UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94th CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 121—PART 23

SEPTEMBER 18, 1975 TO SEPTEMBER 25, 1975

(PAGES 29197 TO 30396)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1975

loans or grants whenever their overall export earnings suffered an abrupt decline because of a drop in raw material prices.

To develop the poor nations further, the United States proposed a series of new international institutions that would encourage the flow of private capital to the poor nations. This approach is meant to supplant increased government aid from the West.

The United States pledged $200 million to a new fund to help poor nations develop the capacity to grow their own food. It also endorsed a code of conduct for the transfer of the technology to the Third World.

The concessions by the poor nations came mostly on principles. But this means that today's compromise will leave the rich nations free to press their capitalist approach when the talks enter those forums where the West retains its leverage—such as the International Monetary Fund and the Paris conference of consumers and producers.

For example, the Third World settled for weak language on tariff preferences for their goods. Such preferences will be granted only "where feasible and appropriate," and could involve unspecified reductions in tariffs. rather than complete removal.

The poor nations also dropped from today's resolution demands for the regulation of multinational corporations and for the right to expropriate the assets of foreign corporations and pay compensation under their domestic laws.

Besides thwarting the poor nations goal of indexation the West avoided any commitment to the so-called "integrated approach" to commodity agreement. This means that the poor nations cannot now insist on one large package deal for all commodities—a negotiation in which their collective leverage would be greater.

U.N. economic experts pointed to the absence of any concessions by the oil-producing nations in today's resolution. Western proposals for a consumer-producer forum on each commodity, including oil, were omitted, as well as any specific reference to guarantees that consumers could obtain stable commodity supplies.

But Assistant Secretary of State Thomas O. Enders, who served as the chief American negotiator in the climactic days of the session, claimed that today's package contained references to 28 of the proposals outlined in the major U.S. policy speech at the start of the assembly. "It was responsive to our needs as well as to the poor," Enders said.

U.S. satisfaction, however, was not complete. Under an "agreement to disagree," reached on the final day of talks, the United States entered reservations on three or four of the major issues in the resolution. Other Western governments also registered reservations, but of a far more limited nature.

U.S. representative Jacob Myerson rejected any system that would artificially regulate world trade.

He also withheld any U.S. commitment to major increases in foreign aid. The U.N. resolution calls upon the industrial nations to provide 0.7 per cent of their gross national product each year for foreign aid. For the United States, this would mean tripling current aid levels to about $10 billion annually—a move for which, Enders said, "The political base no longer exists."

The United States stood alone in its opposition to the use of new Special Drawing Rights—a form of paper currency created to stimulate world trade and credit—as a method of providing increased foreign aid to poor nations.

Myerson also insisted that the United States "cannot accept any implications that the world is now embarked on establishment of something called 'the new economic order'."

Jan Pronk, 35, the Dutch economics minister who served as chief mediator during the assembly, reassured the United States in a press conference later today that "what we did here was not to create a new economic order."

Pronk, the European representative here who is the most sympathetic to Third World views, also insisted that the U.S. reservations were "as few as possible and will not prove a hindrance to future negotiations."

Pronk revealed that negotiations almost broke down—that a collapse "was a real possibility until one or two hours before the end" in the early hours of this morning. The final bargain was made between Enders and Manuel Perez Guerrero, the economic minister of Venezuela, on the key issues of Special Drawing Rights, the Western governmental aid commitments and the reference to the "new economic order."

In the final days, over the last weekend, Moynihan said, both Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and Treasury Secretary William E. Simon were in constant touch with the U.S. negotiating team. Moynihan also made it clear that some difficulties between the two secretaries were resolved by President Ford.

On the Third World side, Perez Guerrero faced a last ditch attempt by Algeria and other radicals to reject the compromise wording.

Some in the Third World caucus, Moynihan said, "did not feel there was enough to be gained from the negotiated settlement we reached and thought they should continue to state unyielding demands, recording disagreement as a matter of principle.

"This was a perfectly understandable strategy. In the end, faced with that established practice or an actual agreement, the larger and stronger in the group chose to enter this agreement and commence the process that has begun."

Enders paid tribute to the 18 members of Congress who served as advisers to the U.S. delegation at this special assembly session, and who endorsed the new U.S. policy proposals. He pointed out that many of the items agreed upon will require Congressional concurrence.

DAY CARE STANDARDS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, once again efforts are being made to water down or delay implementation of the day care standards that provide minimal levels of protection for children in federally assisted child care programs. Legislation has been introduced which for some age levels would permits twice as many children per adult as present standards permit in child care centers, and requests have been made to Secretary Mathews of HEW to delay implementation of these standards or to provide statewide exemptions from them.

Mr. President, this is an issue with which all of us in the Senate are familiar. Over the past few years, we have consistently voted to assure that Federal day care standards continue to apply to federally assisted child care programs. Indeed, the standards for programs under title XX of the Social Security Act now scheduled to take effect October 1, are basically the standards that have been in effect since 1968. The only changes in them involve some loosening of adult-child requirements for school age children, a shift from requiring to recommending educational services for preschool age children in day care programs, and the long overdue addition of adult-child ratios for children under 3 years of age in child care centers.

These standards were made available for public review and comment in the form of proposed regulations several months ago, and the final regulations scheduled to take effect on October 1 were modified as a result of this comment. It would be a major mistake to make any further modifications at this point in response to last minute pressures.

Mr. President, this is not just some academic matter. These standards concern the health and well-being of thousands of young children in federally assisted child care programs. To weaken them further, or to delay their implementation or their enforcement, would be a tragedy.

For the information of my colleagues and the public, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter which Senator BUCKLEY, Senator RIBICOFF, and I sent to Secretary Mathews expressing our strong opposition to any further modifications or delay in this matter, and to indicate that we will do all we can to assure that these standards are implemented and enforced as planned.

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., September 15, 1975.

Hon. DAVID MATHEWS,
Secretary, Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to our attention that you are receiving requests to postpone implementation of or provide statewide exemptions from the Title XX regulations regarding day care standards.

We urge you in the strongest possible manner to deny any such requests and to implement and enforce these standards as planned. These standards provide a minimal level of protection for children in day care, and must not be weakened or delayed. As you know they were made available for public review and comment in the form of proposed regulations several months ago, and the final regulations were modified as a result of this process. Any further modification at this point—before HEW completes the "appropriateness study" of day care standards required by Title XX—would be premature and unwise.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. BUCKLEY.
WALTER F. MONDALE.
ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF.

JOBS FOR REDEEMED ADDICTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my interest in stimulating employment of ex-addicts led me to sponsor a conference of business leaders to promote this goal. I am now pleased to commend to the attention of my colleagues a recent decision by Federal Judge Thomas P. Griesa which held as unconstitutional an employment policy which excluded from jobs methadone maintained ex-addicts.

Judge Griesa's opinion came in a class action against the New York City Transit Authority brought in the U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York—*Beazer, et al.* v. *New York City Transit Authority, et. al.*, 72 Civ. 5307.

The action challenged the blanket exclusion from any form of employment in the New York City Subway and Bus Systems of all former heroin addicts par-