

U.S. CONGRESS

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 6

MARCH 17, 1971, TO MARCH 25, 1971
(PAGES 6807 TO 8258)

FINDING PREVALENT

This kind of research finding—spectacular early results that peter out after a few years is prevalent in early childhood education. The most notable example is Head Start, where gains in 4- and 5-year-olds seem to fade away until it becomes impossible to tell Head Start alumni from other first and second graders in terms of achievement.

Some skeptics interpret this to mean that early education isn't all that it's cracked up to be. They suggest that early education, at great cost and effort, simply teaches children things that they would pick up later on their own, anyway.

Others say the gains are real and important and perhaps unduplicatable later on, when the child is older. But, they say, it is naive to suppose that the gains can be sustained forever when the child is shunted into a society that doesn't follow up on his special training.

EXAMPLE CITED

For his part Schaefer has concluded that "a brief, child-centered tutoring program will have minimal effect in the long run."

He points to the work of P. Levenstein, an early childhood researcher, who visited the parents of his small subjects an average of 32 times over a seven-month period. He left 28 different books and toys with the parents, explaining how they were used and urging the parents to use them in playing with the children.

When he tested the experimental group against a control group, a 17-point IQ gap had opened up. In other words, Levenstein got the exact result Schaefer did, only much easier, by concentrating on the parent rather than on the child. Schaefer's result took 21 months, not seven; more than 300 hours of tutoring per child instead of 32 conferences with parents; and cost of more than \$2,000 per year per child.

The moral, according to Schaefer, is that the family—not the school or day care center or tutor—holds the key to the child's development.

\$7 TO \$70 FOR FAMILY

"But what are we doing about the family? The day care budgets I've seen all spend about \$2,000 a year per child and anywhere from \$7 to \$70 of this—and usually less than \$20—is spent on involving the parents."

Schaefer and others believe that expanding knowledge about the first years of life should be used not to teach the child, but to teach the child's parents how to do a better job of rearing him for maximum development.

They reason that once one generation of parents is taught more sophisticated child-rearing techniques, the job would be done. The techniques would be absorbed into the culture, since parents tend to rear their children much as they themselves were.

ARTHUR GODFREY'S OPPOSITION TO THE SST

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, we have recently heard from Mr. Arthur Godfrey, an entertainer, concerning why we should not build an SST. Recently I was among a number of Senators and Representatives who received a letter from Mr. Godfrey outlining his views.

His opposition to the SST seems to involve three points.

First. We should not build an SST because Arthur Godfrey does not feel people need to travel fast.

Second. We should not build an SST because it would benefit civilians more directly than it would benefit the military.

Third. We should not build an SST

because it might be used by some "rich slob"—the words are Mr. Godfrey's.

Without pausing to explore the planted axioms which prop up Mr. Godfrey's rickety reasoning, I want to share with the Senate a reply sent to Mr. Godfrey by the original recipient of Mr. Godfrey's letter—Mr. James H. Straubel, executive director of the Air Force Association.

So that all Senators may ponder this exchange, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Godfrey's and Mr. Straubel's letters be printed in the RECORD.

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

New York, N.Y.,
March 4, 1971.

Mr. JAMES H. STRAUBEL,
Air Force Association,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: It is with sincere regret that I feel obliged to write this letter. I am just in receipt of your memo of February 22 describing the position of the AFA with regard to the SST.

As Chairman of the Coalition Against the SST, I am scheduled to testify before the Senate Committee on Wednesday, March 10. Regrettably, I find this affiliation conflicts with the position taken by the AFA.

Let me say this: If the SST were being developed by the Air Force strictly for military purposes, I would be the first to support it. But it isn't. It is proposed only as a commercial, civilian vehicle which we need in this world about as much as we need another load of those rocks from the moon. I am unalterably opposed to it not only because it adds to the pollution of the ecosphere, however slightly, but principally because at a time when so many other things should take unchallenged priority, this industrial play toy becomes something akin to an obscenity. Who in the hell needs to get wherever it's going so damn fast? To transport military personnel and logistics would be one thing, but to accommodate some rich "jet set" slob who wants to get to their aperitifs in Paris in half the time is ridiculous.

Not only that, but the airlines are admittedly already over expanded and in serious trouble and I'm doing everything I can to help alleviate that situation. I cannot speak for them officially, of course, but I'll bet you a plate of beans that they hope they'll never live to see it!

Sorry, Jim, but you just lost me.

Regretfully,

GODFREY.

AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1971.

Mr. ARTHUR GODFREY,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR ARTHUR: Your letter of March 4 on the SST, in response to our memo of February 22 on this subject, has been received. I respect you for expressing your views. Copies of your letter, I note, were sent to 21 distinguished Members of the Congress. I feel obliged, therefore, to send copies of this letter to them.

First off, you would go for a military SST, as I know you would, but you oppose this projected investment in advanced aeronautical technology for civilian purposes. I'm surprised at that. We seem quite willing to invest in military vehicles which become civilian airliners—to a great degree, at taxpayers' expense. So what's the big deal about reversing the process? Every major advance in technology strengthens our military posture. Let's not lose any advance we can get. The other team isn't sitting on its side rules.

At issue are two, that's all, two prototypes

of an advanced flying machine. For God's sake, let's get them and wring them out, for everybody's gain. That's all we ask.

And if I thought the SST program would do nothing more, as you put it, than "accommodate some rich 'jet set' slob," en route to Paris, I'd be the first to oppose the program. But who rides the jets today? A Time Magazine survey of 3,000,000 international air travelers tells us that one-third of them have "household incomes" (total family incomes) of less than \$10,000 a year. And 58 percent of them have "household incomes" of less than \$15,000 a year. Hardly "rich 'jet set' slob." And, Arthur, experience tells us that same thing will happen in supersonic travel. The question is—under whose flag?

Sure, the airlines are in bad times, right now. But, I repeat, this is an R&D issue. Two prototypes. That's all. And I have seen letters from the presidents of 12 airlines (Pan Am, American, TWA, Eastern, etc.) that say the airlines fully support the pending legislation. Unless they're lying through their teeth, which I choose not to believe, they want to see two prototypes of an American SST.

You ended your letter on a sad note, sad to me, at least. "You just lost me," you said. Arthur, I hope not. We can't afford to lose you—and, of all things, not for two prototypes of a new flying machine. Not in the face of Jimmy Doolittle's comment, which I believe in, namely: "the SST, of course, is a civilian project, but that's not the important point. In this day and age, any vote against advanced technology is a vote against military preparedness . . ."

Arthur, we just can't lose you on those terms.

Best regards,

JAMES H. STRAUBEL.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am happy to cosponsor the bill to extend the Economic Opportunity Act for 2 years, and to express my strong support for the Office of Economic Opportunity. I welcome the administration's endorsement of this action.

I think that OEO has made substantial progress in the difficult struggle against the grinding dehumanization of poverty.

We have made a good start, but the job is nowhere near done. If we do not continue to build on the base already established, we will not just stand still, we will lose the hard-fought advantages we have gained. Therefore we must commit ourselves to continuing the authorization for OEO and its programs. Having done that, we can act to strengthen the war on poverty.

I am also introducing today, with the bipartisan support of a number of Senators, an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act to create a nonprofit National Legal Services Corp. By improving the operation of the Legal Services program, we believe that the goals of the Economic Opportunity Act can be more effectively achieved.

In the near future, I shall offer another amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act to expand and strengthen child development programs. This amendment will be a significantly improved version of a similar child development measure which I introduced in the last Congress. This will also make the Economic Opportunity Act a more effective weapon in the battle against poverty.

In short, I support the extension of the Economic Opportunity Act because it continues work that is vital to our Nation's economic, social, and moral well-being. We all know that OEO is not perfect. Experience has taught us a number of lessons, and I hope we will be prudent enough to act with dispatch to correct deficiencies and improve effectiveness wherever possible. Above all, though, we must stand firm in our resolve to continue and expand our efforts to bring full human dignity to all Americans.

DAIRY PRICE SUPPORT LEVEL

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, American dairy farmers have been going out of business at a record rate. This has been happening despite the fact that milk and dairy products are the best source of life and vitality giving nutrients so badly needed by hungry people in America and in the world.

Secretary of Agriculture Hardin announced last Friday that the dairy price support level would remain at \$4.66. Last April, the Secretary set the dairy price supports at \$4.66 per hundred weight of milk. At that time, the dollar value amounted to 85 percent of parity. During the year, increasing farm costs caused it to drop to 80 percent of parity. At the present rate of \$4.66 per hundred weight and if present trends continue, by April 1, 1972, dairy supports would be as low as 75 percent of parity.

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) has introduced, and I am co-sponsoring, a bill, S. 1277, to provide that dairy price supports for the next dairy marketing year beginning April 1, 1971, be not less than 85 percent of parity. This would increase the support level from \$4.66 per hundred weight to close to \$5. It is important that this legislation be passed. It would merely retain the support level at the same percentage as was established a year ago—85 percent. Also, the present dairy pay prices to farmers are above the projected support level of 85 percent of parity. If the support prices are not increased from the present \$4.66, it is expected that milk prices will drop sharply. This could mean the loss of from \$3 to \$5 million in farm income during the next year. At a time when our national economy is suffering from cutbacks and unemployment and farm incomes have been steadily decreasing, a further drop in farm income will seriously affect rural Iowans and the cities and towns whose economy is directly affected by farm incomes. This legislation is necessary to protect the dairy farmer and provide him an opportunity for a more equitable return on his investment.

THE JAPANESE TEXTILE AGREEMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I was deeply disappointed last week when the President categorically refused to accept what I believe to have been a generous and even courageous offer on the part of the Japanese textile industry to voluntarily limit their exports of textile products into the United States.

I believe that there are, in fact, serious problems in international trade, and that the American worker is understandably and often rightfully fearful of a continued loss of American jobs in certain sectors of our industry.

However, as long as these extraordinarily complex and profound problems remain subservient to the politically motivated clamor for legislated textile quotas, we will continue to remain at an impasse, unable to look forward in responsible fashion to the solution of the real problems.

The unilateral agreement from the Japanese industry was a brilliant triumph for Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee. Surely no one in the Congress, and quite possibly no one in Washington, is so thoroughly versed on the promises and problems of our international trade situation.

He knows full well the fears of the workingman. He understands the changing nature of international competition which has, indeed, rendered irrelevant some of our textbook allegiance to the pure concepts of "free trade" and "comparative advantage." And Mr. MILLS is as aware as any man of our experiences in the 1960—the great benefits from the expansion of world trade brought on by the Kennedy round together with the increasing evidence that our leadership has often been a lonely one in seeking expanded trade through a reduction in trade barriers.

Yet Mr. MILLS knows, too, the futility of bestowing a great governmental subsidy in the form of legislated import quotas on one industry alone—especially when that one industry, by virtually every meaningful measurement of injury due to imports, has not begun to make a credible case.

Last year, the employment decline in all manufacturing, from December to December, was 6.3 percent—a great national tragedy, but a direct result of the administration's recessionary game plan. In the durable goods category, in fact, employment declined by a phenomenal 8.8 percent.

The decline in textile employment was about 3.6 percent—4.5 percent in textile mill products and 2.3 percent in apparel and other textiles—hardly evidence of unemployment directly attributable to imports in light of the overall recessionary unemployment.

The average monthly unemployment in 1970 for all manufacturing declined 3.9 percent from the preceding year. And by this measure as well, textiles were less affected by the recession than industry as a whole, suffering a 3.4-percent decline in textile mill employment and a 1.9-percent decline in apparel employment.

Surely these declines are cause for great alarm and concern. But to look to the Japanese for a scapegoat—for what is basically a catastrophe in domestic economic policies—is misleading and counterproductive.

What the textile lobby has complained most about in their quest for special congressional treatment is import penetration. I do not deny that penetration in manmade fibers has increased quite

rapidly from a very low base of only a few years ago. But to equate either a penetration rate or a percentage of imports over domestic consumption as injury is to open the door for a flood of protectionism such as this country has never seen.

This is the basis for Mr. MILLS warning that:

I cannot understand how under any circumstances a statutory proposal for the protection of a single industry can be developed which is exclusive of consideration of statutory programs for other affected industries.

Mr. President, how can I accept this case for statutory quotas on textiles when literally dozens of other industries are experiencing far greater penetration than textiles?

Do I urge quotas on automobiles, iron ore, bicycles, hides, tobacco, sewing machines, clocks, and all other products where imports constitute a greater percentage of consumption than for textiles? Or do I say to them how unfortunate it is that they were not in a position to have cut a political deal with this administration?

Mr. President, let us look at the facts of domestic penetration. As reported in the Ways and Means Committee print of June, 1970, the ratio of imports to consumption in manmade fibers was 4.6 percent in 1969.

Here is where the clamor lies—a penetration of less than 5 percent in the category which the textiles industry claims was being taken over by a flood of foreign imports.

Mr. President, let us compare this penetration with a number of other categories of goods where other nations are competitive with our own producers. This list is by no means complete, but I would ask Senators if they would care to erect statutory quotas on each of these goods—or to justify how we can eliminate foreign competition in textiles only.

Ratio of imports over domestic consumption, 1969

	Percent
Man-made fibers	4.6
Steel mill products.....	13.7
Paper industry machinery	7.7
Ceramic mosaic and wall tile.....	38.0
New passenger cars	19.0
Lead	54.0
Zinc	54.0
Stainless steel flatware.....	49.4
Crude petroleum	13.0
Fish	80.0
Mink skins	46.0
Clocks	21.0
Bicycles	29.0
Tobacco	36.0
Iron ore	32.5
Household glassware.....	40.4
Bauxite	87.0
Chrome ore	100.0
Mercury	40.0
Wood screws	58.0
Nails	44.6
Sewing machines	58.0
Calculating machines	60.0
Wigs	79.0
Microphones, loudspeakers	20.0
T.V. receivers; T.V.-radio-phono comb.	30.0
Tape recorders, dictation machines	64.0
Baseball gloves	92.0

The tragedy, which I feel deeply and personally, is that many of us with an enormous sense of concern for the plight of the working man have been put into the position of fighting against these