours each day under a one-to-one ratio with trained adults. Meanwhile the mother was encouraged—but not required—to take part in a center program designed to teach her improved homemaking and baby-care techniques and in some cases to provide basic occupational training.

The oldest children are now moving toward their fifth birthdays. For the last four-and-a-half years they have been picked up early each morning at their homes and brought to the Infant Education Center. Each child in the school has his own teacher until he is 24 months old. At that point small group learning begins with two-year-olds being placed in a class with five other youngsters. When the children are three years old, the size of the class is increased to eight; when they are four, it's increased to 11. Throughout, three teachers are assigned to each class. This formula enables every teacher to specialize in a given area—reading, language development and expression, or mathematics—while providing a constant relationship between each child and several adults and constant relationship among the children.

ACTIVITIES ARE STRUCTURED

The education program is made up of a series of activities including important aspects of sensory and language stimulation. These activities are precisely structured, though the setting is arranged to encourage flexibility and initiative by both the infant and the teacher.

The schedule during four days of each week is firmly set for the children two years old and older. They arrive at the center by 9:00 a.m., and after they are given breakfast, they begin their classes at 9:30. Each of the three teachers engages a third of the pupils in learning activities in his or her special area, using both standard equipment and techniques, materials, and methods that have been developed at the center. For example, the Peabody Language Development Kit for primary level is used for children two, three, and four years old in their afternoon group language class. In the more individualized morning language class, the teacher usually uses equipment and methods developed over the last several years by Heber and his colleagues, and she may occasionally adapt variations from standard methods and equipment for particular purposes.

In his language class, which lasts a half hour, a child is guided by the teacher for 20 minutes of stimulatory exercises; in the remaining 10 minutes he may use the equipment or materials or continue in any way he wishes the activity the teacher began. His second class, also of a half-hour's duration, is likewise divided into 20 minutes of structured activity and 10 minutes of unstructured continuation of that activity. After a half-hour of free play, a third half-hour class brings the children to 11:30, when they decide whether they wish to watch "Sesame Street" on television—which the Milwaukee Project professionals rate highly—or to continue one of the activities begun previously that morning.

After lunch and a nap, there are two additional classes in the afternoon, once more of a half-hour each. For these two classes, each age group is divided into two sections with one teacher working with three to six children. The group language class emphasizes communication and problem-solving. The teacher might ask, for example, "What if you woke up in the morning and could find only one shoe?" The point is to stir the children's imaginations and encourage free verbalization of thought.

A second teacher engages her section in lessons on topics that vary from week to week and include science, art, and music. As in the morning classes, there are 20 minutes of structured activity and 10 minutes of free use of equipment or free exploration of topics introduced earlier. Meanwhile, the third teacher uses this period to work individually with any child needing special help in any subject.

Both the morning and afternoon class groupings are based on a combination of ability and behavior. Hence there is, once more, flexibility within the structure. A child may have his language class at 9:00 on some days and at 11 on other days. For children less than two years old, the day's activities are not as structured as they are for the older youngsters. And on Fridays, the day is less structured for all the children, often allowing for such special occasions as field trips.

The program for mothers continues after the children have begun their classes at the center. Following the initial emphasis on child care and homemaking, the program offers opportunities for vocational training and has assisted a number of mothers to secure steady employment for the first time. The center does not employ any of the mothers but supports an active parents organization in which the majority of them participate.

From the very beginning of their participation in the infant education program the youngsters have been tested as well as taught. At given intervals a number of experimental measures of learning and performance—in language development and motor skills, among other areas—have been applied and standardized tests of intelligence and intellectual development administered.

DIFFERENCES IN PERFORMANCES

Starting when they were 18 months old and continuing at six-week intervals thereafter, the children have been given a series of language performance tests, including both "free speech samples" (recordings of their conversations made at random intervals) and formal language tests. Over a period of three years, striking differences have developed in the performances of children in the experimental group and those in the control group. When the children in the experimental group reached 19 to 25 months of age, their vocabulary production began to accelerate rapidly. For those in the control group, vocabulary production did not begin in any instance until the child was 28 months old, and a number of the control group children still could not speak at that age.

An interesting phenomenon the University of Wisconsin team observed was that at approximately 28 months the children in the experimental group seemed to reach a vocabulary plateau lasting for one to two months. At that stage, as the children began to concentrate on grammatical structure, they produced fewer new words. Three or four months later, however, the children in the active program were able to express themselves in full sentences, some relatively complex, while most of the children in the control group were for the most part still producing unconnected words.

The children in the active stimulation program advanced rapidly not only in expression but in comprehension as well. A test given first at 36 months and thereafter at

three-month intervals measured the children's comprehension of 16 different grammatical features or rules of the English language. At every point, the children in the experimental group showed significantly superior performance.

Indeed, on a whole range of tests—from simple matching and sorting to comprehension and motor skills to tests of intellectual development and intelligence quotient—the children who have been exposed since infancy to the daily routine of mental stimulation have shown remarkable development in contrast with the children in the control group. This holds true even when the performance of the experimental group is measured against the norms established by age peers generally.

Naturally it was hoped and expected that the concentrated, carefully constructed program of stimulation of which one group of children was to be exposed would result in some noticeable differences. But the original specific goal was to test ways of preventing decline in intellectual development in children for whom such decline was predictable on a variety of grounds. What was not anticipated by Heber and his colleagues was the marked acceleration in a range of intellectual skills that has in fact occurred over the last four years on the part of the children in the experimental program.

Those differences are dramatized in the finding that a 42 months of age, the children in the active stimulation program, measured an average of 33 I.Q. points higher than the children in the control group, with some of them registering I.Q.'s as high as 135. Equally remarkable, the children in the experimental program are learning at a rate that is in excess of the norm for their age peers generally.

The results of four years of effort and analysis that have gone into the Milwaukee Project obviously are extremely promising. The professional educators, social scientists, and teachers involved are nevertheless cautious in their interpretation of those results. For one thing, they want to collect and analyze data on the children participating in the project for another two years or more.

Further, the children have doubtless become "test wise," and the project team would like more time to assess the possible effect of this kind of sophistication. Nevertheless, the children in the control group have been tested as often as those in the experimental program, and so the difference in their performances obviously results from differences in their educational environment.

Whatever their caution, members of the University of Wisconsin group do say that, as far as they know, the intellectual stimulation and training given the children in the Milwaukee Project have been more comprehensive and intensive than that to which any comparable groups of infants have ever been exposed. In the course of their efforts, members of the team have developed particular techniques—especially in the area of verbal skill development and reading comprehension—that seem to have affected the progress of the children, though team members are reluctant to suggest that those techniques and approaches are unique or even completely novel. They are, in any case, planning a series of instructional materials based on their research and teaching experience in infant education.

Despite the scientific caution and personal modesty of the Wisconsin group, their excitement at the possibilities they have developed shows through.

"We have seen a capacity for learning on the part of extremely young children that previously I would not have believed possible," says Heber. "While the results are by no means fully conclusive and must continue to be tested, the least that I am willing to say is that it is difficult to conceive of the

children in the experimental program ever falling back to the level of their age peers in the lagging control group."

In any case, the trend of the data being developed in the Milwaukee Project engenders real hope that mental retardation of the kind that occurs in children whose parents are poor and of poor ability can be prevented. If the effort is begun early and remains constant in the early years, even very serious kinds of mental and intellectual disadvantage can possibly be forestalled.

ENDORSEMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently the Day Care and Child Development Council of America met in Washington and reviewed pending legislation in the area of developmental day care.

I am delighted to learn that they endorsed the day care provisions in S. 2007—which reflect the major provisions in S. 1512, the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971, which I introduced with the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), and 29 cosponsors early this year.

In order that the views of this organization of persons experienced in early childhood efforts be available to all of us considering legislation in this field, I ask unanimous consent that the complete statement of the Day Care and Child Development Council of America be printed in the RECORD.

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

COUNCIL ACTS ON PENDING LEGISLATION

Attached is a statement of the Day Care and Child Development Council of America Executive Committee on pending legislation.

The Child Development Title of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971 (S. 2007, formerly the Mondale Bill) may reach the Senate floor the week beginning August 2. Two areas of the bill may be vulnerable to amendment.

(a) *Prime Sponsor Eligibility.* In the bill reported out of Committee, preference for funding goes to localities or combinations of localities if they have the capacities to (1) spend on administrative overhead no more than 5 percent of their allotment and (2) arrange linkages with appropriate health, education, and social service programs.

An attempt is expected to substitute a population requirement for prime sponsorship such that the state's role would be enhanced and expanded.

(b) *Income Eligibility.* The bill now provides for free child care services for families with incomes below the Bureau of Labor Statistics lower living standard for an urban family of four—now \$6,900.

The Administration reportedly favors a cut-off at the present income figure—\$3,900. The \$6,900 has been praised as a significant step toward universal child care!

The Council supports the provisions of S. 2007. Key differences between S. 2007 and H.R. 6748, sponsored in the House of Representatives by Rep. Brademas and others, now are:

1. *Prime Sponsorship.* S. 2007 described above.

H.R. 6748 designates cities of 100,000 or more population and states as being in line for prime sponsorship.

2. *Authorization.* H.R. 6748 calls for "such sums as may be necessary." The Administra-

tion wishes no new sums. S. 2007 provides for \$2 billion in the first operational year. DCC-DCA sees the \$2 billion as inadequate.

3. *Head Start Sponsor Protection.* Within the structure of the present H.R. 6748, no Head Start program sponsors should be terminated without a recommendation from Local Policy Councils and a hearing before the Child Development Council.

4. *Project Policy Committees.* Absent from H.R. 6748 is a provision for Project Policy Committees with approval responsibility over basic goals, policies and procedures for the project applicant, including policies with respect to planning, personnel, budgeting, location of centers and facilities, and evaluation of projects.

Both Houses of Congress will probably be in session through August 6. Some decisions regarding the above may be made before then.

TOWARD UNIVERSAL CHILD CARE: A POSITION ON CURRENT LEGISLATIVE OPTIONS

(Adopted by the Executive Committee of the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., July 26, 1971)

The Executive Committee of the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., following a two day conference of concerned day care participants which explored all aspects of pending day care legislation (S. 2007, H.R. 6748, S. 2003, H.R. 1) and the delivery mechanisms included in each, has chosen the bill sponsored by Senator Mondale as that representing the package that comes closest to the DCCDCA Statement of Principles. The Council had previously been on record in opposition to some central points of H.R. 1 (Welfare Reform) and S. 2003 (Long Bill) as they appeared in earlier versions.

BILL REFLECTS "STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES"

The Council believes that S. 2007, now incorporated as part of the Economic Opportunity Act extension, lays the framework for a coordinated network of child care and development service which—

Are available to children of all ages from conception through youth, to families from every kind of economic and social background and to every community with priority to those whose need is greatest;

Are available through a wide variety of different types of programs and during all of the hours of the day and time of the year that children, families and communities need them;

Have the full range of components required to promote the intellectual, emotional, social and physical growth of the children they serve;

Insure parents a decisive policy role in the planning, operation and evaluation of programs which determine the environment in which their children live;

Place the major responsibility for planning and operating child care and development services at the local level;

Reflect and build on the culture and language of children, families and communities being served and enhance the distinctive features of the child's culture.

PROGRAMS WILL BE DEVELOPMENTAL

Under the mandates of this bill, child care programs must be developmental. They must include a broad range of educational, health, social service, and nutritional elements.

FRAMEWORK LAID FOR UNIVERSAL SERVICES; PRIORITY GIVEN THOSE WITH GREATEST NEED; INCOME ELIGIBILITY IS ACCEPTABLE

The bill lays the framework for universally available services. Priority attention is guaranteed for the economically disadvantaged, migrants, handicapped, Indians, and minority group children, and provision is mandated for bilingual programs. We are particularly impressed with the increase in income eligi-

bility for services without parental fees to families earning up to \$6900. This will enhance the prospects of achieving class integration at the preschool level.

HEADSTART CONSTITUENCY IS SAFEGUARDED

Maintenance of priority, through earmarking of funds, for the present low-income constituency now served at an inadequate level of funding by Headstart, is a vital safeguard. We expect that the strong decision-making representation at the Prime Sponsor level by Headstart representatives will ensure the maximum opportunity for expanding quality developmental programs for low-income children and families.

OTHER POSITIONS APPROVED

The bill also creates demonstration Child Advocacy Programs, authorizing child care facility construction grants, and programs for federal employees.

COUNCIL QUALIFIES ENDORSEMENT

While recognizing the lateness of the hour in terms of prospects of changing the bill's language, the Council qualified its endorsements in several respects. First, it adopted a preference for separating eligibility determination from fees to be charged families with incomes above \$6900.

FEE/ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION NEEDS SEPARATION

The Executive Committee determined that for the purpose of defining eligibility, income gained due to child care availability should be disregarded. This would benefit the two-parent working low-income family and the single parent. But if fees are necessary, they should be charged in accord with total family income, less adjustments.

PARENT-CONSUMER PARTICIPATION NEEDS STRENGTHENING

The Executive Committee considered carefully the elements of the bill creating a structure that blended the sometimes diverse needs of governmental units and program consumers. Possible inter-relationships meshing the interests of the two groupings had been the subject of great concern at the conference preceding the Council's deliberations. While less than fully positive about all the components of the delivery system mechanism in any of the existing legislation proposals, the Council qualified its endorsement of the Mondale bill by adopting the conference recommendation of a 60% minimum parental-consumer participation on all child care boards and councils.

AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS NEED TO BE INCREASED

Another qualified endorsement was sounded in the realism of finances. Mondale authorizes \$100 million in fiscal 1972 for planning and technical assistance, and \$2 billion in fiscal 1973 for program operation. This figure falls far short of the sum needed to provide child care services universally as a public, social utility on par with other essential services such as police, fire, and public education. And the Council is less than confident that the authorization figure will materialize unscathed from budgetary ax-wielders. Our membership and constituents should remember that the intention is to increase resource allocation to child care at an increasing rate until the needs of all children in the United States are realized.

COUNCIL MAKES OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Council discussed the importance of providing opportunities for maximum local control of programs financed under the Mondale bill. The Council recognized some benefits of standardizing social service delivery regions. The arguments for requiring Prime Sponsor territorial conformity with regions within states formed in accord with the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 were considered. The merits of encouraging prime sponsorship by localities were found to

outweigh the disadvantages with respect to overlapping or contradictory coverage areas which are defined for the delivery of some complementary social services.

However, the Council urged that the administering agency should take into account regions established within states under the ICA of 1968 as long as the size of the prime sponsorship area is not thereby in anyway restricted.

As a step toward organizational consolidation and avoidance of duplication, the Council recommends that administrative guidelines be developed by the Office of Child Development, the federal agency designated to administer the Act's implementation, which would encourage Prime Sponsors to designate 4-C Councils as Child Development Councils.

This is in recognition of the labors of dedicated citizens representing private and public agencies, consumers, government, and private individuals who, out of a concern for the welfare of children and in the interest of program coordination, have formed Community Coordinated Child Care groups. The Council views the establishment of a separate Child Development Council at duplicative and therefore unnecessary in those instances where, with minor structural revisions, existing 4-C groups could comply with the composition for CDCs specified in the bill.

COUNCIL THANKS CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

The Executive Committee expressed its heartiest compliments and appreciations to the Conference participants who labored conscientiously to consider the major issues and emerged with a broad consensus. The Executive Committee adopted, in addition to the items mentioned above, Conference Recommendations for:

Creation of a single structure for child care services at state, regional and other levels.

Provisions, legislative and administrative, to make maximum use of funds available through various child care acts which result in community programs for all children, eliminating the segregation of children by category into separate programs. Thus the Council endorses the continuation of existing categorical programs which can be used to accomplish this objective, and seeks to protect the funding priorities already achieved for high priority categories of children.

Maintenance of open-ended appropriations under title IV-A of the Social Security Act.

A definition of "parents" in the context of parent board membership eligibility which includes (a) those needing and eligible for a variety of publicly funded child care services, (b) parents presently using child care services, and (c) alumni who have used child care services and have been selected by parents to represent them.

All legislation should include funds earmarked for parental and community participation at the disposition of parents for public and parent education, which may include transportation, conferences, and information dissemination.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a sage commentary on our distinguished Vice President by Joseph McCaffrey.

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

COMMENTARY OF JOSEPH MCCAFFREY

(As Broadcast Over WMAL-TV (7), Washington, D.C. on 11, P.M. July 26, 1971)

Spiro Agnew must get a lot of laughs out of his job. And he'll get more if his staff here

at home saves some of the clippings from the last few weeks while he has been roaming the world.

The funniest one talks about the quote Drop Agnew move is picking up tempo unquote, and then it says "Invariably these three names appear on what is beginning to look like a priority list of possible alternatives to Mr. Agnew".

Just where these names appear, other than in this story, and who is responsible for making up this priority list remains locked forever within the reporter who wrote the story, and possibly will always remain locked there because who really cares where such nonsense came from?

The three names on the alleged priority list are, hold your breath, Governor Rockefeller of New York, Presidential Advisor Donald Rumsfeld, not exactly a "household" name, and the Republican National Chairman, Senator Robert Dole of Kansas.

The article goes down hill from there. But it surely should be on the top of the stack on Mr. Agnew's desk to greet him on his return.

Where does all this "drop Agnew" talk come from, other than dreamy reporters?

Or a better question: what case can be made for dropping Agnew?

In the face of a conservative Republican Administration making friends with the greatest hate of the conservatives, Red China, why would Richard Nixon compound his problem by dropping the conservative Spiro Agnew?

Those who have always pleaded for a more intelligent China policy have been, in the main, liberals who would not vote for Richard Nixon. The latest move isn't going to win them over, nor would dropping Agnew bring them around.

Vice President Agnew has, like him or not, developed a constituency of his own. It is the same constituency which regrets and, in some cases opposes, the overtures to Red China. Its love for Spiro would bring it out to vote for the Nixon-Agnew ticket again. Dropping Spiro would mean these people would stay home or opt for George Wallace.

And dropping Spiro wouldn't bring a ticket headed by Mr. Nixon any new voting power.

DR. ROGER ADAMS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, Dr. Roger Adams, a leader in the field of organic chemistry, died on July 6, 1971, in Champaign, Ill., at the age of 82. A resident of Illinois for 65 years, Dr. Adams had headed the chemistry department at the University of Illinois for 28 years until his retirement in 1957. He also served on the National Science Board from 1954-60. Dr. Adams was the recipient of the National Medal of Science in 1965 awarded by President Johnson for his work "as the one recognized leader" in organic chemistry for many years.

I ask unanimous consent that the biography of the distinguished chemist from Illinois, Dr. Roger Adams, be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

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

Dr. Roger Adams, who headed the chemistry department of the University of Illinois for 28 years until his retirement in 1957, died on July 6 in Champaign, Illinois. He was 82 years of age.

As one of the world's leading organic chemists, Dr. Adams consistently brought distinction to the University and the state of Illinois. A native of Massachusetts, Dr.

tent and experienced in the traditional methods of land identification and registration, but unfamiliar with the new practices, e.g. the use of aerial photography, required to complete Land-to-the-Tiller in the projected time frame. During the first several months of implementation however, many officials in the DGLA exhibited a remarkable adaptive capacity to the new methods and procedures.

The sheer volume of transfers involved requires not only new methods, but also a decentralization of responsibility. This has already been achieved to a large degree, and represents an outstanding achievement given the short period of operation. Instead of relying entirely on provincial land service employees as in previous programs, the GVN has recruited and trained one Village Land Registrar in each village who with the Village Agriculture and Land Reform Commissioner, has responsibility for taking applications, identifying the land, and maintaining the land register.

Some of the specific tasks with which the U.S. is assisting the Vietnamese Government are: developing training programs for Province personnel and officials in nearly 2,000 villages on the meaning of the new legislation and its detailed administration; developing and disseminating publicity about the program to the rural population; developing and improving procedures to handle the huge flow of applications; producing aerial photography for land identification; and using automated data processing for issuing new titles, updating land registers and compensating landlords.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

Although the Land-to-the-Tiller was designed as a political program and its primary impact will be political, there will nevertheless be positive economic benefits. The new landowners will have for possible investment purposes the income from the 25 to 35% of the crops which they previously paid to the landlords in rent. Because of their new tenure security they will also have a greater incentive to make long run improvements in the land. Some people have expressed concern that by fragmenting land holdings, the Land-to-the-Tiller law will prevent future agricultural development. It is important to recognize that no fragmentation of cultivation patterns is involved; titles are issued to present tenants or squatters against current cultivation patterns. The resulting widespread ownership pattern will perhaps make more difficult the consolidation of holdings and the development of large scale production, and properly so, because now the farmers will have to agree voluntarily to any absorption of their fields into larger farms. Thus Vietnam will avoid the illusory development which occurs when farms are consolidated and the previous tenants or farm laborers migrate to overcrowded cities without the job market to absorb them in useful labor. It is important to remember that small farms are not inconsistent with agricultural development. While the large farms in the United States, Canada, Australia and elsewhere produce the highest output per man, it is countries like Taiwan and Japan, with small farms, which have the world's highest agricultural output per hectare. Since land is scarcer than labor in Vietnam, it is the latter pattern that Vietnam will emulate, at least for the foreseeable future.

MONTAGNARD HAMLET IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM

A companion program to Land-to-the-Tiller is the Montagnard Hamlet Identification Program. A primary cause of Montagnard alienation from previous Vietnamese Governments has been encroachment upon lands traditionally held by Montagnards. The ethnic minority tribal people, numbering approximately 850,000, cultivate roughly 360,000 hectares of land in the Highlands of Central Vietnam.

The promulgation of Decree 138, November 9, 1970, establishes the legal basis for hamlet identification. Hamlet boundaries will be drawn to encompass both privately owned and communally used land which exists within the general hamlet confines. Identifying traditional hamlet landholdings is of the greatest importance in removing the danger of recurring land conflicts in the Highlands. The Ministry of Land Reform and Agriculture now considers this the priority program in the Highlands. At the heart of the hamlet identification program will be the delineation of each Montagnard hamlet's "living area". This living area will be held strictly for Montagnard use and control.

USAID/ADLR is working closely with the Directorate General of Land Affairs and the Ministry for Development of Ethnic Minorities in the preparation of an Implementation Circular which will clarify all points of Decree 138. Also being prepared is a work plan which will outline the role of the central government, the Province, Village and Hamlet in completing procedures for hamlet identification. For 1971, it is expected that 600 hamlets will be identified and "living area" boundaries drawn.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT IN MINNEAPOLIS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last weekend I had the opportunity to participate in a series of events celebrating the opening of the Northside Child Development Center in Minneapolis.

This child development program, sponsored by Control Data Corp., the Dayton-Hudson Corp., and the Federal Reserve Bank, with financial support from the Federal Government, represents an extremely promising initiative in the field of development day care. It is symbolic of the encouraging day care initiatives in the Minneapolis area under the creative leadership of the Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association.

An editorial published recently in the Minneapolis Tribune summarizes well the significance of the new center and the entire movement for developmental day care in Minneapolis. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Sept. 14, 1971]

CHILD-CARE CENTER FOR NORTH SIDE

The need for a vast expansion of day-care services in the United States becomes increasingly urgent. More and more mothers of small children are going to work, by choice or economic necessity or both. It has become national policy to encourage mothers on welfare to seek employment, if at all practical in their family circumstances. Existing licensed day-care facilities in the country can accommodate only 640,000 children, although about 4.6 million women with children under six years old now work, and many more would like to work. Employable women often cannot leave home for jobs; employers are unable to hire qualified women who cannot make provision for their children, and many children of working women are not properly cared for during the day. Meanwhile, families that might get along with little or no public welfare support are completely dependent.

Such problems are as familiar in Hennepin County as elsewhere, but progress in the last year has been encouraging. The Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association has been leading the movement to get new centers orga-

nized and functioning. The most significant achievement thus far is the new North Side Child Development Center, established through the efforts of the association, Control Data Corp., Dayton's department stores and the Federal Reserve Bank. The three business firms provided the local share of funds, to be matched three-to-one with federal money, and children of their employees will use the center. The Hennepin County Welfare Department, though not involved financially (except in potential savings), is cooperating in the project.

The North Side center is expected to be a prototype because it is the first in the country to use the federal funds available with such a combination of industry-community-government sponsorship. It is designed to give much more than routine care; an educational program will be offered 120 children ranging from 6 months to 12 years old. The center was launched last weekend with the enthusiastic support of Sen. Walter Mondale, who sees it as an example of the kind of constructive program his child-development bill, just passed by the Senate, aims to establish.

The organizations, business firms and residents involved in the planning and operation of the new center for children deserve goals, they will show the way for many congratulation. If they accomplish their more such centers.

ARE THE FARMERS' VOICES HEARD?

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, as America becomes a more urban nation, national programs enacted by the Congress in areas such as highway safety, water pollution control, and environmental protection are increasingly being felt by our agricultural community. This is as it should be. Many of these programs extend the same kinds of protection afforded to residents of urban areas to those who comprise the agricultural sector of our economy, and who often reside in nonurbanized parts of our country. This continues the national trend toward erasing past differences between urban and industrial America and rural agricultural America.

But any of our national programs have been developed in response to needs experienced first, or in their most aggravated forms, in urban and suburban America. One result of this has been that the impact of these programs in the agricultural community have not always received the careful attention it deserved.

Developments in a number of areas over the past several months demonstrate that the special problems of agriculture are being examined more carefully in the adoption of national programs by the Congress and in their implementation by executive branch agencies.

In the August 25 issue of Hoard's Dairyman, Mr. Lynn Stalbaum, the Washington representative of the Associated Dairymen, reflects on several of these developments and the increasing progress being made by the legislative and executive branches of Government in adopting and carrying out our national program with increased awareness of their significance for agriculture.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Stalbaum's article to the attention of the Senate for the important, and hopeful, lessons it contains. I ask unanimous con-

LAND-TO-THE-TILLER PROGRAM

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, during the past 3 years, the Government of Vietnam—GVN—has increasingly recognized the importance of land reform. This recognition led to the revolutionary land-to-the-tiller law passed 1 year ago by the National Assembly in March 1970.

This program is one of the major developments in the troubled land of South Vietnam. Its success or failure will likely do much to influence the future stability of the Government of that country and may determine whether or not the tremendous sacrifice the United States has made in Southeast Asia will produce lasting results.

Recently, a land-to-the-tiller briefing paper came to my attention, and I read it with great interest. I believe other Members of the Senate will be interested and helped by this information. I ask unanimous consent that the paper be printed in the RECORD.

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

LAND-TO-THE-TILLER BRIEFING PAPER
GOAL

The GVN goal for the Land-to-the-Tiller program is to transfer one million hectares (2.5 million acres) in the three years of the program's operation. This represents nearly half of all paddy rice and secondary crop land in South Vietnam. Of the total, 200,000 hectares was the target for 1970. Prolonged legislative deliberation and the amount of time required for procedural planning delayed the start of widespread implementation until September 1970, although President Thieu distributed the first titles in August 1970. Progress accelerated rapidly thereafter and the goal of 200,000 hectares was officially exceeded during the six month period completed February 28, 1971, the end of the GVN's 1970 Pacification Year. The goals for 1971 and 1972 are 400,000 hectares in each year.

In more general terms, the goal is largely to eliminate farm tenancy, now estimated at 60 percent of all riceland area. Since complete tenancy statistics do not exist and since some abandoned land is expected to be cultivated and transferred with the continuation of improved security conditions, the precise extent of the program is not yet known. Assuming an average of one to two hectares (2.5 to 5 acres) to be distributed to each family, as many as one million families, or about six to seven million people in rural Vietnam, may be direct beneficiaries of the program. The economic effects of the program will thus be far reaching. The average farm family, which had been paying rental of 25-35 percent of production for use of the land, will have an additional 30-50 percent disposable income.

BACKGROUND

During the past three years, the Government of Vietnam has increasingly recognized the importance of land reform. This recognition led to the revolutionary Land-to-the-Tiller law passed one year ago by the National Assembly in March 1970. The first public statement of the new GVN interest in land reform was President Thieu's speech at Ba Tri in September 1968, in which he promised that no farmers in newly pacified areas would be evicted and that they would receive title to the land they were farming. This implicit recognition of prior Viet Cong land distribution and the initial formulation of the concept of Land-to-the-Tiller have since developed into a new and sweeping program of land reform.

THE FREEZE ON OCCUPANCY AND RENTS

In preparation for new land reform measures, the Government took two steps to freeze the tenure situation in the countryside. This was done to ensure that the present occupant of the land would be the beneficiary of reform. The first step was a Directive in February 1969 freezing occupancy and rents in newly pacified areas. This had the effect of recognizing changes in occupancy which had occurred during periods of Viet Cong control, and it thus removed one of the reasons for landless farmers' opposition to Government pacification. The second step was an April Directive extending the freeze nationwide.

THE LAW

In April 1969, the newly appointed Minister for Land Reform and Agriculture initiated a comprehensive review of the planning that had been done for a new land reform program. The result of this review and subsequent discussions was the Land-to-the-Tiller bill approved by the Cabinet and submitted to the Assembly by President Thieu in July. The Executive bill was passed by the Lower House in September 1969, in a greatly weakened form. The Senate Agriculture Committee then undertook a thorough review of the bill and restored almost all of the original provisions. Action on the bill was delayed by intervening events which took the full attention of the National Assembly, but the bill was finally passed by the Senate and approved by the Lower House. President Thieu declared a national holiday and signed the bill in a ceremony in the Delta on March 26, 1970. Key provisions of the law are:

No retention limit. Previous land reform legislation and many of the recent proposals for modification permit a landlord to keep some land for rental purposes in addition to what he farms himself. The Land-to-the-Tiller law allows for no retention of tenanted lands, except for specific limited categories such as ancestral worship lands and lands owned by religious institutions. However, landowners can retain up to 15 hectares if they are cultivating it directly or with wage labor.

No payment. In the previous land reform program of Ngo Dinh Diem, recipients of the land were required to pay the government purchase price. The Land-to-the-Tiller law provides for transfer free of charge to the applicant, with the landlord to be paid by the Government.

Recognition of present farmer. By providing that land will be transferred to the present cultivator, the law for the first time recognizes the rights of squatters and Viet Cong appointed farmers. The "freeze" of February 1969, prevents evictions carried out to evade the Land-to-the-Tiller principle.

Communal land. Lands owned or managed by the villages have not been involved in past transfers. The law provides for distribution of communal land and provides for payment to the village to compensate for loss of communal lands, and distribution of some revenues. However, separate implementation procedures remain to be worked out for communal lands in Central Vietnam will likely be delayed for some time yet.

Land valuation. The law specifies landlords will be compensated at a rate of 2.5 x the value of the average annual yield. An inter-ministerial committee has established paddy rice prices and five-year average yields for each province in the country. Based on these figures, the national average land price will be about VN\$120,000. Within a given province the paddy price to be used in the formula is fixed but the yield is to be determined on a local basis, with Province officials ensuring that the average yields of all villages do not exceed the known Province five-year average.

Payment terms. The law provides for 20% cash payment to the landlord with the re-

mainder to be paid in eight bonds redeemable annually over an eight-year period. Compensation is due from March 26, 1970 for cultivated riceland, but difficulties in designing a fair and equitable valuation schedule delayed the start of large volume payments. Landlords will thus receive 10% interest, in addition to the regular interest paid on the bonds, for the period from March 26, 1970 to the date of payment.

Worship land. Owners will be allowed to retain up to five hectares (12.5 acres) of tenanted land if it has previously been registered as worship land. Income from this land is used for ancestral veneration.

THE DECREE

The implementing decree for the Land-to-the-Tiller law was signed by the Prime Minister on June 5, 1970. The decree expands upon the law and provides the basic procedural framework for implementation. By declaring all land covered by the law to have been expropriated on the date of promulgation of the law, the decree terminated all rents on those lands from March 26, 1970.

COST

One of the key issues is the cost of the proposed program and the inflationary impact it will have. The U.S. Mission has urged the GVN to keep costs down by avoiding high initial cash payments to landlords and has offered dollar commodity support to help offset the inflationary impact of the program. At the time the bill was introduced an agreement was signed, subject to passage of the bill and initiation of land transfers, to provide \$10 million for U.S. commodities through the Commercial Import Program. To the extent that the piasters spent on Land-to-the-Tiller are transferred into demand for imports, this dollar support will counteract the inflationary impact of the increased money supply generated by compensation to the landlords. To date \$5 million of this amount has been released.

The total cost of the program to the GVN, based on present assumptions about land prices and area to be transferred, will be approximately VN\$190-200 billion including interest (US\$750 million equivalent). This will be spread over a period of years, but the inflationary impact will nevertheless be substantial. Therefore, additional U.S. dollar support is contemplated in amounts dependent on the pace of program implementation, the need for foreign exchange and the availability of funds voted by the Congress for support of the program. The U.S. Government in April 1971, obligated another \$15 million in addition to the initial \$10 million, and plans to obligate an additional \$15 million in fiscal year 1972 in specific agreements tied to progress in land transfer and compensation payments. Subsequent support throughout the life of the program will be considered as part of overall U.S. economic stabilization assistance.

U.S. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Although a village-level land reform program of the magnitude described could not and should not be implemented by Americans, there is a need for American technical assistance and support. The number of U.S. personnel, however, is relatively small. A USAID land reform advisory staff of 32 is currently employed, including 13 advisors assigned to the CORDS four regional headquarters. In addition, the program is supported by other CORDS personnel at the Provincial and District levels.

Implementation of the program is the direct responsibility of the GVN Directorate General of Land Affairs, which has a staff of approximately 1,000 people in the provinces and 400 in Saigon. About three-fourths of these are technicians, the remainder, administrative and clerical personnel. In general, the organization is technically compe-

tions of Government, such as police and fire protection; infringing on the rights of every law-abiding citizen or person in Washington, D.C., who attempted to carry out normal daily business.

The public and the public interest must be protected—and it was.

SENATOR BAYH TESTIFIES ON CHILD DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, at yesterday's joint hearings of the Subcommittee on Children and Youth and the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, which I was privileged to chair, the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana presented an extremely compelling and persuasive testimony on behalf of child development programs.

Senator BAYH, who introduced earlier this year, S. 530, the Universal Child Care and Child Development Act of 1971, and who is also one of the principal cosponsors of S. 1512, the child development legislation I introduced with Senator JAVITS and 30 other Senators, is truly one of the leading spokesmen in the Senate for the interest of children and their families.

We were honored to have him testify on this legislation and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of his statement be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

TESTIMONY BY SENATOR BIRCH BAYH BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEES ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AND EMPLOYMENT, MANPOWER AND POVERTY

I am pleased to be here today to testify on so vitally an important matter as the care and development of our nation's children. As a cosponsor of the bill before you, S. 1512, I have been pleased to note the continuing interest in child care of the kind we have come to think of as the real "minimum"—child care which must be comprehensive. I am also encouraged to note the frequent references in the Senate and in the House of Representatives to the next step for child care—making comprehensive services available to all who need or require them, making child care "universal."

Most American parents seem to realize that someday their children will pass judgment on the care, love and education they have been given. Why is it that America has not yet realized that the future will pass judgment on the care and love and education we give all our children? I do know that the work of these subcommittees and the work we do here today are helping to move us to a recognition of this need.

One of the things that strikes me is the common concern and agreement in most of the conversation and legislation about child care. The issues now are very different than they were two years ago, when S. 2060 was introduced by Sen. Mondale and others. At that time, there was still great disagreement about the need for the "ten essentials," all of which are included in S. 1512 and in great part included in S. 530, the Universal Child Care and Child Development Act of 1971 introduced by me on February 2 of this year. I was pleased to be joined in sponsorship of S. 530 by you, Mr. Chairman, and our distinguished colleague, Senator Hart. A companion bill, H.R. 5369, was introduced in the House by Congressman Helstoski on February

I would like to briefly comment on each of these ten essentials, not only from my vantage point as a cosponsor of S. 1512 but also from the point of view of S. 530. We should also be aware of the hearings taking place on H.R. 6748, introduced by my colleague, Mr. Brademas of Indiana, and others. The bill recently introduced by Representatives Abzug and Chisholm, H.R. 8402, also merits our serious attention. The Abzug-Chisholm bill represents a further step towards both comprehensive and universally-available child care than either S. 1512 or S. 530. Perhaps this is because Representative Abzug had the opportunity to hold hearings on child care needs in her District, and felt the sense of urgency, particularly on the part of women, for child care now. Perhaps the bill is as helpful as it is because it alone has the uniquely qualified contribution of Representative Chisholm, herself a former day care teacher, director and consultant. Representative Chisholm may well be the only member of either body to have had this preparation for dealing with child care.

First, let me comment briefly on the ten essentials, beginning with comprehensiveness. These bills provide for services that go beyond the mere caretaker approach, and provide that child care provided by this bill will be of the sort we think of when we think of Headstart. Those are services designed to meet the needs of children and families, that include educational, nutritional, social and health services. Those are services of high quality, and that meet the kind of requirements, such as the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, that make sure we do not unintentionally harm the children we wish to help.

Second, S. 1512 as well as S. 530, call for local flexibility, a feature shared by the bill you and I, Mr. Chairman, cosponsored earlier this year, and other proposals as well. Where local conditions and local people decide, the programs must work better. A 24-hour center makes sense in New York City, but probably doesn't make sense in rural Indiana.

Third, it is necessary to set priorities for the economically disadvantaged. While I do not believe that it is right or necessary to force mothers to take jobs in order to be eligible for child care, I think that enough of the funds should be reserved so that as many people as possible can use child care services to move toward being self-supporting. At the same time, all of us are aware of the budget constraints being felt—even by the "middle class"—as our economy continues to reel under the impact of this recession. Sheer necessity has forced many single parents and two-parent, low-income families to turn to day care for their preschool and school age children. In the bill, therefore, a significant portion of the funds are reserved for this sort of potentially disadvantaged family unit.

Fourth, the bills recognize that there are other children who, in fairness and from other kinds of needs, should have child care services, and that they should have an opportunity to be with children of other backgrounds. Where possible, these parents will pay fees on a sliding scale for services. In the process, we should avoid the establishment of a two-class child care system. If more parents had access to child care now, on a partially-subsidized basis, we'd have more high-quality, well-staffed child care services that were not limited to the affluent minority that can afford their full cost. If advantaged children require good services, how much more are they required for the disadvantaged? One way to encourage a high level, uniform quality of service is to make sure that there are no early childhood equivalents of the two-class social services that are all too common today.

Fifth, S. 1512 addresses itself to the particular needs of minority, Indian, migrant,

and bilingual children, and not just because these children are more often in poverty and more likely to require child care services. This focus is in response to the growing frustration with current, inadequately financed programs for these groups.

Sixth, local governments will participate in this program. In this regard, some of the language suggested by the Abzug-Chisholm bill may be instructive. They correctly point out that we have not taken sufficient notice of the need for child care services in small towns and in rural areas, and that merely by making it possible for States to operate programs, we are not sure the programs will be provided in the way local people desire. Small towns and farming areas are as capable of managing their own affairs—perhaps more so—as people who live in larger towns. Not only is there an unwillingness to recognize the needs and skills of those who live outside the large urban areas, there's a lack of familiarity with the already overloaded schedules of the States. Few State governments have the extra time to take on the management of another Federally-designed and funded program. States want to be involved, but that doesn't mean that they have to operate programs.

The seventh essential, involving parents, families and communities, is probably the most difficult issue to resolve. Since S. 1512 has been introduced as an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act, the approach for involving local people follows the "community action" pattern. In other child care legislation, slightly different approaches have been suggested. The Abzug-Chisholm approach is to utilize a two-thirds parent participation formula on the child development councils it would establish. The approach I recommend in S. 530 features a "child service district" concept that, as I predicted when introducing the bill, has turned out to be its most controversial element. Whatever road we take to real, full involvement at the local level by the children, the parents, and the community in decisions that affect them, it will be complex. I predict that this feature, this "essential," will continue to be a problem as we consider child care legislation. The fact that community control is the most controversial feature doesn't suggest we should in the least back away from community control—indeed, it may confirm that this is the very heart of a truly successful program.

The eighth essential, protecting current Headstart programs, involves more than protecting the funding. I believe that the reason we support Headstart so vigorously is that the program has features that make it a quality program, and that is why it is essential that in this and any other Federal legislation we be doubly aware of what can happen to these programs. By protecting Headstart in the way outlined in S. 1512, we are assured that our intentions will not be misinterpreted. We know that these are expensive programs, because they are quality programs. We also know that it is the shortage of funds, not the lack of public support, that has kept these programs so small. We are unwilling to trade an expansion in the numbers of opportunities for children, or "slots," for the quality of opportunities. We know that protecting Headstart involves protecting a full funding base for Headstart. We know that if the Administration talks of funding 1972 Headstart or other "quality, comprehensive programs," at the same per-child costs as it expended in 1967, they are threatening Headstart as surely as if they vetoed the entire program. It is the people who work with Headstart children that are essential; it is the number of adults, especially paraprofessionals, that are available that make Headstart unique. It is that 5 to 1 ratio for three and four year olds, and that 7 to 1 ratio for four to six year olds that has made Headstart different, and it is that ratio of adults

to children as much as funds that we are determined to protect. It is for this reason that S. 1512 speaks about "Federal Standards." We want to expand the numbers of children who are protected by Headstart-type standards. We don't want there to be any misunderstanding about good facilities, and for that reason we've included a provision for a new, uniform code for facilities in S. 1512. We've put it after standards because it is less important; Headstart wouldn't be the same if it featured ratios common in non-Headstart programs (15-1 child-adult ratios and higher are the rule). Overworked staff and neglected children don't fare very well, even in gleaming new child care warehouses.

Ninth, S. 1512 and the other bills agree on the need for training and technical assistance. Here, we mean a variety of help for all of those who need assistance in child care programs. That includes public officials, various professionals, para-professionals and non-professionals who must gradually develop what Mrs. Elizabeth Gilkeson of Bank Street College describes as "a new educational institution which begins at birth." That is what S. 1512 and the other child care legislation really is about: moving the nation toward a new, evolved educational institution that serves people better and begins earlier.

Tenth, S. 1512 calls for adequate funds. The precise amount of funds is not as important as the principle of sufficient funds to deliver quality programs. We must remember that the testimony of last year on S. 4101, the Federal Child Care Corporation of Sen. Long, put the cost for full-day child care services for preschoolers at more than \$2,200 per year. School age child care costs less; quality programs for very young children cost more. We are insisting that these dollar guidelines be observed, bearing in mind that programs will cost more than this in the largest cities and less in the lower-cost areas. The average will hold up, because comprehensive services are not cheap.

I believe that we should continue to keep our options open as more and more people are heard on child care. S. 1512 can profit from the suggestions of Representative Abzug, for instance, as she listed the major points of difference between her bill and that of Representative Brademas.

The Abzug-Chisholm bill provides:

1. Seed money grants to help community groups develop a program;
2. A career ladder structure for para-professionals;
3. Two-thirds parent representation on child development councils;
4. Sponsorship of programs by non-profit groups only;
5. 100% mortgage on estimated replacement cost of facilities;
6. An amendment prohibiting sex discrimination in the administration of the program.

I agree, and I sincerely hope that my colleagues in the Senate agree, with the intention of these six points, I trust, as work continues on developing child care legislation, that these points will be kept in mind with regard to S. 1512.

I would like to add one other voice, and one other final suggestion, before closing. The White House Youth Conference task force on poverty in its report on pre-school education, supports S. 1512. It calls for an increase in Headstart, commenting at the time on the fact that it only reaches 15% of poor pre-schoolers. The White House Conference report calls for an expanded day care program, which is comprehensive in nature and community controlled. Finally, and I think we ought to consider adding this suggestion to our deliberations on S. 1512 and other child care bills, it suggests that public kindergartens be financed by the Federal government and made a part of the public school system.

This recommendation deserves particular consideration in these times of financial crisis in the States and localities. The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that there will be roughly 3½ million 5-year olds ready for school next fall. If, as part of our considerations, we could move those children into the schools and provide them with comprehensive services, we would have gone the first step toward comprehensive, universally-available child care.

The White House Conference suggestion would also have financial implications for the States and localities. While I have many questions about what is usually described as revenue sharing and bloc grants, I have no objection to making kindergarten available to every American child. If estimating costs very conservatively, we save the States and localities \$500 per child, providing for Federal support of kindergartens could be the equivalent of \$1.75 billion in fiscal relief.

If we made those kindergarten programs comprehensive, full-day programs, the savings to the States and localities could easily reach \$3 billion.

I think we need to support good ideas, wherever we find them. I think we ought to incorporate the best from child care legislation introduced in the House of Representatives; I think we ought to encourage this Administration to support and spend the funds necessary to do something, and to do something now to make life better during those "first five years of life"—and beyond.

PROFESSIONAL GEOLOGISTS OFFER AID IN ENERGY CRISIS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, it was most timely that a group representing the American Association of Petroleum Geologists was in Washington this week emphasizing the need for a better understanding by Congress and the executive branch of the Nation's energy problems.

Representing the 15,000-member organization were William H. Curry, president for 1970-71, Casper, Wyo.; Dr. Sherman A. Wengerd, president-elect for 1971-72, professor of geology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; James E. Wilson, president-elect 1972-73, vice president, Shell Oil Co., Denver, Colo.; and James O. Lewis, Jr., president of the AAPG professional division, Houston, Tex.

Concerned with what they termed the "looming specter of dropping from an energy 'have' to a 'have less' nation," the group conferred with key Government officials in the White House and the Department of the Interior as well as Senate and House Members and committee staff people who are conducting or planning energy studies.

Curry said that without exception, from White House energy advisers to legislative leaders and staff members, they were greeted with great interest in having the professional explorationists' story heard.

Bill Curry told me:

We found extreme interest at being better informed on the skills and economic risks involved in the search for new reserves required by the U.S. to head off a dangerous shortage. It seemed to be almost beyond the comprehension of the people we conferred with in Washington that the U.S. could soon experience a real energy crisis.

Their visit to Washington was especially timely in view of the President's

message to Congress today on U.S. energy problems. The President's message emphasizes the necessity of more energy from domestic sources and especially from oil, gas, and coal which presently supply almost all of the Nation's massive energy demands.

Mr. President, this is the same message that Bill Curry and his colleagues brought to Washington. During his term as president of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, Bill Curry has made numerous speeches around the country in which he repeatedly pointed out the fact that the United States need not allow itself to become dependent on others for its energy.

Curry said no thinking professional geologist can absolutely promise complete and eternal self-sufficiency from new domestic reserves of oil and gas, but the fact remains that the incentives do not today exist the United States to give explorationists a real opportunity to fully develop conventional oil and gas production. He pointed to the 5 to 7 years required on the average from a decision to explore to the discovery and on-stream production.

Curry added that most petroleum geologists do believe that much more oil and gas remains to be discovered in the United States.

Mr. President, I have assembled excerpts from Bill Curry's speeches during the past year which, I believe, will offer all Senators the opportunity of more fully comprehending the energy problems of the Nation. These excerpts will, I believe, supplement the President's message to Congress on the energy problem and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS FROM AAPG PRESIDENT WILLIAM H. CURRY SPEECHES DURING 1970-71 TERM OF OFFICE

ON GEOLOGISTS

The American Association of Petroleum Geologists is the largest geological society in the world, comprised of 15,000 members in the United States and abroad. We are explorationists, primarily, dedicated to the advancement of geology, "especially as it relates to petroleum and natural gas" and to promoting "the technology of exploring for, finding, and producing these materials from the earth." Our long-range objective is "to be of maximum service to our members in their scientific interests and professional lives, and to enhance their status before the public."

We geologists would like to be of service to our country because we know whereof we speak in exploratory matters. We know the long lag time of three to five years from initiation of exploration to commercial production; the ten years of research that will be necessary to put oil shale and coal on stream; the long odds on discovery; that one just does not get new oil and gas by turning on a spigot; that we are credible people and speak for the good of the nation, and we believe that we can help.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

We worry about the future with its great demands for oil and gas and a declining trend of professional interest in the whose responsibility it is to explore for



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org