

UNITED STATES



U.S. CONGRESS
OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 34

DECEMBER 2, 1971 TO DECEMBER 7, 1971

(PAGES 43951 TO 45312)

There are plenty of campaigns around the country in which you can hold a responsible position and get practical experience—whether it be with an incumbent like Mark Hatfield, Ed Brooke or Chuck Percy, or with a prospective Senator like Bob Smylie in Idaho, David Cargo or Pete Domenici in New Mexico, John Chafee in Rhode Island, or Tom Reardon in South Dakota, or with an outstanding Congressman such as Bill Frenzel or candidates such as John Price in New York. Find a candidate and work for him or her. Or, in the words of the first Ripon book—If you cannot find one, be one. Go to the Convention as delegates or alternates. Become ward and state committeemen and committeewomen. Run for the city council, the state legislature, and the Congress.

One hundred and seventeen years ago a small band of men, fearful for their country's future, frustrated by political fragmentation, and fired by the conviction that principled politics was essential to solving national problems, came together in a small white schoolhouse in Ripon, Wisconsin, to form a political party that could build a progressive America.

The times were not auspicious for their undertaking. Amidst growing division and strife, almost a score of political parties had sprung up in the previous 16 years, only to wither away. At the time Free-Sollers, Know-Nothings, Barnburners, Radical Whigs, Abolitionists, Conservative Whigs, Anti-Nebraskans, Union Democrats and Normal Democrats were all competing for public attention. It took the founders of our party two years to agree on the name "Republican." In some states the new party participated in its first election with no name at all. When the founders of the party first approached an obscure, small town lawyer named Abraham Lincoln and asked him to lead the Illinois party, he flatly refused, predicting that the country's future lay with the Whigs.

But the men persevered. Lincoln reconsidered, and they forged a political coalition that forced the country to face up to its most fundamental problems, that led the union through the bloodiest war in its history into a new era of peace, and that dominated national politics for the next three quarters of a century.

Today, our Party and our country need the faith and spirit of those men in Ripon. To rekindle the Ripon-Lincoln tradition is your mission. It is a very large and difficult undertaking, but a challenge worthy of great men and women. I know you have the ability to meet that challenge, if you have the will.

As James Reichley wrote,

The progressives have little chance of leading the Republican party, let alone the country, before 1976—if then. A few more years of maturing experience, however, will give the younger generation of progressive Republicans time to develop their program. Just possibly, some future Lincoln sits in a governor's chair, in the back rows of Congress, or at some lesser post. If so, the shape of the next national majority probably depends, as much as on anything else, on the thoughts and dreams now passing through his head.

That is your opportunity and your responsibility.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on Thursday, December 2, 1971, by a vote of 63 to 17, the Senate agreed to the conference report on S. 2007, a bill to extend the Economic Opportunity Act, and for other purposes.

During the debate on that measure, under which a time limitation granted 3 hours to those opposing the conference

report, and only 15 minutes to those supporting it, a number of misleading statements were made concerning the comprehensive child development provisions.

I have reviewed the record of the full debate with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty from which this measure arose. In order to correct any misunderstanding about the purpose of this child development program, we would like to answer four of the concerns expressed about it.

First, and of greatest importance, are the allegations that this child development program represents child control. It was charged, during the debate, for example, that the program would concentrate on the inculcation of collectivist attitudes on helpless children; that it is somehow based on the notion that the parent is a failed experiment; that it is totally alien to traditional American values.

Charges and implications of this kind could not be further from the truth. Neither we, nor any of the other 30 Senators and over 100 Congressmen who introduced this legislation, would support a measure of that nature.

The simple truth is that this program is totally voluntary, is designed to strengthen the family, and vests the major responsibility for the operation and control of child development efforts in the parents of the children these programs serve.

This measure specifically requires that programs or services under this title shall be provided only for children whose parents or legal guardians have requested them.

It expressly states that—

Nothing in this title shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional or physical development of their children.

And it deliberately requires that parents of children served by child development programs will compose at least one-half of the membership of both the governing boards created to administer these programs. These parent governed boards—the Child Development Councils and the Project Policy Committees—will decide which programs to fund, and approve the content, curriculum, and policy of each individual project.

Finally, to the extent consistent with the capacity of local governments, these programs will be administered locally—like the public school system—to assure that they operate as close as possible to the parents and the people concerned.

Rather than establishing Federal or State control of children, as some opponents contend, this measure returns tax dollars to localities and States to help them develop and strengthen day care programs in community centers, schools, churches, and Headstart programs.

We believe these provisions are absolutely consistent with the traditional American value on parental responsibility. The emphasis we placed in the bill on parental decisionmaking and parent governed councils reflects our belief in

the strength and wisdom of parents and families—not, as some have charged, on any "notion that the parent is a failed experiment."

Second, a number of our opponents criticized the delivery system in the bill, and argued that there was not a sufficient role for the States. We disagree.

This bill unquestionably puts a priority on local administration—wherever a locality is, in the determination of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, capable of providing high quality, comprehensive services. We placed this priority on local administration precisely in order to assure that these programs will be accessible and responsible to the concerns of parents, and will avoid the danger of remote governmental control.

Yet within this framework the measure provides a significant role for the States:

Every local application must be submitted to the Governor for review and comment.

Five percent of the funds are reserved for States for technical assistance, coordination, and review of these local applications.

And States, as well as other public and private nonprofit agencies, may serve as prime sponsors where localities do not apply, or where the HEW Secretary finds that a locality is incapable of providing comprehensive services.

Moreover, States can administer programs for migrant children, programs in areas where a city or county is not adequately meeting the needs of preschool children, or programs under the Secretary's additional 5-percent reservation for model programs.

These roles, and the Secretary's responsibility to determine whether localities are capable of administering programs are spelled out in the bill, and clarified by a colloquy between Senator NELSON and Senator JAVITS during the debate on the conference report. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF December 2, 1971, pages 44117-44119.

As Wilbur J. Cohen, dean of the University of Michigan School of Education and former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said in a recent telegram to us supporting the child development program in the conference report:

In my opinion, and from my past experience, I believe that the various provisions of Sections 512(2)(0), 513(9), 517(3)(4), 534, 535, 572 would enable the Secretary of HEW and the Governors of the various States to establish appropriate State coordinating arrangements to assure effective statewide planning and review of local projects.

Reasonable men may disagree with the initial priority this measure places on local administration which we believe is essential to assure maximum parental involvement and responsibility. But no reasonable man who has read this legislation carefully can deny that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has substantial discretion with respect to which prime sponsorship applications are approved, or that States have a significant role in the planning and operation of these programs.

Third, the suggestion was made that this measure had not received sufficient consideration by the Congress and the

public. The facts just do not support that conclusion.

President Nixon, in February 1969, brought public attention to this issue when he called for "a national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first 5 years of life."

And since 1969, when the original bills were introduced, over 200 witnesses have been heard by the Senate and House committees considering this legislation. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee in the Senate held 12 days of hearings, and numerous executive sessions on this legislation; the House Education and Labor Committee held 20 days of hearings and several executive sessions.

Moreover, this issue has been the subject of numerous public discussions, conventions, conferences, and studies. The 1970 White House Conference on Children considered this issue, and the delegates to that conference voted as their top national priority the provision of "comprehensive family-oriented child development programs including health services, day care and early childhood education." The Joint Commission of the Mental Health of Children recommended a proposal of the nature as one of its top priorities for children.

And Project Headstart, which has now been in operation for over 5 years, and on which this measure seeks to build, has given the Congress, the executive branch and the public ample opportunity to review and assess child development efforts.

To question or disagree with elements in this measure or with purpose of the entire measure itself is clearly legitimate and indeed helpful to those of us who want to improve it; but to imply that this measure has not received careful and lengthy consideration by the Congress is just plain wrong.

Finally, the suggestion was made that child development and education experts are uncertain about whether a program of this kind should be undertaken. Yet the facts reveal that the professional organizations experienced in the education, health, and welfare of children are nearly unanimous in the opinion that this measure represents one of the soundest investments our country can make.

In addition to the White House Conference on Children, and the Joint Commission on the Mental Health of Children, the following organizations especially experienced in and concerned with the needs of children have urged the adoption of this conference report:

American Academy of Pediatrics.
Black Child Development Institute.
Child Welfare League of America.
Children's Lobby.
Council for Exceptional Children.
Day Care and Child Development Council of America.
National Association for the Education of Young Children.
National Education Association.

The entire list of national organizations representing parents and citizens concerned about children that are supporting this measure—many of whom

were involved in the drafting and refinement of the legislation—includes:

AFL-CIO.
Amalgamated Clothing Workers.
American Bar Association.
Americans for Democratic Action.
Americans for Indian Opportunity Action Council.
American Public Welfare Association.
Committee for Community Affairs.
Common Cause.
Friends Committee for National Legislation.
International Ladies Garment Workers Union.
Interstate Research Association.
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.
League of Women Voters.
NAACP.
National Association for Catholic Women.
National Association of Social Workers.
National Board of YWCA.
National Conference of Catholic Charities.
National Conference of Christians and Jews.
National Council of Churches.
National Council on Hunger and Malnutrition.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Negro Women.
National League of Cities—U.S. Conference of Mayors.
National Organization of Women.
National Welfare Rights Organization.
Southern Christian Leadership Conference.
United Auto Workers.
United Methodist Church.
Urban League.
U.S. Catholic Conference.
United Steel Workers of America.
Washington Research Project Action Council.

Mr. President, we are heartened and encouraged by the bipartisan and overwhelming Senate vote to agree to the conference report, and are hopeful that the House of Representatives will take a similar position in support of this program when it votes on the conference report tomorrow.

THE JOSEPH MacDONALD FAMILY HELPS VIETNAM ORPHANS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, when the American people are asked to help, they do. In a recent newsletter to my New Hampshire constituents, I printed a letter from Father Morris F. Wells, chaplain for the 196th Infantry Brigade in Vietnam. Father Wells, whose parents live in Hampton, N.H., asked me a special favor. He said:

During my tour here, I have become involved with a Catholic orphanage, Phuoc Tien Orphanage, in a small hamlet of the same name, located near Da Nang. There are 190 children with six Vietnamese Sisters taking care of them. One of our battalions, 4/31st Infantry, has unofficially "adopted" the orphanage and the men are doing everything they can to make life a little more pleasant for these children. The children need everything, and anything, but especially summer clothes, toys (there isn't a ball or a doll in the entire orphanage) and food (especially baby food). My request is that perhaps you could put in a "plug" for help in one of your newsletters to your constituents. They could send any used clothing, toys, food, etc., to me and I would be happy to hand carry them to the orphanage. I am hoping that it will be possible to extend the arm of friendship from the USA to this unknown orphanage in Vietnam. God bless you.

The response from New Hampshire has been overwhelming.

The Joseph MacDonald family of 360 Winnacunnet Road in Hampton, N.H., responded to Father Wells' request with so much enthusiasm and generosity when they mailed a package on November 15.

With all the talk about people being afraid to get involved and unwilling to give their time to help others, it certainly has been heartwarming to me to see this kind of response from people in New Hampshire. I am proud to serve them in the U.S. Senate.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the following articles and editorials relating to the Subversive Activities Control Board:

First. An editorial by Carl T. Rowan entitled "Do-Nothing SACB Should Keep on Doing Just That," which appeared in the Washington Star of July 25, 1971.

Second. An editorial entitled "The Sense of the Senate on Subversion," which appeared in the Washington Post of August 10, 1971.

Third. An article by Henry Raymond entitled "Publishers Warned of Threats to United States Freedoms," which appeared in the New York Times of September 23, 1971.

Fourth. An editorial entitled "Faith in One Another," which appeared in the Washington Post of October 3, 1971.

Fifth. An article entitled "Plan Drawn To Fire U.S. 'Subversives,'" which appeared in the Evening Star of October 29, 1971.

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

[From the Washington Star, July 25, 1971]

DO-NOTHING SACB SHOULD KEEP ON DOING JUST THAT

(By Carl T. Rowan)

It seems such a shame to have the United States Congress tied up for days in argument about a do-nothing relic of the postwar witch-hunts called "The Subversive Activities Control Board."

Unfortunately, such action by Congress is necessary if we are to prevent the use of the SACB to impose another spell of McCarthyism and ease the country a little further into police statism.

As things stand, the SACB is no big threat to the people's liberties. The courts long ago clipped the boards' wings to the extent that it is just a \$450,000-a-year boondoggling sop to those conservatives who still see Communists under every bed.

The board now rarely meets, and, according to testimony by its chairman, interviewed only three people last year. So it is hardly the great protector of the nation's security.

But the SACB has been of convenience to presidents. When Lyndon B. Johnson wanted to favor one of his secretaries, he named her groom to a seat on this board.

When Richard Nixon wanted to curry favor with the right-wingers, he named one of their favorites, Otto F. Otepka, to a \$36,000-a-year seat on the board. The Senate has yet to confirm Otepka, who is a sort of Daniel Ellsberg in reverse. Whereas Ellsberg leaked the "Pentagon papers" out of liberal, anti-war convictions, Otepka was fired by the