Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the privilege of the floor for the following staff members during the course of the deliberations—A. Sidney Johnson, William Sprin, Richard Johnson, and Bertram Carp.

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

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am pleased that this bill begins consideration today of S. 3617, the Comprehensive Headstart, Child Development and Family Services Act of 1972. This measure reflects the efforts of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to provide legislation to meet the needs of families and their children. It is a substantially modified version of the child development provisions in S. 2027, which the Congress adopted last year, but which was vetoed by the President. As the committee report explains in detail, the bill has been specifically and substantially revised to address the concerns expressed by the President in his veto message.

The committee bill is a broadly bipartisan measure. It represents a compromise between new, child development legislation introduced this year by myself, Senator NELSON and 12 Democratic cosponsors and similar legislation introduced by Senators JAVITS, TAFT, STAFFORD, SCHWEIKER, PACKWOOD and nine Republican cosponsors.

Mr. FULLBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULLBRIGHT. Mr. President, would the Senator add my name as a cosponsor also?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULLBRIGHT). I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULLBRIGHT) be added as a cosponsor. I thank him for his support.

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

Mr. MONDALE. I would like to comment at this time the senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) for his leadership on this issue as chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty; the senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare, for his long-standing and continuing initiatives in this area; and the junior Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Children and Youth, who has made a deep commitment and contribution to this compromise measure.

I also thank the other members of the subcommittee and the full committee as well for their work and for their contributions to this legislation.

The bill we are considering today seeks to better meet the need for quality, family-oriented preschool programs among millions of young children whose mothers are working or who because of poverty, are denied adequate health care, nutrition or educational opportunity.

It is designed to strengthen and support family life in an era when increasing numbers of mothers are working—when increasing numbers of children are being raised in one-parent families—and even, for reasons of accelerated mobility and changing life patterns, more and more young families are called upon to raise their children in isolation from their parents and other family members who contributed to the primary and fundamental influence on the development of the child.

It recognizes and specifically provides that child care programs must be totally voluntary, and must build upon and strengthen the role of the family as the primary and fundamental influence on the development of the child.

It assures that parents will have the opportunity to choose among the greatest possible variety of family supporting services—including part-day programs like Headstart, after school or full day programs, part time programs, and child care centers for working mothers, in-home tutoring and child development classes for parents and prospective parents.

Finally, by clarifying and modifying the vetoed bill with respect to the President's specific concerns about the Child Development provision in last year's bill, the committee has developed this new legislation in order to address each of these concerns. Since the modifications and revisions are discussed in detail in the committee report, I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the report discussing these changes appear at this point in my remarks.

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

MODIFICATIONS IN RESPONSE TO ADMINISTRATION CONCERNS

In the veto message, the President listed nine specific concerns about the child development provision in last year's bill. The committee has developed this new legislation in order to address each of these concerns. Since the modifications and revisions are discussed in detail in the committee report, I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the report discussing these changes appear at this point in my remarks.

The veto message further suggested that a combination of day care to be provided under the welfare proposal (H.R. 1) and under increased income tax deductions for child care, will meet some of these needs.

The Committee agrees that these new proposals will meet some of the need, but concludes that these new efforts are not sufficient in and of themselves. We found, for example, that a combination of existing Head Start programs and day care under the proposed welfare package would cover only 14% of the children served under the welfare proposal. We found, moreover, that the recently adopted child care deductions in the Revenue Act of 1971 will provide no assistance to families living in poverty. Furthermore, very little of any assistance to families with incomes between $4,000 and $8,000.

Treasury Department statistics reveal, for example, that a family of four who earn an income of $5,000, spending $500 on child care, would realize no tax savings under this Act; and a family of four, with an income of $7,000, spending $500 on day care would realize a savings of only $77.

As a result, even with these other efforts, there are too few child development and day care opportunities for the children in pov-
erty, and practically none for the 1 million children with working mothers in families with incomes between $4,000 and $7,000—incomes which are just a little too high to qualify for most, if not all, of the existing programs such as those under Head Start and Title IV of the Social Security Act, and too low to afford quality day care in private centers. The higher the income, the nearer to near poverty have perhaps the greatest unmet need for quality day care.

The need for expanded developmental day care centers for the preschool children of the home compared to only 18% in 1948.

"One out of every three mothers with preschool children is working today, compared to one out of eight in 1948."

"In 1971, 1.3 million mothers of children under 6 were single parents bringing up children without a husband, and half of these mothers worked.

"Yet, there are fewer than 700,000 spaces in licensed day care centers to serve the over 5 million preschool children whose mothers work."

Although some existing Federal programs help provide day care for these children, they often do not provide the option for development, care of the children's psychological needs, or the care of the physical needs of these young children. These day care programs are developmentally, comprehensively—and that in "many instances we are paying for service that is harmful to children."

A recent OEO publication entitled: "Day Care: Resources for Decisions", concluded: "Over 60% of all full-day centers in the United States are privately operated for profit.

"Most are custodial programs because that's all that most working mothers can afford. Day care in America is a scattered phenomenon; largely private, curiously supervised, growing and shrinking in response to national adult crises, largely unrelated to children's needs."

These findings are supported by the recently released Report of the National Council of Jewish Women, entitled "Windows on Day Care: A Report for Parents," 1972.

In 90 cities throughout the nation, the Report concludes that most day care facilities lack adequate services for children and their parents—and some are downright damaging. It found that:

"Only a very small percentage of the children whose mothers are employed now benefit from developmental day care services. The large majority are cared for in their own homes or in the homes of others and most of them receive only custodial care. Well over half of the children enrolled in licensed day care centers. Of the centers visited by Council members, only about a quarter provided developmental care including education, coordination, development, health, and social components of quality care. Survey participants found that far too many children of working mothers were grossly neglected latchkey children on their own, children who went with their mothers to their places of work because no other arrangements could be made for them, children in day care centers who are so poorly equipped to provide any care at all that they may suffer lasting injury. The first five years of a child's life are the period of the most rapid mental, personality and physical growth. Yet the future of the early years can have disastrous effects."

Dr. Harold H. Howe, Vice President of the Ford Foundation and former U.S. Commissioner of Education, said in detail the results of these inadequacies during his recent testimony to a Senate Committee. He said:

"Perhaps the best way to illustrate the idea of an environmental handicap is to describe an actual situation in which working mothers typically return to work some two weeks after the birth of their child. Yet, they have not developed, through the time that they are working, the child will be placed with another mother whose business is taking in children of working mothers. They are not with their own mothers after a day or so to have her children cared for during working hours. In such a center will be children from several months of age up to school age. A latchkey caretaker might look after up to ten or twelve such children in her home. For the caretaker who has neither training nor transportation, and living in a stimulating environment the entire emphasis is frequently on the passivity of children. The child who doesn't cry, who doesn't ask questions after he has learned to speak, who doesn't move about—in other words the child who does not seek, demand, and get stimulation and is least troublesome to the person in charge—is the child who gets rewarded. Such an environment discourages the early and very significant development of every aspect of the child's existence."

The qualities fortified in children so treated are the qualities which lead to failure in school. The lack of positive stimulation from humans—contact, mirror of objects, from verbal interchange, and from the kind of play through which a child learns to control sizes and control depression and inhibits the development of abilities which are extremely important not only for success in school but for success in life. The developmental lag when the child lacks as a result of its environment encourages the environment which the child doesn't need attention, who doesn't ask questions, who grows up, he is handicapped, and he bears the burden of that handicap through all his life. It is elemental that, even in the case of the child, the effects of care are far better than the effects of cure.

"Increasingly, we know something about how this can be done. With each passing day, we know more about the pace of new developments in this field of knowledge—research workers in the United States and elsewhere in the world are learning that the effective care of these underprivileged children will depend on an impoverished environment can develop a "learned helplessness" in children. When there is little stimulus for the mind, and the child is required to be self-reliant between parent and child, the sufferer lasting disabilities, particularly with respect to the development of a sense of control of his environment. As a result of that, from the simple fact of being poor, it is now fully established that an environment that does not stimulate learning is closely associated in the real world with poverty in its traditional forms. As much as any one thing, it is this factor that leads to the transmission of poverty from one generation to the next."

The problem is all too evident at work in the slums of America's cities, and that is a major reason for our concern.

"It is just as certain that we shall have to invent new social institutions to respond to this new knowledge."

The need for "needs to be served now"—relating to what the veto message called the "protection of children from actual suffering and deprivation"—are still not unmet. Despite expanded nutritional systems, improved medical care for poor children and more effective targeting of maternal and child health services—all of which were cited by President Nixon in his message and all of which we commend and support—many children and families in need of health, nutritional, educational and other social services remain untreated.

Recent findings by the Mississippi Medicaid Commission indicate the magnitude of the unmet health needs alone. The extent of undetected and untreated health problems among poor children examined by that commission—and their implications for child development—are frightening. The Commission estimates that in the year 1971, 1,178 children it examined, including: 305 cases of multiple cavities; 97 cases of faulty vision; 217 cases of enlarged tonsils; 97 cases of hernia; 136 cases of gastrointestinal parasites—mostly hookworm; 53 cases of poor hearing; and 32 other medical conditions requiring immediate treatment.

And Administration estimates of the unmet needs for prenatal care—which are included in detail in the back of this report—indicate that it could cost approximately $390 million to provide prenatal care and hospitalization to the 1.6 million poor and near poor women who deliver children each year without necessary medical attention.

Dr. Howe concludes that the need and the desirability for the wide variety of child development and family services in our new proposal have been demonstrated.

2. Duplication and redundancy. —The veto message suggested that "day care centers for poor children are already provided in HR 1 in the form of child development centers. There would be a duplication of these efforts", and would be "redundant in that they duplicate many existing and growing federal, state and local efforts to provide medical, health, educational and educational services to the very young."

For many of the reasons cited above, the Committee concludes that this bill will supplement and strengthen existing and proposed efforts, not duplicate them or be redundant. Despite the progress being made the task is far from complete. Only one-
fourth of the poor children who could benefit from preschool or after school services are being served. Hundreds of thousands, and in some cases millions, of children are still not enrolled in nursery schools that offer such programs—nutritional, educational services they need.

Thus, our child development program deliberately seeks to build on and improve the substantial gains that have been made in recent years. Currently, reaching fewer than 10% of the poor children who might benefit from it, and provide additional support for prenatal, nutrition, medical, and welfare programs—more programs that President noted—are currently being expanded, but are by no means reaching all those who need them.

Early childhood day care—along with, replacing or duplicating existing or proposed efforts by the programs authorized under this bill are designed as a much needed supplement. The Committee believes that they will strengthen the efforts we have begun in these fields.

3. Costs.—The veto message suggested that "the expenditure of $2 billion a year in a program whose effectiveness has yet to be demonstrated cannot be justified."

The Committee considered this concern and made the following modifications in the new bill as compared to the vetoed bill:

First, the effective date of the bill has been postponed an entire year, so that the planning and training year begins in FY 1973 and the first operational year is delayed until FY 1974.

Second, the authorization for the first operational year has been reduced by 40%—from $500 million authorized by the Administration, to $325 million.

Third, the bill has been clarified to indicate that even that $1.2 billion authorization in the first year can represent only a $700 million authorization increase. That is, the $1.2 billion authorization includes the $500 million authorization for Head Start already in existence in the Authorization Act, and the $700 million extension bill reported by our Committee.

Thus, although this 3 year child development bill we are proposing has a total authorization of $1.5 billion for planning and training in FY 1973, $1.2 billion in FY 1974 and $1.6 billion in FY 1975—this represents less than a $2 billion authorization increase over the next 3 years when local prime sponsors who qualify for the $1.5 billion will be added. Even the Administration noted that the "real increase is substantially more than 40%.

4. Eligibility and the family.—The veto message described one of the objectives of welfare reform as an "effort to bring the family together," but suggested that "the child development program appears to move precisely the opposite direction."

The Committee has considered this concern and made specific clarifications in the modifications in the new provisions for each of the categories in the former bill. For example, "the Secretary of HEW in a difficult political environment, would have limited the number of eligible communities to approximately 500. The Committee considered it and rejected it by a bipartisan vote of 14 to 1.

A similar amendment seeking to raise the population cut off to 50,000—which would have limited eligibility to approximately 1,000 communities, was also rejected and defeated by a 12 to 7 bipartisan vote.

The Committee felt that the 25,000 population cut off represented the best way to provide for the largest number of eligible communities and to provide quality day care for the children and families who need it, not encourage day care for all children whether they need it or not.

5. Parental involvement.—The veto message emphasized that "good public policy requires that we enhance, rather than diminish, both parental authority and parental involvement—particularly in those decisive early years when social attitudes and consciences are formed—on the basis of sound and moral principles are first inculcated."

The Committee agrees completely. That is why we have written in the limitations of eligibility for the program that programs under this Act shall be available "only to children whose parents or legal guardian requests them."

That is also why the bill contains extensive provisions for parental involvement in all aspects of the programs—as volunteers, paraprofessionals and professionals employed in these programs, members of the councils that approve policy, curriculum and other basic elements of these programs. Specifically, the bill requires that the Child and Family Councils, the Local Program Councils and the Project Policy Councils all be composed of at least 50% parents whose children are served by the program. The Committee believes strongly in this policy in these provisions—reflect the policy under the existing Head Start program.

6. Stag.—The veto message expressed concern about "who the qualified people are and where they would come from to staff child development centers."

The Committee responded to this concern by increasing the authorization under the bill for preservice and inservice training of both professional and paraprofessional staff members—at the same time we made substantial reductions in the total authorization for the program. That is, at the same time we reduced total authorizations by 40%, we reduced federal authorizations for staff training by 50%.

In addition, the resources available for staff training during the operational years of this bill, FY 1974, FY 1975, and FY 1976, are capped at 10% of the total authorization. In addition, the Committee notes that an estimated 40,000 individuals, skilled and unskilled, are graduating from colleges each year and would have the ability to recruit and train non-professionals—especially mothers and other family members—for important staff responsibilities in these programs. The Committee proposal seeks to build on that success.

7. Administrative workability.—The veto message expressed concern about administrative workability. Under our bill, all day care-would be eligible for full-day, full-week day care. Instead, the bill would make that child eligible for part-day, or twice a week, or attendance at Head Start and nursery school, or in-the-home tutoring for him and his parents—for the expressed purpose of building on and strengthening family life by making full day, full week, pre-school programs like Head Start or in-the-home tutoring that would strengthen the mother-child relationship.

This limitation is designed to underscore the Committee's desire to build on existing parent-child relationships. If a parent is in the home the bill would offer nutritional and educational services in a way that keeps the parent and the child together. That child would not, unless he were severely handicapped, be separated from his family. Where they would come from to staff child development programs. Moreover, the Committee finds that one of the most encouraging aspects of the successful Head Start program has been its ability to recruit and train non-professionals—especially mothers and other family members—for important staff responsibilities in these programs. The Committee proposal seeks to build on that success.

The Committee made several major changes in response to this concern.

First, by reducing the total authorization, generally, that a community have a population of 25,000—which is 50% in order to become eligible as a direct grantee for HEW child development funds, the proposal actually increased the participation of as many as 7,000 prime sponsors."
the applicant "has the capability of effectively carrying out comprehensive programs under this act."

Third, in order to further simplify program management responsibilities, the Committee, as I indicated earlier, recommends a change in the structure in the minority's bill (S. 3238) which makes the public official of a prime sponsor (Mayor, Governor or county executive) responsible for the initiation of the programs, and responsible for determining policy, selecting the delegate agencies and preparing program statements. Under the vetoed bill, the Child Development Councils had these responsibilities. Under the revised bill, the councils have no day-to-day administrative responsibilities. They are required to assist the prime sponsor with respect to basic policy, delegate agency selection and program statements. The Committee believes this change substantially strengthens and simplifies the management and administration of this program.

8. State role.—The veto message suggested that "the States would be relegated to an insignificant role.

The Committee considered this and made several substantial changes on this point in the revised bill.

First, by raising the general population cut-off for prime sponsors from 5,000 to 25,000, this bill provides that approximately 5,000 localities will operate their own programs in the vetoed bill will now be served under programs administered by the States.

Second, the Committee bill has increased from 5% to 10% the set aside for States for the technical assistance, personnel exchange, dissemination of research and evaluation. Additional funds have been added to this State role requirement for comprehensive state coordination and planning. In order to qualify for these funds, a State must meet adequate agreement with the local prime sponsors in the State on comprehensive and coordinated statewide child development planning. And the States are required to deposit funding for its own programs or programs operated by local prime sponsors in that State.

The Committee believes that this change—in addition to doubling the funds for States—provides a real incentive for cooperation among state and local prime sponsors.

This Committee recommending a change in the development providing the Secretary of HEW with discretion to select, on a demonstration basis, 5 States to serve as a sole prime sponsor for child development programs in those States, even where localities would otherwise qualify.

The provision states that the Secretary shall "designate as state-wide prime sponsors not more than five States which have demonstrated capability and leadership in the field of child development and which are located in various regions of the Nation and have a variety of characteristics, including differing population sizes and urban, metropolitan, and rural area and industrial and work force composition."

It further provides that a State may be designated as a State-wide prime sponsor only if the Secretary determines that: (1) the population of the State does not exceed 5% of the national population; (2) a reasonable opportunity has been provided for each otherwise eligible prime sponsor in the State to participate in selecting the State and the Secretary; and (3) the State prime sponsorship plan submitted takes into account the comments submitted by these localities.

The Committee believes this demonstration plan, along with the changes described above, provides substantial expanded authority for state involvement in this program and represents a major concession on this point.

10. Mutual agreement versus family centered child rearing.—Finally, the veto message suggested that "child development would commit the vast moral authority of the National Government to the task of rearing, and for that reason, to child rearing over against the family-centered approach."

For many of the reasons stated above—the limitation of eligibility for full-day care; the emphasis on parental involvement and control; and the wide variety of non-day care services that are to be given—day care services, part-day day care services, in-the-home services, family planning services and others—the Committee believes this provision is better served under the revised bill.

In the first two years the additional new authority for child development programs under this Act—and day care represents only part of the programs in these States, than, and supplementary to, the additional new funds for day care under the Administration's proposed welfare reform program. Moreover, the sliding scale fee basis in the program provides little or no financial incentives for families with incomes in excess of $10,000 to purchase day care for their children. In contrast, the increased child care income tax deductions signed into law last year provide considerable financial incentives to families in these income ranges to purchase day care, if both parents work.

In addition to making these modifications in response to the concerns expressed in the Program's veto message, the Committee sought further cooperation and consultation with the Administration.

At the suggestion of members of the Senate Finance Committee, a hearing on the new child development bills was called in order to give the Administration an opportunity to testify.

In various discussions, including scheduling, neither Secretary Richardson nor any of his representatives was able to accept the invitation. And no Administration specifications were offered to the Committee during mark-up. Thus we sought to meet what we knew from the veto message were Administration major concerns, and we are hopeful the Committee bill will have Administration support.

At the hearing, however, the Committee did have the opportunity to receive testimony from Senator Buckley, a representative of the Emergency Committee for Children, and Mr. Dale Meers—all of whom had reservations with respect to as well as two supporters of the legislation, Dr. Milton Senn, Sterling Professor Emeritus, Pediatrics and Psychology at Yale University; and Dr. Dale S. L. Johnson, Executive Director of the Center for Early Development and Education in Little Rock, Arkansas.

This testimony—particularly that offered by Mr. Meers and Dr. Senn—resulted in amendments clarifying the bill's special safeguards for very young children, its insistence on high standards, its provisions for child care or other essential program components, and its strong research and evaluation requirement.

In summary, the Committee has sought to address and resolve all of the objections raised to last year's child development bill in the veto message.

FAMILY STRENGTHENING PROVISIONS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would like to say that since last year, it is possible the family strengthening objectives in this bill, and the specific provisions designed to support and assist families and their children. A great deal of misunderstanding and concern surrounded this point in last year's bill, and I think it is important to dwell on the intentions and safeguards in detail.

First, the major objective of this bill, which appears in its first paragraph, states that:

Child development programs must build upon the variety of family supporting services—including prenatals, services in-the-home tutoring, child development classes for parents and preschool education in part-day programs like Head Start, twice a week nursery school programs and others.

Third, the bill reflects in specific terms our desire to build on existing parental-child relationships in child development and preschool education efforts. Thus, it makes full-day, full-week day care available only to children whose parents are out of the home—working or participating in education or training. Services for families in which a parent is at home are included in part-day and part-time Head Start programs or in-the-home tutoring efforts that build on the mother-child relationships. Thus we seek to provide development—rather than custodial—day care programs for those families which need them, and alternative preschool programs for families where day care is not necessary, and existing parent-child relationships can be built upon, supplemented, and strengthened.

Fourth, the bill retains extensive provisions for parental involvement in all aspects of the program. It encourages the use of parents as volunteers, the employment of parents and other family members as paraprofessionals and professionals in these programs. And it requires that 50 percent or more of the members of the councils created to approve policy, curriculums, and other basic elements of these programs will be parents of children served.

BROAD-BASED SUPPORT

Mr. President, through the considerations of this bill over the past 3 years, perhaps one of the most remarkable aspects of the long debate and hearings and legislative process through which we have gone has been the great encouragement and support of a broad-based group of organizations concerned about the needs of families and their children. The support for this measure is growing and broadening as public understanding of the need for this measure has grown.

Last year's bill was developed in conjunction with, and supported by a wide range of organizations interested in children and families, including the Ama...
Amalgamated Clothing Workers; AFL-CIO; Americans for Democratic Action; Americans for Indian Opportunity Action Council; Black Child Development Institute; Committee for Community Affairs; Common Cause; Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Interstate Research Associates; International Ladies' Garment Workers Union; League of Women Voters; Leadership Conference on Civil Rights; National Council of Churches; National Council of Negro Women; National Education Association; National Urban Coalition; National Urban League; National Welfare Rights Organization; United Auto Workers; U.S. Catholic Conference, Family Life Division; and Washington Research Project Action Council.

The members of this coalition and others adopted a set of principles for any new child development bill this year, which the committee believes are embodied in the bill we propose.

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

There being no objection, the principles are agreed to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM THE COALITION'S STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The undersigned organizations are committed to certain principles which were embodied in the legislation which was passed by bipartisan majorities of both houses of Congress last year. We reaffirm these principles as follows:

1. That programs must be of high quality, comprehensive, and developmental, oriented to the needs of children and available to all children;

2. That parents must be directly involved in policy decisions affecting their own children;

3. That programs must be locally controlled and flexible enough to meet individual community needs;

4. That programs must be designed to include children with a variety of socio-economic backgrounds;

5. That adequate protections must be provided to assure that the needs of minority group and economically disadvantaged children are met; and

6. That this nation must make a substantial commitment of new public funds to be directed toward strengthening family life. In addition, the child development programs must be designed to

a. Provide meaningful day care services for the children of working parents and provide after-school and part-day care that will greatly enhance the quality of family living and family services for the nation's families.

b. Be of the type endorsed at last year's meeting of the President's Committee on Economic Opportunity, which meets the following standards:

(1) That programs must be locally funded and controlled, and be flexible enough to meet the needs of the individual family;

(2) That parents must be directly involved in policy decisions affecting their own children;

(3) That programs must be designed to include children with a variety of socio-economic backgrounds;

(4) That adequate protections must be provided to assure that the needs of minority group and economically disadvantaged children are met; and

(5) That the nation must make a substantial commitment of new public funds to be directed toward strengthening family life.

In addition, the child development programs must be designed to

a. Provide meaningful day care services for the children of working parents and provide after-school and part-day care that will greatly enhance the quality of family living and family services for the nation's families.

b. Be of the type endorsed at last year's meeting of the President's Committee on Economic Opportunity, which meets the following standards:

(1) That programs must be locally funded and controlled, and be flexible enough to meet the needs of the individual family;

(2) That parents must be directly involved in policy decisions affecting their own children;

(3) That programs must be designed to include children with a variety of socio-economic backgrounds;

(4) That adequate protections must be provided to assure that the needs of minority group and economically disadvantaged children are met; and

(5) That the nation must make a substantial commitment of new public funds to be directed toward strengthening family life.

In addition, the child development programs must be designed to

a. Provide meaningful day care services for the children of working parents and provide after-school and part-day care that will greatly enhance the quality of family living and family services for the nation's families.

b. Be of the type endorsed at last year's meeting of the President's Committee on Economic Opportunity, which meets the following standards:

(1) That programs must be locally funded and controlled, and be flexible enough to meet the needs of the individual family;

(2) That parents must be directly involved in policy decisions affecting their own children;

(3) That programs must be designed to include children with a variety of socio-economic backgrounds;

(4) That adequate protections must be provided to assure that the needs of minority group and economically disadvantaged children are met; and

(5) That the nation must make a substantial commitment of new public funds to be directed toward strengthening family life.

In addition, the child development programs must be designed to

a. Provide meaningful day care services for the children of working parents and provide after-school and part-day care that will greatly enhance the quality of family living and family services for the nation's families.

b. Be of the type endorsed at last year's meeting of the President's Committee on Economic Opportunity, which meets the following standards:

(1) That programs must be locally funded and controlled, and be flexible enough to meet the needs of the individual family;

(2) That parents must be directly involved in policy decisions affecting their own children;

(3) That programs must be designed to include children with a variety of socio-economic backgrounds;

(4) That adequate protections must be provided to assure that the needs of minority group and economically disadvantaged children are met; and

(5) That the nation must make a substantial commitment of new public funds to be directed toward strengthening family life.

In addition, the child development programs must be designed to

a. Provide meaningful day care services for the children of working parents and provide after-school and part-day care that will greatly enhance the quality of family living and family services for the nation's families.

b. Be of the type endorsed at last year's meeting of the President's Committee on Economic Opportunity, which meets the following standards:

(1) That programs must be locally funded and controlled, and be flexible enough to meet the needs of the individual family;

(2) That parents must be directly involved in policy decisions affecting their own children;

(3) That programs must be designed to include children with a variety of socio-economic backgrounds;

(4) That adequate protections must be provided to assure that the needs of minority group and economically disadvantaged children are met; and

(5) That the nation must make a substantial commitment of new public funds to be directed toward strengthening family life.

In addition, the child development programs must be designed to

a. Provide meaningful day care services for the children of working parents and provide after-school and part-day care that will greatly enhance the quality of family living and family services for the nation's families.

b. Be of the type endorsed at last year's meeting of the President's Committee on Economic Opportunity, which meets the following standards:

(1) That programs must be locally funded and controlled, and be flexible enough to meet the needs of the individual family;

(2) That parents must be directly involved in policy decisions affecting their own children;

(3) That programs must be designed to include children with a variety of socio-economic backgrounds;

(4) That adequate protections must be provided to assure that the needs of minority group and economically disadvantaged children are met; and

(5) That the nation must make a substantial commitment of new public funds to be directed toward strengthening family life.

In addition, the child development programs must be designed to

a. Provide meaningful day care services for the children of working parents and provide after-school and part-day care that will greatly enhance the quality of family living and family services for the nation's families.

b. Be of the type endorsed at last year's meeting of the President's Committee on Economic Opportunity, which meets the following standards:

(1) That programs must be locally funded and controlled, and be flexible enough to meet the needs of the individual family;

(2) That parents must be directly involved in policy decisions affecting their own children;
CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN,
Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.


A careful reading of this bill leads us to the conclusion that its provisions will help to straighten family life.

The need for a national network of day care centers is not only of children and parents but of all the nation's citizens as well. The day care center must first of all be opportunity for significant input from the family. The day care center is a supplement to and not a substitute for the totally development of children. We believe this bill is a step in the right direction.

Sincerely,

MARY JANE PATTENSON,
Associate Director for National Affairs.

RELIGIOUS ACTION CENTER, UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS,
Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.


For many years our organizations, which comprise respectively the congregations and rabbis of American Reform Judaism, have advocated legislation that would enhance the lives of and opportunities for children who are reached by your bill. We believe that the pending legislation enhances the quality of family life in America, and would represent a significant legislative aid both with reference to the current deficits of disadvantaged children in education and in terms of social and economic opportunity. We are particularly attracted to the fact that the legislation is designed to benefit all children, of a comprehensive character, which goes far beyond prior federal programs, and which we believe can have, if adopted, a significant multiplier effect. In a day care process, we believe, can prove the quality of life for poor people generally and poor children in particular.

Last year, we were heartened by Congressional passage of similar legislation and disappointed when the President vetoed it. We hope that this year both Congress and the President will see it through to fruition. To you, we express our admiration and appre-

ROBERT E. JONES,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION
(Resolution on Child Development and Day Care Services, May 14, 1972)

Specialists in child care agree that the period from two to five years in a child's life is critical in the development of physical, mental health and social development. It must be a period of assurance that the day care of their children will be more than a babysitting process. There is urgent need for quality day care for family service centers open to all families.

We urge the prompt enactment of federal legislation to create such centers through-out the country, available to low-income families and on a sliding scale to all others.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN ETHIC UNION—1972—64TH CONGRESS
Approved Resolution on: Child Development Centers—Family and Day Care Centers.
Recognizing, that the nation's children are its most precious asset; and
That child care, infant and child care lay great stress on the importance of the period between birth and five years, when children respond most favorably to health and education programs; and
That, parents must have assurance that the day care of their children will be more than a babysitting process; and
That, there is need for quality day care and family services centers open to all families.

Therefore, be it resolved, that we urge Congress to pass, and the President to sign, the necessary legislation for the construction of day care centers and family service centers throughout the country, available to the poor free of charge and on a sliding scale, if needed, to be administered locally and with community involvement; and
Be it further resolved, that the Congress appropriate funds immediately so that legislation can take effect as soon as possible during this period of serious economic stress.

CHILD CARE CENTERS
Recognizing that there is widespread need for child care centers, that millions of children in North America are receiving either substandard supervision or no supervision; that the need for another day care center is that the day care itself is that the day care provided be of high quality. Custodial day care such as that provided in Title IV of H.R. 1 is not acceptable. It does not serve the child and his family. The day care center must first of all be child centered. It must provide a range and quality of services that serve to develop the capacities of the child both cognitively and noncognitively. So that the day care center is a supplement to and not a substitute for the role of the family, there should be opportunity for significant input from the
parents of the children served. S. 3617, we believe, amply provides both this focus on the children in their own right and a significant role for parents.

For these reasons we hope that the Senate will act favorably upon your bill and express to you our great appreciation for your leadership on this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

David M. Ackerman

Hon. Walter Mondale, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mondale: I have had a chance to study S. 3617, the Comprehensive Child Development bill.

Our organization has been strongly in support of Head Start, Day Care, and other programs during the past two years of hearings. I have made at least twenty-five speeches during that period of time in various parts of the country and have received an enthusiastic response to the concepts of Child Care Development Centers from a number of organizations in the human resources field.

We are a liaison group of mental health organizations which meets monthly in Washington. I append to this letter a list of these organizations. At our last meeting, on May 24th, we heard a paper during the discussion of the status of the child care development legislation and agreed informally to give it the highest priority. While I cannot speak formally for the group, I do wish to convey to you the feeling of the group that the passage of this legislation would probably be one of the most important—if not the most important—developments in the human resources and mental health field in the current year. I congratulate you for your efforts on behalf of legislation.

Sincerely,

Marian Wright Edelman
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America

Dear Mr. Mondale:

I was present at the hearing on S. 3617, the Comprehensive Child Development Bill. I would like to take this opportunity to express to you our full support of this legislation. We believe that Head Start and other existing community and parent-based programs are urgently needed by children and families from every economic sector and geographic section of this country. It is particularly needed by economically disadvantaged children who otherwise may be forced to place their children in damaging custodial care in the name of "welfare reform," and by low and middle-income working families who cannot afford the costs of developmental care and who require adequate facilities simply are not available.

Experience with Head Start has demonstrated the educational, health, and social benefits of comprehensive child development programs, not just for children but for their families and communities as well. That experience must now be expanded in a child development program for primary and firm commitment of resources, this national need requires.

The President's rejection of the comprehensive child development bill which Congress passed last year, was a heartless sacrifice of millions of American children and families for the sake of politics. Contrary to the allegations in the President's veto message, the need for such a program has been clearly and repeatedly demonstrated, and the effectiveness of early childhood programs has been proven. They provide critically needed supports for family life; and the economic resources are there if we are willing to assign the proper national priority to this legislation.

Support for a quality comprehensive child development program has been and continues to be broadly based—in the civil rights communities, among educators and early childhood specialists, church groups, community and parent organizations, labor unions, minority and professional groups, the President's own Administration, and Congress. Opposition has been narrowly focused in right-wing organizations and in the White House.

We commend your leadership in the effort last year which led to bipartisan passage of the child development bill. We urge you to resist efforts to "accommodate" such new legislation to the unfounded charges raised by the President's veto message, but to continue in the interest of a comprehensive child development bill which assures the highest standards of services, parents in decision-making roles, community-based and locally controlled programs, and a substantial commitment of new public funds. Such legislation is the best investment this Congress can make in the lives of our children and the future of our society. We shall appreciate your consideration of this vital public interest subject. We request that this communication be included in the child development hearing record.

Sincerely,

Marian Wright Edelman
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America

Resolution ADOPTED by the Board of Directors of United Neighborhood Houses in pursuant to its unwavering commitment to comprehensive child care legislation for the transmission to all Members of the U.S. Senate

The Board of Directors of United Neighborhood Houses at its meeting on May 21, 1972:

Notes that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has reported favorably a new bipartisan Comprehensive Child Development and Family Services Bill to the 2nd Session of the 92nd Congress

President Carter has called upon Congress for obtaining a bipartisan compromise between the child development provisions introduced in the bill by Senators Mondale, Nelson and 12 other Senators and the bill introduced by pro-Senators Javits, Taft, Stafford, Schweiker, Packwood and 9 Republican co-sponsors;

Calls attention to the fact that this bill (S. 3617; H.R. 92-793) takes account of the criticisms raised in the President's veto on December 10 of the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971;

Urges all Senators to vote for the bill and do everything possible to obtain its enactment.

American Psychological Association

Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mondale:

This is written to indicate the wholehearted support of the American Psychological Association for the principles embodied in the Comprehensive Head Start Child Development and Family Services Act, recently reported out of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

You are to be congratulated on the revision of the original bill; we believe it retains the provisions essential for the welfare of the nation's children while meeting the objections of the President.

For your information I am enclosing a copy of the resolution passed by this Association in September 1971.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth B. Little
Executive Officer

Be it resolved that the American Psychological Association call upon President Nixon to reaffirm the national commitment to early childhood development, as indicated by him in April 1969, and also to implement the resolution of the White House Conference on Children calling for the permanent establishment of the Office of Children and Development.

Be it further resolved that the American Psychological Association call upon the President and members of Congress to support programs of comprehensive child development.

10. At the invitation of President Clark, Council heard a statement from Edward J. Casavantes, Executive Director of La Raza, urging concern and support from APA for Spanish-speaking Americans. Mr. Casavantes was encouraged to submit his proposals to the Ad Hoc Committee on Social and Ethical Responsibility.

WASHINGTON RESEARCH PROJECT ACTION COUNCIL, INC.

Dear Mr. Mondale:

We wish to reiterate our strong and continuing support for a comprehensive child development bill which we believe is urgently needed by children and families from every economic sector and geographic section of this country. It is particularly needed by economically disadvantaged families.
ents. We also know that our efforts cannot begin to meet the pressing national need. We are grateful to you for your leadership in Congress in enacting the landmark Federal program of day care for all the Nation's children.

There can be no doubt that last year's veto of the child development bill was a keen disappointment to the hundreds of thousands of working women in this country who recognize a need for such services for their children. If the President does not. We urgently hope that you and your fellow Senators will pass another child development bill in this session of Congress embracing the comprehensive approach to legislation. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America will support you in that effort.

Sincerely yours,

JANE O'GRADY,
Legislative Representative.


Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: The League of Women Voters of the United States is pleased that the Senate voted to override President Nixon's veto of a child development bill pending: S 1512 and, thus, allow full implementation of an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Amendments.

The League does not believe that a significant number of working women would access Headstart programs without the nation's needs. Even if adopted, there would still be a need for a comprehensive child care program. We appreciate the fact that the League has recognized the need for more meaningful and comprehensive child care programs to serve a broad constituency.

Last year we filed a statement in support of S 2512, the act vetoed by President Nixon. I attach a copy because we still stand behind the principles endorsed at that time. We believe the need for greatly expanded child care facilities and developmental child care has been well documented from many sources. The achievement tests and learning rates in inner city and suburban schools, for example, should be further evidence of the need that children who start out at a great disadvantage wind up being the ones deprived, in the end, of equal opportunity for full education.

As you have doubtless noticed, the League endorsed the "Statement of Principles" and the eleven "Legislative Recommendations" filed by the Child Development Coalition, and submitted to both Subcommittees. Our primary concerns are that the legislation make available a very comprehensive range of child development services which would at the same time require: Complete protection to assure that participating children's voluntary;

Mandatory parental participation in determining the quantity and quality of child care services in their communities;

Availability of services to all children, free of charge. To overcome, to pay and on a scaled ability-to-pay basis;

Assurance of local prime sponsorship, so that as well as large communities could be eligible for federal assistance under the program;

A substantial commitment of federal funds.

The League recognizes the necessity of educating major presidential candidates, Senators and Congressmen, to the needs for comprehensive legislation and of dispelling the fears—however irrational they may be—about "Sovietizing of children's brains." But every year of delay in getting good pre-school programs underway on a national scale is a year lost for thousands of children. The League, therefore, urges that legislation be enacted this year.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. BUSER B. BENSON, President.

STATEMENT TO THE SENATE LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN SUPPORT OF S. 1512—THE COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1971

LeAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES, June 2, 1971.

The League of Women Voters of the United States supports S. 1512 which provides a comprehensive approach to enacting federal support for child development programs. We have supported Head Start since its inception, primarily out of concern that disadvantaged children should have early experience to prepare them to take advantage of educational opportunities in the regular school system. In addition, the League has recognized the need for full support of day care facilities and programs to allow low-income parents to take advantage of training, education and work opportunities. It is clear that this is not just a "在美国"or "Sovietizing of children's brains." But every year of delay in getting good pre-school programs underway on a national scale is a year lost for thousands of children. The League, therefore, urges that legislation be enacted this year.

Sincerely yours,

JANE O'GRADY,
Legislative Representative.


Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: The League of Women Voters of the United States is pleased that the Senate voted to override President Nixon's veto of a child development bill pending: S 1512 and, thus, allow full implementation of an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Amendments.

The League does not believe that a significant number of working women would access Headstart programs without the nation's needs. Even if adopted, there would still be a need for a comprehensive child care program. We appreciate the fact that the League has recognized the need for more meaningful and comprehensive child care programs to serve a broad constituency.

Last year we filed a statement in support of S 2512, the act vetoed by President Nixon. I attach a copy because we still stand behind the principles endorsed at that time. We believe the need for greatly expanded child care facilities and developmental child care has been well documented from many sources. The achievement tests and learning rates in inner city and suburban schools, for example, should be further evidence of the need that children who start out at a great disadvantage wind up being the ones deprived, in the end, of equal opportunity for full education.

As you have doubtless noticed, the League endorsed the "Statement of Principles" and the eleven "Legislative Recommendations" filed by the Child Development Coalition, and submitted to both Subcommittees. Our primary concerns are that the legislation make available a very comprehensive range of child development services which would at the same time require: Complete protection to assure that participating children's voluntary;

Mandatory parental participation in determining the quantity and quality of child care services in their communities;

Availability of services to all children, free of charge. To overcome, to pay and on a scaled ability-to-pay basis;

Assurance of local prime sponsorship, so that as well as large communities could be eligible for federal assistance under the program;

A substantial commitment of federal funds.

The League recognizes the necessity of educating major presidential candidates, Senators and Congressmen, to the needs for comprehensive legislation and of dispelling the fears—however irrational they may be—about "Sovietizing of children's brains." But every year of delay in getting good pre-school programs underway on a national scale is a year lost for thousands of children. The League, therefore, urges that legislation be enacted this year.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. BUSER B. BENSON, President.

STATEMENT TO THE SENATE LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN SUPPORT OF S. 1512—THE COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1971

LeAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES, June 2, 1971.

The League of Women Voters of the United States supports S. 1512 which provides a comprehensive approach to enacting federal support for child development programs. We have supported Head Start since its inception, primarily out of concern that disadvantaged children should have early experience to prepare them to take advantage of educational opportunities in the regular school system. In addition, the League has recognized the need for full support of day care facilities and programs to allow low-income parents to take advantage of training, education and work opportunities. It is clear that this is not just a "在美国"or "Sovietizing of children's brains." But every year of delay in getting good pre-school programs underway on a national scale is a year lost for thousands of children. The League, therefore, urges that legislation be enacted this year.

Sincerely yours,

JANE O'GRADY,
Legislative Representative.
Surely nothing must be allowed to be more important to this country than its children. While the children are the future of the nation, their need is now. We therefore strongly urge that the Congress expedite the enactment of legislation which does no less than the following:

Provide for programs which are of high quality, comprehensive, developmental, oriented to the needs of children and available to all children;

Involve parents directly in policy decisions affecting their own children;

Provide for local control and enough flexibility to meet needs of individual communities;

Design programs to include children with different needs and backgrounds;

Assure that needs of minority group and economically disadvantaged children are met, and

Authorize sufficient new public monies to fund adequately the program.

Legislation of the type described is, we believe, long overdue. We hope that this nation's obligation to help its children develop to their full potential as human beings will be delayed no longer.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH, COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, U.S. SENATE, ON THE COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM OF THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1972

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, INC.,

The National Council of Jewish Women, an organization established in 1893, and with a membership of over 100,000 in local sections throughout the United States, has conducted itself with the welfare of its children since its inception.

At the last biennial convention held in April 1971 in Columbus, Ohio, the delegates adopted the following resolution:

"The National Council of Jewish Women believes that a healthy community, sound family life and individual welfare are interdependent and thrive when barriers of poverty and discrimination are removed. It believes, therefore, that our democratic society must provide viable child development programs to assure the economic, social and physical needs of all the people, and that the public and the private sector must work together to help individuals and families function successfully and independently in a changing society."

"It therefore resolves:

"To work for the expansion and development of quality comprehensive child care programs, available to all children, and to work for adequate financing."

The unmet needs of our children constitute one of the most important challenges our nation faces today. It is vital that these needs be met wisely on the basis of the intensive analysis their importance merits. As a society, we have for all too long given little more than lip service to these needs, meeting only a tiny, fractional part of them. Literally millions of our little children suffer uncaring neglect at the hands of overburdened parents whose ability to let their little children develop is even more limited than their ability to provide adequate nourishment.

We beseech you to correct this shortcoming by providing necessary funds to meet the needs of and provide adequate care for the children of our nation.

Thanking you.

Sincerely,

JAMES W. PRESCOTT, Ph.D., President.

CHILD CARE IS MAJOR CONCERN OF MPA Message from MPA President James W. Prescott:

The two themes of this year's annual MPA meeting are: (a) Child Care and Development, and (b) Aggression. As the members of MPA know, considerable attention has been given to the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971 and its possible amendment to. On December 9, 1971, the Maryland Psychological Association, the Maryland Psychiatric Society and the Maryland Chapter of the American Psychological Association sponsored an evening symposium on the above bill which brought together health professionals, labor leaders and state and county government officials. It was held in the Maryland Psychological Association building of the University of Maryland Institute of Psychoanalytic Training and Research. The opening of the symposium, I had the ugly task of announcing the veto by President Nixon of the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971. Insofar as our annual meeting is concerned with child care and development it would appear appropriate to reflect upon the reasons given by President Nixon for his veto of that bill.

In his message to Congress which rejected the proposed national child development program President Nixon stated: "Neither the immediate need nor the desirability of a national child development program of this character has been demonstrated . . . for the administration's proposal, penalizing financially into supporting child development would commit the vast moral authority of the National Government to the side of compulsion and control, and against the family-centered approach."

Further, Mr. Nixon stated that "for more than two years this administration has been working on the comprehensive child development program (H.R. 1), one of the objectives of which is to bring the family together. This child development program appears to move in precisely the opposite direction . . . good public policy requires that we enhance rather than diminish both parental authority and parental involvement with children—particularly in those decisive early years when social attitudes and a conscience are formed, and religion and moral principles are first inculcated."

I offer below the above stated concern and objectives, Mr. Nixon proceeded to outline the provisions in his welfare bill—H.R. 1. He stated: "Further, in returning this legislation to the Congress, I do not for look the fact that there are some needs to be served, and served now. One of these needs is for day care, to enable mothers, particularly those in low-income levels, to have the full time jobs . . . (and I will) "provide a significant Federal subsidy for day care facilities where both parents are employed" (italics mine). (Veto message—economic opportunity amendments of 1972. Document No. 92-48; December 10, 1971, 92nd Congress, Senate.)

Clearly, the provisions of H.R. 1 to forcibly separate both parents from their children by requiring them to work full time is nothing less than national legislation for parental deprivation and would achieve just the opposite of what the President stated as his objectives . . . to "bring the family together" and to "enhance rather than diminish both parental authority and parental involvement with children."

These issues transcend partisan political considerations, as Congressman Ogden R. Reid's (R-N.Y.) statement on President Nixon's veto message demonstrates. Congressman Reid has clearly bowed to politics and broken faith with the children of America. This historic bill would have given millions of our children an opportunity for a meaningful start on life. The President's veto now kills that hope.

As a result of this veto, which undermines the credibility of the President's pledged commitments to social progress, this Administration cannot escape much of the blame for the children who, in the next decade become the adult consumers, who carry the social burdens to society. The program the President killed would have helped many of those children to grow into constructive citizens. "As a result of this veto, it is just one further proof that this Administration is insensitive to the tremendous problems that burden her family." (December 12, 1971, The Associated Press)

MPA members are probably aware that Rep. Ogden Reid, whose face appeared on the Republican Party 100 years ago when the party was becoming the Democratic Party, his article The Day Care Veto: A Republican Congressman's Challenge to the President in the current issue of the American Psychiatric Association's scientific journal The American Journal of Psychiatry, appears to be in sympathy with the Democratic Party, his article The Day Care Veto: A Republican Congressman's Challenge to the President in the current issue of the American Psychiatric Association's scientific journal The American Journal of Psychiatry, appears to be in sympathy with the Democratic Party.
bership may be interested in a slide which I presented at our symposium on the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971. This portrayed in Figure 1 which relates infant mortality to violent homicides. Several studies have suggested that since the U.S. has one of the highest infant mortality rates of advanced industrialized nations and since this nation has less than 1% of the world's population, these two variables should be at a minimum but does not, this reflects a national indifference to and neglect of our infants. Other studies have linked societal and cultural behaviors to infant-fant-child neglect and abuse variables. Figure 1 represents a national picture of this relationship for the years 1950-1960. Infant mortality in the thirties and forties significantly predicts 15-30 percent of homicides in future years; infant mortality in the fifties and sixties significantly predicts 40-75 percent of homicides in future years.

Infant mortality has a different meaning in this country today than it had in the 1950's. One interpretation of this finding is that violence is intimately linked with those variables associated with our high infant mortality rate. If these variables are human indifference and neglect, as I believe them to be, then the management of aggressions must necessarily involve the management and improvement of the quality of human relationships between adult, infants and children of this nation during the formative periods of development. This cannot be achieved by forcing segregation of the poor children from their children by requiring both parents to work full time, as envisioned by H.R. 1.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to comment on the bill. I compliment the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Wisconsin for the fine work they did in bringing back this bill after the veto, which was most unfortunate. I hope this bill is not vetoed.

Does the Senator recall the testimony by Dr. Bettye Caldwell who is the director of the Kramer School in Little Rock? Mr. MONDALE. I certainly do. Her testimony was one of the most impressive I have heard in the years we have worked on this measure because it was based not only on her brilliance but also her work in this area and her entire experience in the Little Rock area. Her testimony was most impressive.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I call attention to her testimony because not only have I talked with her but also I had one of my representatives in Little Rock to take a personal look at the Kramer School.

This school in Little Rock has been going on now for 3 years. It is an experiment and it has the support of the Arkansas State Department of Education, the University of Arkansas, the local school district and the Federal Government. The school has been a remarkable success and has been accepted in one of the poorer areas of Little Rock. It is about evenly divided between blacks and whites. The acceptance by the community has been remarkable.

I submit that it is not only useful for the individuals involved but also it has given us a great deal of information about race relations. In time I think it will have a great impact on the very difficult problem of our welfare program. The program that H.R. 1, when it is reported, will present to the people of this country is much bigger than this bill. This bill is not only beneficial to the people involved but it is also a bill that deals with difficult social problems in this country. It is difficult to take care of all those matters in one bill. I think that if done in the proper way.

It is difficult to draw the attention of the people to a problem of a kind because the type bill is not as glamorous as treaties in Moscow. However, it is far more important in many respects.

I recall a statement of Dr. Caldwell that violence is intimately linked with those variables associated with our high infant mortality rate. If these variables are human indifference and neglect, as I believe them to be, then the management of aggressions must necessarily involve the management and improvement of the quality of human relationships between adults, infants and children of this nation during the formative periods of development. This cannot be achieved by forcing segregation of the poor children from their children by requiring both parents to work full time, as envisioned by H.R. 1.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am pleased to join as a cosponsor of H.R. 1, in my own name and in the name of the Senator from Minnesota and his colleagues. We are pleased to have the opportunity to comment on the bill. I compliment the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Wisconsin for the fine work they did in bringing back this bill after the veto, which was most unfortunate. I hope this bill is not vetoed.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join as a cosponsor of S. 3716, the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1972. As the title of this bill suggests, it would commit this Nation's resources to the most worthwhile of causes—that of assisting American families in providing their children a better start in life through local, family oriented, child development programs.

Far from undermining the family as the basic unit of our society or "creating a nation of orphanages" as some have implied, this legislation would provide the kind of developmental programs' potential recipients. This bill is not only beneficial to the people to a problem of this kind which was most unfortunate. I hope this bill is not vetoed.

These 8½ million children generally come within either of two groups that are in urgent need of this kind of attention. The first is comprised of children of employed mothers who cannot arrange for satisfactory care for them at home. The second group of children is that whose mothers are economically disadvantaged, who are not now working, and who are unable to provide them the kind of preschool care which would give them an equal start with others.

Although all children have nutritional, educational, medical, and psychological needs, it is clear that children from economically disadvantaged families have far less opportunity to receive these services than their more affluent counterparts. It is this lack of opportunity that degrades the lives of many millions of American children today and enhances the chances that they will soon become misfits and wards of society requiring repair and rehabilitation in later life.

In recent years, we have increasingly recognized that this poverty, the forces which create it, and the policies for development of the poor child are mutually reinforcing. The poverty and Headstart programs were implemented on this rationale, and in approving the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1968, Congress clearly reaffirmed its realization of this principle.

The child care, family services, and preschool programs envisioned in the pending legislation are designed to help reduce poverty by assisting their families in providing them with the kind of environment which will stimulate rather than retard their development. The bill authorizes $2 billion over the next 5 fiscal years for the creation of a network of preschool educational services for low income and developmental day care programs for youngsters whose parents are working. Participation in all of these...
Mr. President, a model for the kind of day care which Dr. Howe compares to "environmental denial" already exists in my State. It is the Center for Early Development in Little Rock, Ark. The center is housed in Little Rock’s Kramer School, a renovated structure in a mixed black and white neighborhood. It is dedicated to an understanding of the importance of early childhood stimulation, to handling children and the family—and not custodial in nature.

Of the many millions of day care arrangements made in this country today, most involve merely custodial care for the child. Today, we know that in numerous instances this can damage a child for life by creating conditions of "environmental handicap." Such conditions were set forth and contrasted with the developmental day care anticipated by S. 3617 in the testimony of Dr. Harold H. Howe, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, which is referred to later in this discussion.

Perhaps the best way to illustrate the idea of an environmental handicap is to describe an actual situation in which working mothers typically return to work two months after giving birth to a child. During the time that they are working, the child will be placed with another mother whose business is taking in children of working mothers, each of whom might pay a dollar a day or so to have her children cared for during working hours. In such a center will be children from several months to five years of age. An individual caretaker might look after up to ten or twelve such children in her home.

For the caretaker who has neither training nor equipment at a facility to provide a stimulating environment the entire day, the environment is frequently on the passivity of children. The child who doesn’t cry, who doesn’t need attention, who doesn’t question; he has learned to speak, who doesn’t move about—in other words the child who does not seek, demand, and get stimulation and is least a part of the person in changing is the child who gets rewarded. Such an environment discourages the early and very significant development of every aspect of a child, except the one he can use. The child learns that being a white collar worker is better than being a blue collar worker. We teach the children that every kind of work has dignity. However, she said she believed that the school would open more options for the students than they might otherwise have.

Mrs. Caldwell said that the children are able to "fit in perfectly well" in their own neighborhoods. She said that she did not advocate taking children away from their families but she said the school could offer children advantages some mothers couldn’t. Mrs. Caldwell said that the school could get the rats and roaches out of their apartment; the school has something to offer," she said.

When he first came here, he couldn’t do the things that he should. He probably never saw anyone before.

Mrs. Caldwell tells of the child of a recorded mother who came to the school thinking she was a slave.

The child, Susan, was "the most forlorn looking child" when she first brought to the school, said Mrs. Caldwell. "She was so shy that she would not answer questions. Now Susan is walking, talking and offering cookies to visitors.

The children eat breakfast and lunch at the center and are given opportunities to learn cooperation and Biosphere skills. Many of the children are the children of workers and the parents are very appreciative of the center and its accomplishments.

The building is ancient, Mr. Bomar says that the school lends itself to the activities of the school.

Although the school building is ancient, Mrs. Bomar says that the school is located in the area of most advantage, where a pupil who earns free time may go to read, or just to be alone. The students have covered the walls of the booths with paper, so they may draw or write on the walls if they wish.

The window shades are covered with bright flowers made from contact paper and flowers and balloons are hung from the ceiling. The preschoolers have their own second-hand piano, painted bright orange, that they can use.

Mrs. Bomar pointed to the walls, covered with murals and paintings by the children. This is their school, they know that it is theirs, she said.

Since the school opened, several persons have visited to view the operation for similar projects in other cities.

Although the 1969 legislature authorized the Arkansas State Department of Education to handle the Arkansas Art Center, two projects, explore the differences of sound, shapes, colors, and textures, were not covered under the bill. Mrs. Caldwell says that the school has provided a federal grant to design a school for the future.

"I think everyone sees this as a model of the future," Mrs. Caldwell said.

The result was a combination day care center and elementary school, with more than 300 children ranging in age from six months through 12 years.

Mrs. Caldwell moved from Syracuse, New York, where she was working on a similar project, to Little Rock in 1968. She joined the University of Arkansas Medical Center staff.

She says she thought she was moving to the end of the earth.

"I found there are more true liberals in Little Rock, than where I was," she said. She says there is not to the school at 7 a.m. They stay until one of their working parents can pick them up. Some stay as late as 7 p.m.

Mrs. Caldwell says the school fulfills several needs, among them child care for the working mother and direction for children from culturally deprived backgrounds. She says that in Arkansas, a typical family is so poor that all she (the mother) can do is get the rats and cockroaches out of their apartment: the school has something to offer," she said.

"I think everyone sees this as a model of the future," Mrs. Caldwell said.

Since the school opened, several persons have visited to view the operation for similar projects in other cities.

Although the 1969 legislature authorized the Arkansas State Department of Education to handle the Arkansas Art Center, two projects, explore the differences of sound, shapes, colors, and textures, were not covered under the bill. Mrs. Caldwell says that the school has provided a federal grant to design a school for the future.
the day care center idea will become the standard.

"I hope that this community and this state won't let this idea go," she said.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Dr. Caldwell, in her testimony before the Subcommittee on Children and Youth on S. 3617 stressed the following conclusions from her experiences in the Kramer School:

Children in day care or child care can develop motivationally and in terms of the skills that are considered adaptive in today's world.

High quality developmental day care settings do not create emotional disturbances, but in instances of instances create happy and alert children.

Day care and institutionalization are not at all comparable and it verges on the dishonest to imply that they are.

I am pleased that this bill is drawn upon the experiences of model projects such as the Center for Early Development and its provisions will expand and build upon the achievements of such centers.

I might add that based upon my belief in the pioneering work of the Center for Early Development and its possibilities for alleviating the conditions that ultimately result in many of our social problems, I submitted an amendment in executive session of the Finance Committee—which the committee accepted—to the child care provisions of H.R. 1. This amendment would provide $60 million in grants to States over the next 3 years for model day care centers in each State to develop the potential for better educational achievement in day care.

Mr. President, nothing is more critical to the future of this country than that every child have the opportunity to develop fully his physical, intellectual, and social potential as a human being. As an enlightened society, we must be prepared to commit our resources to help families realize this potential in their children when they seek such support outside the home. Passage of S. 3617 by the Senate will mark the beginning of this commitment, and I am pleased to lend my support to the enactment of this measure.

Mr. MONDALE. I strongly endorse the observations the Senator has made. I think one of the most dangerous things this country could do would be to pursue a maximum strategy of cold conflict day after day outside the home for the American family. Even during the depression most of us grew up with strong family unity, and we had the support and stimulation which a family provides.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And which other children provide.

Mr. MONDALE. Yes, and the security that comes with it. That is the most important thing we receive as human beings.

We are not going to make gains toward a healthy America by creating warehouses in which we stack children and do nothing for them, and provide no emotional support, no sense of security, and none of the things which are needed for child development.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And no intellectual stimulation.

Mr. MONDALE. And no intellectual stimulation. We are creating a generation of young people that scares me. They will be denied the kind of stimulation that is built into what a healthy person must have. That is what scares me so much about custodial centers. That is not speculation.

Recently a report was issued by the National Council of Jewish Women, basing itself on the testimony made of 90 day care centers in 90 cities. It is absolutely scary in terms of how emotionally and intended these children are all day long.

That is the worst possible thing.

Psychiatrists, psychologists, experts in the field, Bettye Cardwell being one of them, warned about that situation.

We are just concluding 2 1/2 years of work by the Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, of which I am privileged to be chairman. Every year we pay a tremendous economic bill, which includes a welfare bill of $12.5 billion; a crime bill of $10.5 billion. Now big that is; we pay it in terms of lost life; we pay it in other ways such as lack of political participation. And one generation tends to produce another generation that is consigned to the same tragic conditions.

One of the most hopeful things we come up with is that we should provide assistance to strengthen and support family life. In many instances these children come from broken homes where they do not have enough to eat, where the family goes hungry. We have to provide intellectual stimulation, where there is no hope, no music, no books, no aspirations for better life. Many times these children are destroyed before they go into the front door of any school. This happens up to the time they are 5 years of age. Because of the explosive development period, the first 5 years of life are the years when the foundation of a child's life is laid.

That can be a period of great development and growth or it can be a period of shocking, emotional, and mental destruction. We are trying to reach down and help these families give their kids a chance before we have another generation of broken young children. That is what this is all about.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place the following professional staff members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare Committee be admitted to the floor during the consideration of S. 3617, the Headstart, Child Development, and Family Services Act of 1972: Richard E. Johnson, William J. Spring, John Scales, and Richard Siegel.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has reported to the Senate S. 3617, the Comprehensive Headstart, Child Development, and Family Services Act of 1972. As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Economy, Manpower, and Poverty, which held some 13 days of hearings in child care legislation over the last 2 years, I hope the Senate will approve this bipartisan compromise measure by an overwhelming vote.

There is no need in America more fully documented nor more pressing than the provision for quality child care opportunities for disadvantaged children.

In the unwise view of some that the priority for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life.

The child development legislation contained in the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971 (S. 2007) was, as Members of the Senate know, killed by a Presidential veto. The veto message raised objections which bore no resemblance to the legislation actually passed. For anyone who took the words of the veto message at face value, the Congress of the United States stood accused of passing legislation aimed at weakening the American family.

Mr. MONDALE. "Sovietizing America's children." Nothing could have been farther from the truth. Quite obviously whoever wrote the veto message never read the bill. With over 5 million preschool children of working mothers in the country and only 700,000 places provided, the need for additional facilities cannot be doubted. For the poor, the Headstart program has provided a magnificient demonstration of what can be done in centers that provide not only warm and adequate day care but also have education programs crucial to the future of so many of the Nation's children in poverty homes. But the Headstart program now reaches only some 10 percent of the number of poor children who could potentially use its services.

After the veto, members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee went to work on revised legislation attempting to respond to the criticisms raised by the veto message. Senator Mondale and I, together with 14 other cosponsors, introduced a bill providing for an enlarged State role (S. 3193), and Senator Jarvis, and 12 other cosponsors introduced new child development legislation separate from the OEO legislation (S. 3228). The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare accepted the suggestion of the minority members that it would be best to separate the child-care bill from the extension of the Economic Opportunity Act of which it was a part in 1971. Furthermore, last year's proposal was changed in a number of ways in efforts to make the legislation acceptable to the administration. In brief, the changes are as follows:

First, the cost. Rather than authorizing $2 billion a year for the program, S. 3617 authorizes only $150,000,000 for planning—a $1.2 billion in fiscal year 1973—and $1.2 billion in fiscal year 1975. Second, administrative workability. Last year's bill provided that any community of 5,000 population could be a prime sponsor. The new bill provides that local communities of over 25,000 population are entitled to prime sponsorship if
the Secretary determines they have the capability to carry out child development programs. All other geographical areas of the State would be served by the State government as prime sponsor. Whereas there would have been a potential of 7,000 public and private prime sponsors under last year's bill, this year's higher population cut-off figure would reduce the number to 2,000 prime sponsors. That is approximately the number of Head Start grantees and delegate agencies HEW now deals with.

Thus, the responsibilities of the child development councils. The committee has rewritten the bill to make it clear that mayors and Governors have full operating responsibility for child development programs. Under the revised bill the councils coordinate basic policies and guidelines but day-to-day administrative responsibility for carrying out child-care programs rests with the Governor or the mayor.

Fourth, the role of the States is substantially under S. 3617. As previously mentioned, the State serves as prime sponsor in all parts of the State not covered by a local prime sponsor which has a minimum of 25,000 population. In addition, twice as much money—an increase from 5 percent to 10 percent—is set aside for State coordination and comprehensive planning, in cooperation with local officials, for child-care programs. Furthermore, the committee has authorized a major demonstration program for State-administered child development programs. In up to five States, the Secretary would be authorized to designate the State as the prime sponsor for the entire State including those localities of over 25,000 population that would otherwise be eligible to deal directly with Washington as local prime sponsors. These States would have to be selected on the basis of a record of leadership and demonstrated capabilities in the child development area.

The fee schedule negotiated by the committee and the administration last fall has been included in the bill. That schedule provides free services to children whose families earn up to $4,320 per year in the case of a family of four. That figure is the same as the cutoff point for aid to families under the federal family assistance plan. For families of four earning more than $4,320, the fee schedule limits the cost to 10 percent of income between $4,320 and $5,916 and then limits fees to those with higher income to 15 percent of income between $5,916 and $6,960. That figure of $6,960 is the low adequate budget as calculated by the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics for an average urban family of four.

How would the program work? Funds would flow from Washington to cities and States according to a distribution formula based on the number of children eligible for services under the legislation.

At the State and local level, mayors and Governors would set up child development programs. Fifty percent of the membership of these councils would be parents of children to be served; the remaining half would be appointed by the Governor or mayor to represent the public, including education agencies, community action agencies, health and welfare organizations. These councils would be responsible for approving program goals, basic policies, and approving arrangements for programs.

Head Start agencies, schools, charitable organizations, or any other local groups that wished to run child development programs would apply to the prime sponsor for funds. Each operating agency would be required to set up project policies, procedures, and arrangements with the parents of children to be served to oversee the day-to-day operation of child-care programs. Within a community of any size there would be a network of centers serving children, guided by project policy committees. The prime sponsor, the Governor or the mayor or the county executive, would oversee all projects in the prime sponsorship area and allocate funds among the various centers.

As I indicated earlier in these remarks, out of over 25,000 population would have the right to be designated as prime sponsors to administer child-care programs in their own areas if they had the capability. Where local prime sponsors are so designated, the State would serve as prime sponsor for all the rest of the State. In the balance of the State, the Governor would be the prime sponsor and the State would be responsible for administering the overall program. In a provision new to this particular piece of legislation, the Governor would establish a network of child development programs within the State, serving areas of 50,000 population. In this way, State decisions with respect to a particular area of a State would be subject to review in the appropriate area of the State where programs are being carried out.

The existing Headstart program is one of the most successful of our antipoverty efforts. In order to assure that these programs will not be cut back, the bill insures that the first $500,000,000 available under the legislation would be used to continue existing Headstart programs. In addition, the bill provides that 10 percent of the opportunities available in child development programs go to handicapped children. In the past, handicapped children—very often the most needy—have not received the degree of representation among the children served in preschool programs that they should have, considering the proportion of handicapped children in the population.

Let me close by addressing the charge that Headstart is a child-care program which somehow weakens the family. The fact of the matter is that millions of mothers now work based on their own choice or economic necessity. The legislation before the Senate today is merely an attempt to meet our responsibilities to the children who need adequate child care because a parent is not at home during the day. Child-care facilities are often grossly inadequate, as described by witness after witness before the committee. It is more than a little ironic that S. 2007 was vetoed last year at the very time the administration was urging passage of welfare legislation containing provisions that would require mothers of young children to take low-paying jobs or lose welfare benefits.

The legislation now before the Senate is a bipartisan attempt to draft sound and responsible child development legislation. I urge Senators to support its passage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of S. 3617 be printed in the Record. There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This section provides that the legislation may be cited as the "Comprehensive Headstart, Child Development, and Family Services Act of 1972.

SECTION 2. STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

This section sets forth the congressional findings concerning the need for child development and family services and the purpose to authorize and appropriate funds in providing their children with an opportunity for a healthful and stimulating development.

SECTION 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Subsection (a) authorizes the appropriation of $150 million for fiscal year 1973 for the purpose of providing training, technical assistance, planning, and other activities as the Secretary deems appropriate to prepare for the implementation of this title. Subsection (b) provides that the amounts authorized under subsection (a) shall be made available as follows: The amount of $500 million shall be for the purpose of providing assistance under title I of this Act for child development programs focused upon young children from low-income families, with priority for Headstart projects. Up to 15 percent of the amounts which remain thereafter may be made available, as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare deems appropriate, to other programs within this Act, but not to exceed 5 percent of such remaining amounts shall be used for title III. The remainder of the appropriation is to be used for carryover of prior year funds.

Subsection (d) sets forth advance funding authority.

SECTION 4. DEFINITIONS

This section defines terms used in the Act. This section defines terms used in the Act.

SECTION 5. STATE AND LOCAL PRIME SPONSORS

This section provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall provide financial assistance for carrying out child development and family services programs authorized this title to prime sponsors and to other public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations pursuant to plans, program statements, and applications approved in accordance with this title. Financial assistance for carrying out this Act, any obligated at any time for which financial assistance may be used are set forth in this section.

SECTION 102. STATE AND LOCAL PRIME SPONSORS

Subsection (a) provides that a State, a unit of local government of at least 25,000 population or, if less, which demonstrates capability and a particular need, an Indian tribal organization, or a public or private nonprofit agency may be designated as a prime sponsor of child development and family service programs in accordance with the provisions of the legis-
Subsection (b) provides that the plan must provide for a child and family services council, must provide assurances that staff and other representatives of general local government, city, county, or other unit of general local government, and local program councils and project policy committees will not exceed percent of the total cost of child development programs administered by the State, and the purpose of that provision is to decrease to higher start-up costs or other special needs, and must provide assurances to provide or to enter into arrangements with administrative expenses of services for linkages to provide services related to child development.

Subsection (c) provides that, in the case of a State applicant for designation as prime sponsor of areas not served by a local prime sponsor, the plan must also provide for designation of areas to be served by the local program council and the remaining half shall be comprised of not less than 10 members and half must be persons broadly representative of the general public including community agencies and the remaining one-third of the total membership of such council shall be persons broadly representative of economically disadvantaged persons where any unit of general government or other prime sponsor is representing the prime sponsor’s minority group or economically disadvantaged children.

Subsection (m) provides that the Secretary shall approve a prime sponsorship plan submitted jointly to the Secretary for the areas served by such prime sponsors.

SECTION 105. PROJECT APPLICATIONS

Subsection (a) provides that financial assistance may be provided to a project application only if the project application is submitted by a public or private nonprofit agency and contains other provisions set forth in this section. During these procedures, the Secretary must approve or deny any program statement that is not covered by a prime sponsor's program statement.

Subsection (b) provides that the project application must be made to the Secretary. The Secretary must provide written notice, reasonable time for corrective amendments or action, and an opportunity for a public hearing upon which an appeal to the Secretary may be based.

Subsection (d) provides for review by the court of appeals of the Secretary’s final action with respect to prime sponsorship under subsection (j).

Subsection (l) provides that the Secretary shall approve the application of an alternate unit of Government or a public or nonprofit agency for approval withdrawn only if the Secretary has provided written notice, reasonable time for corrective amendments or action, and an opportunity for a public hearing upon which an appeal may be based.

Subsection (f) provides that the Secretary shall establish procedures to permit prime sponsors to submit jointly a single program statement for the areas served by such prime sponsors.
SECTION 108. ANNUAL FAMILY SERVICE PLANS

This section provides that, upon submission of an annual family service plan by any State, the Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance for carrying out such plan. The purpose of determining child development and family service goals and needs, assisting in the establishment of Child and Family Service Councils, and strengthening and development and implementation of program statements.

SECTION 109. SPECIAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS WITH EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES AND OTHER PROGRAMS

This section provides that the Secretary shall use funds made available under section 108(a)(1)(2) to provide assistance to educational agencies and Institutions for higher education, to provide technical assistance to persons of determining the extent to which facilities owned or leased by Federal agencies and other agencies may be used for programs with Federal assistance under this title, and to the full extent of carrying out the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements. A special Committee on Federal Standards for Child Development Services, established by the Secretary, shall be established for the purpose of participating in the development of such standards.

SECTION 303. DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORM METHODS FOR PROVIDING FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

This section provides for a special committee to develop a uniform minimum code for facilities, to be used in licensing child development facilities dealing principally with almost all aspects of the day care centers. Upon approval by the Secretary, standards contained in the code are to be applicable to all projects assisted under this Act.

SECTION 304. MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

This section establishes a program of mortgage insurance for child development facilities, to be administered by the Secretary under this title.

SECTION 305. OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT

This section provides for the Office of Child Development to be the principal agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the administration of this title and for the coordination of programs and other activities related to child development and family service research, training, and development efforts.

SECTION 306. SPECIAL COORDINATING COUNCIL

This section sets forth the prohibition against Federal control of education.

SECTION 310. SPECIAL PROHIBITIONS AND PROTECTIONS

This section provides that nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect, upon parental rights and direct the Secretary to establish procedures to insure that no child shall be the subject of research or experimentation under this Act unless the child's parent or guardian is informed and has the opportunity to except such child therefrom. This section also provides that the Secretary shall have primary responsibility for the development of a uniform method of assessing the needs of young children and to carry out the research and demonstration projects under this section.

SECTION 311. REMOVAL OF EXISTING AUTHORITY AND COORDINATION

This section provides for repealing, effective July 1, 1976, the authorization for Head Start and provides that where such authority is specifically authorized elsewhere in the Economic Opportunity Act shall be provided, wherever feasible, through child care programs under this Act.

SECTION 312. TRANSITIONAL AUTHORITY

This section permits the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to waive al-
iotment and Federal share provisions under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act to relieve hardship resulting from the failure to continue the authorization for Headstart under the President's veto message. The section 229(a)(1) when this Act takes effect.

SECTION 313. ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS

This section authorizes the Secretary to accept, for use under this Act, funds appropriated to carry out other laws if such funds are authorized for the purposes for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT).

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President I support the comprehensive Headstart Child Development and Family Services Act of 1972. This bill, which was reported from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, is the result of a bipartisan compromise between S. 313, which I co-sponsored along with 13 of my Republican colleagues, and S. 3193 introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) and co-sponsored by other Senators.

I believe that this measure represents a substantial improvement in several respects over title V of S. 207, which the President vetoed last December.

I want to commend all concerned for their tolerance and patience in working out the terms of the compromise. Particularly I would like to say a word for the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Mondale), who has taken the leadership in this connection.

I am pleased that this bill is being considered separately, and not attached to the OEO extension, as it was previously the bill which was vetoed. At that time Members of the Senate may recall, I moved to separate the child development section from that bill, and that been done, I feel we might have had a better chance of achieving workable legislation at an early date, and also given more certainly to the existence and continued life of the OEO.

I have consistently urged that this Important measure be debated on its own merit without delaying or hampering the consideration of the OEO extension.

This bill would make it possible for thousands of parents to work or further their education to improve the well-being of their families with the confidence that their children have the opportunity to participate in pre-school and educational day care programs. I believe that this measure would be a desirable complement to the welfare reform legislation which we will soon be considering. While there are guidelines to insure that the various programs are of a high quality, flexibility is provided so that these programs can be designed to meet the needs of the families who choose to participate.

I believe that the administrative workability of the programs in this Act has been improved by our compromise. This bill gives State and local prime sponsors clear responsibility for planning and implementing the programs. The role of the family service and child development councils has been changed from a policy making one to that of approving the plans developed by the prime sponsor. I believe that this arrangement is an improvement over the arrangement in which the councils themselves had some real administrative responsibility, and I did not feel they were bodies set up to take advantage of that administrative responsibility. All of the programs of this type of programs to be carried out in the entire project is now left to the prime sponsor.

Other improvements in the bill include a more realistic authorization—$150 million for start up in 1973 and $1.2 billion for fiscal 1974, as opposed to $2 billion authorized for fiscal 1974 in S. 3193. I call to the attention of the Senate that, in using these figures, I include the level of planning and authorization in the Headstart program of approximately $500 million per year. That amount is included in the $1.2 billion figure which I mentioned for fiscal 1974.

The provision for annual family service plans is to be submitted by the States to insure statewide coordination, and there is an increased authorization for training.

Later today, or tomorrow, I hope to introduce a clarifying amendment further extending the wording of the bill as proposed presently with regard to providing opportunity for individuals to receive training for the increased need which already exists, and which will become even more apparent as we go ahead with this program, for trained both professional and nonprofessional personnel to properly carry out this program.

I support also the basic fee schedule provisions in the bill, which were worked out with the administration last year. This represents one of the principal compromises which was arrived at, and erases one of the objections that the President had to the veto message. Under the plan as it is presently in the bill, free services would be provided to families with incomes up to $4,320 for a family of four, with modest fees between that level and $7,214, the so-called lower living standard of the Bureau of Labor's statistics. If a child is placed in the educational, socialization, and Welfare would establish the fee schedule for families with incomes above that level.

I support the committee report and the additional views. Significantly, the President's veto message was deeply disturbed about the assumptions upon which it is predicated. Certainly one person who was concerned by the previous child development program, vetoed by the President last December, was William Shannon, editorial writer for the Daily News of New York. Mr. Shannon, who clearly considers himself a liberal, expressed his nearly complete agreement with the reasoning behind the President's veto. In particular, he pointed out that "much hard-earned human wisdom" lay behind the President's contention, expressed in his veto message, that:

All other factors being equal, good public policy requires that we enhance rather than diminish both parents involvement in their children.

Mr. Shannon declares that he can only agree with this principle, and asks rhetorically:

Are child-development centers desirable for any children other than the most damaged and deprived? The unpopular truth is that a community facility—call it a day-care center or a child-development center—is at best an inadequate, unsatisfactory substitute, and at worst a dangerous, destructive substitute for a child's own mother.

If the scope of this bill were reduced to this central issue, the overwhelming amount of good over and above present efforts being carried out by Headstart. I believe it deserves the support of the Senate, and I hope we will act favorably upon it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Brock).

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, at the outset, lest there be any misunderstanding, let me state my categorical opposition to this legislation.

Mr. President, why must we deprive the children of this Nation of parental care? Why must we create incentives to effectively deprive them of the opportunity to participate in the lives of their children?

Why not institute incentives to elderly family members who spend time in child care? Such a program could have any number of salutary effects in sustaining that quality of life. What is being asked is for us to deprive—be it being asked to vote on today, while somewhat less bad than the measured vetoed by President Nixon last December, gives impetus to the forces wreaking at today's family.

Mr. President, this bill attempts to inject its plethora of councils and committees, interpositions and bureaucracies, into the lives of children. Such bureaucracies are sterile, infinitely pre-conditioned and arrogant, serving only to deprive the individual of social skills which would help him to strengthen his family and his community.

In the press of important business in this session, many have not had the opportunity to give this bill the thought it deserves. Many of us who have studied this issue have come away deeply disturbed about the assumptions upon which it is predicated. Certainly one person who was concerned by the previous child development program, vetoed by the President last December, was William Shannon, who clearly considers himself as liberal, expressed his nearly complete agreement with the reasoning behind the President's veto. In particular, he pointed out that "much hard-earned human wisdom" lay behind the President's contention, expressed in his veto message, that:

All other factors being equal, good public policy requires that we enhance rather than diminish both parents involvement in their children.

Mr. Shannon declares that he can only agree with this principle, and asks rhetorically:

Are child-development centers desirable for any children other than the most damaged and deprived? The unpopular truth is that a community facility—call it a day-care center or a child-development center—is at best an inadequate, unsatisfactory substitute, and at worst a dangerous, destructive substitute for a child's own mother.
The majority of American citizens would agree with its position. Perhaps, even the great majority of my distinguished colleagues would agree with it too. I certainly do.

How do we develop the premise that effective means should be found to strengthen the family rather than weaken it? By forcing the Federal Government to interfere in family structure? Hardly. Mr. Shannon suggests that if we really wish to strengthen the family—and the bill's proponents claim that this is in effect what they do—it would be preferable to make direct money grants to mothers to take care of their own children. This would reduce their incentive to take outside employment, to leave their sons and daughters in the care of people who have no direct interest in them. By such an action, Mr. Shannon states the Government would make it clear that it considers child rearing an important task, too important, one might add, to be left to impersonal agencies.

Mr. Shannon remarks:

"It is a rare and exceptionally gifted woman who does something more important in the outside world than she does during those rare six years when she is helping to form the personality and character of a child."

He is right.

President Nixon, Mr. Shannon, and a number of other people who have written on this subject are pointing us in the right direction, whereas the proposed legislation would take us very much in the opposite direction.

I cannot state that Mr. Shannon's idea of direct money grants to mothers is the best way of approaching the matter, but it is infinitely preferable to the arrogance underlying this proposed legislation. Should we not test his and other suggestions before being stampeded? Cries that opponents of this bill are "anticlild" are ridiculous. There are many preferable alternative approaches to child development, and only a fool would refuse to see new and better ideas.

One thing makes me as ardent in my belief as the voucher system, it could be aimed more precisely at the economically disadvantaged. It would give them infinitely more "control" over the programs in which they children are enrolled than membership on any number of the child and family service councils, local program councils, and project policy committees envisioned by the drafters of the current bill.

A parent armed with voucher will have an effective "economic vote." for those who run child development centers will be aware that they must tailor their programs to meet the wishes of parents and the needs of children or else go out of business. The voucher system was proposed by the National Urban League in its written statement of June 3, 1971, to the Subcommittee on Children and Youth and the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty.

We recommend some type of direct appeals process for parents who can demonstrate that a center does not serve the best interests of their children and themselves. One alternative might be to provide temporary vouchers to allow them to seek services on the "open market" in order to provide needed services until they are able to obtain either the changes deemed necessary in the center in which they enroll or until they no longer require the service.

The idea of an appeals process in the proposed programs seems extraordinarily clumsy, but the notion of vouchers here is very much in order.

Moreover, Mr. President, it would be desirable, and probably possible, for a voucher to be issued in such a way that a premium could be placed upon child care in the family—preferably the child's own family, as in the instance of Mr. Shannon's proposed direct money grants. The problem of designing a system based upon either direct money grants or vouchers for improving the raising of children is a very complex one. Of course, it is difficult at best to devise a procedure to insure with reasonable certainty that the funds allotted are used wisely by parents in the lower income groups. But then, even high-income individuals do not always spend their money well, nor does this Congress. The Government must not put itself in the business of supervising the decisions of every individual.

Mr. President, by rejecting the bill before us today and going on to work along the lines I have sketched, we would avoid the direct money grant or voucher system—Congress of the United States will affirm its belief in the family as the fundamental building block of any society. It would, at the same time reject the notion that the proper way to raise children is an extension of the Headstart program, which I do not believe the Senator from Minnesota has attempted to point out—that this program goes hand in hand, really, with H.R. 1 and a family allowance type of approach to the problem. It is not anything more than a mere extension of the Headstart program, which I do not believe the Senator opposes, into a slightly broader realm, broader scope, in an attempt to handle problems that apparently are not being handled well.

I hope the day will come when all children can be taken care of in their own homes, and adequately so, and we will not have the problem of working mothers that we have today.

I should like to get the Senator's figures pinned down as to how he feels the program could be handled from a fiscal point of view, if we take the view suggested by the New York Times editorial.

The PRESIDENT. The Senator for Minnesota?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. That was an extensive question. I will try to answer it briefly.

I really think that the fundamental premise we have here is what is the cost for the child welfare system, by infantile or otherwise, taken from its family. This bill would motivate the dilution of family care, family sharing, family concern. To me, there is no possible way to calculate the cost of that to the child. I think we have some of the really good child care centers—some in Chicago and Israel. They still reflect an enormous psychological impact upon the child.

For the life of me, I cannot see how the Government could create an incentive program to encourage a woman
choose the work market over her responsibility of trying to provide her child with every ounce of love available to it, so that it can grow up with dignity and love for other people. I do not think that can be found in a child development center.

The pressure is going to come on Congress and the Government to provide the centers in every community. No one can stand before this body and say there are enough people with Ph. D.’s in psychology and all the rest, to staff those centers. The result is that you are going to have wards, you are going to have warehouses, in which you take the responsibility of these babies from their mothers.

So that the question is not employment. I think there is a better way to do it. I think the mother, when she has that child, accepts the responsibility. I see no reason not to recognize that. We do it in the family assistance program. We do take cognizance of that. We are not requiring them to work until the child is 6. We are creating an additional system of motivation which puts economic pressure on that family to dissolve itself and to abridge the most fundamental principles a family has, which is the rearing and loving of their children?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Ohio, who is the ranking minority member of the Health Subcommittee, the Senator from Minnesota, and the Senator from Wisconsin for the work they did on the bill when it was considered in subcommittee and in committee. It is an enormously complex problem, and the further one gets into the bill the more complicated it becomes. We had some executive hearings on the bill in the markup. A considerable number of changes were made to it. I believe there was some study and some consideration of the philosophical points involved in the bill under the pressure of work within which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare operates, sufficient attention was given to the mechanics of this bill in order to avoid the pitfalls that the previous bill contained or in order to solve what I think is the fundamental pitfall; namely, promising more than we can produce. Over and over again in the past few years Congress has, through legislation, with high ideals, promised to the American public great, flamboyant programs which will solve all the social evils and ills. This is one more of that kind of idealistic approach. I have nothing against ideals. I am for them myself, but I wish Congress would not go on spending the taxpayers’ money thinking it will be a panacea for all our country’s social ills and then not be able to solve most of the ills to which the legislation addresses itself.

I make no formal comments on the bill in the report, some of which I think are worthwhile repeating here. I voted to report the bill so that we could get it out on the floor and consider more fully many of the problems which I felt were inadequately dealt with in committee. I hope, in the process of consideration of this bill, in the limited time we have, through consideration of the amendments which I will propose and other amendments which other Senators will propose, that we can correct some of the defects in the delivery system.

But, frankly, even if we do correct them, even if we are able to make this one of the more efficient bureaucratic systems in the world, any major proportion of the authorized amount will be spent in following 2 years.

In fiscal years 1974 and 1975, 2 years, we will authorize for appropriation $2.8 billion, when a lesser amount in the previous bill was categorized as being fiscally responsible.

So it appears apparent that this has not been cured. As a matter of fact, we have put a little additional custard on top of the pie.

One other point that came up was a series of extended discussions, arguments, and votes, in connection with the size of the prime sponsorship. Last year’s vetoed bill contained a prime sponsorship population requirement of 5,000.

In the process of the veto measure, it was pointed out that this would create so many operating units that it would be totally impossible to find personnel to staff the centers.

This year, the bill contains a prime sponsorship population requirement of 25,000 people or more.

But, Mr. President, who has a knowledge of the presently available number of trained personnel, everyone I have heard of, including HEW, and Jules Sugarman and a significant number of others, have said that we should have a population requirement of 100,000—not 25,000, but 100,000.

If we had 100,000, we would reduce the eligible sponsors to 484 which would bring this program within the realm of administrative workability.

With 25,000, there would be 3,100 eligible sponsors. In addition, there is about 900 more than the present Headstart program with which they have had grave difficulty getting the program into operation.

So I would say to you, Mr. President, that, mechanically speaking, 25,000 simply does not work.

Furthermore, the 25,000 is put in without any doubt whatsoever—as can be determined from the members of the committee who took part in the debate—to try to get the prime sponsorships to be within a State instead of being “a” State. In order to have the local areas within the State competing against each other for funds, instead of letting the State be the sponsor and thereby working out within the State what the necessary areas are for the centers, and how they can be best coordinated with existing programs. I argued this point before the committee. I got nowhere with it there. But I bring it up again because I prophesy that if this bill gets through and does not get vetoed, I think we are going to be in a world of trouble. I think it is still in its present form—then when we get into the actual operation and get the number of applicants called for under the 25,000, we will be in serious administrative trouble.

Yet, Mr. President, I also have an absolute bureaucratic monstrosity, if I will, with all due deference to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Mondale), of committees, councils, and subcommittees—not advisory committees, but actual operating committees. I drew a diagram—a diagram which appears on page 58 of the report. Reference to that diagram clearly demonstrates that we have so many overlapping local councils, State councils, program committees, that the prime sponsor, in fact, does nothing. The Senator from Wisconsin has an idea left if this bill gets through. He wants to try to decide which will work and which will not. In fact, there is no requirement that any councils or committees ever reach a decision.

Nevertheless, that decision has to be reached and made before any program can go forward, so that any one of the councils could sit on its hands as long as it wants to. No matter how many other people want a program to start, it could not even operate. I would say that is another very vexing problem.

It is interesting to me that on the calendar the bill is listed as the Headstart bill. The bill itself is said to strengthen and expand the Headstart program. The fact is, there is about as little relationship between this program and Headstart as it is now operating as there is between a monkey and an elephant. There is no relationship.

Let me indicate some of the things which are supposed to be carried out under the program.

Child development and family services programs is what this bill is called and this bill—or programs—this is found on page 5 of the bill—as follows: “Child development and family service programs” means programs on a full-day or part-day basis which provide the educational services, and health, social service needs to children to attain their full potential, including services to other family members related to the education of the child, and other development of children.

Now, Mr. President, I submit that there is a built-in determination already made that someone knows what the educational, nutritional, health, and other services which are needed in order to raise a child to his full potential. Well, Mr. President, I do not even know that with respect to my own children.

But I do not know how we are going to find experts who can do this with regard to children who will go into the day centers so that the mothers can go to work. I do not understand where we will find the expertise in order to produce an answer as to what services are needed in order to allow children to obtain their full potential.
Mr. President, I have seen many children, and I am sure the Presiding Officer has, that have been well cared for, who have been well educated and who have come to the determination that they did not want to do anything, and they have not. They have not realized their full potential. They have been taken to psychiatrists and psychologists, and they have not proven very much to themselves or to anyone else. However, they have had the benefit of all the services that are supposed to be the very best from the very beginning.

I would say once again and try to emphasize as I have ever since I have been in Congress that there are differences between people, and we cannot get some kind of predetermined standard set up by an expert in Washington and determine that this is the mechanism by which a child will reach his potential. It takes far more than that.

There are other items dealing with the same thing, but this is Headstart or not. Home services and consultation must be provided for the families of preschool age in providing for the healthy growth and development of each child’s full potential. Once again we want programs that have an end, and the kid isn’t reaching his potential, friend.” And you will have to do something to correct this.

“This is what this bill is about. Already some programs provide for day services and activities for children. We have no parents to provide any. There is a list on pages 8 and 9, and we can go back to the definition on page 5.

I referred to the size of the sponsorship once before, saying that it was 25,000. And it is true that on page 13 it says that a prime sponsor may be any State or any unit of local government or any combination of such units having a total population of 25,000 or more persons.

Then it goes on to another one. Then it goes on to No. 3. That says “any unit of local government or any combination of such units, with regard to population, subject to a demonstration by the applicant that it has the capability to carry out adequately a comprehensive child development and family service program, and that is a particular demand for services and availability of resources within the area to be served.”

Presumably, 10 people could be eligible under this bill. Certainly we could have any local educational institution or any local unit of government on which thought it had the capability, then it could be eligible, and it would be eligible, whether it had 25,000 or not.

So when I said in my original views 2,100, I am only talking about 2,100 eligible applicants. If we talk about 25,000 or more, then it is a different situation. However, page 3 of page 13, we could have as many prime sponsors as there are organizations in the country.

Any Indian tribal organization, regardless of size could be a prime sponsor. Then it would have as many local or private nonprofit agencies meeting the requirements of subsection (h) of this section.

All I can say with respect to this is that it is wide open, that 25,000 really does not limit the applications at all. We will have far more applicants than the 2,100 that I referred to in my individual views, or at least there is an opportunity for them to apply.

I believe that we have not met the veto objection on this point.

Then we go on to the question of bureaucracy. And this is a honey. I am not sure I can explain it. I am not sure I can stand here, having been all the way through the hearings and all the way through the markup by the committee, and having read the bill and having looked at the wording of the language, and try to explain it to the Senate.

I certainly cannot, at least not without the chart on page 58, showing what extensive areas of responsibility of the committees and councils. In any event, we have to set up a child and family service council. And usually when we set up committees and councils in addition to a prime sponsor, we set them up in an advisory capacity. However, we do not do that here.

This is what we do with the child and family service council in this case. They will be entitled to approve annual program statements, basic goals, policies and procedures, and the selection, establishment, or other renewal of any agency or service as a prime sponsor. This is found on page 37. It has responsibility for approving basic goals, policies, actions and procedures for the project applicants and for planning, budgeting, location of centers and facilities, and direction and evaluation of projects.

So, we have one child and family service council doing one thing. We have the local program council, and project policy councils. The project policy committee is found on page 37. It has responsibility for approving basic goals, policies, actions and procedures for the project applicants and for planning, budgeting, location of centers and facilities, and direction and evaluation of projects.

Page 46 of the bill says that 50 percent will be apportioned among the States and then within each State among the local areas in proportion to the relative number of economically disadvantaged children in each State.

That means that for a change, at least, we are giving one-half of the money in the area where needed. In other words, it would be the economically disadvantaged kids. I think that is good.

Then, it states:

(B) 25 per centum thereof shall be apportioned among the States, and within each State among local areas, in proportion to the relative number of children of working mothers and single parents in each local area, respectively; and

That means that any child, even if his father is a multimillionaire, is included in the formula.

The next section reads:

(C) 25 per centum thereof shall be apportioned among the States, and within each State among local areas, in proportion to the relative number of children of working mothers and single parents in each State and local area, respectively.

This is an incentive to go to work and an incentive to be a single parent, then you get more money in the State for the purpose of developing these programs.

But there is something very interesting about this. I have not gotten to the bottom of it yet. I may make further comment on it tomorrow. I turn now to what I previously said with the formularies and I find there are charges in the formulary grants for other programs which have been developed very carefully within the bill, so that the method by which people have determined what allocation of funds that will get under OEO or under other pieces of legislation which bear on child development or economic development have been changed by this bill. I have not yet been able to make an analysis to find out what the changes are and to what extent they will bear on the formula allocation given on page 46 of the bill.

Then, we have Federal control of individual citizens. It is not actually as strenuous as it was in the previous bill which was vetoed. Some of the saving provisions may take it out of a condition in which they did the last time, but that was some kind of youth camp, similar to the ones Germany had, but we have some interesting provisions here.

On page 57 of the bill we have the Secretary with power to conduct demonstration and experimental model programs “subject to the fullest extent practicable to each of the requirements with respect to project applications under section 105.” In other words, the Secretary can run his own program with respect to nutrition, health, and developing the full potential of a child.

There is nothing wrong with trying to do research in these programs but I have some doubt as to whether or not we should have the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare running one of the centers, and still saying that we can do this, because you have to get consent of the parent.

This is clear on page 74 under section 310(a) (12).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.
Mr. DOMINICK. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I do not plan to use much further time this evening. I tried to make the points which I think needed to be made in my opening remarks.

This is a measure with which the Senate is quite familiar. We had a long debate and several votes on essentially the same amendments which I think will come before us in the next day or so. I think the Senate is quite familiar with the issues with which we are here concerned.

One of the key arguments used by some opponents of this measure and one which is frequently seen in right-wing journals is that this measure is designed to undermine and weaken the family. This is a charge which I dismiss categorically as being unfounded. In fact, the reverse is true. This measure recognizes that the best place for a child is at home with a healthy, stable, united family. The trouble is, however, that we have millions of families which are either tragically impoverished, deeply divided, or in which, for economic reasons, both parents find it necessary to seek employment. This is not an opinion; it is a fact which we cannot deny.

One-third of all mothers with preschool children are working today. One-half of all mothers with school-age children are working today. This trend was not caused by this measure. It was caused by the economic predicament in which families now find themselves.

There is an alternative we could take which has been suggested by some, and that is a massive, multibillion dollar subsidy program for families of limited income to make it possible for one of the parents to remain home and not to work. I have not heard any of the opponents of this measure remotely suggest they would support anything near that kind of proposal. So the children of poor families are left with advice but no help. And I am referring especially to the tragically cheated children from many broken homes and tragically impoverished homes are left with insufficient food, no health care, no emotional support, no educational stimulation, and no hope. The question is whether they are going to be caught up in the fetal effects of poverty, or whether the government will act upon the almost unanimous advice of people in this field, and practically all organizations that represent experience and understanding in this field. The question is whether we will respond to the top recommendation of the President's White House Conference on Children, and begin a program along that line, as I think the Senate has done this morning.

I have seen, as have many of my colleagues, the predicament which many of these children face and confront in those highly vulnerable first years of life.

This proposal seeks to strengthen the family, assist the family where it needs help in fulfilling those fundamental obligations and responsibilities of a family to its young. It seeks to help families where, because of enormous poverty or because of the need to work, it becomes necessary for both parents to be working during the day. In those cases it seeks to provide an alternative which is helpful, supportive, and developmental during the hours that becomes necessary.

We tried to establish a system of help which assures that these programs will be under the control of the parents whose children are involved. We have a program which is totally voluntary. There is no compulsion whatsoever in this proposal.

One of the key disputes in the development of this measure has been between those of us who favor heavy parental control on the one hand and those, on the other, who want it run by remote State welfare bureaus far distant from the parents and usually without under a system of incentives which I think would be destructive of family life and destructive of the best interests of these children.

So I am hopeful that some of the scare rhetoric that we often hear from time to time and exaggerated talk about warehousing of children, and expressions of that kind, would be rejected and that we could have a responsible, balanced discussion of what this measure involves.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I want to commend the Senator particularly because of certain remarks that were made earlier by some of our colleagues who used the word everything that is directly contrary to my understanding of the purposes of this legislation. In fact, if there is a major purpose of the legislation, I think it is to prevent the warehousing of children that is growing with the growth of day-care centers without adequate controls and without adequate leadership and without adequate research or study of exactly what is being done.

In the committee hearings, as I listened to what is the problem, it was that we have an increase really in what amounts to warehousing of children today with the growth of working mothers. We are trying, as I felt, to go in the opposite direction, to provide meaningful hope for those who want to continue having their children at home, and to provide a more cost-effective custodial kind of warehousing which, in our opinion, is not going to be destructive of the best interests of children.

If I might impose on the Senator from Ohio for a moment, I would like to report what kind of organizations support the measure which the Senator from Ohio helped to write.

We have a letter here from the Board of Christian Social Concerns of the United Methodist Church, signed by its general secretary, strongly supporting the pending legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter appear in the Record at this point.

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


HON. WALTER F. MONDALE, Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mondale: On behalf of our Board staff I would like to indicate our support for S. 3617. This measure represents the findings of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, and Welfare, the Children's Senate Committee of the House of Representatives, and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. We believe that these objectives will be at least partly achieved by the enactment of S. 3617. This measure should help to strengthen family life by providing the assurance of meaningful day care for those children who need it. It will help to make it possible for more mothers to work outside the home. The developmental services for children in terms of education and health should be most advantageous. Also, the alternative of home-schooling and part-day care will help to relieve anxious parents of the burden of otherwise inadequate supervision and training of their children, thus substantially strengthening family life. In addition, the
child development classes for parents should greatly enhance the quality of family living for all who are its beneficiaries.

We strongly urge Members of the United States Senate to support this bi-partisan effort to provide adequate child development and family services for the nation’s families.

Yours sincerely,

DR. A. DUBLERY WARDE, 
General Secretary

Mr. MONDALE. I have a letter from the American Baptist Convention, signed by John W. Thomas, director of the Department of Governmental Relations, supporting the measure now before the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that that letter be printed in the Record.

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

AMERICAN BAPTIST CONVENTION, 

HON. WALTER MONDALE, 
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Please find enclosed a letter from our Department of Ministry with Children in support of S. 3617, the Comprehensive Headstart, Child Development and Family Services Act of 1972.

Please utilize this letter in whatever way that you think best suited to help bring passage of this legislation.

This year for your concern and leadership in this important area of family life and responsibility. If our office can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. THOMAS, 
Director, Department of Governmental Relations.

AMERICAN BAPTIST CONVENTION, 
Valley Forge, Pa., June 19, 1972.

HON. WALTER MONDALE, 
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: On behalf of the American Baptist Convention, Department of Ministry with Children, I would like to indicate our support for S. 3617, the Comprehensive Headstart, Child Development and Family Services Act of 1972.

We realize the crucial importance of the early years in a child’s life, not only for physical and intellectual growth but for social and emotional as well. These are the formative years in which permanent foundations are laid for a child’s feeling of self-worth and confidence in his ability to achieve.

We believe that the Senate, through S. 3617, has an opportunity to improve the quality of health, nutrition, and educational services to young children. This measure should help to strengthen family life by providing parents the means of enabling their children, whose parents, of necessity, must work outside the home. In addition, the child development classes for parents, provided for by this bill, would greatly enhance and augment the quality of family living for all; consequently, a whole generation of children and parents would be the beneficiaries of the kind of learning and growth which would endure both the children’s personalities and the parent’s understanding.

For these reasons, we strongly urge Members of the Senate to support this bi-partisan effort to provide adequate child development and family services for the nation’s families.

Sincerely,

LINDA ISHAM, 
Department of Ministry with Children.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have a letter from Ralph E. Smeltzer, representing the Washington office of the Church of the Brethren, strongly supporting the measure as embodied in S. 3617. They say:

Since we feel it would not only aid the individual child, but would strengthen the family unit, which is the basic unit of our society, we ask unanimous consent that that letter be printed in the Record.

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

CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN, 

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE, 
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The members of the Church of the Brethren have always been concerned about the social welfare of all persons. This bill provides a comprehensive, and more effective provision for needy Americans, such as the aged; the poverty-stricken, the unemployed, delinquent or predelinquent youth, and the young child.

We, therefore, wish to lend our support in favor of this Child Development Bill, S. 3617, since we believe it would not only aid the individual child, but would strengthen the family unit by helping each member of the family unit feel a sense of personal worth.

Sincerely,

RALPH E. SMELTZER, 
Washington Representative and Social Justice Consultant.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have a letter from the United Presbyterian Church of the United States, signed by Mary Jane Patterson, its associate director for national affairs, strongly supporting the measure now before the Senate. We believe that the pending legislation enhances the quality of family life in America, and would represent a significant legislative aid both with the individual child, and with disadvantaged children in education and in terms of social and economic opportunity.

We are particularly attracted to the fact that the legislation seeks to deliver services to children, of a comprehensive character, which goes far beyond prior federal programs, and which we believe can have, adopted, a significant multipronged effect that may dramatically improve the quality of life for poor people generally and poor children in particular.

Last year, we were heartened by Congressional passage of similar legislation and disappointed when the President vetoed it. We hope that this year both Congress and the President will see it through to fruition.

To you, we express our admiration and appreciation for the leadership that you have furnished in continuing to press for this program.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

MARY JANE PATTERSON, 
Associate Director for National Affairs.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have the following letters, which I ask unanimous consent be printed at this point in the Record:

A letter from the Religious Action Center, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, signed by Marvin Brat­

erman, strongly supporting this bill; a letter from the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States, signed by David M. Ackerman, strongly supporting this proposal; a letter from the National Committee Against Mental Illness, signed by Mike Gorman, strongly supporting this proposal; a letter from the American Parents Committee, Inc., signed by George J. Hecht, strongly supporting this legislation; a telegram signed by Stanley J. McFarland, director of government relations, National Education Association, strongly supporting this proposal; a resolution adopted by the resolutions committee of U.S. Conference of Mayors; a letter signed by the Joint Washington Office for Social Concerns, representing the American Baptist Convention, the American Jewish Congress, the Ethical Union, American Humanist Association, and a Unitarian Universalist Association; a letter signed by the American Psychological Association; a letter signed by the Maryland Psychological Association; a letter signed by the Maryland Psychological Association.

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

RELIGIOUS ACTION CENTER, 

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE, 
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.


For many years our organizations, which comprise respectively the congregations and rabbis of American Jewry, have advocated legislation that would enhance the lives of and opportunities for children who are reached by your bill. We believe that the pending legislation enhances the quality of family life in America, and would represent a significant legislative aid both with the individual child, and with disadvantaged children in education and in terms of social and economic opportunity. We are particularly attracted to the fact that the legislation seeks to deliver services to children, of a comprehensive character, which goes far beyond prior federal programs, and which we believe can have, adopted, a significant multipronged effect that may dramatically improve the quality of life for poor people generally and poor children in particular.

Last year, we were heartened by Congressional passage of similar legislation and disappointed when the President vetoed it. We hope that this year both Congress and the President will see it through to fruition.

To you, we express our admiration and appreciation for the leadership that you have furnished in continuing to press for this program.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

MARVIN BRATZERMAN, 
General Secretary.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE 
CHURCHES OF CHRIST, 

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE, 
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Understand that the Senate will consider the "Comprehensive Head Start Child Development and Family Services Act," which would provide for a network of developmental day care programs for children with low income and children whose parents are working. I write to express our support for this piece of legislation. The bill is, we think, a realistic and workable compromise.
The need for a national network of day care centers is clear. Mothers who are already working, mothers who want to work but cannot because of economic necessity, no one to care for their small children, children who need the kinds of services that a developmental day care center can provide—all indicate that this is a public need to which the Congress ought to respond.

Yet fully as important as the need for day care itself is that the day care provided be of high quality, custodial day care such as that provided in Title IV of H.R. 1 is not enough and will serve both the child and his family. The day care center must first of all be child centered. It must provide a range and quality of services that serve to develop the capacities of the child both cognitively and noncognitively. So that the day care center is a substitute for the role of the family, there should be opportunity for significant input from the parents of the children served. S. 3617, we believe, amply provides both this focus on the child as a person in his own right and a significant role for parents.

For these reasons we hope that the Senate will act favorably upon your bill and express to you our great appreciation for your leadership on this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. ACKERMAN

NATIONAL COMMITTEE
AGAINST MENTAL ILLNESS,

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I have had a chance to study S. 3617, the Comprehensive Child Development bill.

Our organization has been strongly in support of child development during the past two years of hearings. I have made at least twenty-five speeches during that period of time in various parts of the country and have reached out to the concept of Child Care Development Centers from a number of organizations in the human resources field.

We have a liaison group of mental health organizations which meets monthly in Washington. I append to this letter a list of these organizations. At our last meeting, on May 24th, we were privileged to discuss the status of the child care development legislation and agreed informally to give it the highest priority. While I cannot speak formally for the entire group, I do wish to convey to you the feeling of the group that the passage of this legislation would probably be one of the most important—if not the most important—developments in the human resources and mental health field in the current year.

I congratulate you for your efforts on behalf of this legislation.

Sincerely,

MIKE GORMAN

THE AMERICAN PARENTS COMMITTEE, INC.,

ATT: Mr. Sidney Johnson

RE: Child development legislation.

CHAIRMAN,
Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MS. CHAIRMAN: As national chairman of the American Parents Committee, and as publisher of Parents' Magazine, I would like to record our strong support for the "Comprehensive Headstart, Child Development, and Family Services Act of 1972", to be reported by the Senate by May 12.

The American Parents Committee, at our annual Board of Directors meeting on January 27, 1972, unanimously recommended support of such a comprehensive bill, and our Washington Report of April 1972 specifically advocated provisions of both S. 3193 and S. 3228. In addition, the May 1972 issue of Parents' Magazine, an issue devoted entirely to the unmet needs of American children, carries a special article on the goals of developmental Day Care, entitled "What Does Our Country Owe Its Children?" Because of the timeliness of this article, I hope it may be placed in the Congressional Record's proceedings of the Senate.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. HECHT,
Chairman.

Senator Walter Mondale,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

The National Education Association Supports a substantial increase in Federal funds for Child Development and Family Services Act of 1972 as major step toward strengthening family involvement in early childhood programs and believes it amply provides both this focus on the child as a person in his own right and a significant role for parents.

For these reasons we hope that the Senate will act favorably upon your bill and express to you our great appreciation for your leadership on this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. HECHT

Director of Government Relations, NEA.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE OF THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES.

Now therefore be it resolved that the U.S. Conference of Mayors urges the enactment of legislation which will provide for a comprehensive range of quality family centered child care services. The Conference urges that if they so choose to provide their children with an opportunity for healthy and stimulating development. Be it further resolved that such cities be given priority in planning and coordinating such comprehensive programs at the local level. Be it further resolved that such programs must be therefore available to families and children with economic or other special needs in direct proportion to that need.

JOINT WASHINGTON OFFICE FOR SOCIAL CONCERN,

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The Joint Washington Office for Social Concern, representing the American Humanist Association and the Unitarian Universalist Association, wishes to record its long-standing support for S. 3617, the child development bill.

We are convinced that the adult society is morally responsible for the prevention of child deprivation and the providing of developmental services for its children. We have been appalled by the high infant mortality rate in this affluent land and by the many recorded (to say nothing of the unreported) instances of child neglect and abuse. All three of our organizations have called for the funding of child care facilities and the creation of child development and family service centers for the country (see attached resolutions) because we are convinced that services of this nature will strengthen family life, reduce tensions which lead to family breakdown and insure that all children be free of the medical, nutritional, and psychological handicaps which need not mar their lives in a society such as ours.

We further applaud the provisions in S. 3617 that these services be provided free to families of four earning less than $4300 and for only modest fees for those earning up to $6960. This guarantees that the poor can raise their children without anxiety for the United States and Canada at all levels of government to funding and activating quality, professional child care centers with effective standards, licensing, inspection and enforcement.

A. Asks that societies of this denomination consider use of their facilities for weekday child care centers.

Adopted by the Tenth General Assembly
of the Unitarian Universalist Association, held in Washington, D.C., June 11, 1971.


HON. WALTER F. MONDALE, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: This is written to indicate the wholehearted support of the American Psychological Association for the principles embodied in the Comprehensive Head Start Children's Development and Family Services Act, recently reported out of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. You are to be congratulated on the vital legislation. We believe it retains the provisions essential for the welfare of the nation's children while meeting the objections of the President.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of the resolution passed by this Association in September 1971.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH B. LITTLE,
Executive Officer.

Be it resolved that the American Psychological Association call upon President Nixon to reaffirm his commitment to early childhood development, as stated by him in April 1969, and to implement the resolution of the White House Conference on Children calling for the permanent establishment of the Office of Child Development; and

Be it further resolved that the American Psychological Association call upon the President to support programs of comprehensive childhood development.

10. At the invitation of President Clark, Council heard a statement from Edward J. Casavantes, representing the Association for La Raza, urging concern and support for APA for Spanish-speaking America. Mr. Casavantes was encouraged to submit his proposals to the Ad Hoc Committee on Social and Ethical Responsibility.

THE MARYLAND PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, Inc.,
April 28, 1972.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The Maryland Psychological Association would again like to extend its support to you for your reintroduction of the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971 (S. 3042, Opportunity Amendments of 1972). Enclosed is a copy of our newsletter which addresses itself to the issues raised by the veto of President Nixon. Hopefully, you might find this of interest and we would be pleased to be of any additional assistance to you in your continuing efforts on behalf of the nation's families and childhood. Please keep us informed of your bill's progress.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,
JAMES W. PRESCOTT, Ph. D., President.

AFL-CIO

AFL-CIO strongly supports S. 3617, the comprehensive child development and family services act. This legislation is badly needed to provide decent day care services for the children of working parents and other children who need such care. The veto of prior legislation needlessly delayed start of this important program. S. 3617 meets many of the objections raised in the veto message while maintaining key principles of the comprehensive programs.

ANDREW J. BREMLER.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it is hard to believe that these organizations, representing almost the full spectrum of religious leadership in this country, would support this measure if they thought it was designed to undermine family life. Practically every letter that we have read states they are supporting it because it strengthens family life and deals with the profound issue of social injustice. It has been ignored for so long when it comes to the area of the formative and development years. I yield further to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAPF. Mr. President, I would like to comment further that the criticism we heard just a few minutes ago of the participation of the various councils and policy committees seems to me to be a safeguard and assurance that we will have participation of the parents, of the family units, and of the institutions of the various communities involved in the program, and assure us that this will not be Government-dominated, Government-run program. This will come from a prime sponsor which will give the political responsibility and financial backing to the President is carrying out this program we will have the deep involvement of the community to prevent the warehousing of children from becoming the sole result.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is absolutely correct. There has been some discussion about the system of delivery we have designed here. It is patterned closely after the existing regulations which govern Head Start.

It does two things, basically. First of all, it requires the approval of local governments, local mayors, local town boards, before there can be a program in one of the local communities. Second, it requires that the programs that are proposed be approved by the boards, the child and family services council, the local program council, and the project policy committee, which have strong representation of the parents whose children are in the program. We do not want outside bureaucrats deciding what is best for parents and children. We want the community, right there, their own parents and those in the local communities where the children live.

We want it so there will be flexibility. What might make sense in Harlem may not make sense in a smaller community in Ohio. There may be some communities which do not want day care at all, which want simply to provide services in the home or provide parental care. There may be other areas where day-care centers are good and the parents desire to leave those decisions, not in the hands of a national bureaucrat or a State welfare bureaucrat, but in the local communities, and above all, in the hands of the parents of the children in the region. That is what we are trying for so long. We do not think we should be tampering with family life through the divine guidance of outsiders.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAPF. Mr. President, if the Senator is prepared to yield the floor, I have an amendment which I might offer at this time.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. TAPF. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 63, beginning with line 6, strike out line 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY SERVICES PERSONNEL TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary is authorized to establish and carry on, in cooperation with the individuals employed or preparing for employment in child development and family services programs assisted under this Act, including sponsored programs, programs of preservice or inservice training for professional and nonprofessional personnel, to be conducted by institutions of higher education, private companies and organizations engaged in teacher training, teacher training institutions, local child development and family service organizations, and producers of skilled personnel.

(b) For the purpose of establishing, developing, or upgrading child development and family services personnel training programs which shall include, but shall not be limited to, the development of programs:
(1) To provide postgraduate level training for teachers of professional and paraprofessional child development and family services personnel and for teachers of teachers of such personnel;
(2) To attract and recruit personnel, both male and female, including parents, students, and older persons, to training for and subsequent employment in child development and family services programs;
(3) To retain personnel prepared for or experienced in education at levels other than childhood so as to enable them to function effectively in child development and family services programs;
(4) To provide preservice and inservice training of professional and paraprofessional personnel for teaching, management, and supervision in child development and family services programs, including the training and certification of Child Development Associates; and
(5) To help parents, including parents with limited education, understand and practice sound child development and family techniques; and
(6) To develop educational television programs and other instructional materials for training child development and family services personnel, programs, and high school students in the principles of child development and family services.

(b) The Secretary shall take whatever steps he deems appropriate to achieve the coordination of child development and family services personnel training programs already in operation with the programs to be established under this Act. The Secretary shall allow for the coordination of training programs with employment opportunities for such personnel.

Mr. TAPF. Mr. President, this amendment is offered on behalf of myself, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFORD), and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS).

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAPF. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. I would like, if possible, to be added as a cosponsor.
Mr. TAFT. And the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE).

Mr. President, I have introduced today an amendment on the Comprehensive Headstart, Child Development, and Family Services Act of 1972, which would provide for the training of high caliber professional and nonprofessional personnel. I believe that the success of these programs will, in part upon the quality of the trained staff who will be working with these participating children.

The shortage of trained personnel was well documented during the subcommittee hearings. Dr. Julie Sugarman, former director of Headstart and John Niemeyer, president of Bank Street College of Education in New York. In his testimony, Dr. Sugarman estimated that a total of 7,500,000 children are currently in need of some type of child-care services on a paid or nonpaid basis. One million of these would be children of working mothers in families with incomes between $4,000 and $7,000. Several hundred thousand additional professionals and nonprofessionals would be required in the future, Dr. Sugarman, current need, according to Dr. Sugarman.

This amendment authorizes the Secretary to provide financial assistance to make it possible for individuals to participate in training programs conducted by colleges, universities, teacher training institutions, State and local child development agencies, States and local educational agencies, national child development organizations, private training organizations, and producers of educational television programming.

These programs will be geared to the recruitment and training of nonprofessional as well as professional staff. To require each state to provide for a college or masters degree would be too costly both in terms of financial resources and in terms of professional supervision, nonprofessional personnel, including parents, volunteers, students, and the elderly, can be very effective in working with children.

The Office of Child Development in HEW has developed a midlevel profession of child development associates. These qualified personnel are nonprofessionals who will be certified in all States. These CDA training programs are included in this amendment.

The amendment also provides for the retraining of already certified elementary and secondary school teachers. This will provide additional employment opportunities for these people and will effectively utilize their talents and prior training.

This amendment makes a change in the more limiting provisions of section 201 of the bill as it is presently before the Senate, and I believe it provides an additional opportunity for the training of the broadest possible range of people that are needed that is absolutely vital to the success of the bill and, therefore, ought to be included in the bill.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think this is an important amendment, which improves the bill. It makes it much clearer in terms of its personnel training aspects, and on behalf of the majority, I would be very glad to accept it if the Senator will move its acceptance.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on my own behalf, I would say that I think this is going to be very helpful, and I am happy that the Senator from Ohio has introduced it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time on this amendment yielded back?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I must begin by expressing my agreement with those of my distinguished colleagues opposed to the legislation before us, the "Comprehensive Headstart, Child Development and Family Services Act of 1972." I supported the President in his veto, and heartily agree with that portion of his veto message in which he argued that the weight of Federal authority ought not to be lent to communal approaches to child rearing without broad and general acceptance of its principles.

Some of my colleagues who support this legislation have treated the question of possible burgeoning costs, potential damage to the children in these programs, and so forth. Some of my colleagues opposed to this legislation have treated the question of possible burgeoning costs, potential damage to the children in these programs, and so forth. All these are legitimate concerns. At the same time, with the unceasing press of business in the Congress, we are often concern ourselves with very immediate problems and consequences, without pausing to take a longer view of the direction in which we are headed with the Senate's indulgence. I should like to occupy a few minutes in doing just that: considering some general propositions relevant to this legislation.

As a rough generalization it may be said that in modern political life there exists two great competing theories of the state. One of these begins with the individual and views the state as made up of individuals possessing independently sovereign rights and deriving its legitimacy from the consent of the governed. The other begins with the social collective and sees the individual as a component of the mass who derives what rights and privileges he has from the state. The United States of America was founded upon the first of these theories; the second theory leads to the establishment of the social systems now existing in the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

The first theory, that starting from the primacy of the individual and individual sovereignty, views the state as simply one of several social entities. It may be a very important one—in our day it has become increasingly so—but still it is only one. Many other groupings exist independently of the state, since our citizens enjoy freedom of association: such organizations as churches, private schools and universities, fraternal organizations, labor unions, and so forth, have an independent right to existence and, as a matter of principle, the Federal government does not and should not function. It is certainly the better part of wisdom that we should be exceedingly careful about permitting the state to encroach upon and limit the powers, and especially the rights, such as these social organisms as these. When the power of the state becomes all pervasive, a society is no longer free in our sense of the word.

The second theory of political organization, which derives from the principles of the state, holds that there can be no social organizations independent of the state. In countries adhering to this approach many of the same sorts of organizations as those just mentioned do exist, but they have their being in order to advance the political objectives of the state, and to serve it. Such organizations may take no initiatives on their own; all initiative must flow from the state. The sole employer of labor is the state, and that means that all citizens are directed by and dependent upon the government. What right the individual possesses are grants from the state, subject to revocation by the same state. This conception of the state is one which obviously the overwhelming majority of Americans will reject.

It is astonishing, Mr. President, given the relatively simplicity of these two opposing political theories, how few people understand what they lead to in their logical development. Let me cite a recent example from the Soviet Union. Not long ago there was published in the United States a book entitled, "A Question of Madness," by Zhores and Roy Medvedev, two heroic dissenters who have fought against the abuses of the Soviet system, and especially the misuses of psychiatry to repress political disagreement there. Their personal courage is worthy of the greatest admiration. Now Zhores Medvedev is an educated man and a scientist, one who has thought deeply about political matters; he is a man who still considers himself a supporter of the premises upon which the Soviet system is based, and fails to grasp its fundamental essence. When in 1970 three secret police agents and two psychiatrists burst into his apartment to seize evidence against him, the following exchange took place:

"Stop," (Zhoris Medvedev) shouted, "this is a private apartment."

"It belongs to the state," a hulking sergeant said, "and the police have the right to enter any apartment."

"The hulking sergeant" spoken of here was not intended to be a sympathetic figure, but the truth is that in his dull way he knew his political theory much better than Medvedev: in a State based upon the abolition of private property and the consolidation of all components of the state, the individual has no right to privacy. The rights, privileges, and powers of the state are paramount, as are its responsibilities.

Mr. President, I hope you will forgive my digression, but it does have a point. The drafters of the child development bill
now before us were actuated, I am sure, by the best of motives. They were particularly moved by the plight of extremely disadvantaged children. But in seeking to alleviate it they have proceeded to expand the powers and—privileges—of the State into very large areas which have always been rightly closed to Government in this country. If this bill is enacted, the State will take over greater and greater responsibilities for the entire process of the rearing of such children which has always been the family’s private preserve. In doing so, it will drastically reduce the area of activity left to private organizations and institutions—and of all our private institutions the family is certainly one of the most important. The responsibility of the state would be extended not just to the child from 3 to 6, not just to the infant, but even to prenatal care for expectant mothers, and beyond that to the counseling of adolescents before they have thought of marriage and parenthood. The family has not done so well as it might have in some of these areas, this is no excuse for undermining it even more fundamentally. If we look at child development from the perspective which I have tried to outline in this session, the introduction would be equivalent to a drastic circumscription of the areas left in the care of private organizations, and a large step toward a system which can fairly be called “totalitarian,” a system in which every important function within a community is left to the family and controlled by the central authority. We need not argue over whether that control is exercised well or badly: In a fundamental sense that is beside the point. Some child development centers already existing do a good job, others a poor one; some families are excellent at raising children, others are not. On balance, however, it seems to me that the family still does a very creditable job of raising children, at least when its authority is not undermined by the schools. It is in our interest to realize this, and to maintain the role of the family by rejecting this legislation and seeking to deal with the real problem of disadvantaged children in a way which will strengthen our free institutions. And it is in our interest to confirm that there are many areas—and the family is certainly one of them—where the State on principle should not tread. For if we forget this principle, we shall move steadily closer to the structure of the totalitarian state. We shall have done so with the best of motives, undoubtedly, but we shall have done so, nonetheless.

Mr. President, I can only agree with the editorial writer of the Wall Street Journal, who said on March 23 of this year:

All in all, though, the day care proposal strikes us as being flawed from just about every perspective: Financially, philosophically and practically. It is a splendid example of the mentality that whenever a problem arises Washington should act, and if it means taking over responsibilities the bulk of the individuals concerned are already handling pretty well themselves.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in opposing this legislation because it will place the Federal Government in the form of a vast new bureaucracy in another large area where it should not be, to the further detriment of our free institutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, in accordance with my understanding with the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from West Virginia, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be made the pending business, but that we do not go forward with any debate on it until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 16, lines 5 and 6, beginning with the word "sponsor" strike all through the word "sponsor" in line 6.

On page 18, line 6, beginning with the word "except" strike out through line 10.

On page 20, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) In the event that a state has submitted a prime sponsorship plan under subsection (a) of this section to serve a geographical area covered by the plan of an applicant under paragraphs (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a), the Secretary shall designate the appropriate portion of the geographical area covered by the plan of the applicant which he determines has the capability of more effectively carrying out the purposes of this title with respect to such area.

On page 20, line 4, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado request that these amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc. They all relate to the same subject.

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

Who yields time?

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of the day, no time be charged to the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The President pro tempore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be granted an extension of time to complete its work on the bill.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be adopted without any amendment.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.