

U.S. Congress.

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

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

VOLUME 118—PART 11

APRIL 19, 1972 TO APRIL 26, 1972

(PAGES 13301 TO 14556)

their utility in relationship to their expense.

In particular, the Assistant Administrator for Cost Benefit as provided in my amendment shall investigate and report to the Administrator on the prospective costs to be incurred and the projected benefits to be derived from any program, project, or undertaking in which NASA is proposed to be a participant or a sponsor. My amendment would require that such a report precede any program, project, or undertaking by NASA and that these reports be reviewed and updated at least annually.

I feel strongly that a specific office within NASA be responsible for preliminary and current evaluation of projects. Criteria should be established by which this will be done, including guidelines for evaluating projects which do not promise specific commercial or financial returns.

In summary, the approach which I have presented in this amendment would introduce a healthy element of fiscal responsibility into the NASA program. It would also allow the Congress to have a better idea of how programs in NASA are progressing, and would inspire confidence on the part of the public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1141

On page 12, after line 3, add the following:

"SEC. 7. (a) There shall be established in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration an Office of Cost-Benefit, which shall be headed by an Assistant Administrator. The Assistant Administrator for Cost-Benefit shall investigate and report to the Administrator on the prospective costs to be incurred, and the projected benefits to be derived, from any program, project or undertaking in which the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is proposed to be a participant or sponsor. No such program, project or undertaking shall be initiated by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration unless preceded by a Cost-Benefit Report, and each such report shall be reviewed and updated by the Assistant Administrator not less frequently than annually. The Administrator shall promulgate rules, regulations and procedures in accordance with which such reports shall be produced.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

On page 12, line 4, strike "Sec. 7" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 8".

### SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1972—AMENDMENTS

#### AMENDMENTS NOS. 1142 AND 1143

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

#### DAY CARE AMENDMENTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, today Senators BAYH, BROOKE, CASE, CRANSTON, HART, HUGHES, HUMPHREY, JAVITS, MCGOVERN, MOSS, MUSKIE, RIBICOFF, STAFFORD, TAFT, TUNNEY, WILLIAMS, and myself, are introducing a series of five amendments designed to assure that any day care to be provided under H.R. 1 will

meet at least minimal standards of quality, focus on the needs of the children served, and be offered under terms which will strengthen family life.

These five amendments—of which I am the principal sponsor of two, and a principal cosponsor of the two being introduced by Senator JAVITS and the one being introduced by Senator TUNNEY—are in the form of amendments to amendment 559, Senator RIBICOFF's amendment to H.R. 1.

We have discussed these amendments with Senator RIBICOFF. They are acceptable to him. He is a cosponsor of them and they have his support.

The central thrust of these amendments is simple. They seek to assure that any day care provided in connection with welfare reform be developmental in nature; meet high standards for quality; be adequately staffed; be explicitly designed to provide for health, education, and nutritional needs of the children served; and be offered in a way that involves parents in the decisions affecting their children.

They are designed to clarify some disturbing ambiguities and omissions in the day-care provisions contained in the House-passed bill, and to assure that any day-care opportunities provided under this program become more than simply custodial parking lot facilities for children.

Mr. President, for the past 3 years, I have been conducting hearings and helping shape legislation concerning preschool education, day care, and child development. The comprehensive child development bill which was passed by the Congress and vetoed by the President was a culmination of these efforts. That legislation reflected what I believe to be some of the essential truths about child development. It was based on an understanding that:

A child's chance for an equal educational opportunity begins long before he enters school;

The home environment—or the day-care environment—in which a preschool child spends his time can have a major impact on his future educational career;

Quality preschool programs for children and parents can eliminate much of the deficit normally produced by poverty or custodial day care;

Programs must strengthen family life and family capabilities; and must provide adequate health, nutritional, and educational services.

As the principal sponsor of that vetoed bill and as a principal sponsor, along with Senator NELSON, Senator JAVITS, and Senator TAFT of a revised and modified child development bill, reported last week by the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, I am continuing to work for enactment of a comprehensive child development bill this year. Nothing short of a quality, parentally based, family-strengthening bill of that nature will meet preschool education and day-care needs faced by many families and children.

Thus, the amendments we are introducing today, while they seek to improve the day care provisions in H.R. 1, are in no way designed as a complete or

even a partial substitute for a comprehensive child development bill.

They are designed instead to recognize that H.R. 1 may provide up to 800,000 new child care opportunities and as such must be amended in a way to assure that this supplementary effort, dealing primarily with the needs of children from welfare families, provides nothing less than quality child care.

The need for amendments such as the ones we are introducing is apparent to anyone who has examined some of the existing day care programs funded in connection with welfare. No less an authority than Dr. Edward F. Zigler, Director of HEW's Office of Child Development, has testified that as much as 80 percent of the existing day care under title IV of the Social Security Act is purely custodial. He has stated before my Subcommittee on Children and Youth that in "many instances we are paying for service that is harmful to children."

His conclusions are supported by numerous studies including the recent report of the National Council of Jewish Women entitled "Windows on Day Care." That report, parts of which I will be inserting in the RECORD shortly, indicate the tremendous inadequacies of many existing day care programs, the damage which is being done to many children in some of these programs, and the need for comprehensive child development legislation and for amendments such as we are introducing today.

Mr. President, permit me to describe the two amendments of which I am the principal sponsor.

The first amendment will assure that standards of any child care provided under H.R. 1 would be no weaker than the 1968 Federal Interagency Day Care Standards. This amendment provides that standards for child care under this act must "be consistent with" the 1968 Federal Interagency Day Care Standards which currently apply to all federally assisted day care programs. The specific intent of this amendment is to guarantee that adult-child ratios in these day-care programs—which parents, researchers, child welfare experts, and other authorities agree is perhaps the single most important guarantee of quality and protection against damage—cannot be diluted. This amendment does not freeze every provision of those standards. It deliberately provides HEW with the flexibility to correct weaknesses and improve the quality of day care. But it will not permit any weakening of those standards which would provide cheaper or less adequate care, decrease the existing emphasis on nutrition and health, or reduce the existing adult-child ratios. The administration has testified to both the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee that child-care opportunities under this program will be developmental. This amendment is designed to reflect that commitment, define it specifically, and give it the support of the Congress.

My second amendment places the administrative responsibility for child-care programs under this act in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—where most existing programs serving

children and families presently reside—including day care and child development efforts such as Headstart, title IV A of the Social Security Act, preschool programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and other programs.

The President has designated the Office of Child Development in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as the principal office responsible for overseeing Federal child-care programs. Yet the House-passed bill places responsibility for child care under this act in the Secretary of Labor. The administration's original welfare reform proposal placed these responsibilities primarily in the Secretary of HEW and this amendment is designed to restore that arrangement. It is designed in addition to underscore the central purpose of all of these amendments; namely that child-care programs be focused on the needs of children and families, not just on considerations of employment and training.

Mr. President, I would like to indicate at this point my very strong support of the two amendments being offered today by Senator JAVITS which will: First, include in the statement of purpose of this act the intent of Congress that child-care opportunities to be provided under the reform measure will be designed to meet the education, health, nutritional, and other needs of children, as well as enable parents to engage in employment, training, or education; and second, insure that mothers who have registered for work and training and who are caring for a child through the age of 12 will not be required to accept work or training if it would necessitate their absence from the home during hours or periods in which the child is not attending school. I am delighted to be a principal cosponsor of these amendments with Senator JAVITS, Senator CRANSTON, and Senator TUNNEY.

I would like to express my strong support as well for the amendment Senator TUNNEY is introducing today which will reserve at least 5 percent of the child-care appropriations under H.R. 1 for staff training. This is a desperately needed amendment and I am delighted to be a principal sponsor of that with Senator TUNNEY, Senator JAVITS, and Senator CRANSTON.

Mr. President, I cannot overemphasize how the experiences a child has during the preschool years affect his chances for success or failure in school, and indeed in life. That is why I believe that any program providing day care, preschool education or health and nutritional assistance to children in the early years of life must be offered in a sensitive manner, with the highest quality, and in a way that involves parents and strengthens family life. That is the purpose of the amendments we offer today.

I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of all five of these amendments and a copy of the two amendments I am introducing be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the explanation and amendments were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF CHILD CARE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY SENATOR MONDALE, SENATOR JAVITS, SENATOR CRANSTON, AND SENATOR TUNNEY TO AMENDMENT NO. 559 TO H.R. 1 MEETING CHILDREN'S DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

H.R. 1 and amendment No. 559, introduced by Senator Ribicoff, place primary emphasis on the provision of child care as a means of enabling parents to become self-supporting by engaging in employment, training or education.

While recognizing this as a legitimate objective, the amendment adds a clear statement of legislative intent that child care programs be designed also to meet the educational, health, nutritional and other needs of children so that each child shall have full opportunity to attain his or her full potential.

The Administration has indicated the necessity of ensuring that child care provided under the Act is developmental in nature.

This amendment would write that purpose into law so as to ensure that the program is administered with at least equal regard to the needs of children as to the employment, training and educational needs of parents.

AMENDMENT TO EXEMPT CERTAIN MOTHERS FROM WORK AND TRAINING REQUIREMENTS UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

In general, under H.R. 1 and Senator Ribicoff's amendment, mothers of school-age children (generally between the ages of six and sixteen) would be required to register and accept manpower services, employment, or training or forfeit their cash benefits under the Act.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, a mother of a child under the age of 13 would become aware of various opportunities through registration and would be required to accept services, employment or training which would not conflict with the need to supervise and give attention to her children when they are in the home, if she determines that to be in the best interest of her family.

This provision will thus avoid the possibility of "latch-key" children—children left without attention, which can only serve to perpetuate the cycle of poverty.

Experience under the current programs has established that the great majority of welfare mothers are motivated by a desire to engage in work or training in order to improve the financial situation of their families and will do so, if adequate arrangements can be made.

The provision of as many as 875,000 child care opportunities as planned under H.R. 1—including more than 584,000 after-school opportunities—will help to make this possible.

STANDARDS FOR CHILD CARE

The amendment would ensure that standards which the Secretary would be required to establish for child care under the Act would be "consistent with" existing Federal Interagency Day Care standards which apply to all federally assisted day care pro-

<sup>1</sup> H.R. 1 currently exempts mothers of children under the age of six from the registration requirements of the bill and then only during the first two years of the program; thereafter the exemption applies only to children under three years of age. Senator Ribicoff's amendment would permanently maintain for all years the exemption for children under six.

Under the amendment also, mothers of school-age children would be required to register and, generally speaking, to accept manpower services, training or employment.

However, a mother, or other relative, caring for a child under the age of 13 would have "good cause" for refusing such services, training or employment if it would necessitate her absence from the home during hours of periods when the child is not attending school.

grams; the Ribicoff amendment provides that such standards shall be "no less comprehensive" than the existing standards.

The difficulty with the existing provision is that standards could be "no less comprehensive" and yet be weaker than existing standards. For example, if the Secretary of HEW were to shift the adult-child ratio from 1 to 5 as under current standards to 1 to 10 under new standards, the new standards would be no less "comprehensive" in the sense that they would address the issue of adult-child ratio.

The amendment uses the words "consistent with" to indicate that standards can be the same as or represent improvements on existing standards, but not a weakened version of what already exists. Thus a smaller adult-child ratio would be "consistent with" objectives of existing standards for quality care, while a greater ratio would not be consistent in that it would dilute quality.

Thus the amendment is designed to bring any new child care programs specifically under existing standards or improvements thereon. H.R. 1 contains no reference to standards or quality and the House Committee Report and other legislative history indicates a willingness on the part of the Committee to permit such standards to be waived.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The amendment vests authority for the operation and administration of child care programs under welfare reform in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is designed to underscore the objective that such programs focus on the children's interest. The President has designated the Office of Child Development of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as the principal office responsible for overseeing federal child care programs. While the House-passed bill places the responsibility for child care in the Secretary of Labor, the Administration's original welfare reform proposal placed these responsibilities principally in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TRAINING OF STAFF

The amendment would earmark at least five percent of all sums appropriated for child care under H.R. 1 for the initial and continued training of competent child care workers of all levels.

The provision of sufficient suitable staff is a critical determinant of the standard of child care services. The rapid expansion of demand for child care services has already resulted in a shortage of trained workers in programs for young children. Many preschools are unable to find the qualified staff they need. The Director of the Office of Child Development has shown that most children presently enrolled in federally funded projects and other day care programs are being supervised by untrained personnel. The supply of suitable people will be even less adequate of new federal programs are established without special attention to the training of both professional and paraprofessional staff. This amendment seeks to incorporate such attention in the Child Care provisions of H.R. 1.

AMENDMENT No. 1142

On page 31, beginning on line 3, strike out "no less comprehensive than" and insert in lieu thereof "consistent with".

AMENDMENT No. 1143

On page 7, line 19, strike out "Secretary of Labor" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."

On page 8, line 1, strike out "Secretary of Labor" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."

On page 8, line 7, strike out "Secretary of Labor" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."

On page 8, line 13, after "Welfare" insert "under section 2134 and other laws".

On page 8, beginning on line 17, strike out "the Secretary of Labor" and insert in lieu thereof "under section 2134 and other laws, he".

On page 9, line 12, strike out "Secretary of Labor" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare".

On page 10, beginning with line 6, strike out through line 11.

On page 10, line 12, strike out "(7)" and insert in lieu thereof "(6)".

On page 10, beginning on line 12, strike out "Secretary of Labor" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare".

On page 10, line 15, strike out "Secretary of Labor" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare".

On page 28, beginning with line 22, strike out all after "transportation" through line 24, and insert in lieu thereof a period and the following: "Where available, facilities developed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under section 2134 and other laws shall be used on a priority basis."

On page 29, line 2, immediately after "2134" insert "and other laws".

On page 30, line 18, beginning with the comma after "establish" strike out all through the comma on line 19.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1144

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

#### CHILD CARE IS FOR CHILDREN

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, one of the more regrettable aspects of the continuing controversy about welfare reform is the fact that the child care services to be provided under H.R. 1 have been viewed predominantly from the perspective of adult rather than children's needs.

Day care for the children of welfare recipients has been treated not as a means for promoting the best interests of children, but primarily as a way of disposing of them so that a parent will be free to accept work or training.

Children should not be treated as pawns in any welfare program, however effective it might be in the immediate concern of removing people from the welfare rolls. The welfare of children is a long-term concern. If we sacrifice the interests of children at this most formative stage of their lives to the interests of their parents, we run a very high risk of alleviating the welfare problem now at the cost of aggravating it later. We run an even higher risk of impeding those children from fulfilling their individual potential for participating in and contributing to society as a whole.

In terms of child care this means that the services provided must not be held down to the level of "warehousing." It is a fallacy to regard simple custodial care as neutral to a child's development. Unless the environment positively encourages development of the different sides of a child's makeup, it is extremely likely that it will do actual harm. Children need more than protection from everyday hazards and cursory individual attention. They need the constant care and attention which a mother normally affords in a good home environment in helping her children develop their bodies, expand their minds, and learn to live with others.

It is essential, then, to insure that the

care to be provided for the children of welfare recipients who wish or are required to accept work or work training should meet at least basic standards of adequacy. The amendments which we are introducing today seek to insure that child care provided under H.R. 1 will meet at least minimum standards of quality, will concentrate on the needs of the children rather than the needs of their parents, and will be made available under terms which will do nothing to weaken family life.

#### COMPETENT WORKERS

In any adequate child care program, proper attention must be paid to the health and nutrition of the child, the type of facilities and equipment, the involvement of parents.

But the single most important factor in determining the standard of care is the character and quality of the adult who takes the main responsibility for the supervision and encouragement of the child—who guides and fosters his educational and social development.

No matter how fine the equipment or how suitable the surroundings, the advantage or disadvantage which a child derives will be determined fundamentally by the capabilities of this person.

If there are not enough people at all levels who are competent to take on the very demanding task of fostering the development of our youngest citizens, then the net effect of our child care programs is all too likely to be to commit our children in ever larger numbers to care which does not deserve the name—to care which damages or inhibits their growth and development.

This fact does not alter whether the care is provided for larger numbers in a center, or for a small group in a home with a single person in charge.

The unavoidable fact is, however, that there is already a definite shortage of properly competent workers for child care. Unless long-term trends in our society are suddenly and unexpectedly reversed, that shortage will be intensified progressively through the seventies.

Since 1960, the number of licensed day care facilities has tripled and the number of children in other preschool programs has doubled. If this trend continues, kindergarten and nursery school enrollment will increase from 3.9 million children in 1968 to 6.3 million in 1980. If the trend is reinforced, it is likely that the increase in demand will be even greater—and there will of necessity be even greater resort to inadequate and unlicensed arrangements.

At the present time there is a shortage of trained people to work in programs for young children. Many centers are unable to find qualified staff. Most children presently enrolled in federally funded projects and other day care programs are being supervised by untrained workers.

The Department of Labor has estimated in the field of early education alone some 23,000 new teachers will be needed every year to cope with the accelerated growth of enrollment—and that is nearly five times as many as are currently being trained each year.

The supply of suitable people will be

even less adequate if new Federal programs such as those in H.R. 1 are established without special attention to the training of staff at all levels.

The provision of adequate competent staff is not something that can be taken for granted. Simply creating a program by legislative fiat will not of itself produce a sudden crop of trained child care workers, especially when the existing shortage is so great. An effort must be made, and it must be made from the beginning.

Putting a heavy emphasis on the use of family day care homes, caring for, say, four to eight children, is no way of meeting the problem, either. The need for competency and suitable training for child care workers at all levels does not decrease with the size of the group of children involved. The evidence is, on the contrary, that affording proper advice, support and training in their homes is actually more expensive than for centers.

While the children's interests should at all times be paramount, it is also necessary to give close attention to the needs of the adult workers. Suitable opportunities must be provided for all workers from aides to cooks to teachers to advance themselves. This is especially important in view of the intention to employ welfare mothers where possible in providing the child care services under H.R. 1. It makes no sense to admit these people only to the lower or middle levels of employment when they may have the capacity, with training, to advance to significantly higher levels.

Of the group of amendments which we are introducing today, the one which I now offer is designed to address this specific and very important problem of staff supply. It earmarks at least 5 percent of the sums appropriated for child care under the family assistance plan and the opportunities for families program for the initial and continued training of staff at all levels, but with particular emphasis on the all-important professional and paraprofessional levels. It also seeks to insure that those welfare mothers who are offered employment in child care will be given the access to training which will enable them to improve their skills and capacities and qualify themselves for progressively more responsible and more lucrative work.

In the context of the version of H.R. 1 which has been passed by the House, this bottom figure of 5 percent would amount to some \$37.5 million dollars a year, a sum which would not at all meet the cost of adequate training. Under the more realistic provisions of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Senator RIBICOFF), it would amount to some \$75 million.

I believe this is a fundamentally necessary investment which must be made and sustained if the many thousands of children who will be involved are to receive the basically adequate standard of care which their future demands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD, together with a list of its cosponsors.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1144

Intended to be proposed by Mr. TUNNEY (for himself, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Javits, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Case, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Pell, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Stafford, and Mr. Williams) to amendment No. 559:

On page 10, line 5, insert immediately after "facilities, the following:

"Of the amount appropriated to enable the Secretary of Labor to carry out his responsibilities under this paragraph, the Secretary shall spend such amounts as may be necessary to assure that the persons trained under the provisions of this paragraph receive as much training as necessary to assure that they are equipped to provide child care services on a level consistent with the Federal interagency day care requirements as promulgated on September 23, 1968."

On page 33, line 12, strike out "especially" and insert in lieu thereof "including".

On page 33, line 14, insert immediately after "section 2111" the following: "(with special regard to the pre-service and inservice training of professional and para-professional personnel)".

On page 34, strike out lines 21 through line 2 on page 35 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) of the sums appropriated to provide for child care services under this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, or any fiscal year thereafter, such amounts as may be necessary (but not less than 5 percent of the total amounts so appropriated) shall be used for the initial and continued training of professional and para-professional personnel for employment in the provision of child care services."

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1146 AND 1147

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce two amendments designed to improve the child care and certain related provisions of amendment No. 599, to H.R. 1, the welfare reform measure approved by the House. These are two of five amendments which Senators MONDALE, CRANSTON, TUNNEY, and I are introducing today to amendment No. 559; each has the support of the principal sponsor of that amendment, Senator RIBICOFF.

The Ribicoff amendment, in which each of us has joined, would substitute a new "Family Assistance" title for that contained in H.R. 1.

The first of my amendments would require that child care provided under the welfare program be developmental in nature—that is, that it will meet the educational, health, and other needs of children, and that it is not alone custodial.

The second would provide that a mother of a school age child between the ages of 6 and 13 would not be required to accept employment or training where it would necessitate her absence from the home during hours or periods when the child is not attending school. However, she would still be required to register for such activities, as under H.R. 1, so that she could be required to work when there is no conflict and would become aware of other opportunities to be accepted at her option.

In addition to Senators MONDALE, CRANSTON, and TUNNEY, I am joined in

these amendments by Senators BAYH, HART, HUGHES, HUMPHREY, MCGOVERN, MOSS, MUSKIE, PELL, RIBICOFF, WILLIAMS, CASE, and STAFFORD.

The other amendments which we introduce today would: First, assure that specific standards for child care are no weaker than existing standards; second, place administrative responsibility for child care with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, rather than the Secretary of Labor as under the House bill; and third, earmark for staff training 5 percent of the appropriations for child care in each year.

As principal Senate sponsors and cosponsors of the child development bill which, unfortunately, was vetoed last year, we continue to support the enactment of comprehensive legislation in this session. The Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty just last week reported to the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am the ranking minority member, a new bipartisan proposal—separate from the extension of the poverty program—to that end.

The new subcommittee bill, the Comprehensive Headstart, Child Development and Family Services Act, combines the best elements of S. 3228, a bill of that same title which I had introduced on February 24, 1972, with 12 Republican cosponsors and, S. 3193, introduced by Senators MONDALE and NELSON, which would have added a new title to the Economic Opportunity Act for child care programs.

Such comprehensive legislation should be our principal effort in child care, but we should include also, as would H.R. 1 and the Ribicoff amendment, a basic authority for child care under the welfare program itself in light of the established link between child care opportunities and the reduction of welfare dependency.

H.R. 1, and amendment No. 559, would each provide 876,000 opportunities each year—consisting of 291,000 preschool opportunities and 584,000 afterschool opportunities; these are significant quotients but quite obviously they must be supplemented by comprehensive legislation since there are some 3.5 million children in poor families under the age of 6 and an additional 4 million under 13 as well as many other children; in contrast there are currently only 700,000 licensed child care opportunities in the Nation.

Our purpose in these amendments is merely to insure that child care provided under the welfare proposal will meet at least minimal standards of quality, concentrate on the needs of children, and will be made available in a context which will serve to strengthen family life.

A detailed explanation of the two amendments which I introduce today follows:

AMENDMENT TO MEET CHILDREN'S DEVELOPMENTAL NEEDS

H.R. 1 and amendment No. 559 places principal emphasis on child care as a means of permitting welfare parents to engage in employment, training, or education, so as to become self-supporting.

While recognizing this as a legitimate objective, the amendment requires that child care must be designed to meet the educational, health, nutritional, and other developmental needs of children so that each will have a full opportunity to attain his or her full potential.

This, in fact, is the intent of the administration. As President Nixon stated in his welfare reform message, August 11, 1969:

The child care I propose is more than custodial. This Administration is committed to a new emphasis on child development in the first five years of life. The day care that would be part of this plan would be of a quality that will help in the development of the child and provide for its health and safety, and would break the poverty cycle for the new generation.

But despite all good faith and intents, there remains the possibility that pressure for effort to provide more "slots" to enable parents to work could result in shortcuts with respect to the quality of child care.

This amendment would write into law the administration's plans to insure that the program is administered with full regard to the needs of children, as well as of parents.

AMENDMENT TO EXEMPT MOTHERS FROM WORK OR UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

In general, under H.R. 1 and amendment No. 559, mothers of school age children would be required to register for and accept manpower training or employment or forfeit their cash benefits under the act.

Also, under our amendment, such mothers would be required to register and, generally speaking, to accept such services.

However, where such work or training would necessitate her absence from the home during hours when the child is not attending school, a mother caring for a child under the age of 13 would have "good cause" for refusing such opportunities.

Thus she would become aware of various full- and part-time opportunities through registration but would be given the option to refuse them if they conflict with the need to give attention to her children while they are in the home.

In this connection, I should note that H.R. 1 currently exempts mothers of children under the age of 6 from the registration and work requirements of the bill and then only during the first 2 years of the program; thereafter the exemption applies only to children under 3 years of age. Senator RIBICOFF's amendment would continue that exemption for children under 6 in all years.

Our amendment is based upon the assumption that welfare mothers do not have to be "beaten over the head" to engage in work or training.

Currently, one of the most unfair myths is that welfare mothers lack a proper motivation to work. In fact studies, such as that conducted by Dr. Lawrence Podell in 1966, have repeatedly shown that at least seven out of 10 welfare mothers would rather work and that eight in 10 have employment experience.

Of course, it would have been possible

to provide that a mother would have "good cause" only if child care or other arrangements were not available, as determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

But such a provision would make child care—as well as work and training—mandatory under the act.

I believe that such a result would be inconsistent with our policies generally and run the risk of lifetime damage in a number of cases.

At the insistence of my colleague Senator BUCKLEY, the child development legislation approved by the Congress last year contained a number of provisions to make clear without any doubt, as intended by its sponsors, that child care would be provided only when the parent or guardian requests it. The new subcommittee bill contains similar provisions.

If mandatory care is bad policy for children generally—as I believe it is—then it is bad policy in respect to poor children.

There can be no double standard.

There will always exist a number of children for whom child care will not be only inappropriate but damaging.

As noted in a letter to me dated December 8, 1970, from the Child Welfare League of America—in general support of an amendment which I previously submitted on this issue:

We believe that the primary concern in making this decision should be to protect the best interests of each child, and some children need to be cared for by their own mothers. A day care service is not beneficial or appropriate for every child. Many children are not psychologically or emotionally ready at school age for all-day separation from their mothers, nor are they all able to tolerate long periods away from home in group care. Some children do not thrive in group situations and need the supportive care of their own families in order to feel secure and develop properly. We, therefore, believe that day care services should never be required when it is not in the child's best interest.

Mr. President, in my view, we cannot leave it up to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Secretary of Labor—however enlightened they may be—to make a determination as to whether the child care available is "suitable" or otherwise in the best interest of the child. In my opinion, no guidelines can be formulated that will express adequately for each of the millions of school-age children in poor households the circumstances under which child care will be a long-term detriment to the child.

It is preferable in my opinion to draw the line in terms of any time conflict between the employment offered and caring for the child, as we propose.

Mr. President, in summary I believe that these amendments, and the others being introduced, are essential to prevent damage to children through short-sighted efforts to deal with the present welfare crises.

It would be ironic indeed if we were to perpetuate the cycle of poverty through a welfare reform measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the text

of these amendments and a description of each be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### AMENDMENT No. 1146

On page 6, line 2, insert immediately after the period the following: "The Secretary shall determine that good cause exists if such individual is a mother or relative actually caring for one or more children under the age of thirteen who are attending school and if such employment, services, or training would necessitate the absence from home of such individual during hours or periods when the child or children are not attending school."

#### AMENDMENT No. 1147

On page 3, line 4, immediately after "Act" insert "(1)".

On page 3, line 12, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(1) and (2) to assure that child care services provided under this Act shall be designed to meet the educational, health, nutritional and other needs of the children served in order that each such child shall have a full opportunity to attain his or her full potential."

On page 7, line 22, immediately after "for insert "children of."

On page 8, line 2, strike out "in order to" and insert in lieu thereof "meeting the requirements of this Act while their parents".

On page 28, line 10, immediately after "services" insert "meeting the requirements of this Act".

On page 28, line 11, immediately after "for" insert "children of."

On page 28, line 15, immediately before "who" insert "for children".

On page 28, line 16, strike out "in order to be able to participate" and insert in lieu thereof "while their parents are participating".

#### EXPLANATION OF CHILD CARE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY SENATOR MONDALE, SENATOR JAVITS, SENATOR CRANSTON, AND SENATOR TUNNEY TO AMENDMENT No. 559 TO H.R. 1 MEETING CHILDREN'S DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

H.R. 1 and amendment No. 559, introduced by Senator Ribicoff, place primary emphasis on the provision of child care as a means of enabling parents to become self-supporting by engaging in employment, training or education.

While recognizing this as a legitimate objective, the amendment adds a clear statement of legislative intent that child care programs be designed also to meet the educational, health, nutritional and other needs of children so that each child shall have full opportunity to attain his or her full potential.

The Administration has indicated the necessity of ensuring that child care provided under the Act is developmental in nature.

This amendment would write that purpose into law so as to ensure that the program is administered with at least equal regard to the needs of children as to the employment, training and educational needs of parents.

#### AMENDMENT TO EXEMPT CERTAIN MOTHERS FROM WORK AND TRAINING REQUIREMENTS UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

In general, under H.R. 1 and Senator Ribicoff's amendment, mothers of school-age children (generally between the ages of six and sixteen) would be required to register and accept manpower services, em-

ployment, or training or forfeit their cash benefits under the Act.\*

Under the amendment also, mothers of school-age children would be required to register and, generally speaking, to accept manpower services, training or employment.

However, a mother, or other relative, caring for a child under the age of 13 would have "good cause" for refusing such services, training or employment if it would necessitate her absence from the home during hours of periods when the child is not attending school.

Thus, a mother of a child under the age of 13 would become aware of various opportunities through registration and would be required to accept services, employment or training which would not conflict with the need to supervise and give attention to her children when they are in the home, if she determines that to be in the best interest of her family.

This provision will thus avoid the possibility of "latch-key" children—children left without attention, which can only serve to perpetuate the cycle of poverty.

Experience under the current programs has established that the great majority of welfare mothers are motivated by a desire to engage in work or training in order to improve the financial situation of their families and will do so, if adequate arrangements can be made.

The provision of as many as 875,000 child care opportunities as planned under H.R. 1—including more than 584,000 afterschool opportunities—will help to make this possible.

#### STANDARDS FOR CHILD CARE

The amendment would ensure that standards which the Secretary would be required to establish for child care under the Act would be "consistent with" existing Federal Interagency Day Care standards which apply to all federally assisted day care programs; the Ribicoff amendment provides that such standards shall be "no less comprehensive" than the existing standards.

The difficulty with the existing provision is that standards could be "no less comprehensive" and yet be weaker than existing standards. For example, if the Secretary of HEW were to shift the adult-child ratio from 1 to 5 as under current standards to 1 to 10 under new standards, the new standards would be no less "comprehensive" in the sense that they would address the issue of adult-child ratio.

The amendment uses the words "consistent with" to indicate that standards can be the same as or represent improvements on existing standards, but not a weakened version of what already exists. Thus a smaller adult-child ratio would be "consistent with" objectives of existing standards for quality care, while a greater ratio would not be consistent in that it would dilute quality.

Thus the amendment is designed to bring any new child care programs specifically under existing standards or improvements thereon. H.R. 1 contains no reference to standards or quality and the House Committee Report and other legislative history indicates a willingness on the part of the Committee to permit such standards to be waived.

\*H.R. 1 currently exempts mothers of children under the age of six from the registration requirements of the bill and then only during the first two years of the program; thereafter the exemption applies only to children under three years of age. Senator Ribicoff's amendment would permanently maintain for all years the exemption for children under six.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,  
AND WELFARE

The amendment vests authority for the operation and administration of child care programs under welfare reform in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is designed to underscore the objective that such programs focus on the children's interest. The President has designated the office of Child Development of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as the principal office responsible for overseeing federal child care programs. While the House-passed bill places the responsibility for child care in the Secretary of Labor, the Administration's original welfare reform proposal placed these responsibilities principally in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TRAINING OF STAFF

The amendment would earmark at least five percent of all sums appropriated for child care under H.R. 1 for the initial and continued training of competent child care workers of all levels.

The provision of sufficient suitable staff is a crucial determinant of the standard of child care services. The rapid expansion of demand for child care services has already resulted in a shortage of trained workers in programs for young children. Many preschools are unable to find the qualified staff they need. The Director of the Office of Child Development has shown that most children presently enrolled in federally funded projects and other day care programs are being supervised by untrained personnel. The supply of suitable people will be even less adequate if new federal programs are established without special attention to the training of both professional and paraprofessional staff. This amendment seeks to incorporate such attention in the Child Care provisions of H.R. 1.

OCEAN MAMMAL PROTECTION  
ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1148 THROUGH 1154

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

Mr. GRAVEL submitted seven amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 10420) to protect marine mammals; to establish a Marine Mammal Commission; and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON  
AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), I ask unanimous consent that his announcement of hearings on April 28, 1972, on amendments to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACKSON

Mr. President, on Friday, April 28, a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to receive testimony and recommendations from selected Federal officials and public witnesses on H.R. 13752, a bill passed by the House of Representatives on April 17 to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for the interim licensing of the operation of certain thermoelectric generating plants, and for other purposes. The hearing will be held in room 3110 and will convene at 10 a.m.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

A RICHLY DESERVED HONOR—SENATOR NORRIS COTTON TO RECEIVE ROBERT FROST CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN AWARD

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, my good friend and senior colleague from New Hampshire, Senator NORRIS COTTON, will receive the coveted Robert Frost Contemporary American Award from the Alumni Association of Plymouth State College next Monday, April 24.

The award is presented each year to an outstanding American, and is made in memory of the beloved poet who taught at Plymouth State College in the early 1900's.

In 1923—about the time that NORRIS COTTON entered public life—Frost wrote this about our Granite State:

Just specimens is all New Hampshire has, One each of everything as in a showcase . . .

Mr. President, New Hampshire has just one NORRIS COTTON, and I rise today, not only to congratulate him, but to pay personal tribute to his character—and to express my appreciation of his friendship.

Robert Frost knew that in New Hampshire "it is knowing what to do with things that counts." And NORRIS COTTON's resourceful, seasoned ability to get things done is well known in our State.

Just a few miles from the quiet town of Lebanon, where he began his career, one of the world's most important cancer research centers is being built. It will stand as a permanent tribute to my senior colleague's accomplishments as a legislator and as an effective leader in man's battle against disease.

The wellspring of his deep humanitarian concern—and, indeed, of his effectiveness—is the man's own character.

Mr. President, we hear much these days of the estrangement between the people and their elected leaders, of the growing complaint that leadership has grown remote and aloof.

This is not so of NORRIS COTTON.

He has kept his humility. He has kept himself accessible. He has never forgotten that he is of the people. To this day, no citizen—regardless of how modest his station—is uncomfortable in NORRIS COTTON's presence. He has just rare ability to put everyone at ease.

This unflinching appreciation of the average citizen nourishes his art as one of the Senate's most accomplished and appealing storytellers.

Robert Frost understood that such true humor draws on a deep taproot of humanity, for he once said:

I judge a man by his anecdotes. If he always attaches a famous name to them, like "the last time I saw the Duke of so-and-so," then I don't like him nearly as much as a man whose anecdotes are about the common people and common every day things.

And now I should like to tell you how I have benefited from NORRIS COTTON's inherent decency.

From the day I entered this body nearly a decade ago, he has treated me with courtesy, with kindness, with utmost civility and helpfulness; and I assure you that the warm friendship that

has grown between us is cherished by the junior Senator.

He and I do not always agree. We are, after all, independent men.

But we share an appreciation of that most familiar of Frost's lines, the old New England folk saying that "good fences make good neighbors."

We know that fences do not divide. They represent mutual respect. We share the north country conviction that the individuality of neighbors is not to be suspect, but to be cherished.

A further thought, Mr. President:

Many months ago, that wise and good lady from the State of Maine, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, told us that our national fate hinged upon the restoration of civility to personal and public life.

Civility. That special grace which assumes sincerity and accords good will and respect to those with whom one honestly differs.

In a period when, throughout the country, shrill voices and small minds have been trying to divide our people, NORRIS COTTON retains that special grace called civility, Mr. President.

Lastly, I like to think that NORRIS COTTON and I have worked together in effective harness. And I like to think that the reason for this harmony and effectiveness is our mutual, and abiding, belief in the goodness and the worth of the people of our State.

Frost spoke of our people in a poem which described his move to New Hampshire:

I hadn't an illusion in my handbag—he wrote,  
About the people being better there  
Than those I left behind. I thought they weren't.  
I thought they couldn't be. *And yet they were.*

They still are, Mr. President. And NORRIS COTTON is living evidence.

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCTIVITY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the National Commission on Productivity has just published and made available to Members of Congress its first annual report on its activities since its inception in July 1970.

The report is a summary of the Commission's efforts to define and study various aspects of the problem of American productivity. It presents in outline plans for the future, including plans that are being made to implement the new title providing for a national productivity policy—the Javits-Percy amendment—that the Senate added to the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of December 1971.

Publication of the report is timely, because our Nation's productivity continues to be a problem, as demonstrated most recently by a poll by the American Institute of Public Opinion—the Gallup poll—which was designed to explore the public's attitudes about productivity. According to Gallup, the poll showed that a majority of U.S. adults believe American workers are not turning out as much