

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 121—PART 31

DECEMBER 11, 1975 TO DECEMBER 16, 1975

(PAGES 39861 TO 41102)

The insinuated qualifier, "on legislative matters," is best answered by looking at the mandate of the Internal Security Subcommittee. Indeed, by merely inspecting its full title. It is called "Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary."

A Congress that has suddenly become so alert to investigating the conduct of the executive agencies should not find this the appropriate moment to be indifferent to the administration of its own laws. Let alone to the necessity of new laws. During the period in question, the Senate subcommittee conducted extensive investigations into, for example, the human cost of communism in the Soviet Union, China,—and, Vietnam; an investigation of vital interest to everyone who wasted his heart and his mind wrestling with moral and geopolitical questions that tormented this nation. The committee examined rules of procedure and information for witnesses in respect of internal security, it revealed the legacy of the experiences of Alexander Orlov, examined Soviet disarmament propaganda, reported on the Weather Underground, went exhaustively into marijuana and hashish traffic, examined Soviet intelligence and security practices, reported on the long list of Fidel Castro's hemispheric subversion, and issued six studies on the awful problems of terrorism and counterterrorism.

The United States today is crushed by the dilemma brought to light by recent revelations involving the conduct of the FBI and the CIA. Both these agencies were set up by statute essentially for the purpose of guarding our internal security. "We are friends of liberty everywhere in the world," John Quincy Adams wrote, "but custodians only of our own." It is hard to imagine a moment when we have needed more than we do today hard facts on the basis of which to adjust the scales. What a curious moment to emasculate the only committee of Congress exclusively devoted to such tasks. Friends of Senator Hatfield would hope that he will reconsider, and are confident that he will reform himself.

INTERRELIGIOUS STATEMENT ON THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, as many of my colleagues are aware, the Child and Family Services Act is being subjected to an outrageous and totally dishonest propaganda attack.

As I pointed out in my speech in the Senate on November 19, 1975, 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 that earlier speech rebutting this attack, which appeared on pages 37380 through 37384 of the November 19 RECORD, I included material rebutting each of the allegations made in the widely circulated, unsigned flyer; an accurate summary of the Child and Family Serv-

ices Act, and a section-by-section analysis of the legislation.

Mr. President, today I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the public, an interreligious statement on the child and family services bill.

This statement, signed by 14 religious organizations who have reviewed this bill, represents a thorough and objective rebuttal of these outrageous and dishonest attacks. I ask unanimous consent that this interreligious statement be printed in the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and members of the public.

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

INTERRELIGIOUS STATEMENT ON THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES BILL

In December of 1971 both the House and the Senate passed the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971. Supported by a coalition of poverty and civil rights groups, labor unions, women's groups, churches, educators, and community and citizens organizations, the bill would have amended Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act "to provide every child (through age 14) with a fair and full opportunity to reach his full potential by establishing and expanding comprehensive child development programs." This bill was vetoed by President Nixon.

In February of 1975, Sen. Mondale (D-Minn.) introduced a very similar bill, S. 626, The Child and Family Services Act of 1975. Rep. Brademas (D-Ind.) introduced a companion bill (H.R. 2966) in the House. This bill would establish programs of part-day and full-day child care, prenatal care, special services for minority group children, food and nutrition programs, aid for handicapped children, and various types of assistance to families with special needs.

The Child and Family Services Act is now under attack by groups and individuals charging that it would give government undue authority over family life. In fact, some groups have charged that the proposed legislation would make the "government responsible for . . . the religious interests of your child," give "children the right to protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents," and make preschool education "compulsory" for all children beginning at age three.

These charges are totally inaccurate. There is nothing in this legislation that relates to religious preferences or religious instruction; nothing that relates to or alters the existing legal relationship between parents and their children; and nothing that provides for compulsory preschool education, or for compulsory service of any kind.

What it seeks to do, instead, is to strengthen and support families in their efforts to provide their children—on a totally voluntary basis—with the basic health, education and other services they want for them but too often cannot afford. Thus, it authorizes funding for a variety of child and family services including prenatal health care, medical treatment to detect and remedy handicapping conditions, and day care services for children of working parents.

Most importantly, any and all of these programs are totally voluntary, and limited to children whose parents request the services. Parent control is further assured by requirements that all programs would be selected, established and controlled by parents whose children participate in them.

A careful reading of the bill reveals that it will support families, not weaken them. The bill states, for example, 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 need for legislation of this kind is clear. The infant mortality rate in the United States is higher than that of thirteen 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 parents are working.

Debate over legislative proposals such as this Child and Family Services Act should be based on the facts, and decided on the merits. To do otherwise—to misrepresent the purpose and provisions of the legislation under discussion—is a disservice to all Americans concerned about families and children.

American Jewish Committee, Ms. Anne Wolfe, Director, Social Welfare.

Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Disciples Peace Fellowship.

Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Department of Church in Society, Division of Homeland Ministries.

Church of the Brethren, Washington Office.

Friends Committee on National Legislation.

National Conference of Catholic Charities, National Council of Churches.

Lutheran Children's and Family Services, St. Louis, Missouri.

National Council of Jewish Women, Mrs. Esther R. Landa, National President.

Network, Synagogue Council of America.

United Church of Christ, Center for Social Action.

United Methodist Church, Women's Division, Board of Global Ministries.

United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., Washington Office.

PAUL A. PORTER: A CAPITAL FIXTURE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Nation lost a great citizen and public servant with the tragic and untimely death recently of Paul A. Porter. Paul Porter, a close personal friend, and a friend of many in this body, was a Washington attorney of unexcelled ability who threw himself wholeheartedly into the public's business both in and out of government.

A lawyer, Office of Price Administration official, Federal Communications Commission chairman, Democratic Party leader, head of an economic mission to Greece and American representative on the Palestine Conciliation Commission after World War II, Paul Porter was a man of concern, compassion and dedication; I was proud to have been numbered among his friends.

Chalmers Roberts, a distinguished Washington Post columnist, wrote an excellent article on Paul Porter and his absorption with and contributions to public affairs. Robert brought to light his humor and dedication to public service. I would like to share his observations with my colleagues in the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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