

U.S. Congress
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 118—PART 11

APRIL 19, 1972 TO APRIL 26, 1972

(PAGES 13301 TO 14556)

must be sought. However, one must ask what price will be paid for this to happen. At the very time when the Soviet Union is financing a massive offensive by the North Vietnamese against the ARVN and U.S. forces in South Vietnam, one must wonder if the Russians are truly desirous of improving relations in the world community.

In considering whether to ratify the treaties with Moscow and Warsaw, the opposition parties in Germany, the CDU/CSU, are asking many questions which it seems reasonable to have answered before so much is given away by the West German Government. The questions concern what secret deals, if any, were made between Bonn and Moscow? Are the German people getting any real concessions from the Communists for what they are giving up?

Simply by raising these questions, particularly by Dr. Barzel, the CDU leader in the Bundestag, and Hans Karl Filbinger, the inestimable Prime Minister of Baden-Württemberg, Moscow has already been compelled to make further concessions to the Brandt government lest the treaties fail entirely in the Bundestag. Given this situation, one must wonder what further concessions can be obtained by holding to a firm bargaining position. In this respect, I look forward to a lasting peace in Central Europe, one built on mutual respect and understanding.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MONDALE BEFORE PHI THETA KAPPA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech made recently by the distinguished and able Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE). I am particularly gratified to be able to place this speech in the RECORD, because it deals with an issue that is close to my heart—women's rights. The Senator from Minnesota has been a strong and dependable supporter of the women's rights measures which have come before the Senate in recent months: The equal rights amendment, the strengthening of the powers of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, and the antisex discrimination provisions of the Higher Education Act.

Senator MONDALE delivered this speech on Saturday, April 15, at the national convention of Phi Theta Kappa, a national honorary for junior college students, in Rochester, Minn.

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

REMARKS OF WALTER F. MONDALE

I hope that I won't offend half of my audience by telling you that I intend to talk about women today. I guess there's a double risk involved . . . the men may prefer not to hear about women at all . . . and the women may feel that the last person they want to talk to them about women is a man.

I'll take that risk, because it seems to me that over the years many of us have been guilty of ignoring the fact that women are at least half our constituency . . . that many of us have been talking and even acting . . . in Washington and in our own States

. . . as if men should and do run the country.

But a lot of consciousness-raising has been going on in the last couple of years. It is no longer possible for a politician running for election to ignore the serious and fundamental questions that the women's movement has raised about our society.

One thing that seems to get in the way of thoughtful discussions about women's rights is terminology . . . phrases like "consciousness raising" . . . there is a lot of confusion and even hard feelings about the language of the movement and its meaning.

For example, I personally don't believe that it is possible to be simply for or against "women's liberation" or "the movement" because these terms mean so many things to so many different people. In talking to you today I hope I can avoid getting hung up on the language and concentrate on the substance.

We have made great strides in this country in recent decades toward eliminating the legal basis for discrimination against members of many groups . . . against blacks and other minorities . . . and against young people, by enacting the 18 year old vote. But we still have a long way to go to provide the same protection to the majority of our population . . . the 51 percent who are women.

Although in some quarters the women's movement prompts only humor and cynicism, the concerns that it addresses are neither funny nor trivial. Discrimination against women is a documented, proven fact in many aspects of American life and a cruel reality that mars the ambitions of untold numbers of American women.

The drive for women's rights is not a new phenomenon in this country. The Equal Rights Amendment was first introduced in the U.S. Congress in 1923 . . . nearly 50 years before its passage by the Senate last month. The passage of the 19th Amendment guaranteeing women the right to vote in 1919 was the result of a long and arduous campaign.

What is new is the widespread and growing recognition that our so-called "free" society has erected many barriers . . . legal and social . . . to the exercise of rights by a majority of its citizens.

The Equal Rights Amendment will go a long way toward rectifying these legal inequalities between men and women. It will strike down laws that have required a woman to serve in prison longer than a man convicted of the same crime; that have provided women with inferior medical and insurance benefits; that have barred women from serving on juries and from being hired to do certain jobs. Some opponents of the Amendment contend that the "equal protection" clause of the 14th Amendment already provides all of the legal protection needed by women. Yet in 200 years, the Supreme Court has not enunciated the application of the amendment to discrimination against women, except in one narrow case.

I cosponsored the Equal Rights Amendment and voted against all attempts to weaken it because I believe that a piecemeal approach to the fundamental question of providing equal rights is not enough. We could go on striking down archaic, discriminatory laws in our courts and state legislatures for years and years and still not complete the job. And as long as one discriminatory law stands we could not truly say that all human beings have equal rights in our society.

The Equal Rights Amendment was not the only important "women's legislation" to come before Congress in this session. Another measure which I cosponsored was an antisex discrimination amendment to the Higher Education Act. This provision is important because it would bar discrimination against women in almost all educational activities . . . not just on the college level. Many studies show that women have not received

a fair chance in college admissions or scholarships . . . or in faculty employment, promotions and salaries.

Our own University of Minnesota has admitted to a less than perfect record in this area. A study of women graduate students and faculty members in the 1969-70 academic year showed that there were no women on the faculty at all in the departments of music, anthropology, psychology and history . . . all of which had substantial female graduate enrollments . . . and only one woman in the departments of geography, political science, sociology and journalism . . . which also had large numbers of women enrolled on the graduate level.

A study by a Congressional committee found that the number of women applying to medical schools increased by more than 300 percent between 1929 and 1960. Applications from men in the same period went up only 29 percent. Yet the percentage of women applicants who are accepted into medical school actually declined.

The provision aimed at eliminating discrimination against women in education is now before the joint conference committee of Senators and Representatives. I am hopeful that it will be approved. If it is, sex discrimination will no longer be permissible on any level of education . . . preschool, elementary and secondary, professional, junior colleges, and vocational schools or graduate institutions. The one exception would be private undergraduate colleges. The Commissioner of Education would be required to study the extent of sex discrimination in these schools and indicate to Congress a year later whether he believes that the legislation should be extended to them.

Another major area where women face discrimination is employment. Statistics show that women often earn less than their male counterparts in many jobs. In 1969, one Congressional committee found 35 percent of male full-time workers earned \$10,000 or more per year while only 5 percent of women earned \$10,000 or more.

The federal, state and local civil services are among the offenders discriminating against women. In the U.S. Office of Education in Washington, men earn an average of twice as much annually as women.

And we all know that there are many jobs which simply have not been open to women in the past although being a man was not necessarily a requirement for them. Although we have had girl pages in the U.S. Senate since April, 1971, the House of Representatives still does not have any. Law and medicine and some of the other professions have traditionally not welcomed women . . . often denying them entrance to educational institutions on the grounds that they might marry and not finish their course of study.

It is heartening to see that women have begun to fight these injustices on an individual basis. In Philadelphia, three women have started a law firm together. Why? As one of the lawyers put it: "When I started hunting for jobs there was one guy who wouldn't even look at my resume . . . He told me his partners wouldn't work with a woman."

But not every woman law graduate can find the capital to start her own firm. The problem is so serious and so widespread that women require a strong guarantee of access to any job and to the salary and other benefits that derive from it. For several years that Federal Equal Employment Opportunities Commission has been looking into the question of discrimination against women in employment. But even when discrimination was found, the EEOC lacked the power to do anything about it. I am proud to say that in this session the Congress recognized that without enforcement power, EEOC would never be a meaningful force in the fight against discrimination.

We approved legislation that will . . . for the first time . . . allow the agency to seek

an order from a federal court against an employer or union that discriminates. In addition, the legislation will extend EEOC jurisdiction to cover employees of state and local governments . . . for the first time.

I have been proud to support all of these major legislative efforts on behalf of women in the current session of Congress. Another legislative effort that unfortunately did not meet with the same success was the bill I sponsored to make preschool education and quality day care available to American families who need them.

The President's veto of day care legislation in December represents a failure to recognize very basic changes that have come about in the role of the family, the role of women, and in American society in general in recent years. There is an unmistakable trend toward having both parents in a family work:

In 1971, 43 percent of the nation's mothers worked outside the home, compared to 18 percent in 1948;

One out of every 3 mothers with preschool children is working today compared to one out of eight in 1948;

Fewer than 700,000 licensed day care opportunities exist to serve the over 5 million preschool children whose mothers work.

And what of the rights of the children of these working parents? Are we to accept the fact that they are often left in the care of other, somewhat older children? Or that they become "latchkey" children with no home and no adult to turn to in case of an emergency during the day? What of their right to get three decent meals a day and to receive the regular attention of a doctor? We cannot abandon these children.

I believe that the provision of dependable, quality day care is so important that I have introduced a new, compromise version of last year's bill. I have sincerely tried in this new legislation to meet the objections raised by the President in his veto message; and I hope that this year the bill will meet with success.

Perhaps if we had more women in Congress the interest of women in the general population would be better represented. We have only one woman Senator—Margaret Chase Smith—and 11 women Representatives—out of 435. It was 1917 before a woman was elected to serve in the U.S. Congress. And this year . . . 1972 . . . when women members of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland complained that no women had been named to head legislative committees . . . the leadership responded by creating a Ladies Rest Room Committee and appointed one of their number to head it.

But in politics as in the other areas I have discussed women have been victims of the stereotype that members of their sex are best suited to volunteer work . . . or to clerical and secretarial jobs.

I call attention to the underrepresentation of women in politics because it illustrates the need for the reforms the National Democratic Party is making to encourage greater representation of both women and young people . . . and I am most encouraged by the signs that women are demanding and gaining a more influential role in politics in Minnesota.

In politics, in education, in employment and legal practices we have made a very significant start in providing legal justice to women. In the context of your broad study of government and ideology, I think it could be said that government has begun to respond . . . that as the ranks of concerned women have grown and as they have exercised their influence on the political system, legislators have begun to respond.

But we have a long way to go . . . starting with the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment by 38 States before it can become effective. As we work toward implementing this and other legislation . . . I

believe that all Americans . . . not just women . . . will be encouraged to become more sensitive and humane individuals, aware of each other's differences but respectful of them.

I agree fully with the conclusions of Virginia Allen, Chairman of the President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities, who wrote to the President in 1969:

"Equality for women is unalterably linked to many broader questions of social justice . . . (what is needed) is a national commitment to basic changes that will bring women into the mainstream of American life. Such a commitment . . . is necessary to healthy psychological, social and economic growth of our society."

JUST TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the McClatchy newspapers of California have used irony to illustrate the Navy's cavalier handling of \$400 million.

The April 10 editorial in the Sacramento Bee, the Fresno Bee, and the Modesto Bee recount the problem of the "hot" money burning a hole in the Navy's pocket. The editorial ends with two pithy sentences:

Cynics will ask why the fuss anyway.
After all, it is only taxpayers' money.

Taxpayers, who have been paying until it hurts too much, are becoming concerned. And they well might. Their threshold of pain is becoming lower.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the McClatchy newspapers' editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

OH, WELL, IT IS JUST TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Around the government bureaus in Washington, D.C., when there is heavy spending in June the explanation is that the agency is getting rid of its "hot money."

The money is not "hot" in the usual criminal sense where it is illegally acquired, although some disgruntled taxpayers may claim it was extracted practically at gun point.

June is the last month of the fiscal year and the funds must be spent or returned to the treasury. In addition, if too much money is in the till, some economy-minded members of Congress might get the idea the agencies could get along with less in their new budgets.

Now a controversy is going on as to whether the Navy is getting rid of \$400 million in "hot money" between now and June 30 or whether the expenditure eventually will prove a saving.

In any event, Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, chief of naval operations, sent a memo to Adm. Isaac C. Kidd, chief of naval materiel, and nine other top Navy officers, suggesting the field in which spending could be accelerated.

Zumwalt expressed fear that unless the money was spent the Navy budget for next year would be cut.

US Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., told an economic subcommittee he was shocked that the military in general is doing its best to "spend, spend, spend" in the face of a \$38 billion national deficit.

Adm. Kidd said it was no such thing because everybody knows inflation is causing materials to go up and if purchases are put off they simply will cost more later. He has given assurances the money will be spent properly and effectively.

Cynics will ask why the fuss anyway.
After all, it is only taxpayers' money.

U.S. FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on April 12, I introduced S. 3488, a bill to provide for a 2-year tour of duty in the United States, but outside of Washington for U.S. Foreign Service officers. The bill would, I believe, make several positive contributions to the FSO's and to the people of the United States. It would provide challenging and professionally rewarding assignments for Foreign Service officers in place of duties in Washington which often underutilize their talents and training. I would provide a highly skilled supplement to the staffs of local and State governments and other public institutions. Finally, it would help to re-acquaint FSO's with their own country and provide a new means of directly informing Americans about problems of foreign policy.

I believe that an article by John Crutcher, Office of Economic Opportunity, and a longtime observer of American diplomats at home and abroad, supports the concept behind S. 3488. I commend this article, which appeared in the Department of State Newsletter, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE FSO AND THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

(By John Crutcher)

In the past 20 years, as a frequent visitor to an assortment of chanceries around the world, I've had an opportunity to pick the brains of FSO's of every grade and description. They are almost invariably stuffed with facts, figures and reliable and valuable opinions about their host country.

Sometimes, though, I've found myself answering more questions about the United States than I asked about the country being visited. This is most likely to occur in more isolated posts than, say, in Western Europe.

After a succession of billets in the Foreign Service, many of the more discerning FSO's develop a feeling of isolation from their homeland—and for good reason.

A conscientious Foreign Service Officer will make every effort to immerse himself in the history, politics, culture, customs and traditions of his assigned country. In the process of doing this, he has scant time for in-depth attention to developments in the United States. What reading is done tends to be concentrated on matters directly related to foreign policy.

Interestingly, most FSO's do not feel isolated from their homeland while overseas. They read, on the whole, a variety of U.S. publications representing a good range of domestic activity. There is always the sound of the mother tongue around the Chancery, and a busy social schedule with conversation often dwellings on domestic developments.

Not until they return to the United States do they realize how great has been the gap between concept and reality and the superficiality of their comprehension of events in their own country.

Of course, such misapprehension varies somewhat by station. Those lucky enough to be stationed in Western Europe, where attitudinal patterns of every sort more nearly resemble those of the United States, are likely to have the least jolt upon return. But whether stationed in Paris or Nepal, there is always, to varying degree, a developing gulf between the apprehension of domestic developments and the reality of attainment.

How can it be otherwise?

We live in the most profoundly revolu-