

UNITED STATES

Congress



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 121—PART 32

DECEMBER 17, 1975 TO DECEMBER 19, 1975

(PAGES 41103 TO 42450)

of drinking and hits an adolescent who just happened to be up and around, full force across the mouth for no apparent reason, do we call it child abuse or alcoholism?" he asked.

Even more difficult to deal with is neglect. "For many adolescent children the necessities of life—food, clothing, shelter—are either denied or provided in a totally inadequate manner," Besharov said.

Then there's the problem of kids thrown out of the home, not just runaways, but kids literally locked out. "They don't get along very well with their parents, but yet they don't want to leave," he said. "Their parents, however, try to abandon them by extra-legal means."

When this happens to kids under 10, it's called "abandonment," he said. But, older children in this predicament are called "ungovernable . . . PINS (Persons in Need of Supervision)."

Sexual abuse is another prevalent aspect of the problem. "It occurs much more than we know," he said. "But, it's important to distinguish among different levels of sexual type behavior. Not all is abuse and neglect."

"Incest between parent and child is clearly a serious matter," he said. "But, I assume fondling goes both ways."

In order for parents—and society—to begin to deal effectively with adolescent abuse they must begin to understand why it happens.

"Parenting is easy when you have easy kids to raise," he said. "But when children start acting out, parents have limited responses and when they start acting out seriously, they have even more limited responses."

MEETING OF THE WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senate I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to the Vice President reporting on the meeting of the Assembly of Western European Union which I attended by his appointment be printed in the RECORD.

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

DECEMBER 16, 1975.

HON. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Vice President of the United States, President of the U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to your appointment it was my honor to represent the Senate and the Congress of the United States on December 1st and 2nd at the Assembly of Western European Union meeting in Paris. I addressed the Assembly on United States-European cooperation in space. In addition, there were meetings with the Chairman and members of the Assembly's Committee on Scientific, Technological and Aerospace Questions.

Both in my speech and in answers to questions from members of the Assembly, I emphasized that our civilian space program is based on full dissemination of information and open sharing of results. I stated that continued cooperation in space depends on each party paying its share of the costs. For example, this Nation is willing to bear the development costs of a launcher, but we expect full reimbursement of the direct and indirect costs of launching a satellite for the European Space Agency, one of its member countries, or any other country.

The Europeans were very interested in the initial efforts under way in the United States to explore generations of electricity in large satellites and then beaming it to earth. There are real possibilities here for joint research that should be explored.

There is considerable interest in Europe about the depletion of ozone in the upper atmosphere and a growing realization—which I stressed in my speech—that international cooperation is the only way to deal with this potentially worldwide problem.

During my brief stay in Paris, Mr. President, I also met with Roy Gibson, the Director General, and other officials of the European Space Agency. They briefed me on the progress of Spacelab, which ESA is developing to fly in the U.S. Space Shuttle beginning in 1980. Spacelab development is proceeding well. Program managers in Europe and here expect some problems to arise later in the mating of two such complex and advanced spacecraft as the Shuttle and Spacelab, but they are confident these difficulties can be overcome.

I also met with Professor Maurice Levy, President of the French Space Agency, and Michel Bignier, the Director General.

In conclusion, Mr. President, my visit to the Assembly of Western European Union was highly successful. Both the Europeans and I came away with a renewed awareness of the many opportunities available through continued cooperation in space. In this way we can expand our knowledge of the earth and the universe and also seek solutions to the problems of energy and environment that confront us on both sides of the Atlantic.

Sincerely,

FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senator.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES BILL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have spoken several times over the past few months about the dishonest propaganda campaign against the Child and Family Services Act.

I am pleased that a number of newspapers in Minnesota and across the country have investigated the charges contained in the widely circulated, unsigned flyer, and based on the results of their investigations, have written editorials clearly denouncing this dishonest attack.

I would particularly like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the public four of the editorials that appeared in the Minneapolis Star, the New Prague Times, the Minneapolis Tribune, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Minneapolis Tribune,
Dec. 12, 1975]

DAY CARE OPPOSITION VIRULENT—AND FALSE

"This bill . . . is being subjected to one of the most distorted and dishonest attacks I have witnessed in my 15 years of public service," said Sen. Walter Mondale in a Senate speech last month. The bill to which the Minnesota Democrat referred is one that would increase federal support for day-care programs. Mondale is the Senate sponsor, and Rep. John Brademas, D-Ind., is the sponsor of the House version. The attacks are contained in an anonymously, but widely, circulated flyer that seems to be part of a well-organized campaign to discredit the bill.

The flyer's main argument is that the Mondale-Brademas bill would take child-rearing out of the hands of parents and "would give the government, rather than the family the right to control child develop-

ment." To back that argument, the flyer cites passages from four-year-old issues of the Congressional Record—taking them out of context, sometimes piecing them together, never indicating that instead of being facts they are the unsubstantiated opinions of a previous day-care bill's opponents.

Even vigorous opponents of the Mondale-Brademas bill have denounced the flyer. A spokesperson for one opposition group noted that the flyer is counterproductive because its arguments are so easily discredited. They certainly are: The bill makes it clear that participation in any program would be strictly voluntary and that policies for both sponsors of day-care programs and the individual projects themselves would have to be set by councils on which parents would make up at least half the membership. Moreover, the bill would expressly forbid any interference with "the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents."

The need for more and better day-care programs is clear. According to the U.S. Labor Department's Women's Bureau, nearly 27 million youngsters under age 18 had working mothers last year, an increase of 1.2 million since 1970. About 6 million of those children were of pre-school age, but there were spaces in licensed day-care facilities for only about 1 million of them. And the number of children needing day care is growing faster than the facilities: By 1985, the Women's Bureau estimates, there will be 6.8 million mothers with children under age 5 either working or looking for work. The Mondale-Brademas bill would go a long way toward helping provide the care those children are going to need. We hope it isn't scuttled by the virulent—and false—campaign now being waged against it.

UNSIGNED CIRCULAR IS REplete WITH FALSEHOODS AND MISREPRESENTATIONS

Customarily when an anonymous letter is received at The Times, it is assigned forthwith to the round file, with or without reading. That is standard practice in newspaper offices.

However, an unsigned mimeographed flyer came to our attention recently which is being widely circulated throughout the country and which calls for refutation and repudiation. The mimeographed circular bears no name, no address and no source of identification. That in itself is reprehensible and lacking in courage of conviction. It is wholly a collection of misrepresentations and downright falsehoods.

The anonymous flyer castigates the proposed Child and Family Services Act of 1975 alleging, in brief, that this legislation would deprive parents of parental direction and control of their children and Sovietize the youngsters in some kind of communal system.

In a speech delivered before the United States Senate on November 19, Senator Walter F. Mondale of Minnesota, one of the sponsors of the bill in Congress, declared:

"Contrary to these unsigned allegations, the child and family legislation contains nothing that changes or affects the legal relationship between parents and their children. Instead, it simply offers to families—on a totally volunteer 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 rectify handicapping conditions, and day care 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(1), (2), section 106(b).

"In addition, this legislation is deliberately and carefully designed to provide parental 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."

In the Congressional Record of that day, Senator Mondale categorically listed and refuted each and every one of the allegations made in the anonymous circular, with citations from the wording of the Child and Family Services Act.

Anyone who has known and watched Fritz Mondale's career from his early activities in public affairs, through his service as Minnesota attorney general and now a United States Senatorship knows full well that he could not be a party to any such program as the anonymous circular falsifies. The people of Minnesota have demonstrated their confidence and trust in Walter F. Mondale by overwhelming majorities at each election in which his name has appeared on the ballot.

It is truly regrettable that able, honest and conscientious public servants who co-sponsored the Child and Family Services Act in the Congress must be subjected to such unfair, anonymous misrepresentation—but it appears that is the burden which we place upon them.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

ATTACK ON CHILD CARE

Four years ago this month, Congress sent to then President Nixon a bill that would have established a comprehensive national child care system by offering a wide range of educational, nutritional and medical services for preschool children. In vetoing it, Mr. Nixon described the legislation as "the most radical" bill to be passed by the Ninety-second Congress and claimed that it "would commit the vast moral authority of the national government to the side of communal approaches to child rearing against the family-centered approach."

In fact, of course, the bill would have done nothing of the kind. It would have made these services available to any American family that chose to use them, and while poverty-level families would have had access to them for free, all other families, which is to say a vast majority of Americans, would have been required to pay according to a sliding scale. Although federally-funded day care program for low-income families have been in existence for some time—indeed were ongoing at the time of Mr. Nixon's veto—no comprehensive child care system has been established.

Such services are envisioned in legislation introduced this year by Senator Mondale of Minnesota and Representative Brademas of Indiana, and like the earlier bill, the consequences of which Mr. Nixon so cruelly distorted, this one also is being subjected to venomous misinterpretation. Mr. Mondale describes the campaign to discredit the legislation as one of the most "dishonest attacks I have witnessed in my 15 years of public service."

Basically, the Mondale-Brademas bill is similar to the 1971 proposal and a successor which died in Congress the following year. It would authorize the Government to designate local or state "prime sponsors" to disperse federal funds for the support of a wide variety of child care programs, all of which would have to meet federal standards. "It is not enough," says Mr. Mondale, "simply to provide mind-numbing, custodial care for children while their parents work, or health and educational services that are third rate . . ."

A key provision of the legislation prohibits any infringement on 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." Despite this unequivocal language, a flyer is being distributed anonymously in many parts of the country accus-

ing the bill of attempting to "sovietize" education and turn the control of children over to the Government. As a result of the flyer, some congressmen report receiving as many as 700 letters opposing the bill.

Moreover the flyer contains a pastiche of citations from the *Congressional Record* on what opponents to the 1971 bill said then in congressional debate. This hodgepodge is presented not as opinion but as fact of federal policy, thusly: "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. . . . Furthermore, there is serious question that maybe we cannot trust the family to prepare young children in this country for the new kind of world that is emerging."

It would be highly unfortunate if such vicious attacks on the Mondale-Brademas bill were to interfere with a rational debate on its merits. The need for expanded child care services ought to be manifest. In 1974, for example, 34.4 per cent of all married women with children under six were employed, and the percentage of unmarried working mothers of preschool children was far higher. With time, these percentages will increase.

Making comprehensive child care services available to these women on a voluntary basis, while recognizing their ascendant rights as parents, strikes us as scarcely a surrender to any "communal" system. To the contrary it would seem sensible national policy.

[From the Minneapolis Star]

THE SABOTAGE OF CHILD CARE

Increased federal support for "child care," which includes day care but embraces a mix of services, is potentially one of the most significant social needs in a nation where more and more mothers with young children not only must, but want to, work. In general, we support it.

Unfortunately, the current state of the debate in Washington is one of confusion that began with President Nixon's veto in 1971 of a bill developed by Sen. Walter Mondale on the specious ground that it fostered "communal" as opposed to "family-centered" child care.

The decision to use any kind of child care, including the traditional reliance on grandparents, is, of course, voluntary. But since the veto an intense, virulent campaign has stirred up opposition to Mondale's current bill. For example, the false charge is made that, somehow, the bill would give children the legal right to disobey their parents!

The upshot is that the measure (coauthored by Rep. John Brademas, D-Ind.) is bogged down. If the proposal for a \$1.85-billion three-year program did pass, it would face a veto that probably couldn't be overridden. Mondale and his supporters could simply delay, or they could scale it down. But the tragedy is that the attacks, described by Mondale as the "most distorted and dishonest" he's seen during his public career, have made reasoned consideration impossible.

Isn't that lamentable when there are debatable aspects of the program that ordinarily would be ironed out? For example, on the role of schools, on the need for a full array of services. On the size of the price tag itself. Too, some supporters of day care centers doubt the need for a high ratio of staff to children, although Mondale fears overworked supervisors could provide only "mind-numbing custodian care" that would do more harm than good.

The fact is that child care and day care centers are here to stay. The federal government is already in the field with scattered programs. William L. Pierce of the Child Welfare League contends "a lot of it is a very lousy kind of care."

That's where the debate should start.

Granted, this isn't the best time to talk about more government spending on anything, but Mondale has a worthy cause that has been sabotaged by irrational attacks.

S. 1145, THE NATIONAL RECONCILIATION ACT

Mr. PHILIP A. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the able Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) be added as a cosponsor to S. 1145, a bill to provide amnesty to persons who failed or refused to register for the draft, refused induction into the armed services, or who were absent without official leave from the armed services during the Vietnam War era.

Mr. President, Senator BROOKE's decision to join with my colleagues, Senators ABOUREZK, GRAVEL, HATFIELD, MCGOVERN, NELSON, and me in cosponsoring this legislation to grant a general and unconditional amnesty to Vietnam war objectors is both welcome and heartening. Coming at a time when the question of amnesty seems to have moved from the public consciousness, I respect the careful thought and reflection which brought him to this decision. His support will be a valuable asset to all of us seeking to alleviate the suffering of those who, because of their objection to the Vietnam war, are still unable to live freely and fully in this country.

Notwithstanding the clamor of other issues, it is fitting that we pause on the amnesty question at this time of year. In yesterday's New York Times, James Reston asks us to consider "A Christmas Amnesty" and I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PHILIP A. HART. As Mr. Reston so aptly points out, both the President and the Congress have declined to give the plight of these men, our own refugees, even the same degree of consideration we have shown for the rights and liberties of citizens of other countries. He correctly chides us that this is unfinished business in the "urgent problem of how to bind up the Nation's wounds." Further, we are reminded that amnesty is scarcely without precedent in this country, and that it is no less needed or important several years after the fact than it is at the cessation of war. Our country is still not whole, and that is a tragedy when it is within our power to make it so.

Over these holidays, I would ask that my colleagues in the Senate put themselves in the shoes of those young men—some now not so young—and their families, for whom there has yet to be peace. And I urge that they follow the fine example set by my friend from Massachusetts in giving amnesty the serious consideration it demands.

The article follows:

[EXHIBIT 1]

[From the New York Times, Dec. 17, 1975]

A CHRISTMAS AMNESTY?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, Dec. 16.—Before we come to the end of the old year, and go on to cele-