

U.S. Congress
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 118—PART 7

MARCH 13, 1972 TO MARCH 21, 1972

(PAGES 7961 TO 9418)

only can save millions of dollars in Government operations but also improve the health and safety of people. She has received numerous national commendations and citations; among many other honors are medals for accomplishments in information sciences from universities in Finland and Sweden, both awarded in 1969.

Dr. Davis was born in Sharpsville, Pa., and graduated from American University in 1950. She earned her MA in 1952 and her PhD in 1955, both from the University of Maryland. She is married to Benjamin F. Lohr, Comdr. USN(Ret.), who is Vice President, Kelly Scientific Corporation, and they live in Silver Spring, Md.

MRS. MARY HARROVER FERGUSON, COMPTROLLER, OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH, AND SPECIAL ASSISTANT (FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT) TO THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Mary Harrover Ferguson is a financial management expert who during the past 18 years has developed and administered a financial system which has provided resources vital to the Navy's research and development program. With a dual responsibility as Comptroller, Office of Naval Research, and Special Assistant (Financial Management) to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, she deals not only with complex financial issues but also with high-level scientific, military, and political personnel who regularly ask for her counsel on those issues.

Mrs. Ferguson provides the perfect—and rare—example of a complete career in the Federal civil service, having started at grade 1 in 1933 with the Depression-born Farm Credit Administration and progressed steadily upward, through several different agencies, to her present grade 17. In 1947 she came to the newly created Office of Naval Research as a budget analyst, advanced to Budget Officer and then to Assistant Comptroller for Budget and Reports, was appointed Deputy ONR Comptroller in 1968, and Comptroller in May 1971. She is involved in all aspects of financial management of the Navy-wide Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Program, with authority for commitment in the decision-making process at all levels. Under her direction a staff of 67 analysts, accountants, ADP systems analysts and programmers, and support personnel, administer an appropriation of well over \$2 billion annually, distributed among 13 administering offices, to support RDT&E efforts performed by contract with colleges and industrial organizations and by 45 RDT&E Navy laboratories, test ranges, and installations.

Mrs. Ferguson has received repeated awards and commendations from the Navy Department, and last year was named "Woman of the Year" by the American Society of Military Comptrollers. She is constantly engaged in a wide variety of professional and community activities. A native of Manassas, Va., she has an AA degree in business administration from George Washington University (1961), and lives in Alexandria, Va. Her husband, John A. Ferguson, Capt. USN (Ret.), is branch manager of Investors Financial Services at Landmark Shopping Center, Alexandria, Va. She has two sons (by her first marriage) and five grandchildren.

DR. RUTH MANDEVILLE LEVERTON, SCIENCE ADVISOR (NUTRITION), OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Ruth Mandeville Leverton, Ph.D., is a scientist in the field of nutrition whose research and appraisals of research have contributed significantly to adequate diets and a more satisfying standard of living in this country and worldwide. She has been instru-

mental in providing information for planning consumer education programs, for analyzing the demand for agricultural products, and for determining the food policies of the Department of Agriculture.

Before entering the Federal service, Dr. Leverton spent 20 years in teaching nutrition, at the University of Nebraska and later at Oklahoma State University. She joined the Agricultural Research Service in 1957 as Assistant Director of the Human Nutrition Research Division, and progressed rapidly through positions of increasing responsibility in the Service. In 1970 she was appointed Science Advisor for Nutrition in the Office of the Administrator, at the equivalent of grade 17. Here she occupies a key position in the mobilization of the Department's scientific resources for the worldwide War on Hunger. She directs the expansion of research to provide nutritional knowledge urgently needed in developing countries, and advises on nutritional requirements for foods for distribution in such countries and in domestic programs for needy families and the school lunch program. She was involved in the most extensive survey of food consumption and dietary levels ever attempted in this country, and first one to yield data on both individual and family eating habits.

Dr. Leverton is internationally known, not only as a scientist, but as an author, lecturer, and educator. She has represented the United States at four Biennial Conferences of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, and at a great many international nutrition conferences. She serves on numerous national committees, and has published more than 70 reports of original scientific research and two widely used books on nutrition. Her many honors include the Borden Award, which she received twice, and an honorary D.Sc. degree from the University of Nebraska. She was born in Minneapolis, Minn., and received her B.S. degree in 1928 from the University of Nebraska, her MS in 1932 from the University of Arizona, and her PhD in 1937 from the University of Chicago. She lives in Washington, D.C.

DR. PATRICIA ANN MCCREEDY, PUBLIC HEALTH PHYSICIAN, PROJECT MANAGER OF VILLAGE HEALTH PROGRAM, VIENTIANE, LAOS, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Patricia Ann McCreedy, M.D., is a public health physician who has major responsibility for the Village Health Program of the Agency for International Development, at Vientiane, Laos. In this program, which assists the Royal Lao Government by extending medical and clinical services to remote rural areas, Dr. McCreedy has been directly and indirectly responsible for operational aspects of keeping an average of 178 rural dispensaries staffed and supplied with medicines; for operation and staffing of eight hospitals with a total capacity of 614 in-patients and operating at a level of 343,686 patient-visits per year; and for the training of nurses, sanitarians, and other paramedical personnel, many of whom are illiterate at the outset, to staff these installations. She makes all necessary personal inspections, including installations surrounded by North Vietnamese armed forces. Since many of these areas are accessible only by air, she travels for hours daily in single-engine aircraft, often in dangerous weather, over mountain ranges and across jungles, and shares the life and homes of simple villagers in remote, enemy-encircled, malarial areas. Because of her detailed knowledge of these places and people, she has made valuable contributions to the Government's knowledge and understanding of the refugee problems in Laos, and also of the narcotics problem.

Dr. McCreedy was born in St. Louis, Mo., graduated from Loyola University in 1947, and earned her M.D. degree at the Louisiana State University School of Medicine in 1951. Following several years in private practice in

Maringouin, La., she served two years as Public Health Officer in American Samoa, and in 1964 went to Laos as Project Manager of the Village Health Program. She is also manager of the Population and Family Planning Project there, and Contract Representative for the Operation Brotherhood Activity. Dr. McCreedy and her husband, Dr. Charles L. Weldon, senior officer at the A.I.D. Vientiane mission, often work as a team. They have three children, a daughter 19 and two sons 17 and 15. Their home when in this country is in Biloxi, Miss.

DAY CARE—CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, two very perceptive articles on day care—child development recently appeared in local papers. Several weeks ago the Washington Post had a very insightful column by Alice Rivlin entitled "Day Care: Policy Questions for an Expensive Program." In this article Dr. Rivlin looks behind the "spurious" arguments that have unfortunately characterized a good bit of the debate over this issue and focuses on the real policy questions involved. She concludes for example:

The principal effect of a large-scale day care program would probably not be to increase the proportion of mothers who are working; rather it would be to broaden the range of child care arrangement available to mothers who have already decided to work.

The second article to which I refer is a column entitled "Need for Day Care Bill Is Urgent," written by Marquis Childs, and published in yesterday's Baltimore Sun.

Mr. Childs summarizes concisely the needs for developmental day care, the tremendous opportunity a program like this could provide to millions of families and children, and the purposes of the child care bill I have introduced with Senator NELSON.

Both articles ignore the heated rhetoric and scare tactics which regrettably surround the passage and the veto of last year's child development bill and help us to focus on the real issues involved.

I ask unanimous consent that these two perceptive columns appear at the close of my remarks and commend them to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President I would also like to have printed at the close of my remarks a copy of a Minnesota poll concerning day care which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune on Sunday, February 27, 1972. The poll, entitled "63 Percent Say Day Care Centers Good for Children," reflects the opinion of a majority of a cross section of Minnesotans and I suspect a majority of a cross section of Americans as well, that quality day care centers for children whose mothers are working involves far more advantages than disadvantages.

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

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Feb. 27, 1972]

MINNESOTA POLL: 63 PERCENT SAY DAY-CARE CENTERS GOOD FOR CHILDREN

"Day-care centers give a child a chance to become involved with other children," said a 27-year-old Glencoe woman. "They also offer learning experience, especially for children that wouldn't get this at home."

But, on the other hand, she also feels they have the disadvantage of "not having a one-to-one relationship that a mother and child might have at home."

After weighing both the advantages and disadvantages, she says that day-care centers do more good than harm for a child.

Her responses were typical of the 600 men and women interviewed in a statewide Minneapolis Tribune Minnesota Poll survey in mid-January.

Socialization, supervision and education are the advantages cited most often while the feeling that day-care centers can't replace a mother is a disadvantage mentioned often.

Over-all, 63 percent of all people interviewed believe day-care centers do more good for a child while 19 percent feel they do more harm. Three percent qualified their answers and 15 percent were undecided.

More women (69 percent) than men (56 percent) said day-care centers do more good than harm for a child.

Interviewers led off the series of questions on day-care centers with:

"Day-care centers are places where mothers can leave their children for care and supervision while they work away from home. What advantages, if any, do you think day care centers offer for a child?"

Thirty-nine percent said a child would benefit by being with, and learning from, other children.

Twenty-two percent said children receive good care or are well-supervised and 17 percent feel there are educational values, including access to facilities they would not have at home.

Thirteen percent said the centers provide consistent surroundings for children, must meet standards, or are better than "just any babysitter" if it is necessary for a mother to work.

Seventeen percent said there are no advantages to day-care centers or that mothers should be at home with the child.

To get at the other side, interviewers asked:

"What disadvantages, if any, do you think day-care centers have for a child?"

The disadvantage given most often (by 27 percent) is that day-care centers can't replace a mother, the child misses out on a one-to-one relationship, or that the mother's love is replaced by impersonal care.

The results of the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota Poll are based on personal in-the-home interviews with 600 men and women 18 years of age or older. Respondents are selected by probability sampling procedures and interviewed by a staff of 110 trained interviewers. The Minnesota Poll was established in 1944 as a public service.

NEED FOR DAY-CARE BILL IS URGENT (By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—With the thousands of words spilled in the Florida primary about busing, not a single word was uttered about the only frontal attack on the tragic deficiencies in American education. Having advertised earlier his opposition to busing, President Nixon's newest proposal comes with ill grace against the background of what he did in December.

Last year the Congress passed by sizable majorities a measure meant to enlarge the opportunities for children living below the poverty line in ghettos, in Appalachia, and in the Southwest, with "condemned for life" written across their condition.

Head Start, the program designed to try to correct the balance for those of the very young who are deprived of a fair chance to begin on the mark at school age, was to be greatly expanded.

But, most important, the bill provided for a great increase in day-care centers for children from homes where both parents go out

to work or where the mother is the sole provider.

Extensive hearings held by Senator Walter Mondale, the sponsor of the bill, showed that there were perhaps 700,000 places in day-care centers that could be considered adequate while the need was for at least 5,000,000.

Toward the end of the last session of Congress, President Nixon vetoed the bill with a message that, as a presidential state paper, reads like a demagogic campaign speech. This, said the President, was an effort to impose the commune system and break up the family pattern. He conveniently ignored the fact that his own welfare reform measure would force many mothers to go into the labor market even though they may have preschool children.

What especially dismayed the sponsors was that they believed they had the sanction of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Elliot L. Richardson. As they reconstruct it, Mr. Richardson was overruled by John D. Ehrlichman, who performs somewhat the same function for domestic affairs as does Henry Kissinger for foreign policy.

Belatedly, Mr. Richardson wrote a letter protesting the failure to clue the states into the program.

By seven votes the Senate failed of the two-thirds necessary to override the veto. Now, Senator Mondale with Senator Gaylord Nelson has a new child care-Head Start proposal modified to meet some of the objections. More authority is given the states, and the authorization is cut from \$2 billion to \$1.5 billion. The hope is not only that it will be passed but that with these changes the President will sign it.

A recent survey by the National Council of Jewish Women found existing day-care services woefully deficient in both quality and quantity. Many centers were described as hardly better than concentration camps for helpless children. In one center children were strapped into high chairs apparently in a stupor.

About this mass neglect, this callous indifference, there can be no illusions. It is the seedbed in the rising generation for crime, violence, disease, unemployment, the whole roster of ills that so sorely beset this affluent nation.

Those who today work with the young who are crippled in mind or body by the terrible distortions of contemporary life can appreciate what this heritage must mean. They function often under severe handicaps with little money or public support.

Of the many institutions around the country working with deeply disturbed children, one here in Washington, the Groome Child Guidance Center, is outstanding. The slow, painful rebuilding of young lives, helping to overcome what is the reward of doctors and teachers. So great is the demand that not surprisingly they feel they are dipping out the ocean with a teaspoon.

They know so well the consequences of mass neglect; shunting the very young from squalid and empty homes onto the streets, where they will be educated in violence and the escapism of drugs. Short of a frontal attack, such as the Mondale-Nelson bill proposes, the harvest of broken lives will grow in the years to come.

"SPURIOUS" ARGUMENT OVER WHETHER MOTHERS SHOULD WORK—DAY CARE: POLICY QUESTIONS FOR AN EXPENSIVE PROGRAM

(By Alice M. Rivlin)

If you want to start an argument at a boring party—and you are tired of busing and Vietnam—try day care. Just ask a few people whether they think the federal government should provide day care for children of working mothers, and in no time your friends will be on the verge of heaving ash trays at each other.

Unfortunately, they will probably be arguing about a spurious issue—the issue of whether or not mothers should work. The argument may sound as though: (1) mothers don't work now, (2) the reason they don't is that the government does not provide day care, (3) if there were a government day care program, many more mothers would leave home, drop their kids in day care centers and go to work, (4) the gut issue is whether this would be good or not.

But out in the real world mothers have not been sitting around waiting for public officials to make up their minds about day care programs. Millions of mothers are working now—even those with very small children.

According to a Labor Department study by Elizabeth Waldman and Katherine Gover, about half the mothers of school-age children were in the labor force in March 1970, as were about a third of those with preschool children. Some worked part-time, but the majority had full-time jobs. Moreover, since many mothers work only part of the year, the proportion with some work history during the previous year was even higher than the proportion in the labor force at a given moment. Among wives living with their husbands, 44 per cent of those with children under 6 and 58 per cent of those with children of school age worked some time during the year. The percentages would be even higher if they included the increasing number of separated or divorced women bringing up children on their own.

Among black mothers, working outside the home is even more usual—and this is not just because a larger proportion of black women are family heads. Among black mothers living with their husbands, 64 percent of those with preschool children and 73 per cent of those with school-age children worked some time during the year.

Clearly we are dealing with a cultural phenomenon—not just oddball behavior. More than 26 million children have mothers in the labor force (up 10 million in a decade) and 6 million of them are under 6 years old. That's a lot of kids.

There are many theories about why mothers are entering the job market, although most of the explanations seem as likely to be manifestations of the phenomenon as causes of it. First, with a falling birth rate, increasing numbers of mothers have two or three children rather than four or more. A mother of two not only has less housework to do than a mother of six, she finds it easier and less expensive to arrange for someone else to care for her children while she works. Moreover, a mother of two knows there are likely to be many years ahead when her children no longer need her. She may decide to keep working when her children are young, so she will not have to start at the bottom of the job ladder when the kids grow up. Second, convenience foods, wash and wear fabrics and labor-saving appliances have made it less necessary for mothers to stay home for reasons other than child care and at the same time have increased the family's need for cash income to pay for all these wondrous things. Third, with the mechanization of industry and the growth of services, fewer jobs require physical strength and more are open to women. Fourth, notions of "women's place" are shifting. Although attitudes may not be changing fast enough to suit the leaders of women's lib, the belief that women should be individuals with lives of their own, not just wives and mothers, is clearly gaining ground fast, especially among the young. And finally, kindergarten and nursery school are increasingly seen as desirable experiences for children even if their mothers do not work. The suburban mother whose 4-year-old is home all day may even feel guilty about it.

Since all these forces seem likely to continue operating in the same direction, there

will probably be an increasing proportion of mothers in the labor force whether the federal government embarks on a large-scale day care program or not. By the end of the decade, the non-working mother could find herself odd-woman-out.

More government-financed day care would doubtless accelerate the movement of mothers into the labor force, and enable some women to shift from part-time to full-time work. It might help some mothers now on welfare to move into the labor force, although it should be remembered that many of these mothers need more than day care to help them get steady work at good wages. They need education, training, work experience, and job opportunities.

Nevertheless, "the principal effect of a large-scale day care program would probably not be to increase the proportion of mothers who are working; rather it would be to broaden the range of child care arrangement available to mothers who have already decided to work."

To many people the word "day care" necessarily suggests a day care center—an institution taking care of a large number of children at once. But most working mothers do not use day care centers. They drop the kid at mother's, or maybe mother lives with them. They use relatives, neighbors, sitters, borders. They give the child a key and leave him on his own. Or they find another mother who is staying home anyway and is willing to look after two or three more children besides her own for a relatively modest fee. Some of these arrangements are good for children and some are dreadful—but that is also true for mothers.

A recent survey showed that day care centers (defined as facilities for more than six children) enrolled only a little over a half a million children in 1970—less than 10 percent of the preschoolers with working mothers. Some of these centers are run for profit and others by nonprofit groups that often receive a government subsidy for caring for low-income children. The profit-seeking centers charge \$10 to 20 a week per child and vary from good to abysmal.

The nonprofit centers usually have more staff and offer a rich educational program and, sometimes, health services and other benefits. The nonprofits spend about three times as much per child, on the average, but only a small part comes from parents. They usually restrict enrollment to children from poor or very poor families and have long waiting lists.

The result is a rather erratic two-class system in which some poor children (those fortunate enough to get into the subsidized centers) get better quality care than is available to families with somewhat higher incomes. The working mother with income slightly above the poverty line has the worst deal of all—unless she has a competent relative to turn to for free care. She earns too much to get her child into a subsidized center, but not enough to pay much for care. She does not even benefit appreciably from the newly liberalized income tax deductions for child care expenses. These benefits go mainly to people in higher tax brackets.

The important policy issue is not whether mothers should work—if they want to they will—but whether the public should take on new responsibilities for the well-being of children. Traditionally there has been little public concern for children until they reach school age and even then public responsibility has been limited to school hours. What happens to the preschool child or the school-age child after school hours has been considered a family responsibility, unless the child was badly abused or ran afoul of the law. But this *laissez-faire* attitude is now under attack, not only from women's lib spokesmen who believe that the public should provide day care so that mothers can make an easier choice between staying home and going to work, but by those who believe

the public has a responsibility to enhance the development and capabilities of children as much as possible and that this can best be done by reaching them at a very early age.

The last argument combines fairly well established facts with an attractive but still unimproved hypothesis. The widely acknowledged facts are that children develop intellectual skills and capacities at a rapid rate in the first five years of life (especially the first three); that children from deprived homes get less stimulation and early education and start school with smaller vocabularies, fewer learning skills, lower IQ's than middle-class children; and that some experimental programs have succeeded in narrowing these disparities significantly—at least for a while. Unfortunately, the gains made by children even in the most successful early childhood education programs appear to fade out when the special programs end and the children are plunged back into the stultifying atmosphere of regular poverty area schools. The unproved hypothesis is that more comprehensive and sustained efforts to reach children earlier and longer—through parent-education, improved nutrition, early treatment of health handicaps, and a variety of part-day and full-day education programs—could make a permanent difference in their lives and build up a momentum that would carry on into the public schools.

The reason it is such a hard policy problem is that the potential cost could be very high. A really excellent full-day school program that provides enough staff to give children individual attention, plenty of space, play equipment, educational activities and routine medical attention costs at least \$1,800 a year per child. Part-day activities cost less, but not a lot less. There are about three million preschoolers in poor families so a comprehensive preschool program for poverty children could cost \$3-4 billion even if they did not all participate. But the real rub is that it would be politically impossible—and certainly unconscionable—to restrict such a program to the poor. Children from families with incomes of \$8,000 or even \$12,000 are not getting that kind of care now and their families could not afford to pay for it. A substantial subsidy, say \$1,000 per child, to this group could cost several more billions.

A lot of us would rather have good preschools than a new nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, but that is not likely to be the choice we get. In the real world of politics the choice is more likely to be between spending substantial sums in early childhood programs and spending them on improving junior high schools, providing college scholarships or easing the plight of the aged poor. If you can get your friends arguing about these hard choices—rather than about whether mothers should work—you will at least have moved them off a spurious issue and onto a really serious and difficult one.

THREATENED DOCK STRIKE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, once again we are being threatened by a dock strike on both coasts of our Nation.

Such a strike would be disastrous not only for the shippers or for business in general, but it would be a severe blow to the average American.

Union leaders are threatening to be their dictatorial worst because they have failed to win the full amount of the inflationary wage increase they exacted on the west coast.

These threats are causing concern even among legislators and journalists who in the past have contended with great consistency that labor can do no wrong.

Mr. President, one of the journalists in Milton Viorst, whose column appeared Monday in the Evening Star. I ask unanimous consent that the column be reprinted in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 20, 1972]

RIGHT TO STRIKE HAS ITS LIMITS

(By Milton Viorst)

The prospect of resumption of the West Coast dock strike—the consequence of the Pay Board's compromise finding on a labor-management wage settlement—raises important questions about the future of union power in American society.

First, it poses the problem of whether the labor movement is to be allowed to destroy the effectiveness of the administration's program of wage-price restraints, which on the whole has been working rather well.

Harry Bridges, president of the West Coast International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, had threatened to strike if "as much as one cent" was lopped off the settlement which the union negotiated independently with the shippers. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, has said he would support Bridges right down the picket line.

In fact, the Pay Board reduced the original settlement from 21 percent to 15 percent, which is a far cry from the 5.5 percent target it had established for wage raises. Obviously, the Pay Board was not indifferent to the longshoremen's threats, even if it did not capitulate completely.

Yet it is clear that if the longshoremen, by going on strike, force a larger settlement, then none of the Pay Board's decisions will be worth the press releases they're written on—and President Nixon's wage-price program will be shattered.

Because of the impact on overall economic policy at a critical time, then, the prospect of a walkout raises a second, even more fundamental question: Whether unions have an inherent right to strike whenever it might suit their fancy.

There certainly was a time when I would have answered with an unequivocal "yes." Those were the days when unions were fighting for their existence—against the hostility not only of employers, but usually of government and the courts. The left never doubted that the union was always right.

But the great labor struggles of the past—the Homestead strike, the United Auto Workers against Ford, John L. Lewis and the coal miners—represent a purer day of the union movement. As often as not these days, labor disputes are waged not so much against employers, but against the public and, often, against nonunion labor.

The current dock dispute is a good example. Both sides are going through a charade of who should benefit most from a reduction of some 30 percent—thanks to new technology—in the handling costs of cargo.

Obviously, it occurs to neither side to reduce prices.

Instead, the two sides make angry faces at each other and wind up with a sweetheart contract in which labor gets the wages it wants and management sets the prices it chooses. In such circumstances, it's hard to get emotional over labor's cause.

Yet Meany insists that labor has a constitutional right to go out on strike, notwithstanding economic policy and the Pay Board. It is curious how the Constitution becomes the last refuge of the economic royalists, no less so because the barons today are from labor as much as from management.

For myself, I have looked in vain through the Constitution for the right to strike. It seems clear that workers have the right to seek to coerce employers by a common refusal to work.