

UNITED STATES



U.S. CONGRESS

OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 14

JUNE 3, 1971, TO JUNE 9, 1971

(PAGES 17735 TO 19108)

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

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

#### SENATOR BAYH TESTIFIES ON CHILD DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

One of the things that strikes me is the common concern and agreement in most of the conversation and legislation about child care. The issues now are very different than they were two years ago, when S. 2060 was introduced by Sen. Mondale and others. At that time, there was still great disagreement about the need for the "ten essentials," all of which are included in S. 1512 and in great part included in S. 530, the Universal Child Care and Child Development Act of 1971 introduced by me on February 2 of this year. I was pleased to be joined in sponsorship of S. 530 by you, Mr. Chairman, and our distinguished colleague, Senator Hart. A companion bill, H.R. 5369, was introduced in the House by Congressman Helstoski on February 17th.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Abzug-Chisholm bill provides:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### PROFESSIONAL GEOLOGISTS OFFER AID IN ENERGY CRISIS

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

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

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

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

Bill Curry told me:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### ON GEOLOGISTS

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

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

#### PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

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