

U. S. Congress.

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 118—PART 22

AUGUST 15, 1972 TO SEPTEMBER 6, 1972

(PAGES 28161 TO 29650)

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3925

A bill to be entitled "An act to regulate the testimony of newsmen in Federal criminal cases"

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. As used in this statute, the term "Newsmen" means any person who gathers information for dissemination to the public as news or pictures through the instrumentality of the press, a radio station, a television station, or any other medium of communications; and the pronouns he and him refer to any such person of either sex.

SEC. 2. A newsmen shall be competent and compellable to testify as a witness in a criminal proceeding before a federal grand jury or a criminal action in a federal court in respect to information gathered by him for the purpose stated if these conditions concur in respect to such information: First, the information is based on the personal knowledge of the newsmen rather than on hearsay communications received by him from others; second, the information tends to prove or disprove the commission of a crime allegedly committed by a third person which is being investigated by the grand jury or made the subject of prosecution in the court; and third, testimony similar to the information is not readily obtainable from another source.

SEC. 3. When a newsmen is subpoenaed to testify in a criminal proceeding before a federal grand jury or in a criminal action in a federal court, the newsmen may move before the judge of the court in which the grand jury is sitting or in which the criminal action is pending to quash the subpoena on the ground that the testimony sought to be elicited from him under it does not satisfy the three conditions enumerated in the preceding section. After notice to attorneys for the prosecution and defense, the judge shall hear and determine the motion of the newsmen in camera and enter such order as may be necessary to protect the newsmen against disclosing any information gathered by him for the purpose aforesaid which does not satisfy the conditions enumerated.

CHILDREN'S LOBBY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently the first annual meeting of the Children's Lobby was held in Washington, D.C. Representative ORVAL HANSEN and I had the privilege of meeting with the delegates on the final day of their conference.

During the conference, the Children's Lobby elected as its first president, Mr. Jule Sugarman, the former Director of Headstart, who currently serves as administrator of Human Resources in the city of New York. As one of its vice presidents, the Children's Lobby chose Gregory Coler, executive director of the Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association. It has been my pleasure to work closely with both of these men in recent years, and I think the lobby is very fortunate to have such gifted and energetic individuals in leadership positions.

In my judgment, the creation of this organization is an extremely encouraging initiative for those of us interested in justice for children. In conjunction with the work of a number of existing agencies and organizations concerned with children and their families, the Children's Lobby can help inform Con-

gress and the public about the impact of various legislative proposals and administrative actions on children.

In addition, the children's lobby can take stands on the major legislative issues before the Congress. It can give those of us in public life its judgment of the merits of proposals affecting children.

As part of this first annual meeting, the children's lobby held a series of workshops on a wide range of issues concerning children and adopted a series of resolutions. I ask unanimous consent that the text of these resolutions appear at the end of my remarks. I do not necessarily agree with all these recommendations. But whether or not I, or any other elected official, agree with every one of the positions this lobby takes is unimportant. What is important is that the children's lobby is helping all of us to focus on how Government actions affect children, and is helping assure that decisions affecting children will no longer be made without adequate information about and attention to their potential impact on our Nation's most precious resource.

Mr. President, permit me to close with my expression of appreciation to all of those who had a hand in creating this new lobby, and of those who will join with it in its fight on behalf of justice for children.

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

RESOLUTIONS—"AREAS OF CONCERN"

GROUP I: CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND DAY CARE

An overview of the pending status of Child Development and Day Care issues in Congress was presented and discussed.

Recommendations and/or resolutions:

1. Children's Lobby utilize every means to defeat H.R. 1.
2. Audience be sought with President Nixon tomorrow (April 10) to set forth our position regarding our stand on comprehensive child development in our Nation.
3. Children's Lobby should focus on comprehensive child care and/or development services as an entity thus avoiding being side tracked or shuttled.

The following basic principles were set forth as guidelines for considering any proposition, issues or legislative matters dealing with children:

1. That programs must be of high quality, comprehensive, and developmental oriented to needs of children and their families and available to all children.
2. That parents must be directly involved in policy decisions affecting their children.
3. That programs be flexible enough to meet individual and community needs and locally controlled by a body whose majority are parents.
4. That programs must be designed to include children with a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds.
5. That adequate protections must be provided to assure that the needs of minority group and economically disadvantaged children are met.
6. That this nation must not only continue existing funding of children's programs but also must make a substantial commitment of new public funds to begin to meet the compelling and immediate need for these services.
7. That the Children's Lobby work out a mechanism to monitor the implementation of all federally funded children's programs.

Leaders: Elinor Guggenheimer of New York—Funding Director, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.; Evelyn K. Moore, Executive Director, Black Child Development Institute, Washington, D.C.

Recorder: Mrs. Allie Mitchell, Project Manager for Head Start; Leadership Development, Southwest Region, Houston, Texas.

GROUPS 2 AND 5: CHILD WELFARE AND FAMILY LIFE

Before getting into specific recommendations, group members agreed that the Children's Lobby would need to differentiate between short-time and long-time goals.

Recommendations*

1. The Children's Lobby should insist that the Federal Government, both Legislative and Executive, place top priority on, and appropriate adequate funds for, human services that will enhance individual and family growth and development.

2. Services should be universally available for children who need them. Eligibility should be determined by the need for service and not by economic status. The quality of child welfare services should be the same for all children without the requirement of a means test. There should be a freedom of choice for the client to obtain services from either public or voluntary agencies.

3. It is essential that federal matching funds for child welfare services in the states be available. These funds should be opened and the federal matching should be 90%, covering a comprehensive variety of family and children social services.

4. Federal funds must be made available to the states and localities for the construction of all necessary facilities—such as shelter care, day care and others—to provide the above family and children services for all who need them.

5. Within the total funding, there shall be provision for training for all categories of personnel working with children; for comprehensive planning for all services; and for demonstration programs for the development of new models of service delivery.

6. The Children's Lobby needs to continue to support the present trend of a combined delivery of Family and Children's Services, not to separate them.

7. In order to develop a base for "adequate" funding for programs for families and children, it is necessary to:

A. To have an analysis of all budgets of present federal family and children programs in order to determine what is presently being accomplished in relationship to where the money is currently being spent.

B. Create a National Advisory Council on Family and Children to advise the President, similar in nature to the National Economic Council or the Council on National Defense.

C. Have conducted a review of the present organizations of Family and Children programs at the federal level so that a more appropriate organization might be developed. Present organization has created so much fragmentation of programs and monies that service efforts are inhibited and frequently duplicated. (This might be repaired, e.g., by a federal Department of Family and Children Services.)

Leader: Dr. Frederick Delliquadri, dean, School of Social Work, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Recorder: Maurice A. Harmon, director, Baltimore City, Department of Social Services, and first vice president, American Public Welfare Association.

*All the recommendations relative to funding were made in spite of funding arrangements spelled out in H.R. 1, in that the group was against the passing of H.R. 1 in its present form.

GROUP III: EDUCATION

Integration

We reaffirm the control importance of a racially and socially integrated society to the realization of the American dream. We vigorously oppose any type of governmental action—whether by Constitutional amendment or by legislative riders—which would have the effect of impeding local options to create conditions for effective integration. The role of the Federal government should be to encourage genuine integration and to give more leadership to the end of building a unified and nondiscriminatory society.

At the same time, we stress that integration must be much more than a mere mechanized mixing of bodies of various colors. What we seek is a true integration of varied ideas, values, and thought—a rich and pluralistic recognition of America's diverse heritage and not simply a merger of all groups into one dominant white culture. Integration, ultimately, means an honest and eager recognition of our country's multi-racial, multi-cultural history and character.

While we cannot presume to instruct the Federal judiciary, we do urge, in the spirit of the foregoing statement, that each court look beyond mere mechanistic and arithmetic racial formulas to the possibility of genuine educational integration.

Finally, we stress that the real issue is neither bussing nor anti-bussing, but rather the climate of fear and division which is being fostered by politicians—in both political parties—who purport to be our leaders. What is needed now is an end to such dangerous demagoguery and an immediate and vigorous effort at national conciliation—the creation of a climate of national unity based on a frank acceptance of America's social and cultural diversity.

Funding of existing Federal programs

The broad array of present Federal education and child care programs must be funded more nearly in accordance with the promise this society has made to the disadvantaged, the poor, the sick and young. We reject all counsel which says "money doesn't make a difference." Rather, we want to try delivering on the promises of yesterday.

This does not mean that we are uncritically accepting of every program now on the statute books. On the contrary, we know of few unblemished success stories in Federal aid programs. All too often, the intended beneficiaries of Federal aid are not the ones who actually receive the Federal aid; all too often, programs are poorly administered by state and local authorities without adequate reference to legislative intent; all too often, Federal aid is spent in a "business as usual" fashion. Thus, at the same time as Federal funds are expanded the conscience of the nation must be refocused on making truly effective use of every tax dollar.

New programs and new funding

The percentage of our government devoted to children and their needs is totally unacceptable. At the same time that more money is needed, we must guard against the tendency to play off one public sector against another, e.g., education vs. child care, health vs. nutrition, etc. We believe that the only chance we have to build a truly great nation is by attacking all of our social problems in a coherent and concentrated manner. Thus, we favor greatly expanded prenatal care, nutrition, comprehensive child health, day care, etc., as well as an expansion of our national spending in education.

We must also guard against the tendency of many who want tax cuts and personal gains as we shift away from military spending. America must spend more in the public sector than ever before—and not merely at the Federal level. Taxes are woefully inadequate for a nation as collectively wealthy as this; we must finally recognize that true

prosperity can only be purchased by being willing to tax ourselves for the neglect of the past and for the sake of our children's future.

Specifically in education, we insist that Federal funding, several times greater than current levels, must always have a reformist character. It would be self-defeating and useless for the Federal government to enact legislation with no indication of national priorities and concerns. While some of us favor general aid for education and others of us support only broad categorized programs aimed at educational revival and specific unmet needs (e.g., handicapped children, compensatory education, career education). We all agree that, at the minimum, Federal funds shall be accompanied by measures to:

1. Prevent reduction of State and local tax effort;
2. Encourage the enactment of progressive State tax measures;
3. Ensure that Federal funds are distributed with special attention to children with special needs (e.g., disadvantaged, non-English speaking, handicapped, etc.);
4. Encourage States and localities to distribute their own resources more equally than is now the case;
5. Ensure that programs are preventive in character and not merely remedial, an early identification of child health and other handicaps is especially needed;
6. Guarantee that educational research and development to review the system will be a high and constant priority;
7. Ensure effective parent education and community involvement in order to overcome the traditional isolation of the schools from the adult world. Schools henceforth must be more accountable to adults for the measurable learning of our children;
8. Give high priority to teacher training and retraining (recognizing that teacher education is a vital community concern and not merely a select professional province).

Disparities in educational spending within (and among) states must be rapidly eliminated. However in the light of the recent Serrano decision, we caution against simplistic notions that equality of educational spending will give us the kind of educational success we seek. The special needs of urban areas and depressed rural areas must be recognized financially in any aid formulas if true equality of opportunity is to be achieved.

Finally, in line with an earlier statement concerning integration, we believe that society must devote substantially more resources to the development of multi-cultural and bilingual educational materials. Our curriculum must be totally reshaped to reflect the true pluralism and diversity of our nation. Ultimately, in fact, we would hope that every child would be proficient in at least two languages as well as knowledgeable about the cultures of all the peoples who have contributed to the building of our nation.

Leader: Donald Morrison, President, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

Recorder: Dr. Samuel Halperin, Director, Educational Staff Seminar, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

GROUP IV: EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

Exceptional children include those who are handicapped and those who are gifted. In defining the criteria for handicap, it was agreed that a child who persistently, extensively, significantly and intensively reveals deficits or deviations in several vital areas of functioning, including physical, intellectual, emotional, perceptual and developmental capacities, is a handicapped child.

It was further agreed and emphasized that children who are not intrinsically handicapped, but whose environment tends to damage them, should not be classified as handicapped when it is their economic, social

and educational deprivation that requires correction. The discussion group took strong exception to the tendency to mislabel low-income minority groups by referring to their children as handicapped. We urge that adequate resources be made available to prevent or correct these economic, social and educational deprivations and their effects. These resources and services are intended to prevent or correct environmental deprivation and its effects on those children subjected to it as compared to resources that are necessary for handicapped children. We propose that resources and services for deprived children be organized in collaboration with special services needed by handicapped children without confusing the differing problems of these two groups of children.

The discussion group then accepted the formulation of three dimensions of the needs of the exceptional child that would provide our Children's Lobby with a helping perspective:

(1) We should plan to overcome discrimination against the handicapped and gifted child in that we as a nation assign the priorities to their needs that would assure them and their families of the opportunities, expectations and resources that would enable each exceptional child to be able to maximize his potential in terms of fulfilling himself. Conversely, each exceptional child should find his self-esteem reflected by the way he is valued and respected in his community and society.

(2) We should plan and provide special services for the handicapped that are coordinated, sustained and integrated in the most desirable settings for the child and his family. This clearly implies that the family is the bedrock out of which normal and handicapped children grow. Each family should be supported and enabled to help their deviant or handicapped child. Our perspective requires a dynamic balance of normative and special settings in which to nurture, guide, educate, teach and provide all services for the handicapped child. This perspective assumes that the strong family, and the nursery school, day care center, public elementary and secondary schools, church, and community center for healthy children can welcome and benefit from the acceptance of the handicapped child as a part of their microcosm. This conviction is based on the assumption that these institutions have sufficient services and resources to enable them to provide adequate learning and socializing experiences for all concerned. Specifically, the classroom teacher cannot be expected to do well by a heterogeneous classroom of non-handicapped, handicapped and gifted children unless she or he have the preparation and backup that is necessary for the exuberant development and expression of the learning and socializing interests of all these children.

Conversely there will always be the need for special facilities where certain handicapped children can receive the intense concentration of special assistance, education and treatment that will enable them to return to or re-enter the family and school at home when they are able to take advantage of the more usual and normative environment.

(3) The perspective of full rehabilitation refers to the ongoing, life-long opportunities, expectations and supports for the handicapped child that will enable him to develop skills, find work and select an appropriate social setting that provide him with satisfaction and opportunities to shape his world. This perspective assumes that there can be synchronized expressions of realistic, humanitarian and productive expectations by the individual and his society. This synchronization of the individual's capacities and society's expectations should enable the handicapped individual to earn his livelihood, to be active in forming and par-

ticipating in a family group and to be an encouraging example to a handicapped child of the next generation.

We recommend that the translation and transformation of these three future perspectives into viable and sustained realities, the rights of these children, become the long-term goals of The Children's Lobby in regard to exceptional children.

It follows logically and as a crucial first step toward these long-term goals that The Children's Lobby should work toward achieving major financial support from Federal sources for a wide array of services for handicapped children at the local and regional levels. In order to assume the effectiveness of such funding we recommend the following guidelines and criteria:

(1) All Federal bills that provide for the healthy development and sound education of children should have sufficient funds allocated to provide early identification, treatment and services for handicapped children who will live and grow up side-by-side with non-handicapped children.

(2) Systematic coordinated services for handicapped children require categorical funding from Federal sources in order to prevent the fragmenting of services and in order to achieve a level of funding adequate to assure * * *.

(3) The Children's Lobby should provide a structure that enables those with special interests to work in alliances with those who have other interests in the services of children. We deplore the tendency toward rivalry when our children, handicapped and non-handicapped, are in urgent need of our concerted interests and energies. When the adults compete or are in conflict because of special interests, the alliances necessary to avoid fragmentation of services will be weakened. This recommendation holds for the various professions as well as for the various professional organizations.

(4) Our efforts are unlikely to succeed if there are not appropriate advocacy energies and influences at the national, regional and local level that will safeguard children's priorities and the implementation of children's programs.

(5) Parents, as in The Children's Lobby, should be accorded a major role and responsibility in establishing priorities, in mobilizing and sustaining resources, in supporting and guiding legislative remedies and in creating influential expectations for judicial mandates to require that "mandatory" legislation become implemented.

(6) Our universal public institutions, especially the public schools, should be enabled to provide integrated and coordinated services for handicapped children by additional educational and clinical services and with proportionate back-up support by specialized facilities.

(7) The most important universal "institution" is the family unit. The early identification, prevention, treatment and rehabilitation of the handicapped child should take place through strengthening the family's ability to be crucially involved in services provided for handicapped children of these services and collaboration with families should respect and take advantage of the family's social, emotional, ethnic and cultural characteristics and resources.

(8) We must overcome deficits in services caused by a failure to coordinate existing services as well as newly created services for handicapped, non-handicapped and talented children.

Leader: William Geer, Executive Director, Council on Exceptional Children, Arlington, Virginia.

Recorder: Dr. Albert J. Solnit, President, Academy of Child Psychiatry and Professor of Pediatrics and Child Psychiatry, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

GROUP VI: HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION WORKSHOP

Hunger threatens the lives and minds of millions of Americans.

In 1969 the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health declared hunger a "national emergency." In 1971 the White House Follow-Up Conference repeated the cry. Yet, the crisis continues. Infants and young children are in the greatest danger.

All this is true under the existing programs and the current levels of income support. Conditions would be worsened under H.R. 1 and similar proposals. Therefore, we vigorously oppose H.R. 1. H.R. 1 in its entirety must be defeated!

Furthermore, any measures like H.R. 1 or the patchwork amendments which diminish already inadequate incomes must be defeated. Our primary recommendation is:

A guaranteed adequate income for all American families (at least at a level comparable to the BLS standard) so that families can feed their own children adequately. We urge immediate implementation of legislation ensuring every family an adequate income with fully humane and constitutional practices.

Secondly, we urge an immediate increase in the appropriations for all child nutrition programs, supplemental maternal and infants food programs and family food programs.

Americans remain hungry today, and malnutrition makes them vulnerable to disease and injury. Some groups, such as pregnant women, mothers and pre-school children, are at great risk because of inadequate diets. Children, depending on where they were born and where they live, may face greater nutritional risks than children who live in countries where food distribution and health care facilities are primitive. In census tracks of many inner cities of this country, over 100 children will die out of every 1,000 children before they reach age one.

The task force on hunger and malnutrition recognizes that the only solution to hunger in America is the provision of an adequate income, with all constitutional and humane safeguards for all families, to assure that families with children will be able to obtain an adequate diet to sustain the health of the child.

We believe that H.R. 1, the Family Assistance Plan, does not meet this basic standard, and we recommend that the Conference oppose H.R. 1 or any similar legislative proposals.

For the immediate nutritional needs of children in the 1973 fiscal year, we propose that action be taken through legislation and appropriations. We find the budget proposal of the Administration for fiscal year 1973 will bring all growth in nutrition programs to a halt, and we recommend that the Conference support higher appropriation levels for these programs, in these amounts:

[In millions]		
Program	Administration requests	Programs need
Families:		
Food stamp.....	\$2,266.0	\$2,500
Commodities.....	270.0	305
Supplemental foods.....	14.7	40
Children:		
School lunch: Needy (sec. 11); general (sec. 4).....	861.5	1,200
School breakfast.....	33.0	100
Equipment.....	16.1	80
Nonschool food service: summer; year-round.....	49.0	92

We believe that every child should have access to a nutritious and acceptable breakfast and lunch; and further, that family income should not be a barrier to participa-

tion. We recommend, and, the budget proposal provides, sufficient funds to enable a reimbursement of 25 cents for every breakfast served to needy children, with a 5c reimbursement for each breakfast served; and 50c for every lunch served to needy children, with a 10c reimbursement for each lunch served.

These reimbursement levels should prevail in all child nutrition programs, in school and out of school; further, the use of reduced price lunches should be restricted to a charge of no more than 10c, with a reimbursement level of 40c per lunch.

Eligibility for free or reduced price breakfast and lunch should be determined by a single national eligibility standard based on the poverty level income set by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, with local school districts free to set eligibility standards which are broader if local conditions warrant.

Finally, under no circumstances should the recommended levels become a ceiling on reimbursement for a child's meals. In those instances where the cost of preparing and serving the meal is higher, the school should be reimbursed at the higher level.

Food Service programs for summer and the year-round day care projects should be greatly expanded, inasmuch as children are in school for about 9 months; and the percentage of pre-school age children in educational or supervisory facilities has increased from about 25 per cent to nearly 50 percent in the past decade.

We recommend that all declared non-profit groups be encouraged to join these programs and to operate food service projects. In order to achieve the expansion that is needed, the cost of equipping these facilities should be paid fully from Federal funds.

Until an adequate family income program can be implemented, we recommend that the food stamp allotment be raised from the present inadequate level of \$108 a month for a four person family to \$146.00 a month. Since over half the people who need the benefits of the program do not get food stamps, the Federal government should reach out to find hungry and malnourished families and persons and assist them to participate in the food stamp program.

We also recommend that regulations be dropped which now force mothers to work, and which force scholarship funds of children to be included in calculating family resources; and we recommend to the Federal government the ruling of the Federal court which overturned the legislative prohibition that children who live with a family but are not related are ineligible for food stamps. We recommend that the Department of Justice accept the wisdom of the Court which enjoins this despicable practice.

We recommend that the Inspector General of the U.S. Department of Agriculture investigate and report on the ineffective and incompetent operation of the food and nutrition programs in the USDA, with particular attention to the inadequacies of the commodity distribution program.

We recommend that all families below the poverty level have access to a supplemental food program which provides additional nutrition for pregnant women to insure better pre-natal nutrition for the child, and to insure adequate nutrition for the child in the formative years before entering pre-school programs. The budget proposal will support a large scale expansion of the present program, which the Administration is presently attempting to kill.

We recommend the supplemental program be carried out in either a voucher form or through the provision of commodities in a clinical setting, and that all declared non-profit groups be assisted in establishing such programs on request.

Leader: Rodney E. Leonard, Community Nutrition Institute, Washington, D.C.

Recorder: Barbara Bode, Executive Vice-President, Children's Foundation, Washington, D.C.

GROUP VII: JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

In our group, after sharing our individual experiences and making our individual points we crystallized our report into three main areas. I have asked the participants to add, correct or completely refute what I present, for I experienced great difficulty in keeping my own special bias out of what we discussed. You see I am thoroughly against the fragmentation of the approaches to meeting human service needs and the labelling which is unavoidably associated with this. I am even more frustrated that we are not as aware as we should about the irrelevant handicaps of these fragmentations and that those of us who are aware do not see dealing with the disadvantages of labelling and fragmentations, as desiring our sustained and unequivocal first priority. I am hopeful that now we have moved from the various forms of mental illness, alcoholism, crime, drugs and violence to children, we could come to grips that it is futile to escape dealing with people as people. The three areas into which our discussion divided itself are:

A. Objectives of the Children's Lobby are:

1. Keep focus on the child's welfare and needs. There is a difference between funding for political expediency and funding to meet children's welfare and needs.

2. Developing and maintaining the thrust in community education and consumer participation.

a. The Children's Lobby should take on the responsibility for educating the public about the difference between legislation which meets their needs and those that do not. The existence of apathy and indifference as a national human characteristic that should be a continuous concern. For example, the Children's Lobby should begin now to look for ways to deal with the apathy which will threaten its existence—one month, one year or even five years from now.

b. In addition to developing the Children's Lobby at the National, State and local levels, the by-laws should articulate the tendency to loose enthusiasm and include the special steps to be taken to prevent or correct this.

3. Develop legislative proposals and push for legislation to realize our stated objectives.

4. Take active steps to have in depth representation by recipients of services who are generally restricted or unable because of Socio-economic restraints.

5. Maintaining sustained surveillance of needs for services and the effectiveness with which these needs are met. Here the effectiveness should be determined mainly by the consumer, the recipient of services.

In terms of surveillance, not only should we work for development and passage of appropriate legislation, but the Children's Lobby should see that there is appropriate funding to support the legislation, that the legislative goals are realized and that legislation is kept in line with changing demands.

It was felt that the Children's Lobby should be fully committed to doing away with the institution to meeting the problem of juvenile delinquency. In this regard, the State of Kentucky is taking an approach that is exemplary. The State of Massachusetts is also moving very decisively away from institutional management.

B. Legislation

There were two specific and one non-specific recommendation in this area.

(1) The Children's Lobby should take immediate steps to do away with H.R. 1. Specific reasons: It does not address itself to the needs of children. It perpetuates problems of juvenile delinquency. Mothers do not have a choice to care for their children if they wanted to, both the children and the parents

are denied of a basic constitutional rights. A legislative structure which allows options with choice for providing child care services and meeting child care needs should be formulated and fought for.

(2) The Children's Lobby should actively push to establish an office for children at the executive level, nationally and each state. This office will be responsible for bringing together all the various fragments of services to children including those involving families and in time including mental health and public education. It was recognized that placing education and mental health for children under this umbrella would be cumbersome, difficult and impossible at this time. We felt, however, that The Children's Lobby should maintain a sustained thrust to include mental health and education under this umbrella. This may start with a coordination of effects at the local level.

(3) In addition, it was felt that the Children's Lobby should seek to enhance the abolition of institutional care systems by lobbying for and implementing appropriate supportive legislation at the federal and state levels.

It was the consensus that the concept of Juvenile Delinquency should be abolished or merged with and become a component of a major program for all youths including youths in distress.

Leader: John Martin, Ph. D., Institute for Social Research, Fordham University, New York, New York.

Recorder: Dr. George Phillips, Superintendent, Crownsville State Hospital, Crownsville, Maryland.

GROUP VIII: MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

The discussion group evolved two short term or immediate recommendations to the Board of Directors, and two long range charges.

The immediate recommendations were:

1. Lobby now for continuation and extension of such existing maternal and child health projects (Title V) as (C. & Y. and M. & I.) these projects due to expire June 30, 1972.

2. Lobby now for the full implementation of child health legislation already enacted at the Federal and State level. (E. G. The EPSDT—Early and Periodic Screening and Diagnosis Program.)

The long term charges were:

1. It is recommended that the Board establish an effective mechanism to develop positions on all proposed National Health legislation to ensure that the specific needs of children are adequately recognized in such proposals and that such programs include adequate arrangements for accountabilities including accountability to the consumer.

2. It is recommended that the Board also attempt to influence the legislative process so that ultimately child health services are appropriately integrated with comprehensive child development services, education—especially meaningful health education and other human services.

Leader: Robert Clayton, M.D., Chief, Department of Pediatrics, Georgetown University Hospital, Washington, D.C.

Recorder: Dr. Morris Green, Professor and Chairman, Department of Pediatrics, University of Indiana, Indianapolis, Indiana.

GROUP IX: THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN

The participants at this section discussed the following major principles:

1. Concern for the rights of children must permeate all of the systems discussed at this conference: health, education, mental health, corrections and the courts, the public welfare field, and the economy itself. In all these fields it is necessary to examine the status of the rights of children as they were enumerated, for example, in the White House Conference on Children and Youth.

2. The Bill of Rights should be examined so

that the rights of children which are implicit can be made explicit.

3. There needs to be clarification of "what is a child"; when it is that a child is an accountable person. In some jurisdictions a seven year old child is adjudicated a delinquent.

4. We are concerned about the rights of all children, and issues of rights transcend differences of economic status, etc. Yet, certain groups of children are particularly vulnerable: mentally ill children, children before the courts, mentally retarded children, etc. We were led, accordingly, to a discussion of advocacy. While a wide variety of meanings have been assigned to that term and studies are now in progress about the shapes and goals of different kinds of advocacy programs, we wanted to stress that programs be child-focused and their emphasis be on the rights of children to the kinds of services and help they need in every societal system. There should also be provision for bringing children and young people into participation in the definition of their needs and rights.

5. The Children's Lobby should bring to attention the usefulness of litigation where rights of children have to be tested. The Lobby should have as part of its task the dissemination of information about test cases and technical assistance.

6. We recommend thorough reviews of child-abuse laws, concerned as we are about the non-effectiveness of many such laws and the limitations of punishing parents without solving the fundamental problems involved in such situations. Penalties of criminality are not sufficient as a legislative program even in regard to the reporting of cases; rather, problem-solving goals must be embodied in an adequate legislative program.

7. The laws of the Family Court and other juvenile courts throughout the country need thorough re-examination with regard to the protection of rights of children, and perhaps especially those children who are not delinquent but who are "ungovernable" or rejected by their parents. It was also recommended that the Gault decision be wisely and sensitively implemented.

8. Assumptions in the provision of services to children and their families should be re-examined, particularly with regard to the biases of professionalism. Certainly children and families should be able to exercise choice in the selection of services which they seek as help. Children and families should not be simply "allocated" to existing programs without their participation and choice.

9. Public and private agencies which serve children and their families must re-examine their respective roles as "protectors" of children, as there is the all too frequent occurrence of the abuse of rights by agencies which purport to be protectors. Particularly we must distinguish carefully between protection and control, and there must not be abuse of rights in the name of protection.

10. The Children's Lobby should support funding patterns which make possible the maintenance of children with their own families, and programs which are open and responsive to today's children and families. There is a need to break through the tyranny of rigid forms of service which are supported by public funding and professional prerogatives.

11. The participants of this discussion group looked forward to the following functions of the Children's Lobby in the future: (a) promotion of legislation which ensures the rights of children to those fundamental opportunities and securities which have been identified nation-wide and particularly at the White House Conference on Children and Youth; (b) the monitoring of litigation which pushes forward the cause of children in test cases of their rights; (c) the creation of public opinion and development of consensus regarding enlightened and effective

ways of caring for children and families, with such public opinion exerted to inform and influence administrative leaders and legislators; (d) stimulation of similarly functioning lobbying groups on state and local levels; and (e) dissemination of information on legislation, policy determinations, and funding patterns relating to the needs and rights of children.

GROUP X: YOUTH

The Committee decided to redefine Youth as the 12-21 age group rather than the age group from 14-24.

Recommendations of the Youth Committee:

1. A minimum of at least four (4) youth, with an equal number of high school and college age youth, on the Board of Directors of the Children's Lobby, with geographical, ethnic, and economic diversification, with a suggestion that the Board facilitate active participation of youth board members.

2. Youth representation of two (2) or more youth on the future Nominating Committees of the Children's Lobby with flexibility and equal consideration of nominations by youth groups as well as those nominations which are given by adult groups.

3. We suggest that all states ratify the vote at 18 to encourage full legal rights and responsibilities of majority at age 18.

4. That all states mandate a comprehensive health education program by qualified personnel as part of the overall school curriculum—kindergarten through college—which would include education on health, including the biological aspects of development and reproduction of the human body, prevention of disease and drug abuse.

5. We recommend that students have a birth right as citizens of the United States to implement in their school systems the freedoms listed in the Bill of Rights.

6. We ask a recognition by the school system that the student is a thinking individual who should have democratic participation in decisions within the school system which affect them such as curriculum organization, teacher selection and boards of education.

7. We ask the Board to recognize that a balanced emphasis should be given the youth needs to rural areas as well as those of urban and suburban areas.

8. We recommend that the National Children's Lobby ask the state groups to investigate current statutes in regard to self-consent for minors.

9. We urge youth representation in the decision making process throughout the entire youth service delivery system.

10. We urge investigation of the current legal status and various efforts on the subject of *runaways* and investigation of the proposed legislation by Senators Fred Harris and Mark Hatfield as stated on page 2 of today's position paper.

11. Finally, we recommend defeat of H.R. 1. Discussion leader (absent due to family illness); Warren Gilmore, President, Youth Organizations United, Washington, D.C.

Recorder: Mary M. Kearey.

GROUP XI. H.R. 1

1. This work group recommends to the Children's Lobby its opposition to H.R. 1 and the Children's Lobby should work actively for its defeat.

(By unanimous vote.)

2. It is recommended that the Children's Lobby adjourn tomorrow to visit the White House as a body to express its opposition to H.R. 1 and urge the President to exert his leadership to defeat it.

(Voted in the majority.)

Leader: Norman V. Lourie, Deputy Secretary for Public Welfare, State of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Recorder: Naomi Hiatt, Illinois Committee on Children and Youth, Springfield, Illinois.

OPEN-ENDED SOCIAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, by now, I am sure all Senators are aware of my deep concern over the massive Federal spending which is resulting from the open-ended social services program.

Although the nature and extent of the program were relatively unknown until only a few weeks ago, more and more citizens are being made aware of the threat which the spending under this "back door revenue sharing plan" constitutes to not only the Federal budget, but the national economy. I personally hope that as the days and weeks pass, our citizens become even more aware of the program.

To help achieve that end, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this time yet another two articles on the program. As you know, the Washington Post has already commented editorially on the social services program and both the New York Times and the U.S. News & World Report, as well as the Post, have featured articles on social services. This week, the Wall Street Journal and the National Observer joined the ranks of newspapers which have opposed the program, and I would like to bring these articles to the attention of the Senate as well as to others who daily read the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the two articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATES DISCOVER AN UNLOCKED DOOR AT U.S. TREASURY

(By Michael T. Malloy)

Imagine looking over the fine print on that contract you signed a couple of years ago and discovering that you unwittingly promised to give blank checks every year to more than 50 people; you sign them and they write in the amount. Bankruptcy lies just around the corner.

The U.S. Government has done something very much like that, and now those checks are flooding in for payment. The fine print in a five-year-old piece of welfare legislation has suddenly turned into a multibillion-dollar drain on a Federal budget already deep in deficit. Secretary Elliot Richardson of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare described the situation last week with such phrases as "raiders on the Federal treasury . . . horrendous . . . hemorrhage of funds."

BILLING DOUBLES

Richardson was complaining about a passage in the Social Security Act that requires his department to reimburse the states for three-fourths of the funds they spend on vaguely defined "social services" to rehabilitate past, present, and potential welfare clients. This used to be a modest program, by Federal standards, with an annual cost of \$230,000,000 five years ago. But now it has exploded out of control.

The states presented the Federal government with bills for \$746,000,000 under this program two years ago, and the billing doubled to \$1.5 billion last year. Last May the states estimated this fiscal year's Federal payments at \$2.2 billion, and by July they had doubled the estimate to \$4.7 billion. "I've heard figures as high as \$6 billion," says Richardson, trying to calculate the final blow to this year's budget.

Mississippi has boosted its demands for Federal reimbursement to \$464,000,000 from \$1,000,000 two years ago. Maryland has gone

to \$418,000,000 from \$15,000,000 in the same period. Many states have only just discovered the bonanza. The accompanying chart shows how the states increased their expected demands on the program from May to June as word got around this spring about the HEW pot of gold.

BLAME FOR GOOSE KILLING

Richardson wants Congress to slap a ceiling on the amount of money his department has to pay out yearly under this program. But he has been unwilling to throw up all the bureaucratic hurdles that his own department could put in the way of many social-services payments. The problem, he conceded at a press conference last week, is that neither the Administration nor the Congress wants election-year blame for "killing the goose that lays the golden eggs."

Mayors and governors around the nation will certainly fight any drastic cut in the social services bonanza because they have learned how to use it as a substitute for the revenue sharing measures that became bogged down in congressional debate. By defining a lot of old programs as "social services," the states find they can get hundreds of millions of Federal dollars without raising an extra penny of their own.

Illinois was one of the first states to discover the gold buried in the Social Security Act. Thomas Corcoran, who directs the state's Washington, D.C., office, explains one way Illinois took advantage of the act:

The agency that runs Illinois' prisons also runs a forestry camp to rehabilitate teen-age offenders. The camp and many other projects were threatened in 1970 by a \$300,000,000 upsurge in state welfare payments. The state didn't dare raise taxes by that much, so the projects seemed doomed.

But the troubled slum backgrounds of the boys in the camp certainly made them potential welfare clients, Illinois officials decided. And the camp's rehabilitation program was a "social service" like that mentioned in the Federal law. But the camp was ineligible under the law because it was run by the state's corrections system, while the Federal money was supposed to go only to the state welfare agency.

Illinois resolved this by having the state welfare agency "purchase" the camp's social service from the corrections system. The welfare agency paid the camp's operating costs and got three-fourths of its money back from the Federal Government. Illinois thus kept the camp going and had a pile of money left over to help relieve its financial troubles. Similar maneuvers made so many other state programs eligible for Federal funds that Illinois' social-service claims on HEW rose to \$173,000,000 in fiscal 1973 from \$28,000,000 two years earlier.

Other states are rushing to hop on the band wagon. Shelby Jean Roten, program co-ordinator of Mississippi's Department of Public Welfare, says she assisted in a "big push" earlier this year to get every local organization that provides social services to sign "purchase-of-service" agreements with her department before July 1.

The campaign identified almost \$160,000,000 worth of eligible projects for which school districts, state health agencies, and similar organizations had already appropriated money. By technically shifting those projects to the Department of Public Welfare's budget for the year that started July 1, Mississippi could inform HEW that it had embarked on a \$620,000,000 social-services program with HEW scheduled to pick up the required three-fourths of the cost. The Federal contribution would be larger than the entire state budget.

EXPANDING THE DOLLARS

"We're not actually spending any more state money," says James Womack, programs