

UNITED STATES

Congress



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 121—PART 29

NOVEMBER 18, 1975 TO DECEMBER 3, 1975

(PAGES 37009 TO 38438)

in Colorado is developing a superior program. This Center is probably unique in its organization, philosophy, and the extent of its geographical responsibility.

It is composed of many institutions, banded together to help find the best ways of treating cancer patients, and then to use that knowledge promptly to help as many people as possible. The list of the constituent organizations includes no less than 26 institutions:

Alamosa Community Hospital, Alamosa, Colo.

American Medical Center, Denver, Colo.

Community Hospital-Mercy Hospital, Durango, Colo.

Denver General Hospital, Denver, Colo.

La Junta Medical Center, La Junta, Colo.

Logan County Hospital, Sterling, Colo.
Lutheran Hospital and Medical Center, Wheat Ridge, Colo.

Mercy Hospital, Denver, Colo.

National Jewish Hospital, Denver, Colo.

Penrose Hospital, Colorado Springs, Colo.

Poudre Valley Memorial Hospital, Fort Collins, Colo.

Presbyterian Medical Center, Denver, Colo.

Prowers' Medical Center, Lamar, Colo.

Rocky Mountain Osteopathic Hospital, Denver, Colo.

St. Anthony's Hospital Systems, Denver, Colo.

St. Joseph's Hospital, Denver, Colo.

St. Luke's Hospital, Denver, Colo.

St. Mary's Hospital, Grand Junction, Colo.

St. Mary-Corwin Hospital, Pueblo, Colo.

Sheridan Memorial Hospital, Sheridan, Wyo.

Swedish Medical Center/Porter's Memorial Hospital, Englewood, Colo.

University of Colorado Medical Center, Denver, Colo.

Veterans' Administration Hospital, Denver, Colo.

Weld County General Hospital, Greeley, Colo.

The Children's Hospital, Denver, Colo.

American Cancer Society, Colorado Division, Denver, Colo.

University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.

Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.

Their philosophy is one of cooperation. In the research areas, groups of scientists from several institutions have come together to form subcommittees who share knowledge, expertise, and sometimes specialized research facilities. There are currently cooperative groups in developmental chemotherapy and cancer immunology. Eventually there will be more.

In the clinical area, there are several encouraging developments. Teams of specialists in several areas of cancer are visiting outlying hospitals, sharing expertise, and seeing patients in consultation. Patients who need highly specialized radiotherapy are sent to one or another

central hospital for such treatment. Plans are underway to provide a centralized rehabilitation facility. An extensive outreach program is being developed that will markedly improve cancer care in parts of six States.

Under the capable leadership of Dr. Ernest Borek, the acting director of the center, there is a growing optimism that many lives will be saved once the center is in full operation. Perhaps the most encouraging aspect of this situation is the voluntary participation of scores, even hundreds, of doctors and scientists throughout Colorado and the surrounding States who have given their time and energies to this program without any remuneration.

The program has been in the planning state for several years. This year the first Federal funds for actual operations were received. The core grant reached Colorado around the end of June, so that they have been in official operation less than 4 months. I am confident that dramatic progress will be made as their program picks up speed.

The geographic responsibilities of this center are enormous. They are responsible for improving the care of cancer patients in an area as large as the original 13 States.

When the program for developing comprehensive regional cancer centers was first inaugurated, no one could be certain how well they would work. I am happy to report that as far as the Colorado center is concerned, the program is already starting to work well. The decision by Congress to spend taxpayers' money on the center's program was a wise one, and I am proud to have been a supporter of that program from its beginning.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a vicious and totally inaccurate propaganda campaign is currently being waged against the child and family services legislation pending before Congress. This bill, which I sponsored in the Senate with 28 other Senators, and Representative BRADENAS sponsored in the House of Representatives with almost a hundred other Representatives, is being subjected to one of the most distorted and dishonest attacks I have witnessed in my 15 years of public service.

Wild and completely false allegations are being made that this legislation would somehow give children the legal right to disobey their parents; somehow prohibit parents from providing religious training to their children; somehow give the Government authority over child rearing; and somehow give children the right to complain about their parents and teachers "without fear of reprisal."

These allegations are absolutely and completely false. There is not a shred of truth in any one of them. If there were, neither I nor any Member of Congress would be sponsoring this legislation.

In fact, research reveals that these

allegations are based on a document that was not even prepared in this country, and has no relevance to it. They are derived from a "Charter of Children's Rights" of the British Advisory Center of Education and the National Council of Civil Liberties which Senator CURTIS cited during Senate debate in 1971.

Yet, mimeographed materials being circulated in many sections of our country allege that the so-called "children's rights" quoted from their foreign document are "becoming part of" the Child and Family Services Act. That allegation is totally false, and I believe that the individuals or organizations making the allegation know it is false. I say that because the materials containing these allegations are unsigned—a clear and significant sign that the organizations or individuals circulating these allegations know that they cannot defend or document them.

Contrary to these unsigned allegations, the child and family services legislation contains nothing that changes or affects the legal relationship between parents and their children. Instead, it simply offers to families—on a totally voluntary basis—access to health, education and child care services which they want for their children but often cannot afford. It offers prenatal health care and early medical screening and treatment to detect and remedy handicapping conditions, and day care services for children of working mothers. And, the bill specifically limits eligibility for these services to "children whose parents or guardians request such services"—S. 626, section 2 (a) (2); section 106(b) (1).

In addition, this legislation is deliberately and carefully designed to provide parent control of any services offered. Thus, the bill requires that all programs funded would be selected, established and controlled by the parents of the children participating in them.

Finally, the bill is specifically designed to support and strengthen families. The very first part of the bill—section 2(a)—states that "the family is the primary and most fundamental influence on children" and that any programs funded by this act "must build upon and strengthen the role of the family." And, the bill specifically states that "nothing in this act shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians"—section 504(a).

It is for these reasons that the legislation is supported by a wide range of civic and religious organizations including the PTA, the AFL-CIO, the United Methodist Church, the U.S. Catholic Conference, the United Church of Christ, the Baptist and Lutheran Churches, the UAW, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Child Welfare League of America, the National Council of Jewish Women, the American Home Economics Association, the National Association of Retarded Children, and the National Education Association.

It is obvious that none of these organizations would be supporting a proposal

of the kind alleged in the unsigned materials being distributed. These organizations, and the Members of Congress who are sponsoring the Child and Family Services Act, are supporting this legislation precisely because it strengthens and supports families and children.

Mr. President, this legislation was specifically drafted in such a way to assure that it would strengthen and support families, rather than weaken them. That is why we included the provisions I quoted earlier concerning the voluntary nature of the programs offered, the prohibitions against any infringement upon the rights and responsibilities of parents, and the statement of findings regarding the primary role of the family and the requirement that all programs build upon and strengthen the family.

During the hearings on this legislation we consistently asked witnesses whether, in their opinion, the bill did indeed strengthen families. In fact, we specifically asked the witnesses representing various churches whether the legislation would, in their opinion, strengthen or weaken families.

Their responses to that question were direct and unambiguous, and well worth quoting on this occasion.

Dr. John W. Baker, associate director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, an organization representing the Southern Baptist Convention, the American Baptist Churches in the U.S.A., the Baptist General Conference, National Baptist Convention of American, National Baptist Convention of U.S.A. Inc., North American Baptist Conference, Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc., and the Seventh Day Baptist General Conference, was asked if the bill "strengthens rather than weakens the American family." He responded by stating: "I feel strongly that it does. I do not see any merit in the argument that I have heard to the contrary."

Ruth Gilbert, of the board of Global Ministries, United Methodist Churches, responded to the same question by stating:

I think that the arguments (suggesting that the bill would somehow weaken families) imply some form of coercion which I do not see in the legislation. Therefore, I would agree that it is a matter of choice, and therefore strengthens the family.

William Tremittier, manager of children's programs of the Tressler-Lutheran Service Associates responded by saying:

I think the bill is supportive, and would provide tremendous resources to families.

Rev. Msgr. Thomas Reese, director Catholic Social Services in Wilmington, Del., testifying on behalf of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, replied:

I would say that it would seem to me that a person who would think that these programs would weaken the family is just not aware of the facts of life.

Mr. President, the needs for the child and family services legislation have been well documented in the 12 days of hearings we have held in the past year. Forty percent of the young children in the

United States have not been immunized fully against childhood diseases. The infant mortality rate in this country is shockingly and unnecessarily high—higher than that of 13 other nations. Almost two-thirds of preschool children with handicaps are not receiving the special services they need. An estimated 200,000 children are struck each year by handicaps that could have been prevented if their mothers had received early health care. While there are almost 6 million preschool children whose mothers are working, there are only 1 million spaces in licensed day care homes and centers to serve them.

As I said when I introduced this bill, none of the provisions in it is etched in stone. Reasonable people can and do disagree about many aspects of this proposal. How much funding can we afford for this program given the budget deficit which exists? What services should be offered, and how can they be administered effectively and efficiently? What are the appropriate roles, if any, for public schools, and for profitmaking day care programs in legislation of this kind. These are the kinds of questions the Congress and the American public must debate and resolve during the consideration of a proposal of this kind. They are precisely the kinds of issues that the subcommittee addressed in its hearings, and on which we deliberately invited witnesses with differing viewpoints.

But, issues such as these must be debated on the basis of facts, not fantasies. And, decisions about them and the proposal in general must be decided on the merits. To approach this issue otherwise—especially in a way that totally misrepresents and distorts the purposes and provisions of the legislation under consideration—is a disservice to all Americans concerned about families and children.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum responding to the specific, inaccurate charges contained in one of the widely distributed, unsigned flyers which attacks the Child and Family Services Act; a brief summary of the Child and Family Services Act prepared by the Subcommittee on Children and Youth, and a section-by-section analysis of the child and family services bill.

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

MEMORANDUM: ATTACKS ON CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES BILL

1. Unsigned Flyers entitled: "Raising Children—Government's or Parents Right?"

ATTACK

"There is before Congress legislation known as the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 (Senate: S. 626 and House: H.R. 2966). If passed it would take the responsibility of the parents to raise their children and give it to the Government."

FACT

This bill would in no way take the responsibility for child rearing away from parents. All programs authorized in the bill (S. 626 and H.R. 2966, Section 2(a)(2)) "must

build upon and strengthen the role of the family and must be provided on a voluntary basis only to children whose parents or guardians request such services." In addition, any practice which would "infringe or usurp the moral and legal responsibilities of parents or guardians" is specifically prohibited (Section 504(a)).

ATTACK

"Child Advocacy Clause. In the Congressional Record we read: 'If, in the judgement of those who are in charge of such a program (the State by way of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare), parents are not doing a good job, the advocate (a "specialist" appointed by the government) would enter the home and direct the education, even within the home. And, if the parent would object, the authority in the home would, DeFacto, be transferred to these advocated (sic).'"

FACT

While this material may have appeared in the Congressional Record (although an exhaustive Record search has failed to discover it), it is categorically false to contend that: (a) such language appears in S. 626 or H.R. 2966; (b) such beliefs are held or advocated by any of the sponsors of S. 626 or H.R. 2966; or (c) that any "child advocacy clause" of any kind appears in the bill (See "Special Note on the Congressional Record" below).

ATTACK

"Charter of Children's Rights of the National Council of Civil Liberties is becoming a part of this Child Development Act."

The flyers go on to list the following items in this charter, alleging that they can "be found on page 44138 of the Congressional Record":

"(1) All Children have the right of protection from, and compensation for the consequences of any inadequacies in their homes and backgrounds. (Note: In other words, never punish your child because he may come back to you with a civil suit.)"

"(2) Children have the right to protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents or authority. The question was asked, by way of example, what do you mean by the fact "Excessive claim", and the example was given, "If the mother or father asked the child to take the garbage out and the child doesn't want to, the parents have no right to insist on it."

"(3) Children have the right to freedom from religious or political indoctrination. That means that you have no right to insist on taking them to church, if they do not wish to go. That also means they have the freedom to insist that they be taught nothing, or any ideas, about God."

"(4) Children shall have the freedom to make complaints about teachers, parents and others without fear of reprisals. This speaks for itself."

FACT

No such language or "charter" has ever been proposed, included or even considered for the Child and Family Services Act or any related piece of legislation. This "charter" initially surfaced during Senate debate on December 2, 1971 on the Conference Report on the Office of Economic Opportunity Act which included child care provisions. Senator Carl T. Curtis (R-Nebraska), an opponent of this measure, said, "In England, child development advocates have gone so far as to draft a charter of children's rights." Curtis continued by reading from something he called the Charter of Children's Rights" of "the British Advisory Center of Education and the National Council for Civil Liberties." Thus, these so-called "rights", never included in this legislation, and were never advocated by sponsors of this legislation. In

fact, the "Council" cited is not even an American organization. (See "Special Note on the Congressional Record" below).

S. 626 and H.R. 2966 specifically state in Section 504(a) that "Nothing in this Act shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional, physical, or other development of their children. Nor shall any section of this Act be construed or applied in such a manner as to permit any invasion of privacy otherwise protected by law, or to abridge any legal remedies for any such invasion which are otherwise provided by law."

ATTACK

"Can the Government Take Away Your Children? Comprehensive child development, the SOVIET-style system, of communal child rearing which almost became law in this country in 1971 is once again being pushed through Congress. The current bills H.R. 2966 (House of Representatives) S. 626 (Senate), are virtually identical to the original act passed in 1971, but fortunately vetoed by the then president, Nixon. Now it is known as the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 and any changes are merely cosmetic."

"In vetoing the original bill which would have removed children from their parent's instruction shortly after birth, Mr. Nixon said that it would weaken the American family by committing 'vast moral authority of the national government to the side of communal approaches to child rearing over against the family oriented approach.'"

"We are in serious danger of 'Sovietizing' the education of our children if we let the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 pass. Those who support this Act in the Congress are convinced that it will 'Sail through the House.'"

FACT

This charge is of course, absurd and irresponsible. The sponsors of the bill have carefully drafted it to protect the rights of parents and their children:

First, participation in the program is completely voluntary. Children cannot participate without the specific request of a parent or legal guardian. (Section 2(a)(2) and Section 106(b)(1))

Second, the bill prohibits any practice which would "infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians." (Section 504(a))

Third, a child cannot be tested unless the parent or guardian is informed and given the opportunity to exempt the child from testing. (Section 504(a))

Fourth, unlike the public school program, the child and family services programs are totally voluntary.

ATTACK

"According to the Congressional Record, the intent of the bill is for the government to be responsible . . . for the nutritional interests of your child, for all psychological interests of your child."

FACT

This statement is totally inaccurate and irrelevant to the legislation.

The intent of the bill is (Section 2(b)) "to provide a variety of quality child and family services in order to assist parents who request such services, with priority to those preschool children and families with the greatest need, in a manner designed to strengthen family life and to insure decision-making at the community level, with direct participation of the parents of the children served and other individuals and organizations in the community interested in child and family service (making the best possible use of public and private resources),

through a partnership of parents, State and local government, and the Federal Government, building upon the experience and success of Headstart and other existing programs." (See "Special Note on the Congressional Record" below).

In fact, the bill specifically prohibits any medical or psychological examination or treatment unless a child's parent or guardian provides written permission. (Section 504(c)).

ATTACK

"The following excerpts are taken from the Congressional Record: 'What is at issue is whether the parent shall continue to have the right to form the character of the children or whether the state, with all its power and magnitude, shall be given the decisive tools and technique for forming the young lives of the children of this country.'"

"As a matter of the child's right, the government shall exert control over the family because we have recognized that the child is not the care of the parents, but the care of the state (sic). We recognize further that not parental, but communal forms of upbringing have an unquestionable superiority over all other forms. Furthermore, there is serious question that maybe we cannot trust the family to prepare young children in this country for this new kind of world which is emerging."

"This all smells of Communism. This is what in fact has been and is being done in Soviet Russia. This is what can become the law of our land, if the Child and Family Service Act of 1975 is passed by the Congress. We elected this Congress, but do we know what they are attempting to do to our freedoms and our rights?"

FACT

These citations, if they did in fact appear in the Congressional Record, are diametrically opposed to the purpose and intent of the bill.

First, the programs are completely voluntary. (Section 2(a)(2) and Section 106(b)(1))

Second, the precisely stated purpose of the legislation is to "strengthen family life," not weaken it. (Section 2(b))

Third, the program is to be operated locally, not by the national government. (Section 104)

Fourth, the bill contains specific prohibitions against any practice infringing on the rights and responsibilities of parents. Section 504(a))

(See "Special Note on the Congressional Record" below).

SPECIAL NOTE ON THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Throughout this leaflet, the "Congressional Record" is cited. The Congressional Record has the ring of an official pronouncement to it. But, anyone who has ever even glanced at the Record knows that it contains not only the debates in the House of Representatives and Senate but also speeches and material simply "inserted" into the Record. Any Member of Congress has the right to insert material in the Record, and therefore, the assertion that a statement is "according to the Congressional Record" is meaningless since the Record itself makes no statement of policy. Policy statements are made by the Members of Congress quoted in the Record.

This flyer provides a good example of the abuse of the citation of the Congressional Record. Senator Curtis of Nebraska included as part of his remarks on a bill considered by Congress in 1971 some material which he attributed to an organization in a foreign country. By misleading citation, the flyer implies that this material appeared in the Congressional Record this year and that it represents the contents of the bill. The bill's

sponsors had never before seen this material.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT

(By the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth)

NEEDS

The infant mortality rate in the United States is higher than that of 13 other nations. Each year an estimated 200,000 children are struck by handicaps which could have been prevented if their mothers had received early health care.

Forty percent of the young children of this country are not fully immunized against childhood diseases.

Sixty-five percent of all handicapped preschool children are not receiving special services.

There are only one million spaces in licensed day care homes and centers to serve the six million preschool children whose mothers are working.

PROPOSED SERVICES

The bill authorizes funding for local communities and parent organizations to choose among a wide variety of child and family services, including: prenatal health care; medical treatment to detect and remedy handicaps; nutrition assistance; and day care services for children of working mothers. The bill does *not* provide for compulsory preschool education.

PARENT CONTROL

Participation in all programs is totally voluntary, and limited to children whose parents request services.

All programs would be selected, established and controlled by parents whose children participate.

FAMILY STRENGTHENING

The bill states that "the family is the primary and most fundamental influence on children" and that "child and family service programs must build upon and strengthen the role of the family".

The bill has been specifically endorsed as family strengthening by a wide range of civic and religious organizations including the Catholic Church, the Baptist Church, the United Methodist Church and the Lutheran Church.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT OF 1975.
S. 626

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1

Section 2

Statement of Findings and Purpose.—Finds that "the family is the primary and most fundamental influence on children; that child and family services must build upon and strengthen the role of the family and must be provided on a voluntary basis only to children whose parents request them" with priority for preschool children with the greatest economic and human need; that there is a lack of adequate child and family services; and that there is a necessary for planning and operation of programs as partnership of parents, community, state and local governments, with appropriate federal supportive assistance.

Purpose is to "provide a variety of quality child and family services in order to assist parents who request such services, with priority to those preschool children and families with the greatest economic or human needs, in a manner designed to strengthen family life and to insure decision-making at the community level" and provide decision-making with direct parent participation through a partnership of parents, State, local and Federal government.

Section 3

Authorization of Appropriations.—Authorizes \$150 million for fiscal 1976 and \$200 million for FY 1977 for training, planning, and technical assistance and \$500 million in FY 1977 and \$1 billion in FY 1978 for program operation. Headstart would be funded under separate authority, and its funding protected by a requirement that no operational funds could be appropriated for this new program unless and until Headstart is funded at the level it received in FY 1975 or FY 1976, whichever is higher.

Forward funding is authorized.

TITLE I—CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES PROGRAMS

Section 101

Establishes Office of Child and Family Services in HEW to assume the responsibilities of the Office of Child Development and serve as principal agency for administration of this Act; and Child and Family Services Coordinating Council with representatives from various federal agencies to assure coordination of federal programs in the field.

Section 102

Financial Assistance.—Define purposes for which federal funds can be used: (1) planning and developing programs, (2) establishing, maintaining, and operating programs, including part-day or full-day child care in the home, in group homes, or in other child care facilities; other specially designed programs such as after-school programs; family services, including in-home and in-school services; information and referral services to aid families in selecting child and family services; prenatal care; programs to meet special needs of minorities, Indians, migrants and bilingual children; food and nutrition services; diagnosis of handicaps or barriers to full participation in child and family services programs; special services for handicapped children within regular programs; programs to extend child and family service gains, including parent participation, into the elementary schools; (3) rental, renovation, acquisition, or construction of facilities, including mobile facilities; (4) pre-service and inservice training; (5) staff and administrative expenses of councils and committees required by the Act; and (6) dissemination of information to families.

Section 103

Allocation of Funds.—Reserves funds proportionately for migrant and Indian children, not less than 10% for services to handicapped children, and not less than 5% for monitoring and enforcement of standards.

Allocates the remainder among the states and within the states, 50% according to relative number of economically disadvantaged children, 25% according to relative number of children through age five, and 25% according to relative number of children of working mothers and single parents.

Allows use of up to 5% of a state's allocation for special state programs under Section 108.

Section 104

Prime Sponsors.—States, localities, combinations of localities or public and nonprofit organizations are eligible to serve as prime sponsors.

The bills current provisions establish performance criteria for prime sponsor; demonstrated interest in and capability of running comprehensive programs, including coordination of all services for children within the prime sponsorship area; assurances of non-federal share; establishment of a Child and Family Services Council (CFSC) to administer and coordinate programs.

Public or private nonprofit organizations

can serve as prime sponsors with priority on governmental units. Any locality or combination of localities which submits an application meeting the performance criteria may be designated prime sponsor if the Secretary determines it has the capacity to carry out comprehensive and effective programs. The state may be designated prime sponsor for all areas where local prime sponsors do not apply or cannot meet the performance criteria, provided that the state meets the performance criteria and divides its area of jurisdiction into local service areas with local child and family services councils which approve the relevant portions of the state's plan and contracts for operation of programs within the local service areas.

The Secretary may fund directly an Indian tribe to carry out programs on a reservation. He may also fund public or private nonprofit agencies to operate migrant programs, model programs, or programs where no prime sponsor has been designated or where a designated prime sponsor is not meeting certain needs.

Directs the Secretary to designate an alternative to any prime sponsor discriminating against minority group children or economically disadvantaged children.

Provides opportunity for Governor to comment on prime sponsorship applications and provides appeal procedure for applicants who are disappointed.

The sponsors want to particularly emphasize that as the bill is considered they intend to invite the testimony of representatives of Federal, State, and local government, as well as other experts, with respect to the best allocation of responsibility among various levels of government which will insure parental involvement, local diversity to meet local needs and appropriate State involvement to assure coordination and maximum utilization of available resources.

Section 105

Child and Family Service Councils.—Sets forth composition, method of selection, and functions of councils. Half of members must be parents, selected by parents of children served by programs under the Act. The remaining members appointed by the prime sponsor in consultation with parent members, to be broadly representative of the general public, including representatives of private agencies in the prime sponsorship area operating programs of child and family services and at least one specialist in child and family services. At least one-third of the total council to be economically disadvantaged.

A state prime sponsor must establish councils at the state level and for each local service area. Parent members of the state council to be selected by parent members of local councils.

Council approves goals, policies, action and procedures of prime sponsors, including planning, personnel, budgeting, funding of projects, and monitoring and evaluation.

Section 106

Child and Family Service Plans.—Requires that prime sponsor submit plan before receiving funds. Plan must "provide that programs or services under this title shall be provided only for children whose parents request them"; identify needs and purposes for which funds will be used; give priority to children who have not reached six years of age; reserve 65 percent of the funds for economically disadvantaged children, and priority thereafter to children of single parents and working mothers; provide free services for children of families below the Bureau of Labor Statistics lower living standards budget and establish a sliding fee schedule based on ability to pay for families above that income level; include to the extent feasible, children from a range of socioeconomic

backgrounds; meet the special needs of minority group, migrant, and bilingual children; provide for direct parent participation in programs, including employment of parents and others from the community with opportunity for career advancement; establish procedures for approval of project applications with priority consideration for ongoing programs and applications submitted by public and private non-profit organizations; provide for coordination with other prime sponsors and with other child care and related programs in the area; provide for monitoring and evaluation to assure programs meet federal standards; where possible, supplement funds provided by this Act with assistance from other sources.

Requires that the Governor, all local education agencies, Headstart and community action agencies have the opportunity to comment on the plan.

Establishes appeal procedures if plans are disapproved.

Section 107

Project Applications.—Provides for grants from prime sponsor to public or private organizations to carry out programs under the prime sponsor plan pursuant to a project application approved by the CSFC.

The project applicant must establish a parent policy committee (PPC), composed of at least 10 members with 50% parents of children served by the project, at least one child care specialist, and other representatives of the community approved by the parent members. The PPC must participate in the development of project applications and must approve basic goals, policies, action and procedures of the applicant, including personnel, budgeting, location of center, and evaluation of projects.

The application must: provide for training and administrative expenses of the PPC; guarantee free services for economically disadvantaged children with fees according to the fee schedule for other children; assure direct participation of parents and other family members, including employment opportunities; provide for dissemination of information on the project to parents and the community; and provide opportunities for the participation of children, regardless of participation in nonpublic school programs.

Section 108

Special Grants to States.—Authorizes special grants to the states, on approval of Secretary, to establish a child and family services information program to assess goals and needs in state; to coordinate all state child care and related services; to develop and enforce state licensing codes for child care facilities; and to assist public and private agencies in acquiring or improving such facilities. A state must establish a Child and Family Services Council to receive a special grant.

Section 109

Additional Conditions for Programs Including Construction or Acquisition.—Allows federal funding for construction or acquisition only where no alternatives are practicable, and provides federal funding for alteration, remodeling, and renovation. Provides that no more than 15% of a prime sponsor's funds may be used for construction; that no more than half of that may be in the form of grants rather than loans, limited to public and private non-profit agencies, organizations, and institutions.

Section 110

Use of Public Facilities for Child and Family Service Programs.—Requires that federal government and prime sponsors make available for child and family service programs facilities they own or lease, when they are not fully utilized for their usual purposes.

Section 111

Payments.—Provides 100% federal share for planning in FY 1976, 90% federal share for fiscal 1977 and 1978, 80% for subsequent fiscal years. Provides 100% federal share for programs for migrants and Indians, and allows waiver of part of all of non-federal share where necessary to meet needs of economically disadvantaged children.

Non-federal share may be in cash or in kind. Revenues generated by fees may not be used as non-federal share but must be used by prime sponsor to expand programs.

TITLE II—STANDARDS, ENFORCEMENT, AND EVALUATION

Section 201

Federal Standards for Child Care.—Authorizes a national committee on federal standards, with one-half parent participation, to establish standards for all child care services programs funded by this or any other federal act. The 1968 Interagency Day Care Requirements would continue to apply until such standards are promulgated, and any new standards must be consistent with the 1968 Requirements.

The Secretary must submit the proposed standards for approval to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Education and Labor. No prime sponsor or project applicant is allowed to reduce services below these standards.

Section 202

Development of Uniform Code for Facilities.—Requires a committee to develop a uniform minimum code dealing with health and safety of children and applicable to all facilities funded by this Act.

Section 203

Program Monitoring and Enforcement.—Requires the Secretary through The Office of Child and Family Services, to establish an adequately trained staff to periodically monitor programs to assure compliance with the child care standards and other requirements of the Act.

Section 204

Withholding of Grants.—Provides procedure for withholding of funds to programs which have failed to comply with standards or requirements of the Act.

Section 205

Criteria With Respect to Fee Schedule.—Requires Secretary to establish criteria for adoption of the schedule based on family size and ability to pay with considerations for regional differences of the cost of living. The criteria must be submitted for approval by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Section 206

Evaluation.—Requires the Secretary to make annual evaluations and report to Congress on federal child family services activities.

TITLE III—RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATIONS

Section 301

Research and Demonstration.—Authorizes child and family services research and requires that the Office of Child and Family Services coordinate research by federal agencies.

TITLE IV—TRAINING OF PERSONNEL FOR CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

Section 401

Preservice and Inservice Training.—Provides for training of personnel, including volunteers, employed in programs assisted under this Act.

Section 402

Technical Assistance and Planning.—Provides technical assistance to child and family services programs.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 501

Definitions.—Defines terms used in the Act.

Section 502

Nutrition Services.—Requires that procedures be established to assure adequate nutrition services in programs under the Act, including use of Section 13 (special food service programs) of the School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act.

Section 503

Special Provisions.—Anti-discrimination provisions, including separate provisions on sex discrimination. Requires that programs meet the minimum wage. Prohibits use of funds for constructing, operating, or maintaining facilities for sectarian instruction of religious workshop.

Section 504

Special Prohibitions and Protections.—States that "Nothing in this Act shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional, physical, or other development of their children. Nor shall any section of this Act be construed or applied in such a manner as to permit any invasion of privacy otherwise protected by law, or to abridge any legal remedies for any such invasion which are otherwise provided by law."

Section 505

Public Information.—Requires that all applications, plans, and written material pertaining thereto be made available to the public without charge.

Section 506

Repeal or Amendment of Existing Authority and Coordination.

Section 507

Acceptance of Funds.

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF TRAVEL AGENTS

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, last month the American Society of Travel Agents—ASTA—held its 45th World Travel Congress in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. More than 5,000 delegates from over 100 countries attended.

By all accounts it was a very successful congress, and the person largely responsible for its success was Mr. Robert McMullen, the ASTA president.

Mr. McMullen has appeared before my Subcommittee on Foreign Commerce and Tourism many times on behalf of the ASTA. On each occasion his insights and recommendations have been most helpful to the committee.

Mr. President, of the many benefits travel offers, none, in my judgment, is more important than its ability to increase mutual understanding among people, and enrich the quality of their lives.

But if a tourist is to realize these benefits, he must, first and foremost, have a trip which is free of scheduling worries, faulty hotel reservations, and the thousand and one other details so necessary for a successful trip.

And it is in this capacity the travel agents perform such a valuable service to millions of people throughout the world.

A travel agent must be part transportation expert, part hotelier, part entertainment guide, and most essentially, part mindreader.

Because travel agents provide such an important service, and because the quality of their leadership is so admirable, I believe the Members of the Senate and the traveling public will be interested in the report to the ASTA membership which President McMullen delivered at the 45th World Travel Congress in Rio de Janeiro.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. McMullen's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT 1975

Good Morning. It has been an eventful year, an exciting year and a rewarding year. There have been touching moments and inspiring ones. There have been exasperations and frustrations and I am sure as I review the record that you will agree with me that while a great deal has been accomplished . . . there is much more work to be done.

Let me report some of our major activities. Assuring adequate levels of compensation for travel agents in connection with the sale of all forms of travel and related services has been and will continue to be one of the principal priorities of ASTA.

During this last year, substantial progress has been made in improving compensation levels, especially with respect to the sale of international and domestic air transportation.

On the international front, as a result of the courage and initiative shown by Pan American World Airways in breaking with IATA, substantial progress has been made in obtaining interim relief in travel agent compensation and in eliminating illegal kickbacks, rebating and discounting. The cornerstone to eliminating these illegal practices is the effective enforcement of rules and regulations and the establishment of compensatory levels of compensation for travel agents.

ASTA is committed to continuing its support of those efforts designed to bring about a more realistic system of travel agent compensation based upon adequate point-to-point and override commission payments and the introduction of compensatory incentive payments.

On the domestic front, as a result of ASTA's persistent efforts, the CAB ordered the domestic air carriers to reinstate an eight percent commission level on the sale of family travel, and to apply that level of increased commission on the new excursion fares. Although these adjustments do not adequately compensate agents for the valuable services they perform, they must be retained and expanded on an interim basis. A study of agency costs will provide a basis for the periodic revision and restructuring of domestic commission levels to adequately compensate travel agents.

We have joined with other travel agency groups in the formation and support of a Commission Study Task Force. We seek, need and urge your personal and financial support of this study. There comes a time for commitment and that time is NOW!

As independent taxpaying business people, we travel agents are entitled to be protected