

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 122—PART 18

JULY 1, 1976 TO JULY 21, 1976

(PAGES 21785 TO 23276)

CHILD ABUSE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would like to share with my colleagues a most interesting article on the subject of child abuse, which appeared in the *Chisholm, Minn., Free Press* recently.

The article concerns a speech by Dr. Robert W. ten Bensel, a University of Minnesota professor of pediatrics, at the annual meeting of the Minnesota State Medical Association.

Dr. ten Bensel, who teaches a course on child abuse, gave a most interesting presentation on the historical aspects of the problem.

Child abuse and neglect have been a major concern of the Subcommittee on Children and Youth, which I chair, for several years. As a result of subcommittee hearings and investigations, a National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect was created in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to support programs designed to prevent, identify, and treat child abuse and neglect.

One of the most important effects of the legislation has been to create a greater awareness of and dedication to responding to the needs of families who are involved in child abuse and neglect.

I think that Dr. ten Bensel's comments provide a valuable historical perspective on the subject and 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:

[From the *Chisholm (Minn.) Free Press*, May 22, 1976]

CHILD ABUSE NOT BYPRODUCT OF A CONTEMPORARY WORLD

ROCHESTER.—"Man's inhumanity to man," and most especially, his inhumanity to children, goes back a long way in history, according to a University of Minnesota professor of pediatrics. But conditions are getting better, he believes.

Although the reported cases of "battered child syndrome" are on the rise in Minnesota and in the rest of the United States, "We've come a long way," according to Dr. Robert W. ten Bensel, noon keynote speaker at the annual meeting of the Minnesota State Medical Association this week.

Dr. ten Bensel recounted the story of the bird who perpetually had a hole in his nest. When asked about it, the bird replied, "We like to lay eggs, but we don't like to raise kids."

Infanticide, the killing of children, goes back as far as history itself, the pediatrician said, with the 18th century being recorded as the "peak of physical discipline." The rule generally prevalent then, he said, was, "You could beat kids and break their bones, but you weren't allowed to kill them."

In 7000 B.C. babies were sacrificed in the walls of Jericho, and in India, girl babies were thrown in the river when the "ratio" was off. The prescribed ratio then was 10 males for every one female, and the "extras" were done away with, Dr. ten Bensel noted. He also told of instances in history where weak or deformed children were killed, so they would not be a disgrace to society.

Famous quotes from the Bible and early history served to foster the severe discipline notion, the doctor said. One such quote was, "Whoever strikes his father or mother should be put to death." Another has been, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it."

Dr. ten Bensel showed slides and gave

further historical perspective on the maiming and killing and the general abuse of children.

In times of famine, mothers butchered their own children and ate them.

In the early 1800's, abandonment of children in London was common practice, and in France, orphanages provided a "bin" with a "slot," similar to a garbage dumpster, where parents could come under cover of darkness and get rid of their unwanted children. Then, nuns from the orphanage supposedly would care for the children. Most often, however, the same children died within a year from malnutrition and lack of care. In the late 1880's, it became common, in Europe, for parents to intentionally maim and cripple their children to make them better "street beggars."

"So as you can see, things were much more severe than they are now. . . . Things are getting better," the physician added.

He said such devices as foot bindings for the Chinese, corsets on children, head bindings, and "swaddling," or the tight wrapping of babies to restrict their activities, were the actual forerunners of types of child abuse.

Almost all cultures used swaddling, he said, when parents had no time to care for the children. "They would simply swaddle the child in the blankets, and hang him up on a tree for the day. . . . Then he was no bother."

Dr. ten Bensel said the papoose boards and backcarriers that are now in vogue are in themselves, also a form of restraint for children.

However, when children were swaddled, and thus restrained, "At least they weren't beaten. When swaddling went out, it created a crisis. The parents had to deal with the kids, and then history began to change."

For 5,000 years, society thought that the best way to discipline children was to beat them, the speaker said. In the state of Minnesota, it is still legal for parents to punish their children with physical means, as long as it is not to excess.

Canes and whips were once very popular punishing devices, because of the "swishing" noise that went along with it, the physician said. In that way, it served as a form of conditioning at the same time.

"But we're moving into a new era," Dr. ten Bensel said. "We're accepting more and more that the young are the future makers and owners of the world."

AEROSOLS: THE DANGER TO OUR HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT CONTINUES

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, many of us are eagerly awaiting the scientific evidence that will prove without a doubt that halocarbon chemicals which are used as propellants in some aerosols are in fact depleting the ozone layer of the stratosphere. If we had such evidence, if it were even possible to obtain, I am sure many of us could easily vote to phase out aerosols which use these nonessential chemicals as propellants. What would the impact be?

Over three fourths of the aerosols which use halocarbons are hair sprays and deodorants of one type or another, the remainder are convenience household items such as pan sprays, home insecticides, and the like. These aerosols would soon be replaced by aerosols that merely use carbon dioxide or other propellant gases rather than halocarbons. The real loss to the public would be a spray which is just slightly less misty or fine, and the aerosol would have a tendency to be less pressurized as the container was close to empty—basically the two and only two

reasons for halocarbons being used in aerosols. I imagine the public would also find a greater number of roll-on and stick deodorants than before halocarbon aerosols were phased out. On balance, these losses are far from anything the Nation would regret for an increased assurance that their health and environment were better protected.

The National Academy of Sciences report on the ozone-halocarbon controversy was due in April, over 2 months ago. Then it was expected in late June, that passed as yesterday. Now I understand it will be later this summer.

Admittedly, we may not have that report prior to the Senate debate and vote on a "qualified ban" on halocarbon aerosols. However, we can very easily make that the Nation's policy on the control of aerosols and let the actual decision to ban aerosols using halocarbons be made by the appropriate Federal agency.

By a "qualified ban" I mean the amendment which several of my colleagues and I have joined in supporting to be offered during the debate on the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1976. A qualified ban would require the EPA Administrator to decide by a date certain whether or not sufficient evidence exists to uphold a ban on aerosols using halocarbons. Simply enough, if the evidence does not exist the Administrator waives or modifies that qualified ban. This approach has been taken in a number of statutes for the control of other practices, chemicals, and goods, and deserves serious consideration as a decisionmaking procedure in the control of aerosols that are widely claimed to be depleting the ozone layer of the stratosphere.

Moreover, considering the danger to our personal health and the environment, and the fact that we really do not need spray cans for underarm deodorants and the like because substitutes exist right now, the risk-benefit plays out in favor of controlling these chemicals.

The danger which these gases present to the ozone will probably be debated for years to come. We have all witnessed the long drawn out controversies over red dye, DDT, PCB's, and the like, and have ultimately found that environmental protection was warranted. I hope we come to the same reasonable conclusion in this case concerning the nonessential danger which aerosols pose to our safety.

I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the *Washington Post* this morning concerning the growing danger of aerosols using halocarbons be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *Washington Post*, July 1, 1976]
PROOF GROWING ON DANGER OF SPRAY CANS,
PANEL SAYS

(By Victor Cohn)

Scientists reported growing evidence yesterday that gases from aerosol spray cans may be damaging the ozone, the layer in the atmosphere that protects life on earth from the sun's most damaging rays.

But the question is not settled, said most of the members of a panel who summed up the findings of a conference at the National Bureau of Standards in Gaithersburg.

One panelist, Dr. Mario J. Molina of the University of California at Irvine, called for