

NOTICE OF HEARINGS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in accordance with the requirements of section 111(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, I announce that the Subcommittee on Children and Youth will hold hearings on Monday, April 26 and Tuesday, April 27.

These hearings will examine the recommendations of the White House Conference on Children including the conference's recommendations concerning child development.

THE UNITED STATES AS A WORLD PEACE POWER

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, the President of the United States has made a step in the direction of world peace by easing a 22-year embargo on trade with Red China. It is a step in the direction of peace since it opens a communications channel that historically has brought greater understanding between nations of the world. Trade and visitor exchanges put nation-to-nation relations on a people-to-people basis. Events have shown that people can be a powerful influence upon the actions of any government.

The President's action deserves our support and the support of all Americans since it demonstrates our Nation's willingness to temper its role as a world military power and more substantively emphasize our role as a world peace power.

The President's cautious but significant steps toward improved relations with Peking are well timed.

He has made them following announcement of further U.S. troop withdrawals from South Vietnam.

He has made them at a time the strategic arms limitations talks are showing signs of progress.

He has made them after a plea for world peace through disarmament was issued by the Soviet Union's Communist Party.

He has made them after Premier Chou En-lai proclaimed in Peking that "a new page in relations" between the United States and Red China has been opened.

His timing is right. This Nation needs to take the initiative and give encouragement to further moves toward improved international communications and understanding.

Americans can see the futility of continuing to try to ignore the existence of one-fourth of the world's people who only 25 years ago were fast friends and trading partners. The Chinese were our allies in World War II and there is certain to yet remain a great reservoir of good will between the Chinese and American people. But that reservoir has been untapped since the Communist takeover of the China Mainland, because our system of withholding diplomatic recognition has made impossible even private attempts to maintain a bond between the two peoples.

Mr. President, such a recognition system makes little sense when evidence clearly shows our refusal to trade and communicate with the people of Red China has and is causing no change in

their system of government. The fact is that when a government emerges, whether we agree with its doctrine or not, whether we recognize it or not, that government still governs. More important, the people ruled by that government are still there. With them rests the power potential to change the government structure which rules them. It is not the policy of our Government to undertake to destroy another government on the basis that we do not agree with its doctrine. Since we have long accepted the reality of other governments it seems that the time has now come to also accept the practicality of other governments. It is time to stop dealing in absolutes in international relations by allowing the maximum communication and commerce between citizens of this Nation and citizens of other nations consistent with national security considerations.

Americans have become highly aware of the importance of effective, open communication among the varying segments of our own society, between the young and old, between blacks and whites, labor and management, Federal Government and local government. We have found out, in the last decade particularly, the turmoil that can result when individuals refuse to sit down and reason together. Nationally we have discovered that problems are not solved, and misunderstandings are not resolved when they are ignored. The time has come to make the same discovery internationally.

Mr. President, little has been accomplished by ignoring China. In fact little seems to ever be accomplished when our country cuts off all relations with any other country.

President Nixon has renewed national and international hope for greater understanding and reduced world tension by removing at least part of the needless obstacles standing between the United States and the people of China. The junior Senator from Oklahoma applauds his actions.

"FACE THE NATION"

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, as one Senator who has supported the President's actions in Vietnam, and I think I plan to do so in the future, I should like to comment briefly on my reaction to Representative McCloskey's appearance on "Face the Nation" yesterday.

As I watched the program, it appeared to me as if Representative McCloskey was saying only one thing; that was that villages in Laos are being bombed as a matter of deliberate policy, whether for military reasons or otherwise, and that the American public is not being told about it. He further alleged that he had endeavored to find out about it, that he had asked the Air Force for pictures or other evidence that villages still exist, and that no evidence has been forthcoming that they do. I did not sense that he attributed any ill motive to the President. In a number of occasions he indicated he thought the President might not be aware of what was happening to those villages as a result of American bombing action.

Without in any way commenting on the correctness or incorrectness of the

Congressman's charge, I wish to state that I regard PETE McCLOSKEY as one of my closest friends in Washington. He is a man of unquestioned integrity. Our country and the Republican Party would be better off with more men in Congress of PETE McCLOSKEY's stature and conviction.

QUORUM CALL

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). Is there further morning business?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senate will receive a message from the President of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 92-15, PART II)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. TUNNEY) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting to the Congress the budget for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971.

This budget presents the District government's plans and programs to meet the highest priority needs of the city. Consistent with the objectives of the Reorganization Plan #3 of 1967, this budget is the product of full, intensive deliberations by both the Mayor and the City Council.

My review of the proposed fiscal year 1972 District budget approved by the District of Columbia Council indicates that its appropriation requests do not provide for the full year costs of programs which have been approved by the Council for partial year funding in fiscal year 1971. These costs were included in the Mayor's budget proposals submitted to the City Council, but were eliminated during Council review.

Under the District budget approved by the Council, such important programs as implementation of the new court reform legislation and expansion of the Washington Technical Institute and Federal City College are not funded after June 30, 1971. Furthermore, the budget requests do not provide for the fiscal year 1972 costs of the pay raises granted during fiscal year 1971 and which are currently in effect.

In view of these omissions, the District budget approved by the City Council do

dependent East Bengal arising which will join hands with discontented elements favoring the secession of India's own West Bengal, including Calcutta. In these fears we glimpse the troubling prospect of an Indian-Chinese struggle for influence over any new government in East Pakistan.

In short, whether the People's Republic of China sides with the central Pakistan Government or with the East Bengalis, it is possible that the stage is now being set for a renewal of heightened tension, perhaps even hostilities, between China, India and Pakistan. Were this to happen, outside powers like the United States and the Soviet Union would find themselves increasingly under pressure to take sides in the form of economic aid, arms shipments, or even military action.

Working through the United Nations to halt arms shipments to either side and to place economic assistance funds temporarily in escrow holds out some hope that the fighting will end quickly before outside powers commit themselves too deeply. Making the fighting both more difficult and more expensive may encourage both sides to resume negotiations, taking into account the clear price of failure which now surrounds them. In his reply to President Podgorny of the Soviet Union, President Yahya Khan stated his intention to start talks with "rational representative elements in East Pakistan at the earliest opportunity." Now cannot be soon enough.

Hopefully, knowledge that the world is prepared to assist with the expense of reconstruction also will encourage reconciliation between fellow Pakistanis.

Some believe that simply halting our own arms deliveries would suffice. I disagree. For some time the central Pakistan Government has been drawing down its reserves to buy arms on a cash and carry basis. Thus in January 1971, Pakistan's reserves totalled only \$184 million whereas they totalled \$342 million a year before. United States cash sales for Pakistan and India are classified so we cannot know how much of this money was spent on United States arms. Pakistan units operating in East Bengal, however, are known to be using U.S., Soviet and Chinese arms.

We must underscore that West Pakistan's monthly imports average approximately \$70 million a month whereas her exports average only \$28 million. At the same time, the conflict in East Bengal, which involves massive logistical outlays, is reputedly costing as much as \$70 million a month. And so long as the war continues, Pakistan is deprived of the valuable exports of jute from East Pakistan, which traditionally account for about one-half of all Pakistani exports.

According to newspaper reports, a senior Pakistani finance official, Azi Ali Mohammed, is now in Washington to obtain four objectives:

To persuade the United States to speed up delivery of the uncommitted portion of the current fiscal year's 120 million in aid funds.

To obtain a moratorium from the World Bank on a forthcoming \$40 million repayment.

To receive a standby credit of \$175 million from the International Monetary Fund.

To convene a meeting of the Pakistan consortium, which includes the United States, Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Japan.

The timing of this visit could not make more clear the close relationship between the prosecution of this war and its further financing. A decision in present circumstances to continue economic assistance is nothing other than a decision to support those forces favoring the conflict's prolongation and to weaken those working for its peaceful resolution.

The events in East Pakistan constitute a civil war. For that reason I do not believe outside powers should take sides. My concern is that by granting aid outside powers do take sides. They, in effect, state that they wish to contribute to the war effort of the central Pakistan Government. Unfortunately, donor countries cannot avoid this dilemma by earmarking aid funds for specific purposes. Money of all commodities is supremely fungible. When foreigners earmark aid funds for one purpose, the receiving government is able to trim its own allocations in this area. Meanwhile, the war continues.

In East Pakistan our correspondents have been expelled. Our diplomats are reduced in number. No impartial outside official is able to observe conditions in East Pakistan freely. Reports, necessarily unconfirmed, each day descend on us of frightful slaughter, first by the army, then by the other side. We are thus in the worst of positions—bidden to obtain information, importuned to help. Under such circumstances the only reasonable course for ourselves and other nations is to adopt a neutral stance—to halt arms sales to both sides and to place all economic assistance funds in escrow.

A case can be made that any adjustments in our aid program should exclude food shipments which benefit the hungry East Bengalis already hard hit by the November 1970 cyclone. Unfortunately, the April 15 New York Times carries a despatch from East Pakistan which reports that the army of the central Pakistan Government is destroying food stocks in East Bengal in an effort to stamp out resistance. This is an issue which our Government should, and I know, will keep under constant review. But it makes no sense to continue to ship food to East Pakistan when the army is in the process of destroying it.

We must hope that in the end both sides in Pakistan will see reason and abandon the folly of violence. It is true that the central Pakistan Government can press ahead with a policy of suppression. But even if successful, suppression inevitably will leave a residue of communal hatred which will weaken Pakistan at every turning point in its national history. Suppression is a policy that may lead to temporary success, but could result in ultimate demise.

Those in resistance, on the other hand, may press ahead for the complete destruction of Pakistan as a nation and for final independence for East Bengal. These objectives will be purchased, however, at a fearful price in blood and devastation. Moreover, whereas Pakistan is now a major actor in the Sino-Indian drama, an independent East Pakistan may be no more than a pawn. The valuable role that Pakistan plays in world politics also would be lost.

Unless the alternative is permanent suppression, at some point there must be a renewal of negotiations. This is true whether the outcome is reconciliation or final independence. It is then that a respected Moslem statesman selected by the UN Secretary General for his wisdom and impartiality may be able to assist the two sides in talking to one another after weeks or months of bitter fighting.

Currently, the two sides may refuse to make use of the services of an impartial statesman. But this is no reason to delay his selection. He can be preparing for the moment when he will be needed.

One objection to the approach outlined may be concern that the UN is incapable of action. UN bodies could find themselves paralyzed as so often they have paralyzed on other international issues.

This possibility cannot be denied, but I believe it is incumbent on UN members as their first response to any world crisis to make an effort to mobilize international peacekeeping machinery. If there is any

chance that an international approach can be worked out, that chance should be seized. Nothing is lost and nations may always turn to unilateral adjustments in their policy after others have aborted an attempt to use UN machinery.

Pending UN treatment of the proposals advanced, the only policy appropriate and consistent for the United States will be informally to implement a total ban on arms deliveries to either side in Pakistan and a placement of all United States aid funds to Pakistan in escrow. Later, in the event common action through the United Nations proves impossible, the United States may make its policy formal, reviewing it in light of events at the time.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

SENATE RESOLUTION 73

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY) be added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 73, a resolution to amend Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. TUNNEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) be added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 73, a resolution to amend Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROTH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERCITY RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE AND HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 36

Mr. TAFT, on behalf of Mr. PEARSON, submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 88) authorizing additional appropriations to the Secretary of Transportation for the purpose of providing urgently needed intercity rail passenger service around the Nation and for the purpose of research and development in the field of high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes, which was received, ordered to be printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment—No. 36—was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID AND QUALITY INTEGRATED EDUCATION ACT OF 1971—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 45 AND 46

Mr. ERVIN submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1557) to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies in order to establish equal educational opportunities for all children, and for other purposes, which were received, ordered to be printed, and to lie on the table.

are virtually ignored and unrepresented. The facts are there for anyone to obtain and study. In grades 16 through 18, we are almost totally excluded in agency after agency. Here is a true national disgrace. We qualify to die for America and be mentioned in holiday speeches, but not to rise near the top by merit in our government's Civil Service.

In addition, the California State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights recently reported that:

Racism has been a major factor in denying the Mexican-American access to our political and governmental institutions in California today. The Committee found much evidence that the . . . administrations at all levels of government in California have chosen to accept this condition rather than mobilize our society to combat it. For many years, in spite of large and continually growing numbers in California, the Mexican-Americans have been conspicuously absent from governmental positions in this State. This has been true at all levels of government: municipal, county, state and federal (in those instances where Federal officials work within the boundaries of California).

If the facts are correctly reported in the following monograph, Federal Government Employment of the Mexican-American in California, which I shall submit for the RECORD, I clearly do not think we can allow this deplorable situation to continue.

According to this report, 12 of the 27 largest agencies employ no Mexican Americans in even minor, bureaucratic decisionmaking positions. None of the 27 have more than 3 percent in such positions, and some employ Mexican Americans in proportion to their availability in the work force. Statewide, Anglos are 20 times more likely than Mexican Americans to be in even a minor decision-making position.

Of the 293,770 full-time civilian Federal employees in California, only 5.6 percent—16,506—are Mexican American, as compared with 14.9 percent of the work force. This results in Mexican Americans being effectively precluded from middle-class Federal jobs or from jobs affecting the economic, employment, and housing problems of Chicanos. This *de facto* discrimination against Mexican Americans and their virtual exclusion from better-paying, policymaking positions has produced a form of Government apartheid.

With 70 percent of the agricultural work force in California being Mexican American, it is difficult to comprehend, for example, why none of the top 500 employees in the Department of Agriculture is Mexican American.

Nationwide, Federal Government civilian employment shows a similar underemployment pattern for all Spanish-surnamed persons. Of 2,571,504 full-time employees, only 74,449 are Spanish surnamed. Although Spanish-surnamed persons represent 7 percent of the Nation's population, they constitute only 2.9 percent of all employees. This 2.9-percent Spanish-surnamed figure has remained constant over the last decade.

The absence of any Mexican Americans at agencies such as the U.S. Information Agency—0 of 52—and the Federal Trade Commission—0 of 59—are reflected in the failure of the Information Agency to achieve credibility in Latin America and

the FTC to protect the rights of the Spanish-speaking consumer.

This ignominious record strains credulity in that Chicanos capable of leading combat missions should be capable of sufficient training to push papers.

Today I have written to Mr. Robert E. Hampton, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission. I have asked him whether he agrees with the findings of this report; and if he so agrees, what specific steps, and with what results, if any, have been undertaken.

The data necessary for this report was made available as a result of the assistance of my office in securing the information on Federal Government employment of Chicanos in 47 Federal agencies located in California.

In order that this matter can be brought to the attention of all, I ask unanimous consent that the monograph, prepared by Public Advocates, Inc., under the sponsorship of the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc., be printed in the RECORD.

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

MONOGRAPH

A. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY—DE FACTO DISCRIMINATION

The statistics in this monograph are from the official computer tapes of the United States Government, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C.

The individual agency statistics on federal government employment of the Mexican-American in California, published herein, have never been compiled before, much less published.

In the opinion of the organizations preparing this report, these statistics have been deliberately suppressed by the U.S. Civil Service Commission because they refute the President's possibly sincere, but definitely inadequate efforts to secure for the Chicano¹ in civilian employment the equal opportunities that presently exist in the military—that is, population parity and an equal opportunity for leadership.

In summary, these statistics show that:

I. Each of the 27 federal agencies employing 100 or more Californians is a *de facto* discriminator. None employ Mexican-Americans in proportion to their availability in the qualified work force.

II. Of the 293,770 full-time civilian federal employees in California, only 5.6% (16,506) are Mexican-American, as compared to 14.9% of the work force. (Discrimination factor of 170%)

III. If President Nixon issued an Executive Order (pursuant to his Article II Constitutional powers) to enforce population parity in federal civilian employment, 27,265 additional jobs would be created for Mexican-Americans in California and 105,556 additional jobs nationwide for members of the La Raza Community.

IV. The result of such an Executive Order would be to increase annual Mexican-American income by \$245 million dollars in California and the La Raza Community by \$950 million dollars nationwide.

V. This sum is greater than the annual amount of poverty funds expended for the La Raza Community.

VI. Mexican-Americans are effectively precluded from middle-class federal jobs or from jobs affecting the economic, employment and housing problems of their people. For example, twelve of the twenty-seven largest agencies have no Mexican-Americans in even

minor bureaucratic decision-making positions, none of the twenty-seven have more than 3% in such positions, and State-wide, Anglos are twenty times more likely than Mexican-Americans to be in even a minor decision-making position.

VII. This *de facto* discrimination against Mexican-Americans and their virtual exclusion from better-paying, policy-making positions has produced a form of Government Apartheid.

Civil Service Commission's false elitism

In large measure Government Apartheid has been caused by the false elitism championed by the Civil Service Commission, a flagrant under-employer of Spanish-surnamed persons. [2.3% of nationwide staff (119 of 5,288) are Spanish-surnamed; and, only 1 of its top 197 persons is Spanish-surnamed.] This elitism is exemplified by favoring academic proficiency over job performance and testing punctuation instead of aptitude.

Philadelphia Plan Executive order

Unless the nation is prepared to accept continued Government Apartheid in which Anglos determine the economic, employment, educational, housing and social fate of fourteen million "disenfranchised" Spanish-surnamed "subjects," drastic, immediate action is called for.

This monograph consequently recommends immediate Presidential action on a nationwide basis consistent with Vice President Agnew's call for Population Parity for the La Raza Community at all levels of federal civilian employment.² This "Philadelphia Plan" action can best be achieved by a specific Executive Order establishing specific employment goals and time-tables for population parity for all minorities.

As one Chicano veteran leader expressed it: "Chicanos have population parity in terms of military fatalities. The Government now has an obligation to end the inequity of our being first in war and last in peace."³

B. METHODOLOGY

All of the individual agency statistics are from the unpublished federal government computer tapes on file with the U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C. These statistics were secured for Public Advocates, Inc. and the Mexican-American Population Commission through the intercession of a U.S. Senator.

The significance and accuracy of the tapes is undisputed. Nevertheless, spot verifications have been made with federal government officers and at government offices during the month of September, 1971.

The statistics are as of November 30, 1970, for forty-seven (47) federal agencies and departments employing 293,770 full-time civilians in California.

C. CHICANOS SHORTCHANGED BY 27,000 JOBS AND \$245 MILLION ANNUALLY

Largest minority in nation

As of October, 1970, California's Mexican-American [Chicano] population was 2,980,000 or 14.9% of the State's population.⁴ Thus, Mexican-Americans in California constitute the largest minority in any state,⁵ as well as the largest Mexican-American population in any state.⁶

The federal government, unlike the State of California, refuses to keep separate statistics on Mexican-American employees. However, they do keep statistics on Spanish-surnamed employees. Generally, this results in an exaggerated count of Mexican-American employees, particularly at higher positions, due to the inclusion of Central and South Americans, and, often, incorrectly, Portuguese and Italian-Americans. It is estimated that the use of Spanish-surnamed employment statistics, in lieu of Mexican-American statistics, results in an exaggerated Mexican-American statistic of from 5 to 30%, de-

Footnotes at end of article.

M.D., Dir., Judge Baker Guidance Center, Harvard University; and Mrs. Alexander Ripley, Vice Pres., California Children's Lobby.

This advertisement sponsored by The Children's Lobby, Jule M. Sugarman, President, 112 East 19th St., New York, N.Y.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN,
Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF
YOUNG CHILDREN IN CONVENTION IN MINNEAPOLIS,
MINNESOTA, NOVEMBER 5, 1971

RESOLUTION NUMBER 2

Whereas the President of the United States of America has voiced his commitment to meeting the needs of all young children in this country and

Whereas President Nixon has admirably placed in the Office of Child Development the position of Child Advocacy and the responsibility for implementing the recommendations of the 1970 White House Conferences on Children and Youth and

Whereas the nationwide need for comprehensive child development services for many young children can be provided only through bold Federal legislation and appropriations.

Therefore, be it resolved by the National Association for the Education of Young Children in convention in Minneapolis, Minnesota this fifth day of November, 1971.

That the President of the United States put aside the differences between his administrative proposals and the Comprehensive Child Development amendments to the Economic Opportunity bills. Specifically

(1) that programs be established to serve children from all income levels based on ability to pay

(2) that the protection of Head Start and Follow Through be assured

(3) that communities of 5000 or more be assured of having the opportunity to go directly to the Federal government for funds

(4) comprehensive standards at least equal to those provided by the 1968 Federal Interagency Standards for Day Care be upheld.

That President Nixon take a vigorously supportive posture toward the passage of this bill with the above listed components and the allocation of appropriations

That he advise Secretary Richardson of his determination to immediately serve the needs of young children by this most constructive action.

VETERANS MUST STILL WAIT FOR
GOOD HOSPITAL CARE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, all of us remember the shocking conditions of neglect in our veterans' hospitals that were exposed in the spring of 1970. Congress acted immediately to correct the most serious problem of totally inadequate levels of professional staff and hospital workers, to assure patients the treatment and care they deserve. However, it now appears that Congress was mistaken in its assumption that the enactment of increased appropriations would necessarily result in an improved staff-patient ratio commensurate with the serious need in our veterans' hospitals.

In 1970 it was revealed that while community hospitals averaged 2.72 staff members per patient, there were only 1.5 staff members for each patient in Veterans' Administration hospitals. It is contended that this VA hospital ratio now stands at 1.8:1 nationwide.

However, what is at first glance an encouraging improvement, proves on closer

examination to result in large measure from statistical gamesmanship employed by the Office of Management and Budget. In fiscal 1971, VA hospitals operated at an average level of 84,500 inpatients per day. But for fiscal 1972, the OMB ordered the VA to reduce bed patients to an average level of 79,000 daily—meaning that almost 47,000 fewer hospital patients could be treated this fiscal year. That is one way to improve the staff-patient ratio, but a method that Congress has firmly refused to accept.

It is well recognized that the VA medical service serves as a major resource for medical education, training, and research, and that it has played a vital role in America's health care system, caring for over 7 million veterans last year through its network of 165 hospitals, 202 independent clinics, and 65 nursing homes. But it is also clearly evident that this extensive health care system has been critically underfunded and understaffed.

With the enactment of Public Law 92-78 this past summer, Congress tied a \$279.9 million increase in the original VA medical care budget for fiscal 1972 to a firm mandate that the VA maintain a minimum daily patient load of 85,500. In addition, the President has called upon the VA to take the lead in rehabilitating veterans returning from Vietnam with drug abuse and narcotics addiction problems—estimated by the VA Medical Director to have reached over 50,000.

But rather than permitting an offensive to be launched to meet these health care objectives on behalf of our veterans, the OMB has repeatedly ordered a retreat. Last year, Congress increased the VA's proposed budget with the intention that an additional \$105 million be used primarily to hire more staff. However, the OMB ordered the diversion of these additional funds to pay for equipment purchases, management costs, dental services, and certain salary increases.

To counter this directive, Congress rushed through an \$8 million supplemental appropriation, which enabled the VA to hire 8,600 new employees, including 802 physicians.

But just as this forward step toward improved medical care for our disabled veterans was being taken, the White House and the OMB called a halt. Refusing to release \$71 million of the funds appropriated by Congress for VA medical care in the current fiscal year, the OMB has prevented the VA from hiring over 11,000 more hospital personnel. And on August 15, the White House ordered a 5-percent employment reduction in the VA Department of Medicine and Surgery. This order has wiped out any significant personnel increases hoped for this year and has confronted the VA with an extensive morale problem among present hospital personnel.

But it is the patient in the VA hospital and the veteran waiting to be admitted for required treatment who have suffered from these administration actions. It is clear that, in general, our VA hospitals are making every effort to provide patients the treatment and care they need. But the odds are heavily stacked against these hospitals being able to substantially

improve and expand medical care to meet the extensive health problems of our older veterans and those returning from Vietnam.

There are over 15 million World War II veterans, among whom the need for quality medical care continues to increase. And the number of Vietnam-era veterans being discharged this year is expected to increase by 300,000 over the recent annual rate of 800,000. Ten of fifteen percent of all patients treated in VA hospitals are Vietnam-era veterans.

However, it is reported that two of every five veterans applying for admission to VA hospitals are being rejected. And the admission waiting list of veterans with non-service-connected health disabilities and illnesses has more than doubled since the beginning of 1971—from 2,861 to 7,176. It is estimated that this category of health problems accounts for 65 percent of the care the VA provides.

In the face of rising public concern over this denial of hospital inpatient treatment to our veterans, the Office of Management and Budget has recently permitted a partial release of VA medical care funds appropriated by Congress. It is claimed that this action will allow the VA to raise the hospital daily inpatient load to 85,500—the level mandated by Congress for the current fiscal year. However, the 4-month delay in releasing these funds will actually result in a daily patient level average over the full year of only 83,000. And it will mean that present VA hospital staffs, already overworked, will have to care for many more patients each day, because of the continued withholding by the OMB of funds appropriated for substantial increases in hospital personnel.

I firmly believe that America has an absolute obligation to provide the best possible medical care to those who have served our country and contributed to the national defense. Long-term veterans' medical care is as much a part of our defense costs as the short-term emergency care given on the battlefield.

I call upon the Office of Management and Budget to release all the funds that Congress has felt are so vital to achieving an effective medical delivery system for our veterans. It is unconscionable that this administration should seek to achieve fiscal savings at the expense of health care for those who have put their lives on the line for their country.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT OF THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, on October 23, 1971, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTANA) stated in his address before the Coalition Conference of Spanish-speaking Americans that—

Across America, our young men return from the Indochina adventure. All have given their share and more. What rewards and responses do they find? Minimal ones. Frustrating ones. Grudging ones. They were adequate for utilization as cannon fodder in Asia, but are rarely considered good enough to qualify for equal treatment back home. . . . In higher government pay-grades, we

(4) an assessment of the policies and structure of existing and proposed interstate planning and developments affecting such policy;

(5) a review of State, local, and private policies, plans, and programs relevant to such policy;

(6) current and foreseeable needs in the areas served by policies, plans, and programs designed to carry out such policy, and the steps being taken to meet such needs; and

(7) recommendations for programs and policies for carrying out such a policy, including such legislation and administrative actions as may be deemed necessary and desirable.

(b) The President may transmit from time to time to the Congress supplementary reports on urban growth which shall include such supplementary and revised recommendations as may be appropriate.

(c) To assist in the preparation of the Report on Urban Growth and any supplementary reports, the President may establish an advisory board, or seek the advice from time to time of temporary advisory boards, the members of whom shall be drawn from among private citizens familiar with the problems of urban growth and from among Federal officials, Governors of States, mayors, county officials, members of State and local legislative bodies, and others qualified to assist in the preparation of such reports.

APPENDIX B

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1970—PUBLIC LAW 91-524

To establish improved programs for the benefit of producers and consumers of dairy products, wool, wheat, feed grains, cotton, and other commodities, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Agricultural Act of 1970".

TITLE IX—RURAL DEVELOPMENT

COMMITMENT OF CONGRESS

SEC. 901. (a) The Congress commits itself to a sound balance between rural and urban America. The Congress considers this balance so essential to the peace, prosperity, and welfare of all our citizens that the highest priority must be given to the revitalization and development of rural areas.

LOCATION OF FEDERAL FACILITIES

(b) Congress hereby directs the heads of all executive departments and agencies of the Government to establish and maintain, insofar as practicable, departmental policies and procedures with respect to the location of new offices and other facilities in areas or communities of lower population density in preference to areas or communities of high population densities. The President is hereby requested to submit to the Congress not later than September 1 of each fiscal year a report reflecting the efforts during the immediately preceding fiscal year of all executive departments and agencies in carrying out the provisions of this section, citing the location of all new facilities, and including a statement covering the basic reasons for the selection of all new locations.

PLANNING ASSISTANCE

(c) The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Congress a joint progress report as to their efforts during the immediately preceding fiscal year to provide assistance to States planning for the development of rural multicounty areas not included in economically depressed areas under authority of the Housing and

Urban Development Act of 1968. The first such annual report shall be submitted not later than December 1, 1970, and shall cover the period beginning August 1, 1968, the date of enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, and ending June 30, 1970.

INFORMATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

(d) The Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Congress a report not later than September 1 of each fiscal year reflecting the efforts of the Department of Agriculture to provide information and technical assistance to small communities and less populated areas in regard to rural development during the immediately preceding fiscal year. The first such annual report shall be submitted not later than December 1, 1970, covering the period beginning July 1, 1969, and ending June 30, 1970. The Secretary shall include in such reports to what extent technical assistance has been provided through land-grant colleges and universities, through the Extension Service, and other programs of the Department of Agriculture.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

(e) The President shall submit to the Congress a report not later than September 1 of each fiscal year stating the availability of telephone, electrical, water, sewer, medical, educational, and other government or government assisted services to rural areas and outlining efforts of the executive branch to improve these services during the immediately preceding fiscal year. The President is requested to submit the first such annual report, covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, on or before December 1, 1970.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

(f) The President shall report to Congress on the possible utilization of the Farm Credit Administration and agencies in the Department of Agriculture to fulfill rural financial assistance requirements not filled by other agencies. The President is requested to submit the report requested by this section on or before July 1, 1971, together with such recommendations for legislation as he deems appropriate.

Approved November 30, 1970.

SUPPORT FOR COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently two very prestigious groups of individuals familiar with the needs of children and experienced in the field of child development expressed their overwhelming support for the comprehensive child development bill now in conference.

The National Association for the Education of Young Children at their recent convention in Minneapolis, Minn., adopted a resolution urging the President to support this proposal and seek adequate funding for it.

A number of leaders in education, health, day care, and civil rights signed a statement—which appeared as an advertisement in the Washington Post, sponsored by the Children's Lobby—urging Congress to finish work on the bill and the President to sign it.

Both groups called for legislation that will provide developmental day care opportunities, on a voluntary basis, with parental participation and eligibility for children from all income levels.

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

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

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 9, 1971]

MEMORANDUM

To: The President of the United States and the Congress

Subject: The Comprehensive Child Development Act *

FACTS

On February 19, 1969, President Nixon called for a "national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for a healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life."

On April 9, 1969, the President said, "I again pledge myself to that commitment."

This year, House and Senate action, with bipartisan leadership and support, passed Comprehensive Child Development Bills (S-2007 and H.R. 10351) and they are now in Conference Committee.

The differences between the two versions can be quickly reconciled.

The Comprehensive Child Development Act will result in one of the best investments the nation can make in its future.

It will provide a comprehensive program of educational, nutritional, and health care to those preschool children whose parents believe they need it.

It will allow a child's participation to be completely voluntary on the part of the parents.

It will give parents a real voice in the planning and operation of the programs.

It will offer quality day care service to the working women of America so that their families may have an adequate standard of living.

It will extend the enormous experience and success of the Head Start program.

It will deal with the problems of America's latch-key children.

It will reduce school failures.

It will build healthier children.

ACTION NEEDED

The Conference Committee must resolve the differences at today's meeting.

Both Houses must repass the bill.

The President must sign that bill.

We urge that the Comprehensive Child Development Act be passed to fulfill the President's pledge and the commitment by the Congress.

Robert Aldrich, M.D., Vice Pres., Health Affairs, University of Colorado; Joyce Black, Pres., New York City, Day Care Council; Arnta Boswell, Prof., Social Work, University of Chicago; Urie Bronfenbrenner, Prof., Human Development and Family Studies, Cornell University; Jerome Bruner, M.D., Director, Center for Cognitive Studies, Harvard University; Richardo Callejo, Attorney, Spanish Speaking, Sur-Named Political Assn., San Francisco; Eli E. Cohen, Exec. Sec., Natl. Committee on Employment of Youth; and Raymond Cohen, M.D., Past President, Texas Pediatric Society.

Manuel Diaz, Jr., Vice Pres., New York City, Urban Coalition; James Dumpson, Dean, School of Social Work, Fordham University; Marion Edelman, Washington Research Projects, Action Council; Donald Fink, M.D., Former Dir., American Academy of Pediatrics Consultation Service; Marcus Foster, Ph.D., Superintendent, Oakland Public Schools; Glenn Gibson, M.D., Pediatrician, Baton Rouge; Elinor C. Guggenheimer, Policy Council, National Political Women's Caucus; and Dorothy I. Height, Pres., Natl. Council of Negro Women.

Francis Keppel; Reginald Lourie, M.D., Pres. Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children; Sanford Matthews, M.D., Regional Pediatric Medical Coordinator, Atlanta; Joseph Monserrat, Member, Board of Education, New York City; John Niemeyer, Chairman, Day Care and Child Development Council of America; Josephine Nieves, Dir., Puerto Rican Studies, Brooklyn College; Julius Richmond,

³⁶ U.S. Congress. House. *Third Annual Report on National Housing Goals, Pursuant to the Provisions of Section 1603 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968*. 92d Cong., 1st Sess. House Document no. 92-136, June 29, 1971, p. 3.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

³⁸ U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Banking and Currency. *Papers Submitted to the Productions, Housing Demand, and De-Subcommittee on Housing Panels on Housing and The Urban Environment: Report and Recommendations of Three Study Panels*. 92d Cong. 1st Sess.

³⁹ U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Banking and Currency. *Investigation and Hearings of Abuse in Federal Low and Moderate Income Housing Programs: Staff Report and Recommendations*. 91st Cong., 2d Sess.

⁴⁰ U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Banking and Currency. *Hearing on HUD Investigation of Low and Moderate Income Housing Programs*. 92d Cong., 1st Sess. March 31, 1971.

⁴¹ HUD Report Upholds Banking and Currency Committee on Section 235 Housing Program. *Congressional Record*. 92d Cong., 1st Sess., September 13, 1971: H8361.

⁴² U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs. Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs. *Hearings on Withholding of Funds for Certain Housing and Urban Development Programs for the Remainder of Fiscal Year 1971*. 92d Cong., 1st Sess. March 3, 4, 1971, p. 1.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁴⁴ U.S. President (Nixon). *Message From the President of the United States Proposing a System of Special Revenue Sharing for Urban Community Development*. 92d Cong., 1st Sess. House Document no. 92-61, March 5, 1971.

⁴⁵ U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs. Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs. *Hearings on Proposed Housing and Urban Development Legislation for 1971*. 92d Cong., 1st Sess. August 2 and 3, 1971, p. 38.

⁴⁶ Resolutions of the 1971 Annual Meeting of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. *Congressional Record*, 92d Cong., 1st Sess.: S10397.

⁴⁷ U.S. Congress. Senate. Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs. *Hearings on Proposed Housing and Urban Development Legislation for 1971*. . . . *op. cit.*, p. 120.

⁴⁸ For the derivation of this bill (H.R. 9688), see above pp. 47-48.

⁴⁹ U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. *Department of Housing and Urban Development, Space, Science, Veterans and Certain Independent Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1972. Report to Accompany H.R. 9382*. 92d Cong., 1st Sess. House Report no. 92-305, June 23, 1971, pp. 2-3.

⁵⁰ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. *General Criteria for New Communities*. Subpart B, Sec. 32.6 *Federal Register*, xxxvi, no. 148, July 31, 1971: 14207-14209.

⁵¹ *New Communities: Vital Point of National Growth Policy*. HUD News, HUD no. 71-411, July 8, 1971: 2.

⁵² President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization. *Memoranda for the President of the United States. Establishment of a Department of Natural Resources: Organization for Social and Economic Programs*. Washington, May 12, 1970, p. 148.

⁵³ U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs. Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs. *Hearings on Land Use Planning, and Management Programs—S.J. Res. 52 and Title II, S. 1618*. 92d Cong., 1st Sess. July 12, 13, and 14, 1971, p. 48.

⁵⁴ Thomas, Nicholas P. *Revenue Sharing: What Will be Its Impact on Planning?* Part I. *AIP Newsletter*, v. 6, no. 6, June 1971: 6-10.

⁵⁵ U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Subcommittee on

the Environment. *Hearings on H.R. 7211 to Establish Public Land Use Policy; to Establish Guidelines for Its Administration, and for Other Purposes*. 92d Cong., 1st Sess. Serial no. 92-20, July 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30, 1971, p. 78.

⁵⁶ U.S. Congress. House. *Message From the President of the United States Relative to Revenue Sharing*. 92d Cong., 1st Sess. House Doc. 92-44, February 4, 1971, p. 5.

⁵⁷ U.S. Congress. Senate. Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs. *Hearings on S.J. Res. 52 and Title II, S. 1618, op. cit.*, pp. 43-44.

⁵⁸ Lilley, William, III. *White House Report: Community Development Proposal Will Test Nixon's Credibility and Power*. *National Journal*, v. 3, no. 41, October 9, 1971: 2030-2038.

⁵⁹ U.S. Executive Office of the President. Office of Management and Budget. *Restoring the Balance of Federalism: Second Annual Report to the President on the Federal Assistance Review*. Washington, June, 1971.

⁶⁰ U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Select Subcommittee on Labor. *Hearings on H.R. 17, H.R. 29, and H.R. 3613*. 92d Cong., 1st Sess. February 24, 25; March 2, 3, 4, and 17, 1971, p. 285.

⁶¹ "Guidelines of the U.S. Department of Labor for Developing Programs Under the Emergency Employment Act of 1971." *Manpower Information Service, Reference File*. Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., Washington, p. 91:1325.

⁶² Council on Environmental Quality. *Second Annual Report on Environmental Quality*. Washington, August, 1971.

⁶³ Commission on Population Growth and America's Future. *An Interim Report to the President and the Congress*. Washington, March 16, 1971, pp. 25-30.

APPENDIX A

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1970—PUBLIC LAW 91-609

To provide for the establishment of a national urban growth policy, to encourage and support the proper growth and development of our States, metropolitan areas, cities, counties, and towns with emphasis upon new community and inner city development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970".

TITLE VII—URBAN GROWTH AND NEW COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

PART A—DEVELOPMENT OF A NATIONAL URBAN GROWTH POLICY

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 702. (a) The Congress finds that the rapid growth of urban population and uneven expansion of urban development in the United States, together with a decline in farm population, slower growth in rural areas, and migration to the cities, has created an imbalance between the Nation's needs and resources and seriously threatens our physical environment, and that the economic and social development of the Nation, the proper conservation of our natural resources, and the achievement of satisfactory living standards depend upon the sound, orderly, and more balanced development of all areas of the Nation.

(b) The Congress further finds that Federal programs affect the location of population; economic growth, and the character of urban development; that such programs frequently conflict and result in undesirable and costly patterns of urban development which adversely affect the environment and wastefully use our natural resources; and that existing and future programs must be interrelated and coordinated within a system of

orderly development and established priorities consistent with a national urban growth policy.

(c) To promote the general welfare and properly apply the resources of the Federal Government in strengthening the economic and social health of all areas of the Nation and more adequately protect the physical environment and conserve natural resources, the Congress declares that the Federal Government, consistent with the responsibilities of State and local government and the private sector, must assume responsibility for the development of a national urban growth policy which shall incorporate social, economic, and other appropriate factors. Such policy shall serve as a guide in making specific decisions at the national level which affect the pattern of urban growth and shall provide a framework for development of interstate, State, and local growth and stabilization policy.

(d) The Congress further declares that the national urban growth policy should—

(1) favor patterns of urbanization and economic development and stabilization which offer a range of alternative locations and encourage the wise and balanced use of physical and human resources in metropolitan and urban regions as well as in smaller urban places which have a potential for accelerated growth;

(2) foster the continued economic strength of all parts of the United States, including central cities, suburbs, smaller communities, local neighborhoods, and rural areas;

(3) help reverse trends of migration and physical growth which reinforce disparities among States, regions, and cities;

(4) treat comprehensively the problems of poverty and employment (including the erosion of tax bases, and the need for better community services and job opportunities) which are associated with disorderly urbanization and rural decline;

(5) develop means to encourage good housing for all Americans without regard to race or creed;

(6) refine the role of the Federal Government in revitalizing existing communities and encouraging planned, large-scale urban and new community development;

(7) strengthen the capacity of general governmental institutions to contribute to balanced urban growth and stabilization; and

(8) facilitate increased coordination in the administration of Federal programs so as to encourage desirable patterns of urban growth and stabilization, the prudent use of natural resources, and the protection of the physical environment.

URBAN GROWTH REPORT

SEC. 703. (a) In order to assist in the development of a national urban growth policy, the President shall utilize the capacity of his office, adequately organized and staffed for the purpose, through an identified unit of the Domestic Council, and of the departments and agencies within the executive branch to collect, analyze, and evaluate such statistics, data, and other information (including demographic, economic, social, land use, environmental, and governmental information) as will enable him to transmit to the Congress, during the month of February in every even-numbered year beginning with 1972, a Report on Urban Growth for the preceding two calendar years which shall include—

(1) information and statistics describing characteristics of urban growth and stabilization and identifying significant trends and developments;

(2) a summary of significant problems facing the United States as a result of urban growth trends and developments;

(3) an evaluation of the progress and effectiveness of Federal efforts designed to meet such problems and to carry out the national urban growth policy;

tional sadists. There were soldiers performing their professional duties, and several loyal disciples who lingered despite their blasted hopes. Except for the faithful disciples, they hooted and hissed, and they jeered and glibed at the victim on the cross.

But the travelers on the road did not even stop. With callous indifference—so the story goes—"They that passed by reviled on him saying—'Save Thyself.'" Looking up at the man on the central cross, they hooted as they hiked, they jeered as they journeyed, they mocked as they walked.

Beholding the scene on the hillside, these travelers gave little attention to the two thieves who were getting their just desserts; but to the man on the central cross who had forgiven sinners, healed the sick and raised the dead and was now not able to save Himself. They sneered, "Save Thyself!"

Imagine what these cruel epithets must have done to a man stretched out in the torrid desert sun—with multiple hemorrhages, swollen arteries, throbbing veins and a burning and raging thirst. To a young man thus poised between life and death, do you not suppose there came the tempting appeal to exploit His supernatural powers?

To His subconscious mind—if indeed not His conscious mind—could there have been the thought—"I am yet a young man. I have done my duty in preaching and teaching and healing. Why not yield—extract the nails, destroy the mocking throng in a moment, come down from the cross, save myself?"

But this crowd knew not the true Jesus. There was a self in Jesus which did not have to be saved. But the self of integrity, honor and obedience to the whole will of God—that self had to be saved even though the physical self perished. When the crowd yelled, "Save Thyself," our Lord said inwardly, "I will save myself—the higher, holier self, the self committed to doing the full will of God."

And so it came to pass that this struggle was won on the cross because it had been won on earlier moral battlefields.

That is the clue to our Lord's life and so it must be the clue to all of our lives. It portrays a principle which has to be confronted by every man and woman and youth all along the way of life. No man can by his own acts achieve salvation. No man can save himself from his own sins. Salvation is the gracious gift of God. But in another sense—in his moral choices, in his daily decisions, in his judgments in a crisis—each one must choose which self is to be saved, the lower or the higher self.

That choice is no less great today two thousand years later than it was on a dark Friday; nor will it be two thousand years from now. The greatness of character, the quality of a human personality, is to be seen in the way this choice is made. Courage and character are developed by staying on the cross and going on in spite of fears. When hardship is encountered, when suffering is to be borne, when defeat overtakes one, when a cross looms on the distant horizon, there is always the tempting claim: "Save your skin. Take it easy. Don't get hurt. Save thyself." There is, however, another alternative: "To thine own self be true." And this is what I guess I would like to leave you with here today.

To find spiritual depth, man must look inward to discover three basic truths: Who he is, where he is and where he is going. If an individual cannot do this he becomes an actor playing a role for exterior effect, reacting almost solely to the response of his superiors and his peer. He uses and responds to traditional values not because he believes them, but because they are the proximate causation of exterior applause. Man must seek peace of mind and inner reserves of strength before he can commit himself to a higher cause or challenge.

And that higher cause or challenge, put quite simply, is in choosing which self is to

be saved. That choice is perhaps more difficult today than any time throughout the ages it has confronted man. For we are in trouble as a species and the future worries us as never before. Wherever we look we see the brooding threats of an unwise and unjust war, of domestic violence, of poverty, pollution and over-population.

We pass this way at a time when any one of these threats could severely damage us as a society. Taken together, they are sapping our very lifeblood—not just of America, but of mankind.

The obvious question is can we survive? We can, of course, and we shall. But I submit we must take a long and searching look inward. We must rekindle our traditional values at a time when their validity is being challenged as never before. What are these traditional values to which I speak today? There really is nothing complicated about them. They're as old as society, but they ring as true today as ever and they roll off the tongue just as readily. Compassion and understanding; tolerance and justice; faith and truth. And, yes, peace.

The temptation to forsake these values is with us always and no vocation is exempt from them. There are devices and designs to ignore them, to forget them, to discard them, yet still achieve a kind of success in life. Even a preacher may have one or two eloquent, emotionally elevating sermons or a politician one great moving speech for the show window. But what does it avail him if he casts these sparkling jewels before the world and then has nothing in the storehouse of his mind and soul, to sustain him and lift others through the years?

A man may know how to put together an acceptable message. But if he knows not how to lead, he may become as "sounding brass and tinkling cymbal." The "famous speaker" is sometimes only famous because he has neglected everything else but rhetoric and elocution and become merely a platform exhibitionist. A glamour boy of politics may appeal to the party hangers-on, but what does he do with the tough decisions that inevitably come his way? The eminent officeholder can become so exalted as to be unavailable, so busy with weighty concerns that he has only an audience come to behold a performance and not citizens crying for leadership and direction. There are ways to "save oneself"—to get attention and popularity, to survive by demagoguery and obfuscation.

There are times when each of us is called on to make choices. The easy road or the tough. Will you recoil from a difficult choice in bitterness and try to escape? Or will you welcome the trial of your faith?

John Kennedy in his book, "Profiles in Courage," selected from the rolls of the United States Senate men who were giants of their times; men who literally destroyed themselves by making decisions their consciences dictated but their constituency violently opposed. Three of these were Daniel Webster, Sam Houston, and Thomas Hart Benton. The issue was Henry Clay's compromise of 1850. Houston and Benton were southern-oriented, Webster from abolitionist Massachusetts. Each denounced the firebrands from their states. Each declared the Union must be preserved. Within two years each was out of office and soundly denounced in their respective states. They had not "saved themselves" but they had been true to themselves. Each died shortly thereafter, broken men without honor or respect in their day.

Walter Lippmann renders harsh judgment both on the politician and the electorate in a recent book. He says, "With exception so rare they are regarded as miracles of nature, successful politicians are insecure and intimidated men. They advance politically only as they placate, appease, bribe, seduce, bamboozle, or otherwise manage to manipulate the demanding, threatening elements in their constituencies."

"The decisive consideration is not whether the proposition is good but whether it is popular—not whether it will work well and prove itself, but whether the active-talking constituents like it immediately."

I am not willing to accept this judgment. I am convinced that the complications of business, public and private, daily obscure innumerable acts of private and political courage, large and small.

Each of us in our daily lives makes decisions that shape our lives, mold our character. All choices are not earth-shaking, momentous milestones. Most come on little mouse feet. We can slide into a great collective cop-out that ill prepares us for the big dramatic crisis, the supreme test that will mark our lives, perhaps end them.

And the supreme test does come to some. Come as it did to those four chaplains on the sinking transport "Dorchester" in the cruel winter waters of the North Atlantic during the war: Would they use their life belts to save themselves and return to their wives and families and their waiting churches; or would they give their life jackets to the troops? One by one they stripped themselves of their jackets and draped them about four fear stricken soldiers. Then they clasped hands and were last seen praying together on the slippery deck, as the Dorchester plunged to her frigid grave. They did not save themselves. But in their deed they preached more sermons, more eloquently than in multiplied lifetimes of pulpit expression.

The heart of our gospel is that you can never save yourself. You can only give yourself, and in giving, find life.

Whenever a choice must be made as to which self is to be saved, let us make it by the wisdom and in the power of our faith.

Nobility of character and inner worth comes not by avoiding the small, onerous daily challenges that test and train us but by accepting them and thereby strengthening our higher self.

There is no greater tragedy than that of a man risen to prominence who has no faith to fall back on. No inner strength to meet the challenges that inevitably come.

For centuries the lenten season has been the occasion for Christians to renew their faith. Faith in their religious belief and faith in themselves. In a way I suppose it is a selfish thing we do. Selfish because in such renewal our lives are enriched and our characters made more capable of grasping the magnitude and responsibility of Christian service. Service in a higher sense.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently the Washington Post published a perspective series of articles by Gayle Tunnell on early childhood development, followed by a thoughtful editorial entitled "Nobody in Charge."

This series, besides reviewing a number of day-care and child-development programs in the District of Columbia, also identified many of the major questions and issues confronting child-development efforts generally.

The series pointed out what a small percentage of preschool children—both poor and nonpoor—are participating in child-development programs like Headstart.

It revealed the fragmented and uncoordinated nature of child-development efforts in this country.

It described the marked variation in quality among different day-care and child-development programs.

It identified the differences between pure custodial care and quality developmental services.

WHERE MILITARY AEROSPACE CUTBACKS HAVE HIT HARDEST

	Contract awards (Millions of dollars)		Percent decline
	Fiscal 1968	Fiscal 1970	
Airframes:			
Texas.....	\$2,229	\$1,355	-39.2
California.....	714	605	-15.3
New York.....	623	563	-9.6
Missouri.....	717	502	-30.0
Aircraft engines:			
Connecticut.....	1,240	636	-48.7
Ohio.....	519	257	-50.5
Massachusetts.....	206	104	-49.5
Other aircraft equipment:			
Texas.....	200	174	-13.0
California.....	215	130	-39.5
New Jersey.....	81	60	-25.9
Missile-space systems:			
New York.....	267	237	-11.2
Florida.....	257	225	-12.5
Washington.....	261	218	-16.5

Data: Defense Department.

NEW REALISM PERVADES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(NOTE.—Because of hefty cutbacks in Government R&D funding, some firms have left the field, others are upping IR&D, all are trimming overheads.)

With military R&D a major casualty of government cutbacks in funding, electronics companies across the nation have found their fortunes suddenly going into reverse. Some have actually given up on the military R&D market and are moving into different and, they hope, greener areas. Others are attempting to capture military production programs by increasing their internal R&D and are slashing overhead relentlessly. Most, in any case, have redirected their R&D toward immediate payoffs in highly marketable products. However, several firms say their Government-funded R&D has remained level—and a few report that military contracts have gone up.

Yet many companies say they aren't worried that the R&D cutbacks will make them lose technological ground and place them at a disadvantage when business picks up again. Says one engineer, "Everyone is in the same boat, so why should we worry about falling behind our competitors?"

A less sanguine view is held by the Pentagon's Director of Defense Research and Engineering (DDR&E), John S. Foster, Jr. In his fiscal 1971 budget request for research, development, test and engineering, Foster pointed out that the \$7.34 billion sought was \$23.4 million below the prior year's appropriation and would buy 4% to 7% less effort in real dollars. "We will not be able to explore some promising technical opportunities relevant to defense, and we anticipate laying off technical personnel, closing certain laboratories, cutting out many contracts and stopping projects," he complained. Despite this lament, the House slashed nearly \$391 million more from his request, appropriating some \$6.95 billion.

Still, people in Foster's shop are now convinced that the worst is over, and they talk of a turnaround in research funding in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971. Development programs, though, are another matter. As Pentagon R&D managers see it, the four categories of development—exploratory, advanced, engineering, and operational systems—will get more money overall in the new Nixon budget, but the emphasis will be on exploratory and advanced development of new strategic weapons and communications systems. And even with the expected increases, most electronics companies will continue to feel the effects of military R&D cutbacks throughout the year.

One of these is Lockheed Electronics Corp., Plainfield N.J., which was hard hit by the curtailment of development funds for the tri-service three-dimensional radar and the failure of a market to materialize for its

multifunction helicopter radar with an antenna in the rotor blade—both projects that it had backed heavily. With no new major military programs to bid on in the next few years, the company has not only reoriented its Military Systems division, but changed its name to the Products and Systems division. Military R&D will still continue with both internal and contract funds, but more R&D will go to developing commercial products, such as data communications equipment and automated factory equipment, says a company spokesman.

Others, like the Aeronautics division of North American Rockwell Corp., Anaheim, Calif., have used company funds to develop finished hardware for several programs, some of which could lead to production contracts. Thus, the company hasn't reduced in-house R&D in proportion to the reduction in military R&D, but instead has cut overhead.

Officials at the Data Systems division of Litton Industries Inc., Van Nuys, Calif., say that the contract they won to develop and produce a new command and control system for Nike and Hawk Air Defense Missile Batteries was awarded to them in large part because they spent their own R&D dollars to develop a video processing system and advanced display console for the larger command and control system. The military customer was able to visit Litton and test actual hardware during evaluation, instead of having to assess a paper proposal. That, and the fact that Litton's L-3050 computer used in the system was already in the Army inventory, were major factors in Litton's winning the initial \$8.5 million contract last July.

Most companies are taking a very close look at how they spend R&D money even on projects of seemingly immediate usefulness. A case in point is the Soniscan magnetoacoustic memory made by Sylvania Electric Products Inc. in Waltham, Mass. [*Electronics*, July 6, p. 49]. Although Soniscan is almost assured of a market in the Navy's advanced airborne digital computer, Sylvania is now studying the three possibilities of developing it internally, selling rights to the device on a royalty basis, or spinning off a partially owned company to take over the product, to discover which is least costly.

This hard-nosed approach to R&D is shared by James M. Early, vice president and research director of Fairchild Semiconductor, Mountain View, Calif. He sees 1971 as the year that "many central research labs, including Fairchild's, get product-oriented." After a bad year, Fairchild has cut its internal R&D by 10% according to group vice president M. M. Atalla, and made project groups responsible for getting products from R&D into production.

Raytheon in Lexington, Mass., cut personnel at its Missile Systems division and Research division, and the Equipment Development laboratories consolidated its R&D. Now with a lower overhead and closer scrutiny of R&D, Raytheon maintains it's getting more for its research dollar.

Fairchild-Hiller Corp., in Germantown, Md., best known for its aircraft and space satellite programs, is spending most of its new internal R&D money on medical electronics. Bendix Corp. in Detroit, Mich., directs its nondefense R&D work at pollution control devices like laser smoke detectors, electronic fuel injection systems, and medical electronics—wherever the payoff is sure if the research succeeds.

Adding a postscript to the new practical look in R&D, Richard T. Dibonna, a vice president of Microware Associates in Burlington, Mass., says, "I only want Government support if it means eventual profits; we organized ourselves to live without much Government R&D in 1970, and it's a very good thing we did, since we had about one quarter the amount of R&D funding we had in 1966."

Others, however, report military R&D hasn't dropped in their companies. While the

test and evaluation part of the budget has dipped, exploratory development is up about 5%, advanced development up 18.5%, and engineering development up 36.7%. "We don't find our market changed," says a spokesman at Motorola's Government Electronics division in Scottsdale, Ariz. "The prime contractors will be hurt like hell, but what they're doing in the face of lack of funds for new systems is refurbishing old systems, which is good for our business." For example, he notes, B-52s are being given upgraded electronic warfare systems, and the Motorola division hopes to cash in on this with its system for "hiding" B-52s from the enemy.

Another company that hasn't suffered military cutbacks is Hamilton Standard in Windsor Locks, Conn., a subsidiary of United Aircraft. About four years ago, Hamilton decided to develop capabilities in on-board digital computation—and last year picked up several contracts for developing computer-based supervision control systems for the engines in the F-15, F-100, and F-104 aircraft.

ITT's Defense Communications division in Nutley, N.J. reports that it actually won more R&D contracts in 1970 than it did in 1969. Most recently it got a \$6.3 million contract to develop and build two prototype Navy satellite terminals. Charles Haller, division president, attributes this success to the division's policy of sinking a lot of money into internal R&D to develop its technical capabilities.

Military funding also won't be reduced at the Mitre Corp. in Bedford, Mass., a non-profit Federal contract research center with a funding ceiling controlled by the Department of Defense. And Government R&D at Varian Associates in Palo Alto, Calif., about a third of its total R&D, stayed the same for 1971. But the general decline in business will probably drop Varian's internal R&D budget down to \$13.2 million in 1971, \$1.1 million less than the 1970 sum spent by the company.

Similarly, a major northeastern electronics company, with 89% of its R&D Government-funded, reports no change in 1971 and an overall increase of 2.7% in its total R&D budget for a total of \$247 million. But even so, the company has been forced to cut personnel and overhead.

(The contributors to this report included James Brinton and Gail Farrell in Boston, Lawrence Curran in Los Angeles, Stephen Wm. Fields and Marilyn Howey in San Francisco, Ray Connolly in Washington, Alfred Rosenblatt and Peter Schuyten in New York, and Jane Shaw, McGraw-Hill World News in Chicago. It was written in New York by William J. Bucci.)

A TIME TO LOOK INWARD

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, recently I had the privilege of listening to a very timely message that was presented to a breakfast group in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech given by the senior Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBY), be printed in the RECORD.

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

A TIME TO LOOK INWARD

When you go to Jerusalem, you discover that Calvary was not a high mountain but a little knoll outside the Old City. Skirting the base of this elevation was a road which led to nearby villages.

On that little hill, one cruel Friday afternoon, a frenzied, motley crowd gathered. There were the Scribes and Pharisees, glib politicians and gesticulating merchants; the purely curious and the constitu-

And, most disturbingly, it revealed the way in which "the focal point of government interest in young children seems to be shifting too—from the develop-the-child emphasis of the great society days to the free-the-mother-to-work emphasis of the Nixon administration's proposed welfare reform bill."

These articles underscore the need for parental participation and involvement in child-development programs and the need to structure and fund these programs in a way that provides young children with a full and fair opportunity to develop to their full potential.

The editorial concludes, quite correctly, that—

Educators still have much to learn about the potential of children under age 5, but that is no excuse for the awful state of early childhood care in this city or anywhere else, for that matter.

As one who sponsored child-development legislation last session, and will introduce a revised and strengthened bill this session, I found the articles and the editorial to be extremely useful.

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

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

NOBODY IS IN CHARGE

If you live in Washington and have a child under 5 years old, you may know all too well that by the time this city's kindergarten and first-grade children reach the third grade, only one in four will be reading and doing arithmetic as well as the average child nationally. That's a grim statistic which says a lot about the state of our public school system here.

But what do children in Washington learn before they enter kindergarten, during those very important years that we've all been told to worry about? Staff writer Gayle Tunnell set out to find out—and came up with an alarming situation report that appeared as a five-part series in this newspaper last week. After exhaustive interviews and research, Mrs. Tunnell reported that early childhood education here (and elsewhere) has been a hodgepodge of largely patternless public programs and scattershot, expensive private activities:

"Child care in the District is a jigsaw puzzle with many pieces missing and most of the rest not fitting right. Nobody is in charge—no individual or agency, no one in the school system or in the mayor's office. It is nobody's job to know what is being done, what isn't and what could be."

In effect, we discover that on a general national scale, there is plenty of lip service to early child care: congressmen always mention the need for educational services for the very young; the President commits the administration to this goal; and there's lots of research going on to find out how children learn, retain and convert experiences into whatever they finally know or do as adults.

Yet beyond this lip service and a rather routine commitment of public money each year, preschool programs seem to wind up in one of two categories—those for the low-income mother who is provided nothing more than day care for her children, and those for the well-to-do mother, who wants and can afford outside stimulation for her children, for whatever social and intellectual benefits it may provide.

Some of these programs turn out to be great fun for a child, and perhaps educational as well. Others tend to be nothing more than mind-dulling way stations, poorly equipped and operating on shoestring budgets. The federal government's involvement in this field, which began as a matter of im-

proving the lot of little children, now seems to stress day care—to get welfare mothers off the rolls—more than quality education.

The point is that there is no direction in the courses charted for our young children, and also that there are few if any reliable records on what services are offered in this city or how many children are receiving them. No one seems to know how much each program costs, which centers have vacancies—or even what requirements the city should demand. Licensing requirements, developed in 1924 and changed in only minor respects since then, deal strictly with custodial consideration, not with education or recreation standards. Inspections are few and tend to be spotty.

Educators still have much to learn about the potential of children under the age of 5, but that is no excuse for the awful state of early childhood care in this city or anywhere else, for that matter. As a beginning, Mayor Walter E. Washington and the City Council could make a thorough survey of exactly what is and is not offered in this city, and could prepare some concrete suggestions, regulations and legislative proposals for public and congressional consideration. Somebody in officialdom simply must care enough to get started now.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 28, 1971]
SOME LEARN, MOST DON'T: CHILD CARE IS CHAOTIC—I

(By Gayle Tunnell)

It is 9:30 a.m. at Bible Way Nursery School.

In one corner of the large, neat and very bare room 21 children, 3-to-6 years old, and two adults sit, watching "Captain Kangaroo" on a small-screen black-and-white television perched far above their heads on a room divider.

About half the children seem attentive, a handful are squinting or glassy-eyed and five have their heads down on the table either resting or sleeping.

According to Bible Way's mimeographed schedule, which is given to parents, the children are watching "Sesame Street" on Channel 26. In fact, the television is not equipped to get Channel 26, although the Bible Way director says a set that can is expected soon.

There is no talk, either during commercials or after the program ends. The images flitting across the small screen are the only movement, their mechanically jolly banter the only sound.

This is early childhood education in Washington, D.C., in 1971. Not all of it, and certainly not the best of it. But some of it, and not the worst.

The idea that the period from birth to five years is a Very Important Time in a child's life, a time that holds the key to all he will ever know or do later on, is now widely accepted.

President Nixon believes it. In February, 1969, he committed his administration "To providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life." In April, 1969, he repeated that commitment.

Congressmen on both sides of the aisle believe it. There is an aura of political one-upmanship about the platitudinal of child care proposals now being passed around Capitol Hill.

Rotary Club speakers, public school officials, cocktail party goers—they all believe it, too.

And certainly the social scientists do. University presses in recent years have spewed forth conclusions ranging from Benjamin Bloom's at the University of Chicago, that children develop 50 per cent of their capacity to learn by age 4, to Jerome Kagan's, at Harvard, that class and skill differences can be spotted readily in babies as young as 8 months old.

But the rhetoric and research obscure the central fact:

Almost nothing is actually happening.

TWO MARKETS

As in the past, most programs for very young children are not operated at public expense but by private individuals and groups aiming at two quite separate class parent, buying the stimulation of nursery school, and the low-income parent, buying inexpensive custodial care that allows him or her to work.

The commitment of public money to early childhood education, never overwhelming, is at best no greater than and at worst considerably less than it was three and four years ago.

That is the pattern nationally, and the District of Columbia is no exception.

There are 75,000 children under age 5 in the city today. There are about 9,500 places in licensed day care centers and nursery schools and in the school system's prekindergarten program for 4-year-olds.

Some of the spaces are taken up by middle class youngsters. Many of the rest of the spaces are custodial, some of them mind-dulling, rather than educational.

Child care in the District is a jigsaw puzzle with many pieces missing and most of the rest not fitting right.

NOBODY IN CHARGE

Nobody is in charge—no individual or agency, no one in the school system or in the mayor's office. It is nobody's job to know what is being done, what isn't and what could be.

Programs and center vacancies are not matched with needs and children. There are no cooperative training programs or faculty exchanges. There is little college or university involvement.

One inspector from the department of public health is charged with visiting more than 200 group child care sites in the course of the year. Inspections must be cursory and infrequent, but maybe it doesn't make much difference: The standards the inspector is trying to enforce date from the 1920s.

Much more public money for early childhood education has been promised by the federal government, at least for day care services that would permit welfare parents to work.

HOPES AND PROBLEMS

The promise has kindled old hopes and raised new problems.

Big business, sensing a blue chip future in day care, is waiting on the sidelines. It wants to move in with franchising, mass buying, and cost-efficiency studies, much as it moved into the nursing home business after the passage of Medicare and Medicaid.

The prospect of more money also has intensified infighting between public and private agencies over who will be doing what, how and for whom. The jurisdictional dispute is matched by a theoretical dispute over how it should be done.

Some research says that waiting until a child is 3 or 4 to dose him with early education is waiting too long. Other research dismisses as inefficient programs that aim at developing the "whole child," rather than concentrating on academics. Both findings are largely ignored in practice.

While there are indications that children from federally funded Head Start programs lose their competitive edge soon after entering public school, there are arguments over whether this is an indictment of Head Start or of public school.

An occasional voice warns that early education is being oversold and asks if the care and rearing of small children really should be turned over to Big Government or Big Business, at the expense of the family.

In the meantime, most of the 14,000 6-year-olds and 10,000 5-year-olds entering District first grades and kindergartens each year face a bleak future: By third grade, only one

in four will be reading and doing arithmetic as well as the average child nationally.

Most of the District's early education programs are private—profit or nonprofit, with the distinction often a hairline one.

For example, the 5,500 District children 5 years old or younger enrolled in licensed, full-day programs, 4,800 are in private centers. Of the 2,000 children in licensed part-day programs, all but 360 are in private nurseries and preschools.

With few exceptions, private centers aim at one or the other of two quite different markets.

One is the low-income family. Mother is forced to work either to supplement father's salary, or often to support the family herself. She needs a safe, inexpensive place to leave her child during working hours.

The other is the middle- to upper-middle class family, willing and able to buy "the best" for its children at a very early age. This group buys nursery school for its supposed intellectual and social benefits, much as it will later search out music lessons and summer camp.

CLASS IN MANSION

Shortly before 9 a.m., cars begin pulling up in front of National Child Research Center, a rambling, porched brick mansion at 3209 Highland in Cleveland Park. Bought with an acre of land for \$21,500 in 1930, the school dominates a neighborhood where a smaller house some doors away sold recently for \$180,000.

A staff member standing on the sidewalk opens the car door, greets the parent, and helps out a pint-sized boy in a John-John Kennedy haircut and a college sweatshirt. He walks up the path, says good morning to the school's director, Barbara Jeanne Seabury, on the porch, then disappears inside.

His parents are paying \$750 (\$680 if he attends the afternoon session) for 2½ hours a day, five days a week, nine months a year of creative play for him under optimum conditions.

CLASS HAS 150 STUDENTS

His class—one of four in the morning and four in the afternoon, adding up to 150 3-to-6-year-olds in all—includes 18 children, two degree holding teachers, and equipment ranging from gerbils and rabbits to paints and clay to books and educational toys.

Each classroom is equipped with a one-way-glass booth, wired for sound, so teachers can observe and evaluate their charges and each other and so parents can watch their offspring in action.

The school serves a snack each day, but shuns the traditional milk-or-juice-plus-cookies fare for a varied menu intended to develop young palates—chili, buttered rice with cinnamon, French toast, potato chips and dip.

The children are frighteningly competent and verbal, with the older ones adept at concentrating on something for an hour or more and at picking up where they left off after an interruption.

Most of the 4-year-olds who want to play house just start playing house. They rough out the game verbally in advance, settling everybody's role and much of the plot. ("No, you be the mother, I'm littler, so I should be the baby." "But you were the baby, now I should be the baby." And so forth.)

Despite a tuition that puts it well out of reach for the \$10,000-a-year family, the nonprofit school expects to run \$12,000 in the red this year, about 10 per cent of its operating budget. Tuition will go up in September, probably to \$825 for both morning and afternoon sessions.

Parents also are expected "if at all possible" to contribute an additional 10 per cent of what they pay for their own child to the school's scholarship fund. Seven of the 150 pupils are on scholarship this year.

EARLY CALLS

Miss Seabury, who is now accepting applications for 1973, says some mothers call from the maternity ward to enroll their child and that the school probably could be filled at twice or three times the present tuition: "Some parents would even like it better if it were more expensive."

But, she says, she and the board of directors are shaken by the prospect of a school more and more limited primarily to children of the white wealthy, interspersed with a few black children on scholarship. The school is considering partial scholarships to bring back some middle income youngsters, and hopes government interest in early education may result in a voucher system that would pay part of the cost for low and middle income children.

Miss Seabury agrees that most of the children her school now serves would do fine without it, and explains that their parents are really buying "insurance." At the same time, the school enriches these children—as it would any child—and while these may need it least, their parents can afford it best.

MORNING DEVOTION

In the basement of Bible Way Church, 1130 New Jersey Ave. NW., the children and adults have sat through their daily hour of TV. Now it is 10 a.m., time for morning devotions—prayer, songs and flag salute.

The children perk up some with the singing—there are a few giggles and some jockeying for position in the rows—then a lapse into near-silence as the daily schedule's one hour of "activities and class" begins.

The 4-and-5-years olds sit around a circular table with an adult who hands out crayons and mimeographed drawings to color in one Sunday-school alcove.

The 3-year-olds sit at a table in another alcove. Their teacher goes around the circle asking each child his name. Three do not know.

NOBODY TALKS

The striking thing about Bible Way Nursery School is that nobody—adult or child—talks. In three hours of observation, the noise level never rose above a subdued and sporadic hum and, with 21 preschoolers present it was more often nearly silent.

The room in which 32 children (11 were absent) spend up to 11 hours a day is sparsely equipped. There is a rack—beyond the reach of most of the children—holding perhaps two dozen books, most of them of the cheap drug-store variety; some women's magazines; and some encyclopedia brochures.

A play stove, sink and ironing board, with two tin pans, stand against one wall—but there are no empty grocery cans and boxes, let alone dishes, to use in playing with them. A battered rocking swan is the closest thing to a muscle-developing toy; a bead-counting rack is the closest thing to an educational toy.

There are also 15 or so simple band instruments (sticks, bells), two small trucks, two small tractors, two boats, two grimy stuffed animals, two plastic telephones, and a three-cage circus pull-toy. There is a piano, although no one plays it during singing.

The morning schedule calls for breakfast, morning devotion, the hour of TV and an hour of "class" after lunch comes mid-day devotions, and then three hours of naptime. From 3:15 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. is set aside for getting ready to go home ("Put each child's street clothes on to go home"), and from 4:30 to 6 p.m. for going home.

Bible Way charges \$15 a week, \$19 if the parent wants the child picked up in the morning and taken home at night. District welfare pays \$3 a day for five children to attend this center, one of 63 in the District with which welfare contracts in paying all or part of the costs for 882 children.

Not counting transportation, that works out to \$780 a year, \$30 more than what National Child Research Center charges for

its morning program. The difference, of course, is that Bible Way is providing all-day, all-year custodial care. Per hour, Bible Way costs less than a fifth as much as National Child Research.

Pearlie Brown, Bible Way's director, got her job in September after seven months of teaching in another District day care center "like this one except for devotions." She says that she and the three teachers under her have high school educations and that they earn about the minimum wage.

PROFIT POSSIBLE

Mrs. Brown says it is possible to make some profits, even at \$15 to \$19 a week per child for all-day care. Her ambition is to start up a day care center of her own soon.

Virginia Williams, who inspects all of the District's 200-plus licensed, group day care centers each year—describes Bible Way as "fairly typical, unfortunately" and "not one of the worst." Both Mrs. Williams and Evelyn Shidler, head of welfare's child care division, emphasize that it is much better today than it was one or two years ago. Then, they say, it had even less equipment.

When the two distinct courses in outside-the-home child care began, there were some practical justifications for the differences between them.

The well-to-do mother, who wanted and could afford stimulation for her child, did not work and did not need day care.

The low-income mother who had to work needed day care, could not afford the "extras" of stimulation, had no reason to believe anyone else would afford them for her, and was largely unaware of their importance anyway.

All this has changed now—but the two traditions remain.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 1, 1971]

HEADSTART: GOVERNMENT DISCOVERS THE CHILD—II

(By Gayle Tunnell)

In the 1960s, big government discovered the small child as surely—although far less expensively—as it discovered the moon and Vietnam. The preschooler wormed his way into State of the Union messages, domestic policy statements, even into the federal budget.

But while the rhetoric accelerated the money set aside for early childhood programs remained stable or declined.

The focal point of government interest in young children seems to be shifting too—from the "develop the child" emphasis of the Great Society days to the "free the mother to work" emphasis of the Nixon administration's proposed welfare reform bill.

Although Head Start today involves only a quarter of the nation's 1.8 million 3- to 6-year-olds from low income families, down from 40 per cent in 1966, it remains by far the federal government's largest single investment "in the first five years of life."

The theory is simple: Providing the "head start" that the upper middle class traditionally has given its children is even more important for the children of poverty, it might solve social problems and prove cheaper in the long run.

In Washington, two "brands" of Head Start are in operation—a full-day, full-year program operated by National Capitol Area Child Day Care Association for 440 children, and Capitol Head Start's full-year, four-hour-a-day program for 360 other children.

Not surprisingly, since Head Start applied the best of the upper-middle class nursery school tradition to low-income children, there are striking parallels between the private National Child Research Center in Cleveland Park and the Head Start centers scattered over far less affluent Washington neighborhoods.

National Child Research has more style, more space, and perhaps a bit more equipment than the low-rent school and church rooms used by Head Start, but there is the same emphasis on creative play rather than formal group learning.

Barbara Jeanne Seabury at National Child Research probably would be comfortable with the philosophy expressed by Virginia Street, education coordinator for National Capitol Area Child Day Care Association:

"If you keep a child comfortable and happy and trusting his teacher, he'll teach himself."

Like those in National Child Research's Cleveland Park mansion. Head Start classrooms have a science corner, a reading corner, a "playing grown-up" corner with sink and stove and dishes and high heels and handbags, and many of the same creative playthings, educational toys, and muscle-developing physical equipment.

Of course, there are differences too. The all-day Head Start program costs the government something over \$2,000 a year per child, while the National Child Research program costs the upper-middle class parent from \$680 to \$750 for 2½ hours a day, nine months a year.

Head Start tries to get two-thirds of each child's nutritional requirements into him during the course of the eight or nine hours a day it has him. It also provides medical care and social work services to its young charges.

Certainly there is a difference in the children, with those at National Child Research far more verbal and far less passive than their Head Start counterparts.

Other differences while small, are telling. Head Start classrooms are routinely equipped with small stretchers for "ambulance play," one of the children's favorite grown-up games. The arrival of the ambulance in the night . . . the crying . . . the talk of what to do . . . the carrying out of the patient—a view of adult-life not shared by the 3 and 4-year-olds in Cleveland Park.

But the clay and finger paints and macaroni collages and Tinkertoys—much of that, and much of the classroom atmosphere, is similar.

Day-long Head Start and National Child Research share another distinction. Both have a high degree of parent involvement. Never mind that it is carefully nurtured in Head Start and almost inevitable in Cleveland Park.

Mothers, and an occasional father, are in and out of National Child Research Center's one-way-glass observation booths all week long, and community members' and parents' areas of expertise are sometimes called on for staff training.

When asked how involved her Cleveland Park parents are with the school, Miss Seabury is first incredulous, then amused and then serious.

"They're up tighter than I'd like them to be," she admits. "I can't think when a parent last simply said to me, 'I enjoy my child.' It's usually, 'What do you think of the Suzuki method?' or 'Where can I find a good music appreciation teacher for my child?'"

Close cooperation between parent and school is regarded as very important by everyone in early childhood education. And while involvement is typical of the middle- and upper-middle income parent, it is usually hard to come by with low-income mothers who have little spare time and may be overwhelmed simply by the practical difficulties of getting through the day or week.

Each day-care center operated by the National Capitol area has a parent advisory committee that is active and, according to Mrs. Street, interviews and selects the center's director and teachers from a pool of applicants screened by headquarters.

Until Head Start came along in 1965, almost all early childhood education programs were provided by private groups and individuals, profits or nonprofit. Such programs,

still dominant today, cater to the historically different but fast-blurring needs of two quite different sets of parents.

Day care was for the low-income parent, who had to work. It operated from early morning to evening, but—to make working worthwhile—it had to be cheap. It boiled down to day-long custodial care.

Nursery school was for the well-off parent who didn't work. It operated for a few hours a day, and it offered social and intellectual stimulation—or perhaps status and a free pass into private schools—to the parent who could afford "the best" for his child.

The great significance of Head Start probably does not lie in numbers of children served or numbers of dollars spent or even in "proofs" of what it has or has not accomplished, although all these are important.

What Head Start did was take the best of the upper-middle-class nursery school tradition and apply it to the low-income child—and this, on a significant scale, was nothing less than revolutionary.

In the past, the flow has always been the other way. On those rare occasions when a stimulating program was developed for the culturally deprived child, the program was quickly transferred instead to the child whose parents could afford it. The classic example is the Montessori method, pioneered in the Italian slums but practiced in the American suburbs.

Even today, hardly any program that aims at social and intellectual development of the child operates during hours that permit the parent to work. This is true of most nursery schools and of public schools for 4-year-olds, as well as most Head Start.

On the other hand, requirements for day-care licensing often concern themselves wholly or mostly with providing a safe, custodial environment, rather than with education.

But despite all the talk in high places about the importance of early education, Head Start enrolled 471,000 youngsters this year, the same that it enrolled last year and the same that it expects to enroll next year.

Enrollment in federally subsidized preschool and kindergarten programs operated by public school systems has also stalled at 342,000 children for each of the past three years.

During 1966-1969, Head Start enrollment hovered around 700,000. Much of the decline reflects the conversion of some summer Head Start programs to year-round programs, with the result that fewer children are served for longer periods.

Declining or stable budgets in years of steeply rising costs have taken their toll. Spending for Head Start reached 1967 levels (\$347 million) this year, when \$360 million was allotted, up from the \$339 million proposed in President Nixon's budget.

In the District, both Head Start programs and the public schools' preschool programs have felt the effects of federal budget cuts.

The only kind of federally supported early education program that is expanding locally is paid for by model cities money. Model cities now has 160 children in day care, with another 50 being added next month; 90 other children receive after-school care.

The federal government's involvement with the very young child, begun to provide early education for the disadvantaged child as a matter of social policy, today emphasizes day care so that welfare mothers can take job training and go to work.

The new focus began with amendments to the Social Security Act passed by Congress in 1967. Federal support for this kind of mother—and manpower—oriented day care has been rising with funds channeled through state welfare departments.

In theory, such day care takes place in centers that meet federal regulations as to program, staff and so forth. In fact, an unknown number of these children are in cen-

ters that are largely or wholly custodial rather than educational. Others are in centers for a matter of only a few months, too brief a time to affect them much, regardless of center quality.

President Nixon's proposed welfare reform bill would replace some existing program of this type with day care for an estimated 450,000 children of welfare recipients in its first year. Again, the proposal is basically job-oriented, with day care a supportive measure.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1971]

DAY CARE TECHNOLOGY: GROWING FIELD—III

(By Gayle Tunnell)

Serve preplanned, prepackaged lunches like those used by airlines in a daycare center, and there is no need for a fully equipped kitchen.

Or a cook. Or an automatic dishwasher. Or the part-time help to run it.

All that is really needed is a food preparation room with freezer space for a week's worth of lunches and oven space for a day's worth, and a food disposal room with bins big enough to absorb the day's disposable paper and plastic cups, plates, spoons, bowls and forks.

Each child may be fed a hot, nutritionally balanced lunch for 40 cents a day, compared with 65 cents to have it catered and even more if the school prepares it.

So reports Joyce Manes, president of Edufax, Inc., a fledgling, wholly owned subsidiary of Listfax, Inc., a 3-year-old information systems company, with offices at 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW.

Edufax itself is still very small: a matter of a year-old pilot day-care center in Silver Spring and a second center just getting under way in the District, plus negotiations for centers in perhaps a half-dozen other communities around the country.

But what Edufax represents—American business and all that that implies—is very big. Edufax is only one of dozens of firms either in or about to get into, what they see as a great growth field for the future: day care.

Mrs. Manes said her business is aimed at helping others start a high-quality, low-cost day-care center, without having to "reinvent the wheel." Once a center is operating Edufax will withdraw from day-to-day operation, but will provide continuing technical assistance—research, computerized record-keeping, mass buying of certain equipment and so forth.

Prospective clients include individuals, community of church groups, labor unions or businesses or—especially—agencies dispensing contracts for day care at government expense.

According to Mrs. Manes, for \$30 to \$35 a week per child (depending on costs in a given community and the hours the center is open), she can provide the child with a high-quality developmental program; the operator with a 12 to 15 per cent profit, and Edufax with a blue chip future.

When big business looks at the early education—day care field, it sees an overwhelming demand, largely unmet by existing supply.

The demand is represented by two American stereotypes—the working woman and the silent majority.

Half of the mothers of school-age children and one-third with children under school age now work at least part time, an eightfold increase since the beginning of World War II.

Working mothers fall into two main categories: those who work mostly because they want to (to use their education or skills or creativity) and those who work mostly because they have to (to supplement their husband's income, to support a fatherless family, stay off welfare).

Both groups are demanding the same thing

for their children—safe, day-long care and an enriching program.

The comparatively well-off mother who chooses to work is tired of the hassle of hiring a housekeeper, at \$70-a-week or more; of then feeling guilty at leaving her child in the housekeeper's company all day; and of finally sending the child to nursery school for a few hours a day to supplement the housekeeper, at \$500 or \$750 or \$1,000 more a year.

SECOND BEST

The low-income mother who must work is tired of seeing her children get second best, or worse, simply because she can't afford any more.

Meanwhile the silent majority—the 60 percent or so of all Americans between the well-to-do, who can afford nursery school, and the quite poor, who can qualify for Head Start—hears about research on early childhood and asks, "What about my child?"

This question and the demands of working women are translated into the widely held belief, within both government and the business community, that affordable early education for everyone is an idea whose time has come.

Big business believes it can use cost-accounting, franchising, central support services, mass buying, modern technology and time-and-motion studies to provide high-quality day care and early education more cheaply than big government has been able to do.

It also believes that public pressure for child care will produce much more public money to pay for it—the entire cost for the poor, and part of it, under some sort of sliding scale or voucher system, for part of middle America.

Big business is ready and waiting in the wings.

In the basement of Emery School, Lincoln Road and S Street NE, Big Business is getting its first chance in the District to show that it can operate a high-quality day-care center more efficiently and less expensively than big government has been able to do.

Even in its current unjelled state—renovations still under way, supplies and equipment still coming in—the Emery center has a certain businesslike aura.

Like corporate planners where it will cut down on employees' lounging, Edifax is locating the toilets so that the tots will have to walk through the "academic" room—and hopefully be lured into the mainline learning activities there—to get to them.

And instead of handing each child a standard half-pint carton of milk and a straw for lunch, Emery gives the child a small paper cup and has him pour his own, refilling as often as he likes. Someone has figured out that it's a rare 3 or 4-year-old who can down eight ounces of milk at a sitting. As a result, the center gets along with an average of one half-pint per child for both lunch and snack, with almost no waste.

EMOTIONAL REACTION

The prospect of big business involvement in day care and early childhood education produces an emotional reaction in nearly everyone traditionally associated with the field.

Some organizations and individuals—the Child Welfare League of America is one—are working to document suspicions with respect to specific plans or activities by specific firms in the child care field.

Mary Ann Banta, director of the Edifax center at Emery school and a Montessori-trained teacher with six years' experience in mostly suburban preschools, said that she had some qualms about the implications of big business in child care.

Before taking her salaried job with Edifax, she satisfied herself that the blueprint allowed freedom for differences from center to center and that the corporation was not in

the business of manufacturing its own supplies and equipment.

"I don't find any less concern about children than there is, for instance, in the school system," she said. "I've been to many a faculty meeting where children weren't even mentioned."

"There is a different approach in the business world. So many of the things we assumed were unsolvable aren't . . . I think whether we like it or not, business has discovered education."

DAY CARE PROBLEM: WHO'S IN CHARGE?—IV

(By Gayle Tunnell)

Addie Golden begins her day before 7 a.m., when she drives the Park Terrace Nursery School bus to pick up her charges. If she is lucky, her day ends a little after 6 p.m.

She does many things that are rare in day-care centers that are inexpensive enough for the working poor and welfare mothers who are her customers.

She takes her children on field trips every Wednesday, to the duck pond or the public library or to see a department store Santa. She has bought lots of equipment out of what could have been profits—including a World Book Encyclopedia.

Two years ago, when a free training program for day-care operators was offered on five consecutive Saturdays, Mrs. Golden went to all but one held on a week-end she had to be out of town.

She says that no one has helped her before or since, adding wistfully that when she worked in a center in North Carolina, local college students sometimes came to read stories and help her put shoes and boots on the children.

Mrs. Golden struggles along on her own. So does nearly everybody else in the District involved with preschool or day care.

Nobody in the District is putting it all together.

Nobody is in charge.

Not the public schools, nor the mayor's office nor City Council. Not city welfare, not the public health department, not even an agency funded by the federal government to do just this.

In July, 1969, the District school board committed itself to early education, voting to extend public schools downward to include the city's 4-year-olds.

The 4-year-olds in Mrs. Golden's center are among the 85 per cent or more that the school system hasn't got around to reaching and shows no signs of reaching soon.

Still, no one in the school system is helping Mrs. Golden develop, let alone pay for, the kind of educational program the schools' contend these children need.

Mrs. Golden receives \$15 a week for each of the 12 children in her center whose mothers are on welfare—\$3 less per week than the mothers of the other 16 children pay.

Ironically if Mrs. Golden made enough money to hire a director with a degree in early childhood education and teachers with some college education, welfare might pay her \$22.50 a week per child. This is what it pays centers that meet federal standards for staff, program and equipment.

JUST A GLIMPSE

Mrs. Golden is likely to get one glimpse of the District health department's inspector in the course of the year—but only a glimpse.

The inspector, Virginia Williams, is charged with visiting the city's 200 centers to renew annual permits. She must also file written reports, investigate applications to open centers, and follow up any complaints.

Although she is an early childhood specialist and presumably could give some good advice, she barely has time for the mere mechanics.

Then there is Community Coordinated Child Care, known as 4Cs, which was created by the federal government two years ago to coordinate public and private day-care and pre-school efforts in the District.

As a coordinating effort, 4Cs remains at a primitive stage. There is not even a record at its office, for example, of how many day-care centers and preschools there are in the District, let alone how many children each enrolls, what kind of program each offers, how much each charges, what centers have vacancies, and other basic information.

NO TRAINING PROGRAMS

Although 4Cs was involved in the training program Mrs. Golden attended two years ago, the only effort of this kind anyone can remember, it offers no training program now. It does not serve as a clearinghouse for putting a center or school with a problem in touch with another that might have a solution.

Mrs. Golden, as she knows full well, is on her own. Other operators in the District are on their own too, many of them trying a lot less hard and doing a lot less well for their children than she is.

The 4Cs has been hampered by turnovers on its board and a limited staff. And by something else, too: Mutual distrust and antagonism among the agencies and operators. Much of it boils down to a long-standing fight between private operators, especially profit-making private operators, and publicly funded programs.

Private operators tend to view public program officials as arrogant newcomers who don't know what they are talking about, who are shielded by government handouts from the realities of the marketplace and who are determined to put them out of business by insisting on standards that maybe the government can afford but that their customers cannot.

For their part, public officials—when they mention private operators at all—often imply that most are ignorant or greedy or worse.

FRICTION HAMPERERS

The friction has shackled efforts to coordinate child care in most communities over the past five years.

"Everybody wants to knock down the private centers," says Charles Davenport, president of the Nursery School Administrators Association, a kind of mutual protection society formed by 45 of the District's private operators.

"They say of private centers, 'They do it for profit. They're watering the milk . . . There are substandard facilities in (government) funded programs too—and many more than you would think."

"I don't understand this. The private centers aren't a threat to the funded ones. The funded ones are a threat to us."

STICKING POINTS

Two years ago, 4Cs was asked by the city to develop new licensing standards for District child-care centers.

This assignment bogged down in public and private differences on what was essential to a good program, and it inflamed private operators' fears that they would be priced out of the market and forced to close.

Major sticking points were proposals that specific educational backgrounds be required of center directors and staff and that the adult-child ratio permitted in centers, now 1 to 10, be reduced.

In recent weeks, representatives of public and private operations on the 4Cs standards committee and governing board have apparently reached agreement, not yet official or public, on these questions. Once the 4Cs board adopts them, the proposed changes will be submitted to the City Council, probably in the next few months.

CHANGE OVERDUE

Few would argue that some sort of change in licensing procedures is overdue in the District.

Madeline Jolley, chief of the department of public health's community standards division, says the situation is "shameful." One of her two assistants, Virginia Williams, who visits each of the District's more than 200 licensed group centers at least once a year, adds:

"You almost hope that at least the people don't beat the kids. There is very little you can do."

Licensing requirements, developed in 1924 and changed in only minor respects since (the last change was in 1963), deal with strictly custodial considerations—enough space, adequate health precautions, hot lunches, individual sleeping cots. They do not require any educational or recreational program for the child, nor do they require any special qualifications (other than "good moral character") of the staff.

And while the total number of licensed day-care centers and preschools has mushroomed from 96 in 1953 to 209 in 1969, the staff expected to enforce what standards exist is exactly the same: One child care specialist, Mrs. Williams.

As it did decades ago, the community standards division today consists of one chief, two child-care specialists (Mrs. Williams' colleague shares responsibility for licensed foster families with welfare and with the Family and Child Services Agency) and two clerks.

CLEARS \$100 IN GOOD WEEK

Back at Park Terrace Nursery School, 5111 Fitch St. SE, Mrs. Golden and her two assistants and her 28 children begin the routines of a new day.

In a good week, she says, she clears about \$100. In a bad one, about \$50.

"I think if I didn't love them I'd go out and get myself a job."

The children are buoyant, friendly and noisy. Naps are not the long, drawn-out affairs that Mrs. Williams of the health department says are characteristic of centers that either can't be bothered with the children or don't know what to do with them awake. Here they run from about 1:30 to a little before 3.

"It's a full-time job in nursery school just to help the children understand about life," Mrs. Golden says.

"What I'd really like to do is go out in the neighborhood and work with neglected kids, the ones you talk to and they say, 'No one likes us. No one cares.' They're 5 or 7 years old and already they're bitter."

EARLY EDUCATION ISSUE: IS NURSERY CARE ENOUGH?

(By Gayle Tunnell)

A handful of 5-year-olds stand in front of a wall chart showing five houses, each with a long winding path leading into it. The houses are marked "a," "e," "i," "o," and "u."

"Who can walk the path into the 'a' house?" asks the teacher.

The child reads the words written on the path—at, cat, rat, rabbit, hat, mat, man, band, bat, mad, bar, ran and sat—with confidence, stumbling only on "bar" but promptly getting bailed out by another 5-year-old.

The scene is Tots Nursery School Inc., 1317 Shepherd Street NW, one of the few District day care centers that emphasizes formal, academic learning at an early age. According to the school's director, Tots routinely turns out prospective first graders who are ready to read and write and do arithmetic like second graders.

The emphasis on structured, academic learning at Tots is on the cutting edge of a growing debate within the field of early education.

Is it enough just to take the traditional upper-middle-class nursery school program and apply it to the low-income child, then sit back and expect that child to "catch up"?

More and more researchers are saying no. They say the low-income 3-year-old is already far behind his middle-class counterpart and that he must work hard and long to catch up. No relaxed, free play program for him. He has no time to lose.

Other research on early childhood education supports hypotheses that are largely ignored in practice, in the District and elsewhere.

There is growing evidence, for example, that waiting until a child is 3 or 4 to dose him with early education is waiting much too long, that the time to get him in is the cradle or when he's just beginning to speak.

Still other findings suggest that aiming at the child at all is like trying to walk uphill with weights on, that the thing to do is teach the child's parents. Compared to the influence of a parent, these studies indicate, a school or center or tutor pales into insignificance.

DO WE WANT IT?

Behind all the "how do we do it?" debate is an even more basic question: Do we really want to do it at all?

In all the hullabaloo about day care and preschool, a few voices warn that early childhood education is being oversold, that it cannot and will not accomplish all that is hoped for it, and that it could prove dangerous as well as disillusioning.

One of these voices belongs to Earl S. Schaefer, chief of early education research in the Center for Study of Child and Family Mental Health, associated with the National Institute of Mental Health in Bethesda.

Believing that "the professionalization of child care may be as bad as the professionalization of sex," Schaefer shakes his head and wonders aloud:

"How is it that just when it appears that the schools are failing as institutions and many collapse, all we can think of to do is extend school—at the top (open admissions policies in colleges) and at the bottom (day care and preschool)?"

"I'm concerned about a society in which people do not take the initiative and accept responsibility for themselves and their children. Rearing children is part of being human."

ORIENTATION KEPT

The District's large-scale efforts to prevent educational deprivation later on—the public school's kindergarten and pre-school programs and Head Start—retain the "whole child" orientation of the middle-class nursery school tradition.

No one contends that children do not develop, intellectually as well as socially and physically, by being put into what boils down to a free play situation, surrounded by a rich assortment of educational games and toys and subtly guided by teachers.

But there is research suggesting that children develop more, and more permanently (intellectually, at least) under more direct tutelage, and that teaching 4- and 5-year-olds to read and do arithmetic may give them a more efficient "head start" than will teaching them reading and arithmetic "readiness."

PRESSURE COOKER

A few preschools around the country have gotten impressive early results in a kind of "pressure cooker" academic environment with teachers asking tots as many as 20 questions a minute. The children are encouraged to regard classes as "work sessions" and "workmanlike behavior" (paying attention, sitting up straight, answering questions regularly) is systematically rewarded with praise and cookies.

National Head Start administrators are now embarked on a research project to try

and settle what method of teaching disadvantaged children is most effective. Called "Planned Variation," the effort involves at least eight different teaching methods, most of them much more "academic" in emphasis than most Head Start plans operating now.

In the District, a center just getting under way at Emery School and operated by Edifax, Inc., intends to teach children aged 3 to 5 reading and arithmetic, rather than just "readiness" to learn these skills. A special sequence of materials built around a 44-character phonetic alphabet will be used.

Otherwise, it is necessary to look to Tots, a center serving the sons and daughters of the black middle class, particularly the children of District schoolteachers.

NO CHANCE TO PLAY

"I want my children to compete equally with all children, even if they're green," says Charles Davenport, the Tots director. "The time when nursery school was a place to play is over."

Davenport explains that he, like most District black people, grew up under a segregated system. Now that more than token integration has arrived, black children must compete directly with white children "who have 100 years or more of nursery school behind them."

Davenport sees himself as helping to even up the odds. He agrees that the strong education emphasis at Tots is a prime selling point with the black professionals he serves.

The atmosphere is more school-like than that in any other center or school visited, including preschool and kindergarten operated by the public system. Teacher-directed activity is the rule, rather than the exception; children begin learning consonant sounds at 3, can all write their names by 4, and are assigned both reading and arithmetic books by 5.

A mother arrives to collect her daughter from Mrs. Davenport's group, which is calling out, then writing, then reading words containing the "a" sound.

GOING FOR EXAM

The daughter is leaving to take an exam to enter private school on the fall. Fewer than half of Tots' 6-year-olds go on to Davenport warns parents, they may have problems adjusting.

Mother and teacher have a hurried, whispered conference about what to say to give her confidence.

"We have to show how smart we are at Tots," mother explains to the other 5-year-olds as she brushes her daughter's hair. "Good luck," they chorus as their classmate leaves.

Research suggesting that children can accept a mainline academic program at a much earlier age than formerly thought is overshadowed by what may be an even more important finding, however.

That is that waiting until a child is 5 or 4 or even 3 to "inoculate" him with early education is waiting far too long, that he needs such education while still in diapers, perhaps soon after birth.

Four years ago, Schaefer, the psychologist with the National Institute of Mental Health, began using college graduates with some special training to tutor low-income toddlers in Cardozo for four hours a week, beginning at age 15 months.

The tutored group was compared with a control group from a slightly more affluent neighborhood in Northeast Washington who received no tutoring.

At age 3, when the tutoring stopped, the tutored group had an average IQ that was 17 points higher than the non-tutored group, and it looked like Schaefer was on to something big.

Then came the complications. By age 4, the gap between the tutored and untutored had narrowed to 10 points. By age 5, to five points.

FINDING PREVALENT

This kind of research finding—spectacular early results that peter out after a few years is prevalent in early childhood education. The most notable example is Head Start, where gains in 4- and 5-year-olds seem to fade away until it becomes impossible to tell Head Start alumni from other first and second graders in terms of achievement.

Some skeptics interpret this to mean that early education isn't all that it's cracked up to be. They suggest that early education, at great cost and effort, simply teaches children things that they would pick up later on their own, anyway.

Others say the gains are real and important and perhaps unduplicatable later on, when the child is older. But, they say, it is naive to suppose that the gains can be sustained forever when the child is shunted into a society that doesn't follow up on his special training.

EXAMPLE CITED

For his part Schaefer has concluded that "a brief, child-centered tutoring program will have minimal effect in the long run."

He points to the work of P. Levenstein, an early childhood researcher, who visited the parents of his small subjects an average of 32 times over a seven-month period. He left 28 different books and toys with the parents, explaining how they were used and urging the parents to use them in playing with the children.

When he tested the experimental group against a control group, a 17-point IQ gap had opened up. In other words, Levenstein got the exact result Schaefer did, only much easier, by concentrating on the parent rather than on the child. Schaefer's result took 21 months, not seven; more than 300 hours of tutoring per child instead of 32 conferences with parents; and cost of more than \$2,000 per year per child.

The moral, according to Schaefer, is that the family—not the school or day care center or tutor—holds the key to the child's development.

\$7 TO \$70 FOR FAMILY

"But what are we doing about the family? The day care budgets I've seen all spend about \$2,000 a year per child and anywhere from \$7 to \$70 of this—and usually less than \$20—is spent on involving the parents."

Schaefer and others believe that expanding knowledge about the first years of life should be used not to teach the child, but to teach the child's parents how to do a better job of rearing him for maximum development.

They reason that once one generation of parents is taught more sophisticated child-rearing techniques, the job would be done. The techniques would be absorbed into the culture, since parents tend to rear their children much as they themselves were.

ARTHUR GODFREY'S OPPOSITION TO THE SST

Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. President, we have recently heard from Mr. Arthur Godfrey, an entertainer, concerning why we should not build an SST. Recently I was among a number of Senators and Representatives who received a letter from Mr. Godfrey outlining his views.

His opposition to the SST seems to involve three points.

First. We should not build an SST because Arthur Godfrey does not feel people need to travel fast.

Second. We should not build an SST because it would benefit civilians more directly than it would benefit the military.

Third. We should not build an SST

because it might be used by some "rich slob"—the words are Mr. Godfrey's.

Without pausing to explore the planted axioms which prop up Mr. Godfrey's rickety reasoning, I want to share with the Senate a reply sent to Mr. Godfrey by the original recipient of Mr. Godfrey's letter—Mr. James H. Straubel, executive director of the Air Force Association.

So that all Senators may ponder this exchange, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Godfrey's and Mr. Straubel's letters be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 4, 1971.

Mr. JAMES H. STRAUBEL,
Air Force Association,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: It is with sincere regret that I feel obliged to write this letter. I am just in receipt of your memo of February 22 describing the position of the AFA with regard to the SST.

As Chairman of the Coalition Against the SST, I am scheduled to testify before the Senate Committee on Wednesday, March 10. Regrettably, I find this affiliation conflicts with the position taken by the AFA.

Let me say this: If the SST were being developed by the Air Force strictly for military purposes, I would be the first to support it. But it isn't. It is proposed only as a commercial, civilian vehicle which we need in this world about as much as we need another load of those rocks from the moon. I am unalterably opposed to it not only because it adds to the pollution of the ecosystem, however slightly, but principally because at a time when so many other things should take unchallenged priority, this industrial play toy becomes something akin to an obscenity. Who in the hell needs to get wherever it's going so damn fast? To transport military personnel and logistics would be one thing, but to accommodate some rich "jet set" slob who wants to get to their aperitifs in Paris in half the time is ridiculous.

Not only that, but the airlines are admittedly already over expanded and in serious trouble and I'm doing everything I can to help alleviate that situation. I cannot speak for them officially, of course, but I'll bet you a plate of beans that they hope they'll never live to see it!

Sorry, Jim, but you just lost me.

Regretfully,

GODFREY.

AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1971.

Mr. ARTHUR GODFREY,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR ARTHUR: Your letter of March 4 on the SST, in response to our memo of February 22 on this subject, has been received. I respect you for expressing your views. Copies of your letter, I note, were sent to 21 distinguished Members of the Congress. I feel obliged, therefore, to send copies of this letter to them.

First off, you would go for a military SST, as I know you would, but you oppose this projected investment in advanced aeronautical technology for civilian purposes. I'm surprised at that. We seem quite willing to invest in military vehicles which become civilian airliners—to a great degree, at taxpayers' expense. So what's the big deal about reversing the process? Every major advance in technology strengthens our military posture. Let's not lose any advance we can get. The other team isn't sitting on its slide rules.

At issue are two, that's all, two prototypes

of an advanced flying machine. For God's sake, let's get them and wring them out, for everybody's gain. That's all we ask.

And if I thought the SST program would do nothing more, as you put it, than "accommodate some rich 'jet set' slob," en route to Paris, I'd be the first to oppose the program. But who rides the jets today? A Time Magazine survey of 3,000,000 international air travelers tells us that one-third of them have "household incomes" (total family incomes) of less than \$10,000 a year. And 58 percent of them have "household incomes" of less than \$15,000 a year. Hardly "rich 'jet set' slob." And, Arthur, experience tells us that same thing will happen in supersonic travel. The question is—under whose flag?

Sure, the airlines are in bad times, right now. But, I repeat, this is an R&D issue. Two prototypes. That's all. And I have seen letters from the presidents of 12 airlines (Pan Am, American, TWA, Eastern, etc.) that say the airlines fully support the pending legislation. Unless they're lying through their teeth, which I choose not to believe, they want to see two prototypes of an American SST.

You ended your letter on a sad note, sad to me, at least. "You just lost me," you said. Arthur, I hope not. We can't afford to lose you—and, of all things, not for two prototypes of a new flying machine. Not in the face of Jimmy Doolittle's comment, which I believe in, namely: "the SST, of course, is a civilian project, but that's not the important point. In this day and age, any vote against advanced technology is a vote against military preparedness..."

Arthur, we just can't lose you on those terms.

Best regards,

JAMES H. STRAUBEL.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, I am happy to cosponsor the bill to extend the Economic Opportunity Act for 2 years, and to express my strong support for the Office of Economic Opportunity. I welcome the administration's endorsement of this action.

I think that OEO has made substantial progress in the difficult struggle against the grinding dehumanization of poverty.

We have made a good start, but the job is nowhere near done. If we do not continue to build on the base already established, we will not just stand still, we will lose the hard-fought advantages we have gained. Therefore we must commit ourselves to continuing the authorization for OEO and its programs. Having done that, we can act to strengthen the war on poverty.

I am also introducing today, with the bipartisan support of a number of Senators, an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act to create a nonprofit National Legal Services Corp. By improving the operation of the Legal Services program, we believe that the goals of the Economic Opportunity Act can be more effectively achieved.

In the near future, I shall offer another amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act to expand and strengthen child development programs. This amendment will be a significantly improved version of a similar child development measure which I introduced in the last Congress. This will also make the Economic Opportunity Act a more effective weapon in the battle against poverty.



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