



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, February 9, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Father Jerry McAndrews, S.J., superior at Loyola College, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, for those who have accepted freely the awesome responsibility of framing the laws of this Nation, we offer this prayer.

Let them remember that law serves to promote freedom, to give aid to the weak, to protect the innocent, to restrain the strong, to punish the guilty, and most important, it serves to unite Your people.

Let them not forget that all authority comes from You and that all just laws imitate and express Your will.

It is a will that creates rather than destroys; that is both just and merciful; that issues commands yet shows patience.

Finally, let them remember that law-makers are peacemakers, and that the fruit of justice is sown in peace by those who practice peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 5, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act so as to provide for an independent Federal agency for the supervision of federally chartered credit unions, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. BENNETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 13300) entitled "An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to provide for the extension of supplemental annuities and the mandatory retirement of employees, and for other

purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. PELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SMITH of Illinois, Mr. SCHWEIKER, and Mr. SAXBE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14733) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the program of assistance for health services for domestic migrant agricultural workers and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SAXBE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a compilation of the hearings, reports, and committee prints of the Senate Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations entitled "Planning-Programming-Budgeting."

THE LATE HONORABLE BEN FRANKLIN JENSEN

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) is recognized.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the Speaker and the Members of the House of the death of one of our former colleagues, the Honorable Ben Franklin Jensen. Ben, who represented the Seventh District of Iowa for 26 uninterrupted years, from 1939 to 1964, was stricken by cancer at the age of 77, and passed away here in Washington at the George Washington University Hospital on February 4.

Ben was the mentor and guide of my political life, and I looked on him as a second father. I worked under him as county chairman when he served in Congress, and it was with his blessing that I ran for his seat in 1966. His wise counsel and unflinching support will be sorely missed.

He is survived by his wife of 53 years, the former Charlotte Hadden, and a daughter, Mrs. Donald Fitzpatrick,

of Marblehead, Mass. He also leaves two sisters, a brother, five grandchildren, and a great-grandchild. On behalf of the Speaker and the Members of the House, I extend to all of them our deepest regret and sympathy.

Funeral services will be held Tuesday, February 10, at Exira, Iowa, where he will be buried.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent for a special order to be held at the close of business Tuesday, February 17, for the purpose of eulogizing our former colleague. During that hour, all those who wish to may join in paying tribute to Ben Franklin Jensen.

This country has lost a great American.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERLE. I am happy to yield to my distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to learn of the death of our former colleague from Iowa, a dear and valued friend of mine, Hon. Ben F. Jensen.

During his period of service in the House of Representatives from 1939 to 1965, Ben Jensen was a hard-working and dedicated Member. He was also one of the most colorful Members of the House. In debate, in discussing the issue, or issues, involved in a pending bill or matter, he expressed his thoughts and views in a direct and distinct manner.

Ben, as he was called with affection, was possessed of those rich qualities of life that makes up a nobility of character.

To those who enjoyed and possessed the friendship of Ben Jensen—they had a real friend, not one who was a surface, a wavering, or an expedient friend.

He was one of the Members who was wounded on March 1, 1954, when a militant group from Puerto Rico shot deliberately and recklessly at Members of the House then present, supposedly to dramatize the cause of Puerto Rican independence.

After his recovery from his wounds, and upon his return to the House, Ben Jensen told his colleagues, "No one can blame the people of Puerto Rico." This is an excellent example of the bigness of Ben Jensen.

It can be truly said of Ben Jensen that he was a great American, a dedicated legislator, and whose love of his fellow human beings, without regard to race, color, or creed, was evidenced during his lifetime in and out of the Halls of Congress.

Mrs. McCormack and I extend to Mrs. Jensen and her daughter, and other loved ones, our deep sympathy in her great loss and sorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to my distinguished minority floor leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Ben Jensen was a dear friend of mine. I join the gentleman from Iowa and the distinguished Speaker in expressing to Ben's family the deepest condolences of Mrs. Ford and myself.

It was my privilege for a number of years to serve on the Committee on Appropriations with Ben Jensen. He was a strong man on the committee. He was truly devoted to the responsibilities that he held on that important committee.

He was a man of convictions, and yet he was a man of compassion. He not only did what he thought was right, but also he would fight on the floor of this House for those issues and those views that he held so strongly.

It was my privilege also to know Ben socially and he was a delightful person. On many occasions I have talked with him, discussed matters with him not in a legislative way but from the point of view of what his views were and mine on the major problems that faced this country.

I had great admiration and respect for Ben Jensen and he had as many such friends on both sides of the aisle.

I was sorry to see Ben leave the House of Representatives. However, typical of Ben, he maintained a deep interest in community affairs and was a frequent visitor to the Capitol and to this Chamber where he was always welcome. Ben Jensen wrote a fine, outstanding record in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate and re-emphasize the loss of this country in a great citizen and a superb legislator, Ben Jensen.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SCHERLE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Ben Jensen was a colleague whom I admired and a friend I loved. In his bearing and attitude he represented the rugged Iowa soil from which he came. He was independent, strong, forthright, honest, and able. I saw him only a short time ago when he paid a visit to the Capitol. We had quite a long chat. He had lost some of the physical strength that characterized his appearance here on the floor, but he still had the old Ben Jensen spirit. He was truly an individual; he was different; he did not fit in a mold. He was a great man and a great Congressman. I have lost a real friend and the country has lost an outstanding servant.

I join with the gentleman from Iowa in extending to his loved ones my very deepest sympathy.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

I now yield to my colleague from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, there are so

many things that one who has been closely associated with Ben Jensen might say at a time like this, always beginning with the fact that he was a strong man and a Christian family man. Less well known to many Members is the fact that he was a creative individual, an inventor of a number of very useful things, and an artist as well, spending considerable time in his later years as a sculptor. Most important, I think, is the fact that the House of Representatives was Ben Jensen's life. To that institution he was completely dedicated. Although he was known throughout his political career as a conservative, Ben, from the beginning of his days in Congress, and especially as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, was indeed one of the leaders in resource development and conservation. In this Ben Jensen was a great leader and in this effort he will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Iowa for those kind words.

I deeply appreciate the generous comments and remarks of the Speaker of the House as well as the distinguished majority leader and my distinguished minority floor leader, as well as those of other Members. I will convey the messages to the survivors with deep respect and appreciation from all of the Members.

HEARINGS SET BY COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on January 26 I introduced, with the sponsorship of all members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, a resolution to amend the present requirements of House rule XLIV on financial disclosure.

The resolution was referred to our committee and I rise today to let members know that the committee has scheduled public hearings on the resolution to open Thursday, February 19, in the committee room, 2360 Rayburn Building.

The committee invites the views of Members of the House on the resolution and requests that you advise the committee staff if you desire to testify in person. If you prefer to submit a statement, rather than appear, simply forward it to the committee so that it may be included in the RECORD.

The committee welcomes also the views of other interested persons who may desire to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House will recall that when our committee submitted the present financial disclosure rule, it emphasized that experience probably would indicate the need for revision.

In the committee's view, the time has arrived for making the changes proposed

in the pending resolution. Our committee is unanimous in support of the proposed changes. It believes they are needed to strengthen the disclosure requirements.

The revision we recommend would require public disclosure: first, of the sources of honoraria of \$300 or more; and, second, of the sources of loans of \$10,000 or more for which no specific security was pledged and which were outstanding for 90 days or more in the calendar year covered.

The committee is hopeful that the hearings will develop a broad base of opinion concerning the provisions of House Resolution 796. Please advise the committee staff if you desire to be heard or submit a statement.

PROPOSED NEW OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-222)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

We live in a time when the technology of telecommunications is undergoing rapid change which will dramatically affect the whole of our society. It has long been recognized that the executive branch of the Federal government should be better equipped to deal with the issues which arise from telecommunications growth. As the largest single user of the nation's telecommunications facilities, the Federal government must also manage its internal communications operations in the most effective manner possible.

Accordingly, I am today transmitting to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1970, prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code.

That plan would establish a new Office of Telecommunications Policy in the Executive Office of the President. The new unit would be headed by a Director and a Deputy Director who would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The existing office held by the Director of Telecommunications Management in the Office of Emergency Preparedness would be abolished.

In addition to the functions which are transferred to it by the reorganization plan, the new Office would perform certain other duties which I intend to assign to it by Executive order as soon as the reorganization plan takes effect. That order would delegate to the new Office essentially those functions which are now assigned to the Director of Telecommunications Management. The Office of Telecommunications Policy would be assisted in its research and analysis responsibilities by the agencies and depart-

ments of the Executive Branch including another new office, located in the Department of Commerce.

The new Office of Telecommunications Policy would play three essential roles:

1. It would serve as the President's principal adviser on telecommunications policy, helping to formulate government policies concerning a wide range of domestic and international telecommunications issues and helping to develop plans and programs which take full advantage of the nation's technological capabilities. The speed of economic and technological advance in our time means that new questions concerning communications are constantly arising, questions on which the government must be well informed and well advised. The new Office will enable the President and all government officials to share more fully in the experience, the insights, and the forecasts of government and non-government experts.

2. The Office of Telecommunications Policy would help formulate policies and coordinate operations for the Federal government's own vast communications systems. It would, for example, set guidelines for the various departments and agencies concerning their communications equipment and services. It would regularly review the ability of government communications systems to meet the security needs of the Nation and to perform effectively in time of emergency. The Office would direct the assignment of those portions of the radio spectrum which are reserved for government use, carry out responsibilities conferred on the President by the Communications Satellite Act, advise State and local governments, and provide policy direction for the National Communications System.

3. Finally, the new Office would enable the executive branch to speak with a clearer voice and to act as a more effective partner in discussions of communications policy with both the Congress and the Federal Communications Commission. This action would take away none of the prerogatives or functions assigned to the Federal Communications Commission by the Congress. It is my hope, however, that the new Office and the Federal Communications Commission would cooperate in achieving certain reforms in telecommunications policy, especially in their procedures for allocating portions of the radio spectrum for government and civilian use. Our current procedures must be more flexible if they are to deal adequately with problems such as the worsening spectrum shortage.

Each reorganization included in the plan which accompanies this message is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of title 5 of the United States Code. In particular, the plan is responsive to section 901(a)(1), "to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;" and section 901(a)(3), "to increase the efficiency of the operations of

the government to the fullest extent practicable."

The reorganizations provided for in this plan makes necessary the appointment and compensation of new officers, as specified in sections 3(a) and 3(b) of the plan. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are comparable to those fixed for other officers in the executive branch who have similar responsibilities.

This plan should result in the more efficient operation of the government. It is not practical, however, to itemize or aggregate the exact expenditure reductions which will result from this action.

The public interest requires that government policies concerning telecommunications be formulated with as much sophistication and vision as possible. This reorganization plan—and the executive order which would follow it—are necessary instruments if the government is to respond adequately to the challenges and opportunities presented by the rapid pace of change in communications. I urge that the Congress allow this plan to become effective so that these necessary reforms can be accomplished.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 9, 1970.

EXEMPT POTATOES FOR PROCESSING FROM MARKETING ORDERS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 817 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 817

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2214) to exempt potatoes for processing from marketing orders. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTI), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 817 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of S. 2214 to exempt potatoes used for processing from marketing orders.

The purpose of S. 2214 is to exempt from the coverage of Federal marketing orders, for a period of 2 years following the date of enactment of this legislation, potatoes used for dehydrating, chipping, or other processing, and thereby affording these potatoes the same treatment

provided potatoes used for canning and freezing.

At the present time the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended in 1946, provides an exemption for canning potatoes and freezing potatoes.

S. 2214 merely extends the same exemption to potatoes used in the dehydration process, a relatively new technique, which is growing in importance every year. Since the marketing order law has historically recognized the distinction between fresh agricultural commodities and those used for processing, the exemption being sought is no different from exemptions allowed under present law.

From the viewpoint of equity, too, the proposal cannot be denied, for the various methods of processing compete in business with each other. It is only fair that the same rules apply to all three processors. To deny dehydrators and other processors the exemption now enjoyed by canning and freezing processors would mean the continuing grant of an unfair advantage to the latter in their competition for the national market.

Although the Committee on Agriculture did not feel that the enactment of the bill would weaken marketing orders, an automatic review of the effect of the legislation was provided by the 2-year limit for this new exemption.

There is widespread grower support for this legislation, and the Committee report is explicit in stating that approval of this legislation does not establish a precedent for other products or for potatoes that are not processed.

A most welcome aspect of the proposed legislation is that its enactment will result in no added costs to the Government. In fact, it may mean some savings in Government expenditures because of the reduction in administrative services within the Department of Agriculture which is likely to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 817 in order that this House may consider and pass S. 2214, a bill which certainly is not a "hot potato."

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to exempt from the coverage of Federal marketing orders, potatoes used for dehydrating, chipping, or other processing operations.

Historically, Federal marketing order law has recognized the distinction between fresh agricultural commodities and those grown to be processed. With respect to potatoes, the original 1937 Marketing Agreement Act provided an exemption for potatoes to be used in canning. A further exemption for freezing was added in 1946 when that process was perfected. Now another exemption is needed to keep the industry up to date with dehydration and other newly perfected processes.

The exemption is for a 2-year period. The Department of Agriculture has advised that no increased cost to the Government will result from passage of this legislation; it is not too happy with

the bill, believing it will reduce the effectiveness of marketing orders in view of the increasing quantities of potatoes going into exempted uses.

There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill—S. 2214—to exempt potatoes for processing from marketing orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, S. 2214, with Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself whatever time I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, S. 2214 is needed to update the National Marketing Order Act of 1937 as it applies to potatoes. When the act was first passed, all fruits and vegetables for canning were exempt from marketing orders. The reason that only canning was mentioned was because canning was the only major method of preserving food at that time. In 1946, when freezing had become a major method of food preservation, the Marketing Order Act was amended to exempt all fruits and vegetables for canning or freezing from marketing orders.

Today, in the potato industry, we have chaos. Potatoes for canning and freezing are exempt from marketing orders. But, potatoes for dehydration, potato shoe-strings, and potato chips are subject to marketing orders. This chaos is increased by the fact that potatoes are grown throughout the United States. They are planted nearly every day somewhere in the country, and harvested everyday somewhere else in this great Nation. While Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and Colorado have marketing orders, Maine, North Dakota, Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania, and other major potato producing areas do not have marketing orders.

The necessity for this bill was realized when a shoestring manufacturer in California was subjected to a marketing order for controlling the size of potatoes which he could purchase while his two

major competitors in New York and Arkansas were not subject to marketing orders and similar controls.

Mr. Chairman, among my constituents is one of the truly great national potato chip companies. They manufacture and distribute potato chips and other snacks nationally. They have told me of the terrible difficulties and entanglements, the hardships to producers and consumers alike, that will result if their plants in some areas of the country are subjected to marketing order regulations that do not apply to their competitors who sell in the same markets. This bill will prevent this happening. This is a good bill that was carefully considered in the Agricultural Committees of both the Senate and the House. It passed the Senate by a voice vote and I urge my colleagues to vote for it here today. Thank you.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me why this bill is for only 2 years?

Mr. PURCELL. It was mentioned a few minutes ago. The reason that has been given is that we do want to do this carefully. We want to proceed with caution in having some segments of an industry not under marketing orders. When the 2 years is up it may be decided that it should be permanent. This air of caution would be the reason I will give for providing for this 2-year period.

Mr. GROSS. The bill not only pertains to marketing orders but pertains to processing, does it not?

Mr. PURCELL. Yes, sir, for potatoes.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I would be glad to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. I would like to speak to the point raised by the gentleman from Iowa.

I might tell the gentleman that a great deal of concern was expressed by potato producer groups in certain parts of the country that this bill would weaken the effectiveness of marketing orders. Other producers of fruits and vegetables also testified against the bill on the basis of the fact that they felt this legislation would set a precedent that would weaken existing marketing orders on other commodities. Even the U.S. Department of Agriculture had some reservations in this respect and presented to our committee the views outlined in their letter on page 3 of our Agriculture Committee report.

So, although our committee does not feel that enactment of the bill would significantly reduce the effectiveness of marketing orders as a means of strengthening returns to the producers of various agricultural products that utilize marketing orders, we decided that in order to provide for automatic review of the effect of this exemption we should at this time approve only a 2-year bill. Then, if our review reveals that marketing orders were, in fact, adversely affected by this legislation, we would have an opportunity to make needed corrections. If, on the other hand, it becomes evident from the review that the legislation created

no problems, we could look forward to making it permanent.

I wanted also, during the course of this colloquy with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL), to make this quite clear to some potato producer groups as well as other producers of fruits and vegetables who have this great concern about the bill as it is presently written.

Mr. PURCELL. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington for her comments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill which would set a uniform and consistent rule for all potato processors.

This bill, which has been approved by the Committee on Agriculture with only three dissenting votes, would exempt from the coverage of any Federal marketing order—for a period of 2 years following the date of enactment of this bill—potatoes used for dehydrating, chipping, or other processing. It would thereby give these particular potatoes the same treatment that the law now affords potatoes for canning or freezing which are presently exempt from the application of Federal marketing orders.

When we held the hearings on this legislation in the Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, it became clear that the present law was discriminatory against dehydrators and other processors. Some processors—those purchasing potatoes for canning or freezing—are exempt from the Marketing Order Act, but other potato processors—those dehydrating potatoes, for example—were subject to the restrictions of volume, quality, timing, and other administrative regulations inherent in a marketing order.

This bill, then, simply would treat all potato processors the same—that is, it would exempt them from Federal orders.

As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL) has pointed out, the 2-year life on the exemption provided under this bill will no doubt be extended. I did not feel we needed to put a 2-year life on the bill, but in order to allay the fears of some grower groups, the committee agreed to this compromise.

Personally, I can see little justification in the inclusion of any processor within the umbrella of a Federal marketing order for fruits and vegetables. The act itself through the years, and since its adoption in 1937, has carefully confined its application to fresh fruits and vegetables. With only a few exceptions have processing crops been included. The action by the House, in approving this bill, would certainly be helpful in forming future policy as to the treatment of processors under this program.

A second reason I feel this bill is desirable is that it is a reflection of the fact that modern technology has changed the potato processing business. In the 1930's canning was exempted. In the 1940's freezing was exempted. And now, in the 1970's, dehydrating and other

processing is exempted. This is nothing more than a reflection of the changing technology in potato processing.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I urge that this bill be passed and sent to the President today. It is a good bill because it reflects technological change and because it treats all potato processors the same. It also manifests a sound congressional policy in regard to the exemption from marketing orders of processing crops.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this is a good bill. It places the firms that are in the operation of dehydrating and chipping potatoes in the same category of those who are canning and freezing. I think that by having those exemption orders but keeping the dehydration under the order is certainly worse than unfair competition. So I am in favor of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER).

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2214. I am one of the sponsors of H.R. 11243 which is a similar bill. This legislation originated as a result of a grave injustice that was done to a business concern in San Jose, Calif. The Pik-Nik Co. was founded over 30 years ago in San Jose and has manufactured high-quality potato shoestrings from small potatoes which farmers otherwise could not market because of their small size. By producing shoestrings from these potatoes, Pik-Nik was creating a market for the small size potatoes for the growers and at the same time supplying the consumer with a low-priced snack product of high customer acceptability.

For 30 years, Pik-Nik bought size B potatoes from the Klamath Basin and shipped them to San Jose for processing into shoestring potatoes. Then suddenly in October of 1968, the USDA changed Marketing Order No. 947 to prohibit the shipment of size B potatoes. This action resulted in Pik-Nik being forced to make the painful choice of either continuing to do business at a loss or closing down their plant. The plant was ultimately closed; the entire payroll laid off; and many people suffered. The farmers who lost a market for their small potatoes found that they received less than one-third as much for these potatoes for livestock feed or starch, as they had been receiving from Pik-Nik.

In the meantime, Pik-Nik competitors in Arkansas and in New York State who were making similar products from similar potatoes, but were not operating under marketing orders, were not affected. They continued to do business as usual.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is needed if the Pik-Nik Co., is to be able to once again buy potatoes from the Klamath Basin with full confidence that they can rely on this supply without being discriminated against by marketing order regulations that do not apply to their competitors.

If these potatoes were to be frozen or canned there would be no problem. But

since Pik-Niks' canned, precooked potatoes are not packed precisely in a manner conforming to the technical definition of a canned product the canning and freezing exemption does not apply. It seems that canning requires heat to be applied after the can is sealed and, of course, this is impossible with a shoestring potato. So we have another example of discrimination which is justified on the basis of a technicality.

The only difference between this bill and the one I introduced, is that my bill provided for an unlimited exemption, while this measure provides only for a 2-year exemption. I am sure that in 2 years, it will be necessary to extend this bill to make it permanent. But, at least for the next 2 years, Pik-Nik and other potato processors will know that their operations will not be disturbed by marketing order regulations that apply to them and do not apply to their competitors.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this legislation today.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, at the present time the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 provides for an exemption for canning potatoes, adopted in 1937, and for freezing, adopted in 1946.

This bill merely adds the same exemption to potatoes used in the dehydration process. This is a relatively new technique which is growing in importance every year.

As these various methods of processing compete, it is only fair that the same rules apply to all three processes.

While the committee did not feel that the enactment of the bill would weaken marketing orders, it provided for an automatic review of the effect of the exemption by putting a 2-year limit on the bill. This limit was added by the Senate and accepted by the House Agriculture Committee.

I want my colleagues to know that I strongly favor marketing orders. We operate under a Federal marketing order in the Twin City area where the milk produced on my farm is marketed. Many potato growers benefit from marketing orders which I support.

The problem with a plant which dehydrates potatoes is that they would be covered by a marketing order if they were constructed in an area whose producers were covered by an order. Since it would be difficult for a dehydrating plant to compete with a plant which cans potatoes or freezes potatoes which are exempted under the present act, I think this legislation is necessary.

Exemptions from the Agricultural Marketing Agreements Act is not limited to potatoes. Numerous other commodities and processes are exempted. Again, referring back to marketing orders for milk, these are limited to fluid milk and are not utilized for manufactured milk meaning butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk.

The committee report makes it clear that approval of this bill does not establish a precedent for other products or for potatoes that are not processed.

I shall vote in favor of this bill and urge other Members to do likewise.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8c(2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation, is amended as follows:

(1) In clause (A) after the words "vegetables (not including vegetables, other than asparagus, for canning or freezing)", insert the words "and not including potatoes for canning, freezing, or other processing"; and

(2) In clause (B) after the words "fruits and vegetables for canning or freezing," insert the words "including potatoes for canning, freezing, or other processing."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective only during the period beginning with the date of enactment of this Act and ending two years after such date.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having resumed the chair, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2214) to exempt potatoes for processing from marketing orders, pursuant to House Resolution 817, had reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEMOCRAT STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE AN INDICTMENT OF THE PREVIOUS DEMOCRAT AD- MINISTRATION

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have great sympathy and understanding for my friend the Honorable CARL ALBERT, majority leader of the House of Representatives, as he and his Democratic colleagues sought to paste together a rebuttal to President Nixon's state of the Union message. In 1966, 1967, and 1968, I and my Republican colleagues had similar experiences in responding to the then President's state of the Union message. At that time I noted the comments of the news media and I must confess I was not too happy. I suspect my Democratic friends have had a similar reaction to their presenta-

tion. Needless to say, I am glad to have some new members of the "club."

Technically, the Democratic state of the Union message was a well-staged program without much substance. There was a lot of talk about longstanding problems that have gone unsolved while the Democratic Party controlled both the White House and the Congress. They told us what the state of the Union was when they turned it over to President Nixon and a Republican administration, and we all must agree their efforts from 1961 through 1968 had left a lot to be desired.

I was surprised that the Democrats would emphasize crime in the city of Detroit, a community which has had Democratic mayors for a number of years. The record shows President Nixon submitted strong anticrime legislation to the Congress in 1969, and regrettably so far the Democratic-controlled Congress has not approved a single proposal in this Congress to combat the crime problem.

Also, it should be emphasized that all of the military procurement cost overruns on defense contracts were signed under a Democratic administration. Unfortunately, Secretary of Defense Laird now has the tough job of paying the billions with taxpayer dollars for those Democratic military procurement mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of the statement released by me on the Democratic state of the Union show.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The document referred to follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. GERALD R. FORD

The Democratic State of the Union message can best be described as an indictment of the previous Democratic Administration. It provided no answers but it did raise many questions. The essential question was . . . Where were the Democrats during the eight years before President Nixon came into office?

If we have a mess in our environment, as Senator Jackson stated, where were the Democrats while that mess was developing? Who made the mess? Who was in charge while all of this was going on?

Yes, we are suffering from chronic inflation. But what caused it? The \$57 billion in Democratic deficit spending during the 60's was the chief cause of the inflation we are wrestling with.

The Democrats complain of high interest rates. These interest rates are a direct result of Democratic inflation.

The Democrats talk about the crime problem yet they let the entire First Session of the 91st Congress go by without passing a single Nixon anti-crime bill.

In this State of the Union message, the Democrats have again shown themselves to be a party that talks about problems, spends more than the federal government takes in, but never solves any of the problems. The Democrats spent $\frac{3}{4}$ trillion on social needs during the eight years before President Nixon entered the White House, and what do we have to show for it?

Let them answer that question in their next political side show.

CRIME

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I can refute what the distinguished gentleman has said or not. At least we have caused him to feel that he should respond to us.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly interested in what the gentleman said about the subject of crime. I am sure that he will agree that we are all against it. I think our record will stack up well against that of the administration.

The committees of the Congress, both the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on the District of Columbia, are now considering crime legislation.

Mr. Speaker, more than 2 weeks have passed since President Nixon in his state of the Union message summoned the Congress and the American people to join him in a war against crime. In calling us to do battle "against the criminal elements which increasingly threaten our cities, our homes, and our lives," the President's words were moving, his rhetoric lofty and his delivery flawless. The Congress had every reason to expect, I believe, the immediate submission of specific legislative proposals to support that frontline soldier in the war on crime, the man on the beat. Such has not been the case.

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 was passed by the Democratic 90th Congress at the behest of President Lyndon B. Johnson. Title I of this measure authorizes Federal grants to strengthen local police departments in their fight against crime. Grants can be made for the recruitment and training of police officers. They can also be used to help pay their salaries. Moneys can be utilized for the construction of police stations, jails, and other physical facilities, as well as the purchase of the new type of sophisticated equipment required today for the effective prevention and detection of crime. The act also provides for strengthening courts, and speeding the process of justice.

Fighting crime at the local level, and crime is a problem which has to be fought at the local level, costs money and lots of it. Mayors and police chiefs without exception tell me this is what they need from the Federal Government; they need more of it and need it quicker and with less bureaucratic redtape. It was because of this that the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), introduced H.R. 14341 on October 14, 1969. This bill would provide an authorization of \$750 million for law-enforcement grants for fiscal year 1971. The current authorization terminates June 30 of this year. Hearings on crime in the streets were announced by Chairman CELLER on January 16. Despite a request by the House Judiciary Committee for departmental comment—and despite the fact that this bill was introduced several months ago—the Justice Department has yet to express its views on H.R. 14341.

Even more mysterious, however, I find the failure of the White House or the Justice Department to date to submit a draft bill or any form of Executive communication on the funding subject to the Congress. This failure most certainly belies the grave sense of urgency with which the President dealt with crime in his state of the Union message.

I am fearful that 1970 may witness a repeat performance of the charade we experienced so often last year in connection with administration proposals. According to this script, the President enunciates some lofty generalities, usually delivered to the American people via television; Congress is then forced to wait many weeks and often months before any concrete legislative measures are received from the Executive. It is, of course, impossible for a congressional committee to hold hearings on a White House press release. When legislation is finally transmitted, the President or one of his spokesmen then quickly berates Congress for failing to act promptly on his recommendations.

The President and his administration appear to be a great deal more interested in winning public relations victories than victories in the war against crime.

Rhetoric rather than results is obviously the hallmark of the present Republican administration.

FIGHT AGAINST CRIME

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I have just listened to the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD) and the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT) on the subject of crime and the attempt of each to lay blame on the other's political party for the very serious crime situation that has developed in our country. At least, that is the way I interpreted their remarks, and I feel sure I got the point of each.

I think everyone knows I am nonpartisan in my views. I do not really know how to play party politics, I have always been more interested in my country than my party. Maybe, at times, I have appeared to be partisan but I have always given the welfare of my country first consideration.

With all deference to the party leaders of this body, I do not think the country is really impressed with the charges or insinuations that the other fellow's party is for crime while his is against it; or that one is more against it than the other; or that one does more to put down crime than the other.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country know the leadership of both political parties and the Members of this House are opposed to crime. It would be absurd to think otherwise. I am sure they know that everyone is trying to do his best to put down crime. No one tolerates crime except the criminal. There are no

criminals in this House. There are no criminals in position of leadership in our two parties.

Maybe I should not make these remarks, but I think we would get along much better and be of more influence in promoting law and order if we would lay aside the charges and insinuations that the members of the other political party are all either for crime or responsible for such failures as there are in the effort to eliminate same. Let us leave politics out of this problem and get along with our work. And in the end there will be sufficient glory, credit and satisfaction not only for ourselves and our political parties but for our people whom we are here to serve.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

(Mrs. GRIFFITHS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which will establish a national health insurance program under the social security system, and which will give to middle Americans those health and medical benefits presently being developed for the poor and aged, and which the wealthy already have simply because they can afford to pay for them.

This bill would relieve State and local governments of health service tax burdens, currently estimated to be about \$7 billion annually. In addition, since this bill would eliminate medicare and medic-aid, the \$10 billion supporting these programs would become available for the comprehensive national health program.

My bill would also preserve free choice of physicians; preserve traditional professional freedom of practice and methods of payment; and maintain, indeed, utilize the authority of local medical and dental associations and societies.

At the same time, my bill would make it possible for doctors and dentists to bypass time-consuming business administration and bookkeeping functions and permit them to concentrate on the practice of medicine and dentistry. It recognizes that the business of doctors is administering health and medical care. They should not have to be bookkeepers or credit collection agencies.

Mr. Speaker, most Americans who incur extended or serious illnesses and mishaps today, cannot afford to live. In fact, the cost of a major illness is such that 9 out of 10 Americans are medically indigent right now. They cannot afford to pay the high costs of care without severe economic sacrifice. Health expenditures now amount to \$294 for every man, woman, and child in the Nation. For some middle Americans, this means spending from 10 to 25 percent of their income on uncontrollable health and medical services. For some middle American families, of course it is even more, while for some, it is less.

At the same time, middle Americans are supporting health care for the rest of America, and the income tax system gives them little credit for doing so. Cur-

rent tax deductions for medical expenses favor the rich, simply because they can afford large expenditures for health care and therefore receive large tax deductions for them. The fact is, the more they spend, the more they get back. Middle Americans, though, find that while their medical expenses consume a proportionately large share of their income, a tax deduction, while welcome, is still an unaffordable luxury.

My bill would eliminate this regressive feature in health care tax deductions and remove the burden of supporting a major share of the Nation's health costs from the backs of hard-working middle American wage and salary earners, who are paying for health care at all costs, for all people.

It is widely acknowledged that we face a crisis in health care. Symptomatic of the stress in the health delivery system is the recent outpouring of books dealing with the problem. Recently published books such as "The Doctors" by Martin Gross; "The Troubled Calling, Crisis in the Medical Establishment" by Selig Greenberg; "Medicine in Transition" by Dr. Iago Goldstein; "Ferment in Medicine" by Dr. Richard Magraw; "The Coming Revolution in Medicine" by Dr. David Rutstein; "Professional Power and American Medicine" by Alton Tack; and "Hospital Regulation: Dilemma of Public Policy" by Anne R. Somers.

More and more articles are being published in magazines and periodicals about the crisis. On July 10, 1969, Secretary Finch and the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare stated:

This Nation is faced with a breakdown in the delivery of health care unless immediate concerted action is taken by government and the private sector.

So there is little dispute, today, as to nature of the health care crisis. The health delivery system, itself, is sick. Those who have expertise with regard to the organization and delivery of health services stress that increased medical knowledge with resulting specialization of function has not been accompanied by a growth of organization or a financing system that will permit equal opportunity of access to the system. The result has been fragmentation of services with no well-defined point of entry into the system by the consumer-patient.

Symptoms of the breakdown are many. I intend to cite only a few, the first of which emphasizes concern of Congress and the public over the runaway escalation of health care costs.

The inflationary facts of health services are astonishing. The Nation's spending for health reached \$60.3 billion in fiscal 1969.

Per capita health expenditures rose 11 percent in fiscal 1969, as compared to fiscal 1968. Public outlays for health rose nearly 15 percent in 1 year. Payments for hospital care increased 17 percent in 1 year and reached a total of \$22.5 billion in fiscal 1969. The American Hospital Association recently testified before the House Ways and Means Committee that the average daily room rate would rise to nearly \$100 a day by 1973. Daily

room charges already exceed \$100 a day in some of our teaching hospitals. Expenditures for physicians' services also rose 9 percent for fiscal 1969 over the prior year. The December 8, 1969, issue of "Medical Economics" predicts that gross receipts of private physicians will average "at least 10 percent higher" for calendar year 1969 as compared to 1968.

Small wonder, then, that health care has absorbed an increasing proportion of the gross national product. In 1950, health expenditures accounted for 4.6 percent of the GNP. In 1960, 5.3 percent and in 1969, 6.7 percent. In fact, if health expenditures continue to absorb an increasing proportion of the gross national product at the same rate as has occurred in recent years, by the year 2077, 108 years from now, health expenditures will consume the entire gross national product leaving nothing for food, clothing, or shelter.

What are we getting for our money? In relation to huge health expenditures, the United States is faring rather poorly in comparison with other countries in the Western World. Exorbitant costs and expenditures are begetting inadequate results and inferior services. Objective statistical measurements of infant mortality, maternal mortality, and life expectancy not only show we rank below most other Western countries, but that our relative position has been declining. In 1964, the United States ranked 16th among the countries of the world in infant mortality. However, in 1950, the United States ranked sixth and in 1960 the United States ranked 11th. Maternal mortality rates—the percentage of mothers who die in childbirth—show the United States to be 11th place. With regard to life expectancy, the United States ranks 18th for males and 11th for females.

Significantly, all of the countries that rank ahead of the United States with regard to these objective health indices have a national health program which either provides or finances health services for the vast majority of their citizens. It is also significant that these countries are providing health services to their respective populations at a lower per capita cost than in the United States. For example, in 1965, the Social Security Administration estimated that the United Kingdom spent 4.2 percent of its gross national product on health. In that year, the corresponding U.S. expenditure was 5.9 percent of the GNP.

The questions we must ask are:

Why has American medicine failed to live up to its potential?

Why is it not the best in the world?

The crux of the problem is that we have a system of 20th century technology shackled to a 19th century organizational pattern and attitudes.

First, physicians seek to maximize their financial return to the time and effort they must expend to provide care. In short, they are human beings with the same needs and interests as other human beings. It is no reflection on their integrity nor their compassion to suggest that other things being equal, they will choose to practice in a manner

which will maximize their incomes. There is a grain of truth, though, in the cry of young medical students heard recently: "Hip! Hip! Hippocrates. Up with service. Down with fees!"

Idealism, though, however necessary and commendable it is, is not enough. We need to change the incentive system in manner which will reward efficiency and penalize inefficiency and outright fee-inflationary practices.

Under the present system, the physician is financially rewarded in proportion to his patient's immediate malady. Instead, we must give the doctor a financial stake in keeping the patient in good health at the lowest possible cost. Such a system would financially penalize unnecessary hospitalization; unnecessary surgery; and unnecessary medical services. Reward would be based on efficiency and quality care.

So the bill I am introducing today is designed to accomplish far more than simply paying for health services. Our experience under the medicare and medicaid program has amply demonstrated the fallacy of having the Government underwrite the cost of health care largely determined by the providers. But we must not overlook the fact that these two programs have substantially helped some 38 million Americans. This bill would not only contain the rising costs of health care within the limits of the 6.7 percent of the gross national product we are now spending, but it also has the potential of actually reducing cost as a percentage of the GNP over the years.

How is cost control achieved? It is accomplished by having the Federal Government contract for health, hospital, and dental services with organized groups of physicians, with hospitals and with groups of dentists. Contractual relations between free parties is a cornerstone of our private enterprise business and industrial system. It is a time-tested system in the health field as well.

For over two decades, the prepaid group practice plans—which might be regarded as mini-national plans—such as the Kaiser Foundation health plan have contracted with medical groups for comprehensive health services. These contracts place the medical group under a budget. The budget is liberal. If the cost of providing services is actually less than the amount stipulated in the contract, the physicians receive a bonus at the end of the year. Thus, the more efficiently the medical group provides services, the more they make in monetary rewards.

The cost savings achievable under the contract system are nothing short of spectacular. For example, the President's Commission on Health Manpower studied the Kaiser plan in depth. The Commission's conclusion was that the Kaiser plan provided as good or better care than was available in the general community at from 20 to 30 percent less cost.

In addition to Kaiser, all other prepaid group practice plans have demonstrated the capability of reducing hospitalization and the number of surgical procedures. A recent study of the Federal employees health benefits program showed the

group practice prepayment plans had but one-half the number of nonmaternity hospital days per 1,000 subscribers, as the alternate coverage. Federal employees have a choice, from among five different types of coverages, including an indemnity plan and Blue Cross-Blue Shield. The group practice prepayment plans also had 42 percent fewer surgical procedures than Blue Cross-Blue Shield.

My bill does not abolish the fee-for-service system and I specifically allow for it, but only under conditions which would provide effective cost control. Under the bill, the Federal Government could not only contract for medical services with organized medical groups, but with local State and county medical societies as well. Where physicians in a county desired to be reimbursed on a fee-for-service basis, the medical society could contract with the Federal Government to provide services. The physician-members of the medical society would, therefore, be assuming group responsibility for providing services within the terms of the contract. However, distribution of the money among members would be determined by the group. The Federal Government would have no concern nor, in fact, would promulgate no regulations dealing with compensation of individual physicians.

My bill does, however, require that where a medical society does assume responsibility for delivering medical services, it must establish a system of peer review and administration procedures to assure beneficiaries that the care they receive is of optimal quality. The medical society would receive a 5 percent bonus payment to cover their administrative expenses for providing this service.

This reimbursement method is time tested. The San Joaquin Medical Foundation was established in 1954 and makes good use of the self-policing concept. Last year the San Joaquin Medical Foundation contracted with the State of California to provide medical services to medicaid eligibles. At the end of the year the foundation returned \$200,000 to the State of California. Quite a contrast to those few who were able to twist the program into a get-rich-quick scheme.

Under my bill, the medical society or a foundation organized by the medical society would not be required to refund cost savings to the Government. If physicians curtail unnecessary hospitalization, unnecessary surgery; and use paramedical personnel more effectively, I feel they should be rewarded for their efforts. From the standpoint of Government, we should be interested in a fair contract at a fair price. If care is rendered more efficiently, then efficiency should be rewarded.

A refinement to the San Joaquin concept is the Physicians Association of Clackamas County in Oregon. Here the medical society contracted with the State of Oregon to provide not only medical services, but assumed the responsibility of paying for hospital and pharmacy services as well. This introduces a concept approaching that of comprehensive group practice plans, where the plan assumes responsibility for providing all services required by the patient.

Comprehensive payments for comprehensive services offer the greatest hope for containing medical costs, because the health plan gains financially whenever the patient's medical needs are met by a less expensive form of treatment. Only when payments cover the entire spectrum of medical needs, is the physician free to substitute less costly outpatient services for inpatient services; less costly nursing home services for hospital services; and less costly home health services for nursing home care.

My bill would, therefore, provide incentives for medical and dental groups, county medical societies, hospitals and other non-profit organizations to provide or arrange for comprehensive health services under a single contract. The incentive is a 5 percent extra allowance when any of the above organizations indicate an interest in providing comprehensive care. I would like to add, that only under a system of comprehensive payments for comprehensive services, can an organization really plan, program and budget their income and expenses and make effective use of systems analysis.

The bill I am introducing would provide financial access to comprehensive health services on an equal basis for all men, women, and children who have 1 year's residence in the United States. This would achieve a most desirable result: physicians, dentists, and hospitals would be assured of adequate remuneration whether they practice in a poverty or affluent area; in the city or in the country. For there is an urban-rural imbalance in the availability of doctor care. In the countryside, over 412,000 people in 115 counties scattered through 23 States do not have access to a physician at all. One out of 50 Americans cannot get a doctor under any circumstance.

There is also a doctor imbalance inside our large cities. New York City, for example, has an overall physician-population ratio of 278 doctors per 100,000 residents. We call it a well-doctored community. Yet, in the shadows of the city's affluence, the ratio is only 10 doctors per 100,000 residents in poor areas and ghettos.

So the imbalance is not only between urban and rural areas—appalling as that is—but between poor and affluent areas within cities.

If this bill should become law, we would certainly witness a migration of physicians from the "overdoctored" areas to the "underdoctored" areas of the United States, since the money will be there, whether the area is rural or poor or affluent. My bill, then, would motivate doctors to serve not on the basis of a community's wealth, but on the basis of the peoples' need for health care in the area.

Most importantly, this bill would stimulate the development of improved health delivery systems so that the quality of care and the efficiency by which it is delivered would be improved. The bill is designed to resolve the principal problem we face today; namely, a sophisticated 20th century technology shackled to 19th century organizational patterns.

My bill would not only provide free choice of primary physician, but also

allow beneficiaries free choice of health delivery systems—solo or group practice. Moreover, beneficiaries would choose their personal physician when they were well and not under the stress of illness.

Physicians would be guaranteed that there would be no interference with the clinical practice of medicine. They would be free to participate or not to participate in the national health insurance program. Participation could be on either a full-time or part-time basis. In fact, physicians would have the greatest professional freedom they have ever known. Within the framework of a budget, they would be able to establish their own methods of compensation. They could, if they so choose, eliminate all paperwork in connection with claims and concentrate on that which they were so magnificently trained to do: Practice medicine. In my opinion, this bill will enlist significant support from many members of the medical profession.

Let me turn, now, to the benefits my bill will provide:

First. Coverage for every man, woman, and child who has resided in the United States for 1 year or more.

Second. Comprehensive health benefits, including hospitalization, as required and without limits; physician services, including surgery, subject to a small \$2 cost sharing charge per visit after the first visit; preventive care and physical examinations, nursing home care as required and without limits, home health services subject to a \$2 charge per visit and rehabilitation services.

Third. Comprehensive dental services for all children under age 16 subject to a \$2 cost sharing charge per visit after the first visit. Dental examinations and prophylaxis provided at no cost to the patient.

Fourth. Eye care including an allowance for eyeglasses and frames.

Fifth. Prescription drugs.

These benefits would be financed under the social security program. Employers would pay 3 percent of payroll, employees 1 percent of payroll, and the Federal Government would match the employer contribution from general revenues. Employer taxes are higher than employee taxes to take into account that employers are now paying the entire cost of most employee health insurance benefit programs. If the employer contributions were less than 3 percent, some employers would enjoy a windfall, in the sense that their contribution would be less than their current payments into voluntary health insurance programs. The Federal contribution would not be much more than current Federal, State, and local combined expenditures for health services. Thus, the Federal Government would be relieving the tax burden of State and local government for health services.

If this bill is enacted, the United States could rank first among all nations, in providing high-quality health care at reasonable cost for all people. In my opinion, the national medical and health crisis can only be resolved through a national comprehensive health insurance program, with comprehensive financing.

The time is long overdue to make health care for all Americans in all in-

come levels a matter of right, rather than a matter of privilege or pity.

The Senate Finance Committee has just recommended that fees be established for doctors. I reject this solution and I offer this bill as a better means of better health for every American at a lower cost; with the traditional rights of American medics guaranteed.

National health insurance is an old idea, but a "Now" solution. Its hour has arrived.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION FOR INVESTORS' MONEY PASSES INTEREST RATES HIGHER

(Mr. MELCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, Government competition for investors' money presses interest rates higher.

Treasury Department and other Government agency sales of notes and bills at 8 to 8¾ percent attracts savings and investments that would otherwise be in accounts of banks and savings and loans across the country. The administration policy of driving interest rates higher has not controlled inflation but has created a money crisis.

Washington is fast becoming the financial magnet of the Nation, grabbing up the very funds that provide the private lenders the goods and wares that keep them in business. The lack of credit for the homebuilding industry, for construction, for business, and for agriculture can be laid at the doorstep of a Federal financial octopus that has grabbed more and more funds by increasing the interest rates of their notes. State and municipal bonds are unsold because they are limited to lower interest rates.

Last year proved to be one of the best years banks ever had for high earnings. The mounting interest rates worked for their benefit. It might prove to be a prelude to the downfall of private banks because their source of depositor's money is being dried up by the administration which can and does pay over 8 percent interest.

The competition in the money market is heavily one-sided for the Treasury Department, which has exercised no restraints on setting its own interest rates but it does, by regulation, control the interest that banks and savings and loans can pay depositors, keeping that rate below what the Government offers.

Treasury attracts capital by paying over 8 percent but regulates the private lenders to an average of slightly over 5 percent. For several decades banks have been a constant customer for Treasury bills and notes, carrying a portion in their investment portfolios to balance out loans. The attractive Treasury high rates short circuits the banks by Treasury cutting out the middleman with sales direct to investors. This might sound good at first but the outcome could well be disastrous when banks with reduced deposits can no longer meet the needs of their borrowers. What this means out on the construction job, or in keeping the store, or down

on the farm, is that there may not be any operating loans from the local bank.

In the drouth days of the 1930's the Federal Government made what was termed "seed loans" with low interest rates, to get bankrupt farmers back in the business of growing crops. Now the Federal Government is sowing the seeds of recession with high interest rates that can be the bankrupters of the seventies.

It is a question of direct competition where the Treasury Department not only makes the rules but rules in its own favor blocking out the banks. It is an investor's bonanza but the Nation's dilemma—the bitter fruit of a risky policy. The administration is sowing recession. It is time for the Treasury to reduce its rates to near to the rates it prescribes for banks and other commercial institutions, and to rely on Federal Reserve to take more of its securities rather than milk the countryside dry of capital.

BALANCED BUDGET NEEDED TO REDUCE INTEREST RATES

(Mr. COLLINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, in my hometown, one of the most important phases of our economic life is the bank interest rate. Our community grows by borrowing money, putting it to work and from the products of our endeavors repaying the loans.

Usually, newspapermen call on Congressmen for news. The other day I was talking to my friend, Dick West, of the Dallas Morning News and he gave me some interesting information. Dick had been talking to one of the biggest bankers in the South about this subject of interest rate.

The banker pointed out the very interesting fact that the prime rate change from 1934 to the present has always had a trend upward. In 1934, the rate was 1½ percent. Today the rate is 8½ percent. During this period, the rate has increased 27 times and reduced nine times, but the reductions do not last long, and the trend for the cost of money always continues upward.

The increase in the prime rate is not planned nor controlled by any one commercial bank. Money is a commodity and the force of inflation and money demands have caused the escalated interest rate.

Government financing is a major cause of increased interest rates. In the period from 1960-65 the prime rate increased only one-half percent from 4½ to 5. But the pressure of excessive Government spending drained the money from normal private commercial banks. Government spending doubled in the sixties. The pressure began to intensify with the shortage of funds and prime rates climbed rapidly from 5 percent on March 1, 1966, to 8½ percent on June 9, 1969.

Liberals in Congress cause high interest rates. With Washington spending excessively, adequate funds are not left for home construction, new machinery, and

working capital for the private business sector. Most Americans cannot afford to buy homes today because of high interest rates.

The year 1970 is a political year. Political demagogues are having a field day on how they are going to cut the interest rates. The same big spenders are the ones who toss their head to the sky and moan like a coyote in the wilderness. Then they vote to spend money on foreign aid, poverty programs that end up increasing the number of poor, more supergrade Federal bureaucrats, and double spending on an extravagant concert hall.

Let us get specific on how to stop the rising cost of living. First and most important, balance the budget. Even do more, run a surplus of \$10 billion so that more funds can be available in the private sector. And the time has come when we may need to have price and wage controls. I have always opposed them in the past, because economic history shows their limitations. But today America is becoming more demanding of action, and has the spirit to make this program succeed.

The year 1970 marks a year of political courage in standing up for a sound budget. And we need to realize that this financial chaos caused in the sixties with years of waste cannot be corrected in 6 months of austerity. But we must follow up last years balanced budget with a strong surplus this year. Interest rates will not suddenly and dramatically drop. Fiscal sacrifice will provide the only sound permanent economic solution.

Here are the prime interest rate changes from 1934 to the last change on June 9, 1969:

Prime interest rates from 1934

[Rate in percent]

Effective date:

1934—December 1947.....	1½
December 15, 1947.....	1¾
August 10, 1948.....	2
September 22, 1950.....	2¼
January 5, 1951.....	2½
October 17, 1951.....	2¾
December 18, 1951.....	3
April 27, 1953.....	3¼
March 17, 1954.....	3
August 4, 1955.....	3¼
October 14, 1955.....	3½
April 13, 1956.....	3¾
August 20, 1956.....	4
August 7, 1957.....	4½
January 21, 1958.....	4
April 21, 1958.....	3½
September 11, 1958.....	4
May 18, 1959.....	4½
September 1, 1959.....	5
August 23, 1960.....	4½
December 6, 1965.....	5
March 10, 1966.....	5½
June 30, 1966.....	5¾
August 16, 1966.....	6
January 27, 1967 (split rate).....	5½
March 23, 1967 (split rate abandoned).....	5¾
November 20, 1967.....	6
April 19, 1968.....	6½
September 24, 1968 (split rate).....	6
September 25, 1968 (split rate).....	6¼
November 12, 1968 (split rate abandoned).....	6¼
December 2, 1968.....	6½
December 18, 1968.....	6¾
January 7, 1969.....	7
March 17, 1969.....	7½
June 9, 1969.....	8½

DEMOCRATS IN TROUBLE IN CONGRESS BECAUSE THEY BADLY MISJUDGED NIXON

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday we got the word that the national chairman of the Democratic Party was resigning. Many of us are sorry to see him leave since we think he clearly spelled out the difference between responsible Republican government under President Nixon and irresponsible partisan criticism.

For the benefit of the outgoing national chairman, I should like to call attention to the column written by Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond that appeared last Saturday in the Washington Post:

DEMOCRATS IN TROUBLE IN CONGRESS BECAUSE THEY BADLY MISJUDGED NIXON

(By Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond)

The Democrats in Congress are in trouble. By now they are pretty sure why.

They are in trouble because they misjudged at three official points the kind of President Richard Nixon would be:

1. They greatly underestimated Mr. Nixon's political skill and purposes.

They couldn't believe that he would succeed in preempting the major issues so that in an election year they are going to have to pass most of the President's programs on welfare reform, environment, crime and other matters.

2. The Democrats had their minds so fixed on the Nixon of the past that they thought they pretty much could ignore the Nixon of the present. They just couldn't give up their own image of Nixon as the intensely partisan, tough, gut campaigner against Helen Gahagan Douglas and the stiff, unpersuasive high school debater against Sen. John F. Kennedy.

In consequence the Democratic Congress last year simply waited around for the President to fall on his face, and when he didn't it was too late for them to adjust to reality.

3. Finally, the Democrats simply couldn't conceive that Nixon could so soon emerge from an embarrassing minority election—43 per cent of the vote—to a position consistently commanding a nearly two-thirds public support.

They knew that when Lyndon was Senate majority leader he helped his Democrats win every congressional election during President Eisenhower's two terms by recognizing Ike's popularity and supporting him most of the time.

They knew this but gravely misjudged Mr. Nixon's popular potential. They assumed they would be dealing with a harassed and constantly criticizable President. They assumed national opinion would be almost continuously on their side.

Because of these miscalculations this Democratically controlled Congress has now lost the initiative to a President they thought would be a pushover and has lost control of the big domestic issues.

They threw away the opportunity last year to pass legislation at a time when they could have emerged—as the Democratic Congress did under Sen. Johnson's guidance—as the responsible law-making arm of the government. And now, on the eve of the congressional elections this fall, the Democrats in Congress will almost certainly have to give Mr. Nixon nearly everything he asks.

The Democrats got their own priorities reversed: They stalled last year when they should have acted and are acting this year because it is no longer safe for them to stall.

Mr. Nixon himself is moving faster and farther in adjusting his spending priorities than he intended. He showed at first that on

domestic matters he wanted to keep the spending lower than that which he is now supporting, until Vietnam costs could be radically cut and inflation put under control.

But he saw that the problems wouldn't wait and that the voters wouldn't wait, and he saw that he would likely go the way of Herbert Hoover unless he responded. This is where his political critics again miscalculated. They figured he couldn't and wouldn't respond.

The President has defused the demagoguery that he is against people and for economy for its own sake. He has cut the military to a lower percentage of the budget than at any time in 20 years. He is proposing to spend more on welfare, health and education than any previous administration.

So it now seems clear that the central issue of the fall campaign is almost fully shaped. The issue is national priorities—how much federal money is spent on what?

The Democratic stance is that we ought to spend more, even if inflation isn't checked, and the Nixon stance is that we are spending all that can safely be spent until inflation is checked.

Our guess is that anti-inflation policy, designed, as Senate GOP leader Hugh Scott has aptly put it, "Not just to save a dollar but to save the dollar," is good politics.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON ADVANCE PAYMENTS TO FARMERS

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to set the record straight with regard to advance payments to farmers under the wheat, feed grain, and cotton programs.

For several years the Federal Government had been paying 50 percent of the compliance payments at the time the farmer signed his compliance contract, with the other 50 percent being made in the fall. This policy was changed in 1969 by the Johnson administration.

On January 15, 1969, when President Johnson submitted his final budget to Congress his budget provided for only 25 percent of the advance payment, rather than 50 percent as has been made in previous years, and provided further that no advance payments would be made for the 1970 program. This was done although no advance notice had been given to the farmers of America that this change would be made.

Upon taking office 5 days after the Johnson budget was submitted, the Nixon administration was faced with a serious decision. That decision was whether or not to permit the Federal Government to break faith with the farmer and pay only 25 percent of the payment in advance in spite of no previous notice, or whether there was a moral obligation to pay the full 50 percent in advance, giving notice that in future years no advance payments would be made at the time of completing the compliance agreement.

Because of the fact that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman in his initial announcement of the 1969 feed grain program on December 26, 1968, did not in any way indicate any change in the way advance payments were to be made to farmers, Secretary of Agriculture Hardin and President Nixon felt that there was

a moral obligation to make the 50 percent advance payment in 1969 and to again give notice at that time that no advance payments would be forthcoming in 1970. It was upon this basis that Congress was not asked to appropriate funds to pay the 50 percent in advance in 1970.

I think his explanation for this action is significant and I would like to quote from the February 5, 1969, statement of President Nixon when he said:

I have taken this action because I feel the government has a moral obligation to honor this implied commitment.

In that same statement, the President said:

As a result of my decision, budget outlays for the current fiscal year will rise by \$168 million in comparison with the expenditure figures presented by the outgoing administration. However, if there are no advance payments in 1970, the combined effect for the two fiscal years 1969 and 1970 will be approximately as contemplated in the budget document.

The present administration realized how unfair it would be to the farmers participating in the program to carry out the intentions of the Johnson administration with no prior warning. Because of this moral obligation, a full 50-percent payment was advanced last year. However, unlike their predecessors, the Nixon administration gave full warning that in all likelihood this would mean no advance payments in fiscal 1970. Secretary Hardin confirmed that decision in a release dated December 29, 1969. This announcement is an interesting contrast to Secretary Freeman's announcement of December 26, 1968, giving no warning that any changes were in the mill.

Secretary Hardin realizes the extreme financing problem faced by farmers and has announced that full payments will be made as soon as possible after July 1, 1970. This will make payments complete as much as 2 months earlier than in previous years and will avoid an additional strain on the fiscal 1970 budget.

MARIHUANA LAWS

(Mr. HUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, a sampling of news articles in recent months on the subject of drug laws leads to the unmistakable conclusion that there are those at the heart of the debate who are bent on legalizing marihuana.

The easing and eventual elimination of restrictive marihuana laws have become a symbol of youthful defiance of a society of laws as well as the trademark of the hippie cult which finds relevance only under the influence of an array of mind-altering drugs, including marihuana.

I am still not convinced that community standards have dropped so low as to accept token penalties which, because of their contrast with present laws, will have the effect of being nothing more than a slap on the wrist. The mere prominence of the debate emphasizing lighter penalties is not only confusing, but it is misleading. Certainly, if the enlightened thought is that the drug abuse problem

will be resolved through education, no amount of effort will counter what the law tends to condone.

For example, on the same page of a recent issue of the Washington Post, there appeared an article citing a proposal to the Washington City Council by its Chairman and Councilman Henry Robinson to ease the marihuana laws to the point of being a practical nullity. Directly across from this article was another under the promising title, "Major Crime Fight Pledged by Mayor." In the following day's issue: "United States Pledges \$1 Million in Aid To Help Mexico Curb Narcotics."

One of the two reasons Mr. Hahn gave for his proposal was that because a substantial number of the population has chosen to disobey existing laws, the laws should be relaxed. Quite obviously, this logic suggests the proposition that the larger the number of people who break any given law, the weaker that law should be. This kind of weak-kneed rationale should be of little consolation to the law-abiding citizens in this crime-ridden city and, to be sure, the abuse of marihuana, interwoven as it is with other dangerous drugs and narcotics, is a serious social problem whose danger should not be minimized by a scheme of penalties that attempts to segregate these drugs in terms of their relative physical dangers.

TEXTILE IMPORTS

(Mr. MANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the textile import situation is worsening. The need for congressional action is becoming more apparent. Secretary of Commerce Stans is quoted in the Journal of Commerce of February 5, 1970, as having stated in a speech before foreign newsmen:

It is not possible for the United States to make an adjustment necessary to absorb the flood of textile imports.

The truth of this statement is being demonstrated daily by increasing layoffs and monetary losses in textile plants across this country. The garment industry is being particularly imperiled. Mr. Stans also stated:

It is highly likely Congress will act in the matter of limiting textile imports, and possibly other products, if there aren't agreements in a relatively short time—and by short time I mean three months.

Mr. Speaker, Congress is rarely accused of acting too speedily. Indeed, quite the contrary, and I suggest the wisdom of getting on with this matter. In that connection I hope that I am correctly informed that hearings on trade legislation will commence before the House Ways and Means Committee in the near future. Frankly, I believe that it will take the coordinated effort of both Congress and the Executive to control this situation. I was interested to note in the December 1969 issue of Textile World the following item:

PORT ELIZABETH.—"The South African textile industry faces possible recession unless adequate protection is provided against Jap-

anese 'dumping.'" TW's Herb Langston reports that statement from G. Cedric V. Graham, chairman of the South African Worsted Mfrs. Assn. Mr. Graham says the association is now awaiting action from the Board of Trade for a completely new form of protection against the Japanese. "We face contracted markets similar to those in 1967 when we had to dismiss workers and cut back production because of large-scale dumping." Additional protection came then in the form of tariff duty and import controls. This protection is now proving ineffective as Japanese manufacturers, encouraged by South African importers, he says, find loopholes. Worsted firms are supporting the cotton textile manufacturers contention that protection be based not on price but on construction or technical qualities of the cloth. Mr. Graham says: "No matter how clever we are, the Japanese are cleverer."

Even with some protection South Africa is having trouble. Without protection some of the communities of our Nation are facing economic disaster, and "No man is an island."

THE LATE WILLIAM JUDSON HOLLOWAY, FORMER GOVERNOR OF OKLAHOMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a great former Governor of my State of Oklahoma, and one of my closest, warmest friends, passed away on Wednesday, January 28, 1970. He was William Judson Holloway, Oklahoma's eighth Governor. He served from 1929 to 1931, during the days of the great depression, when our State's budget was less than \$30 million. Governor Holloway frequently commented that those were "troubled times" but felt he had had a "constructive administration." This he certainly did. He was one of Oklahoma's greatest chief executives.

The Governor's choice of adjectives reveals his bias which was that of a builder. He was affirmative, positive, and creative. He worked for his State and the Democratic Party. He was a power and an influence in government and politics until the day of his death. For years he stood alone as Oklahoma's most beloved and respected citizen, the revered senior statesman of our State. He was Mr. Democrat to all his party faithful. He was Mr. Oklahoma to public-minded citizens of every age.

Governor Holloway was born on December 15, 1888, in Arkadelphia, Ark., the son of a Baptist minister, Stephen Lee Holloway and Molly—Horne—Holloway. He was graduated from Ouachita College, Arkadelphia, in 1910, studied at the University of Chicago, and received an LL.B. degree from Cumberland University in 1915. During the interim period—1911 to 1914—he served as principal of Hugo High School in Choctaw County, Okla., in my congressional district. He was admitted to the Oklahoma bar in 1916 and opened his first law office in Hugo. In 1917 he took his first elective job, becoming Choctaw County prosecuting attorney. He served until 1921 when he was elected to the State senate. He served as senate president

pro tempore in 1925 and 1926, and was elected lieutenant governor in November 1927. It has always been a source of pride to me that he rose to political fame and greatness from my congressional district.

In 1929, at the age of 40, William J. Holloway became the youngest Governor in State history up to that time, filling the unexpired term of Gov. Henry S. Johnston. Forty years later he still relished the memory of those hard but challenging days, pointing out that "it is a great honor for any man to be Governor."

Governor Holloway later served with the Interstate Oil Compact Commission and also established a successful law practice in Oklahoma City. He was at work in his office on the day of his death.

Work was as much a part of Bill Holloway's life as his need to contribute something "constructive." It was in these terms that he viewed life in general and his own life in particular. He had had a heart attack several months before his death. Perhaps with total retirement he might have prolonged his life, but such a life would have been no life at all for a man who had spent half a century in the midstream of activity.

Although he bowed out of elective politics early in his career, Governor Holloway was never far from the mainstream of events in Oklahoma. His principal efforts, as was pointed out by our present Gov. Dewey Bartlett, were directed toward "the betterment of Oklahoma." His counsel was sought by many of Oklahoma's chief executives, and as Governor Bartlett stated, "was always given unstintingly." Governor Holloway, without official status, continued to serve his State and the Democratic Party in countless ways over a period of many years, concerning himself with all its needs, including the need to develop new workers and leaders. He had a keen eye for men and women interested in public service. He counseled and encouraged many of them. I am grateful that I was one of those who benefited from his interest.

Governor Holloway and I enjoyed periodic visits over many years during which we discussed the issues involving Oklahoma and the Federal Government. Our last visit was in Oklahoma City a little over a month before he died. I felt during our long conversation that evening, as I always felt when I was with him, how fortunate it was to be able to sit with a friend whose affection was so sincere and whose greatness was so obvious in his very demeanor. His views were always wise and relevant, his unusual perception and judgment sharpened by years of experience.

As distinguished in appearance as any stereotype of a chief executive, Governor Holloway was also a great gentleman. I cannot imagine him behaving in other than a civilized and kindly way. The strength and goodness of his character were revealed in his manner and his attitude. He was a large-souled man of spotless integrity, great strength, and compassion. Politically, he might be described as a pragmatic idealist.

Governor Holloway earned his place in the annals of Oklahoma's distinguished men, and in the affections of her citizens. To know him was to respect him and to love him. He often commented that he had had a very satisfactory life, revealing, I think, an acceptance of life and a maturity of view that does not necessarily accompany the octogenarian years. He was grateful for life's blessings, happy to have had great opportunities to be of service, and satisfied that he had done his best.

I will miss my dear friend whom I have known well since I was a high school boy in the mid-1920's. I am comforted to know that I had a small part in his life and am grateful that he had an important part in mine.

I extend to his distinguished son, my good friend Judge William J. Holloway, Jr., of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the 10th District, to his grandchildren and all his loved ones, my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

I have lost one of life's dearest friends. Oklahoma has lost one of her noblest sons.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER).

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I heard of the recent death of my dear friend and one of Oklahoma's most beloved citizens, former Gov. William J. "Bill" Holloway.

Bill Holloway was one of those rare men who, having held public office for several years and achieved political acclaim and success as a relatively young man, voluntarily stepped out of the limelight at the peak of his popularity because he knew he had served the people of his State well and felt he owed the remainder of his life to his family and his law practice.

Elevated from lieutenant governor to become the eighth Governor of the State of Oklahoma at the age of 40, Bill Holloway established a reputation for hard work and efficient administration as a depression era Governor, and his capacity for work continued as his hallmark throughout his lifetime. It was therefore fitting indeed that his death found him at work at his law office.

Although he held no public office after his term as Governor ended in 1931, he never lost his interest in politics and often served in some sort of advisory role to Oklahoma public officials until as late as 1965.

In Bill Holloway's passing I have lost a fine friend and Oklahoma has lost a leader whose life, both public and private, was an inspiration to all who knew him. Mrs. Belcher and I extend our deepest sympathy to his son, U.S. Circuit Judge William J. Holloway, Jr., and to all his family.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to me to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of one of Oklahoma's distinguished citizens and former Governor, William J. Holloway. The Governor's untimely death is a great loss to our State. He took pride in his heritage and worked unceasingly to serve Oklahoma and her citizens. The people of Oklahoma are most fortunate in having had a man of his stature serve

as Governor, and we are all indebted to him for his many years of public service and his leadership in civic affairs. The people of the State of Oklahoma will long remember him and the mark he made in Oklahoma's development and progress.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma lost one of its greatest men and outstanding leaders when Gov. William J. Holloway died.

Governor Holloway served Oklahoma as State senator and Lieutenant Governor before moving into the Governor's office following the impeachment of his predecessor.

He served as a healing force during a turbulent period of Oklahoma history, and this service won him the respect and admiration of people from all walks of life throughout the State.

Governor Holloway has been a long-time close and dear friend of mine, and I am among the thousands of Oklahomans who will miss him very much.

Governor Holloway's son, Judge William J. Holloway, of Oklahoma City, is a highly respected Oklahoman and also a personal friend of mine. I share Judge Holloway's deep sense of loss at the death of his father.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all my other colleagues from Oklahoma may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and service of the late Honorable William J. Holloway.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was not objection.

COMPREHENSIVE HEADSTART CHILD DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1970

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MACGREGOR), is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Comprehensive Headstart Child Development Act of 1970. There are 13.3 million children in America between ages 1 and 17 whose mothers work outside the home. More than 4 million of these children are under the age of 6, and over 3 million are from disadvantaged families. About one-fourth of the Nation's mothers who live with their husbands and have pre-school-age children are working and many more would seek employment to help balance the family budget or to avoid being welfare recipients, if suitable child care services were available at prices they could afford.

This bill attacks the problem of child day care and child development from five sides:

Research: The bill proposes the establishment of a National Institute for Early Childhood Development and Education. It would be modeled after the National Institutes of Health. The purpose of this Institute would be to conduct research on early childhood development and learning and to see that the Institute's findings are reflected in the conduct of programs affecting young children. Work being done by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, by the Office of Education, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development would be coordinated with the activities of this new Institute so that research and development can proceed as quickly as possible with maximum use of resources available.

Increased facilities: The bill provides for increased child care centers—for both the deprived and the children of working mothers, whether or not deprived—through consolidation of six of the 61 existing Federal programs into a single, comprehensive Headstart program which would provide funds to both public and private agencies according to a sliding scale based on total family income.

Increased staff: To meet the need for the thousands of teachers and other personnel needed for early childhood programs, the bill adds an authorization of \$20 million to the Education Professions Development Act for training or retraining professionals and paraprofessionals for early childhood programs. Repayment of college loans will be forgiven for graduates who are employed in child-development programs. In addition, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare is authorized to make grants covering the cost of inservice training programs. These measures will insure that both professionals and paraprofessionals in the field will be able to upgrade their skills, develop their careers, and stay abreast of the most recent developments.

Improved evaluation: The bill calls for a comprehensive and thorough evaluation of existing Federal programs that pertain to early childhood and day care, and a report to the Congress of the findings and recommendations resulting from this study. A means to insure a continuing assessment of these programs will also be established.

Improved coordination: While evaluation of the 61 existing Federal child care and development programs will perhaps suggest various ways to coordinate the programs more effectively, this bill takes a major step forward in that direction. The comprehensive Federal Headstart program established in this measure would be, in effect, the result of pooling some seven programs now in existence, all of which provide funds for child care and child development services for underprivileged children. Under the new arrangement, the programs would be jointly administered at both the Federal and State levels so that the maximum benefit could be derived by giving the greatest number of children the widest range of needed services.

I hope that the Congress will move to meet the need for increased child care

and development services by enacting these proposals which we have introduced today.

PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE HEAD-START CHILD DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1970

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK), is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, the Comprehensive Headstart Child Development Act of 1970 which is being introduced today is organized into six separate titles, as follows:

Title I—Consolidate child care programs, combining Headstart, Title I ESEA (preschool portion only), Migrant daycare (OEO), and daycare provisions under Title IV of the Social Security Act and the Labor Department's manpower programs.

Title II—National Institute for Early Childhood Development and Education.

Title III—Facilities assistance: mortgage insurance program, additional authorizations for Neighborhood Facilities program.

Title IV—Personnel training: \$20 million each for training professional and nonprofessional personnel, service in lieu of student loan repayment; inservice training provisions.

Title V—Federal government child development program for children of employees.

Title VI—General provisions: evaluation of federal programs, Office of Child Development, definitions.

Within this framework, the bill provides for the following:

PROGRAM CONSOLIDATION

Bring together, under one funding authority, the major federal programs which provide operating funds for day-care and child development programs.

New programs or additional appropriations would be authorized only when the consolidated program is functioning effectively.

STATE COMMISSION

State commission representative of all public and private agencies concerned with early childhood education, welfare and day-care would be involved.

Function would be to assess needs, establish priorities, develop a state plan, and eventually, to approve applications for funds.

Urban areas would be guaranteed a fair share of state commission funds.

PHASED IMPLEMENTATION

A carefully planned step-by-step approach to future expansion to assure well designed and prudently administered programs.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE INVOLVEMENT

Mortgage guarantees would facilitate construction of centers.

Profit-making corporations would be eligible for direct grants.

Same standards would apply to private corporations as to others under the program.

Fees will count toward matching requirements.

Employers could be eligible for grants to operate day-care programs for employees' children.

RESEARCH

A National Institute for Early Childhood Development would be established to serve as a focus for research; to conduct research and test findings through federally-controlled programs; to coordinate research conducted under other federal, university, and private auspices.

TRAINING

Educational Professions Development Act would be authorized additional appropriations for training professional and paraprofessional personnel.

Forgiveness of student loans for those entering early childhood programs.

Tuition grants for early childhood personnel upgrading their skills.

FACILITIES

Construction authorized where more economical than renovation or rental.

Additional appropriations authorized for Neighborhood Facilities program.

Mortgage guarantee program for private profit-making or non-profit agencies.

Federal grants, loans, and interest subsidies authorized.

EVALUATION

Special evaluation of existing federal programs pertaining to child development will be made.

On-going evaluation of future programs authorized, with annual reports to Congress.

FEDERAL FUNDS PROVIDED FOR

1. Economically disadvantaged children younger than compulsory school attendance age.

2. Children of working mothers, whether or not economically disadvantaged (payment for services on a sliding-scale fee basis).

3. Programs to help economically disadvantaged adolescent girls and expectants learn the fundamentals of child development and nutrition.

Cost—\$123 million above current expenditures for FY 1971.

NEED FOR CHILD CARE AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The United States is faced with a tremendous and still growing need for child development and child care services—for underprivileged children who need extra help in order to reach their full potential, and also for many of the more than 12 million children whose mothers work outside the home.

Despite the presence of at least 61 Federal programs pertaining to child care and the efforts of State and local governments, private nonprofit and profitmaking organizations, churches, schools, cooperative nursery schools, and family day care homes, only a little over a million children can be accommodated. Yet the need is many times that number.

A large part of that need stems from the growing numbers of wives and mothers, even those with small children, who seek employment outside the home. One-third of the wives in this country were employed outside the home in 1969, as compared with only one-fifth in 1952.

There are now 5 million preschool children whose mothers work full or part time, as compared with only 3.8 million in 1965—a 30-percent increase in just 5 years.

About one-fourth of the Nation's mothers who live with their husbands and have pre-school-age children are in the work force, and surveys indicate that many more would seek employment in order to help balance the family budget or to get off the welfare rolls, if only they could find suitable child-care services at prices they could afford. A considerable portion of the working mothers come from families with a total income of over \$10,000, and they are quite willing to pay the cost of high quality child

care services. But in many areas, adequate day care centers or other arrangements are simply not available at any price. A mother then must choose between an uncertain network of baby-sitters, relatives, and neighbors to look after her child, or a less-than-desirable group child-care situation, or simply quitting her job and staying home. Except for the period during World War II in the past working mothers have more often than not been those who found themselves widowed or divorced and, therefore, the sole support of their families. But now, in this time of changing social institutions, we find that child-care services are not even beginning to keep pace with the demand—and it is too often the children who are left to pay the consequences.

A second kind of need is one which Headstart and title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have already focused our attention upon. This is the need of children from economically disadvantaged or otherwise deprived backgrounds who need extra educational, social, medical, nutritional, and other services if they are to have a chance of achieving their full potential. Recent studies have shown that the results of Headstart have not been all that we hoped for when the program was established. Part of the reason for these disappointing findings is that many Headstart children were in the program for only a brief summer's experience—hardly enough time to attend to their medical and nutritional needs, much less to try to enhance their social and intellectual development. But many disadvantaged children do not have a chance to receive even these limited services. There are at least 3 million children aged 3 to 5 from disadvantaged families—Headstart's full year capacity is only a quarter of a million children; summer Headstart can accommodate just under that amount.

Several of the witnesses who have appeared before the House Education and Labor Committee have argued that one of the most effective ways, in the long run, to prevent severe deprivation of children from economically disadvantaged families would be to establish programs aimed at their parents, or even at adolescent girls and expectant mothers who will become parents. These programs would try to help these parents and future parents help their children by providing proper nutrition, educational, and social development opportunities. Often, educational deprivation comes as much from the parents' simply not knowing what to do as from their not being able to do it for financial reasons—repeating the names of objects and colors to a toddler who is just learning how to talk, for example, requires only a parent's time and interest.

These are compelling and urgent needs which have not been met by the existing combination of Federal, State, local, and private efforts. It is to these needs that the bill we are introducing today is addressed.

The following articles and testimony of witnesses before the Education and Labor Committee represent only a sampling of the great attention which has

been given to the need for adequate child development and child-care services in recent months.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to commend my colleague for the excellent work he has done as chairman of the Republican Task Force on Education and Training which has been conducting studies on this topic. The piece of legislation to which he has referred would consolidate six day-care and child development programs, including Headstart. As we know, a great number of Federal programs in one way or another presently provide assistance for day-care programs. The proposed legislation will help to consolidate under one head, in the Office of Child Development, the kind of preschool programs that are necessary if we are going to meet the proposals which the President held out for adequate programing, including welfare, family assistance programs, training, and employment of people who are presently on welfare and who are unemployed. If we want to produce the great amount of results in order to alleviate the problems of disadvantaged children, many of whom at the present time go through 10 or 12 grades of school and are still functionally illiterate, we must start before they begin in the first grade.

This is the least expensive means in order to assist disadvantaged children, and I believe it is the most effective. The program which has been put together, which I am pleased to join the gentleman from Oregon in introducing, is one in which we will build on the programs that have been successful and move into those programs which have not been successful in the past.

THE INVOLVEMENT OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS

The number of children who eventually might become involved in early childhood programs is many times the number now enrolled. Now, for example, out of some 1.5 million who are eligible for Headstart, only 500,000 can be accommodated. Only 2 percent of the children of working mothers are cared for in child-care centers.

To get an idea of what we might have to expect, we will have to know how many children there will be. As of July 1, 1969, there were:

Children under 3	10,448,000
3-year-olds	3,643,000
4-year-olds	3,867,000
5-year-olds	4,050,000
Total	22,008,000

Both the birth rate and the numbers of children born each year have been declining in recent years, a trend accentuated by a growing interest in population control. But a sharp increase in the numbers of women of childbearing age will reverse present trends, in terms of numbers of births. Even conservative estimates project about a 40-percent increase of annual births, from 3.8 million a year to 5.3 million. Furthermore, the percentage of children who will want or need these services can be expected

to increase. There are two reasons: First, the percentage of working mothers is continuing to rise every year as more and more mothers of young children seek work, usually to help out with the family budget, but increasingly to use their job skills as secretaries, teachers, nurses or other occupations which require special training. Second, the Headstart program has made many parents more aware than ever before of the special importance of the first 5 years of child's life, and they are seeking similar preschool experiences for their children. A recent article discusses this trend:

THE FAMILY CAUGHT IN THE MIDDLE

(By Herrick S. Roth)

The average American family earned \$8600 last year—a Census Bureau computation. There are four members in that family, which is still primarily blue collar. The adult members are reasonably satisfied with their lives, generally. They live in urban areas and do have some hang-ups—taxes, inflation, blacks and Vietnam.

Because a majority of the principal breadwinners of the average family are either members of or have their economic pattern of living set by unions, there is more than a little information to be gleaned from this trade unionist and his average family.

Parents in the average family have an increasingly stronger opinion about education of their children—when and where their children should be engaged in formal schooling. This is one of the shifts of the 1960's, even if the worker is still primarily blue collar. His affluence has caught up with both himself and his spouse. They both used to leave the decision-making of the lay public school boards and even the limited activities of the school parent organizations in the hands of the white collar, professional style family leaders. They now either have activated their own participation or at least are not nearly as fearful of speaking up to the school master and public official about their own unique wisdom and opinions on educating children—especially their own. Whether or not they really know how best to educate their own children is hardly the point.

They are suddenly concerned, because the attitudes and activities of others have caused them to be concerned. They are confident and ready to speak out—especially when they seem to sense in very typical trade union fashion that they are getting the short end of a deal. What's good enough for one is good enough for all is more true than trite for this average workingman and his family. So, if he thinks that someone else is being given something special, he is speaking up, even before he has time to analyze the accuracy of his assertions.

Education today includes the early childhood variety. Today's working man remembers one generation back when kindergartens were not the general order of the day in the public sector.

Now, he knows that in most urban environments, they are. If they are not, he, through his union, has resolved to get them and support their establishment and funding. The chances are that if he has a five-year-old at his home, the youngster is in kindergarten; the father and mother are impressed with the benefit to and reaction of the child; unless there is no work available to the father and his property taxes and mortgages and finance charges are getting beyond him, he'll fight to keep that kindergarten service available.

WATCHING THE POOR BENEFIT

But now what does he see? He finds the very poor being offered more early childhood opportunities at someone else's expense than he has been able to offer his youngest chil-

dren at anyone's expense—unless it be out of his own pocket. He knows—or instinctively feels—that the very rich and those that are almost rich (high in the upper middle income brackets) can or do provide at their own expense the preschool education of their own children. He's just becoming aware that he is being left out.

It is not unlike everything else that he sees, or thinks he sees, going on around him. If his son or daughter has gotten nursery or preschool training, it has been directly out of his own family pocketbook. More than likely, it has been a nursery school or day center type of private situation; it has cost money, but it might have been more custodial care than educational during the working hours common to both him and his wife. His aggravation and the price against his personal budget are adding to some deterioration in his generally satisfied state.

If there can be Head Start for the young child of the economically disadvantaged, there can be for him, too. Without examining the bill of particulars he has two attitudes about early childhood educational programs and schools: (1) we can afford it for all if we can afford it for any; (2) we will be paid back many times over for enriching our educational investments in the very young at very early dates.

LABOR MOVEMENT POSITIONS

Some key examples of this average workingman's labor movement blend in with his more personal reactions. In New York City, the trade union movement and central labor council (AFL-CIO) is in general support of the well-defined statements of priority set forth in October, 1969 by the largest local union among all of the crafts and trades embracing 60,000 locals in the AFL-CIO. UFT, Local 2 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, recently claimed: "It is vital that a nationwide early childhood program be instituted with education on a full-time basis beginning at the age of three."

Even on higher levels, on October 5, 1969 at its 8th Biennial Convention, the AFL-CIO in its Resolution on Education (No. 204), spoke of "need" in additional terms, this time—not just the need to pump extra funding into poorer areas, which it still underscored fully. It looked at both ends of the chronological spectrum, as it leveled strong criticism at the "lumbering bureaucratic structure which has made schools slow to respond to the real needs of their students, faculty and communities. . . . It has long been the position of the AFL-CIO that free public education should no longer be limited to twelve (or thirteen) years of school. For the very young, especially those who have been economically deprived, pre-kindergarten classes have proved to be the great benefit in improving further educational achievement."

The average American—working man, blue collar, not too badly off and urban-oriented—is not about to settle now for early childhood educational opportunity only for the very poor or the very rich. His child needs it too, and he probably won't tolerate delays in establishing public funding of such programs.

Thus we can expect not only that there will be more pre-school-age children in the near future, but also that proportionately more of the parents of those children will want or need child development programs. This means that even though present programs do not begin to meet current needs, we must prepare to provide for significantly more children, if we are even to maintain present rates.

The following analysis by Selma Mushkin gives one estimate of what we can expect.

COST OF A TOTAL PRESCHOOL PROGRAM IN 1975

(By Selma Mushkin)

How much by way of resources is required to make a full-scale attack on early childhood education? The numbers of children under five by 1975 are estimated at 21 to 27 million, depending upon the fertility rate.

To try to approximate the costs that would be involved in providing child development services with an educational component and to provide preprimary education, account must be taken of the following:

(1) The numbers of children in each of the age groups of preprimary education.

(2) The number of children from among those in these age groups who would make use of such child care and preprimary education facilities.

(3) A reasonable nationwide cost per child that would take account of professional and para-professional salary levels five years or so hence, material and equipment cost, etc.

(4) The scope of the services provided (to what extent health service component, dental care, nutrition services are included, as well as educational services).

(5) The period of the year, the length of the week, and the hours per day for which services are provided.

The issue of how such costs should be financed is essentially a separate one from the question of availability of the services. Consideration in program development should be given to service for the community as a whole, with appropriate charges imposed in relation to the payability of the families and with safeguards to assure that the care of the child does not depend upon the payments made.

Following are estimated total costs for a nationwide early childhood effort in 1975:

Total program: Tax costs (combined program 0-5 year old): \$5,483,000,000 to \$7,667,000,000.

Program for 3-4 Year Old Group

(a) Total cost, program for 3-4 year olds: \$10,000,000,000 to \$12,500,000,000.

(b) Tax costs (assuming an average for one-third the children): \$3,333,000,000 to \$4,167,000,000.

(c) Total number of preprimary children (3 and 4 year olds): 8,000,000 to 10,000,000.

(d) Average cost per preprimary child (average per ¾ day): \$1,250 per child.

Program for Children 0-3 Years of Age

(a) Total cost (at \$2,500 per child): \$6,500,000,000 to \$10,250,000,000.

(b) Tax costs: Total: \$2,125,000,000 to \$3,500,000,000.

(i) Children paying part costs (on average of one-half cost): \$375,000,000 to \$500,000,000.

(ii) Children receiving services without charge: \$1,750,000,000 to \$3,000,000,000.

(c) Total number of children: 13,000,000 to 17,000,000.

(d) Total number of children of working mothers (low estimate: low fertility, 25% of mothers working) (high estimate: high fertility, 30% of mothers working): 3,300,000 to 5,100,000.

(e) Total number of children using facilities (assume 80 per cent will use): 2,600,000 to 4,100,000.

(i) Full cost covered by charges: 1,600,000 to 2,500,000.

(ii) Part cost covered by charges: 300,000 to 400,000.

(iii) No charge (30% of the children): 700,000 to 1,200,000.

If nothing else, it should be clear from these figures that the Federal Government can never be expected to pay the full cost of providing child-development and child-care services for all who need them. If Dr. Mushkin's figures correctly anticipate the future need, it would cost a total of \$10 to \$125 billion for 3- to 4-

year-olds and \$6.5 to \$10.25 billion for 0- to 3-year-olds—a total of \$16.5 to \$22.75 billion, and this is excluding 5-year-olds, even though many States do not operate public kindergartens.

We cannot expect, either, that State or local governments will be able to assume this burden. They are already hard pressed to keep pace with the growing costs of traditionally provided services—the Youngstown phenomenon is being repeated more often than we would like to think.

The involvement of private enterprise in providing child-development services may be a way out of this dilemma. It is a little realized fact, for instance, that private, profitmaking nursery schools, kindergartens, and day-care centers are right now providing over half the total services available. The following figures for day care provide an example.

Type of center	Number of centers	Number of children	Percent
Public	730	34,600	6.0
Voluntary-philanthropic	3,800	167,000	32.0
Independent profit	6,900	247,000	47.4
Other	2,170	73,000	14.0

Many people, when they think of profitmaking corporations organizing and operating child-care and child-development services, forget that the vast majority of the high quality nursery schools, summer camps, and similar institutions which serve only those middle-class families lucky enough to afford them, fit into the classification of private profitmaking corporations. Somehow the image of making money by helping young children to reach their full potential often draws a negative reaction—people forget that the private profitmaking programs came first and that philanthropic and public programs like Headstart were set up so that children from low-income families would also have a chance to receive similar services.

But this is indeed the case, and when we try to plan for future child development needs, we should not forget it. This is the reason why the bill we are introducing today not only permits, but encourages, private enterprise to become involved in working with young children. The involvement of private enterprise can ease the financial burden of providing needed services in two ways:

First, right now, there are, in practically every large city, thousands of working mothers or women who would like to go back to work, who can afford to pay most or all of the cost of child-care services for their children but who find that adequate facilities and programs are simply not available at any price. Often the few centers that do exist are limited only to low-income of AFDC children, or else they have waiting lists of months and even years duration. Private enterprise can help to meet this need by establishing more centers in areas where there is great demand.

Second, repeatedly, private enterprise has demonstrated the capacity to duplicate public programs at significantly lower cost. Headstart, for example, averages between \$1,700 and \$2,000 per year for each child, and some programs have

even averaged out to \$3,000 per pupil and higher. If private corporations can operate high-quality programs for the same children, but keep costs down by using sophisticated management and organizational techniques, then we should take advantage of this additional resource in order to extend programs to as many children as possible with available funds.

Thus private enterprise can increase the amount of services available at no additional cost to Federal, State, and local governments, and it can also effect a savings in the cost of services already being subsidized by the Government.

It is important that every precaution is taken to assure that the same high standards established for publicly financed programs will apply to private profitmaking programs. Our bill uses the existing Federal interagency day-care requirements as a guide, but the following summary of the various State requirements which apply to child-care programs illustrate the diversity of regulations in this area, as well as the necessity for careful planning on the part of any firm planning to establish child-care programs on an interstate basis. But let me emphasize again, that we require profitmaking firms to maintain the same standards as those required of public and private nonprofit programs.

Summary of State personnel and space regulations governing child-care centers

(Based on a survey of 48 States—excluding Hawaii, Alaska, and the District of Columbia)

Inside square footage per child:	States
20 square feet.....	2
30 square feet.....	8
35 square feet.....	32
35 to 50 square feet.....	3
40 to 50 square feet.....	1
Information not available.....	2
Outside footage per child:	
40 square feet.....	1
50 square feet.....	3
50 to 60 square feet.....	1
60 square feet.....	1
65 square feet.....	2
72 square feet.....	1
75 square feet.....	20
80 to 75 square feet.....	1
80 square feet.....	1
100 square feet.....	6
50 to 100 square feet.....	1
75 to 10 square feet.....	1
200 square feet.....	1
Information not available.....	8
Adult-child ratio—2-year-olds:	
2 to 1.....	1
5 to 1.....	2
6 to 1.....	2
8 to 1.....	9
6-8 to 1.....	1
10 to 1.....	17
8-12 to 1.....	1
15-18 to 1.....	1
Information not available.....	14
Adult-child ratio—3-year-olds:	
5 to 1.....	1
7 to 1.....	1
8 to 1.....	1
10 to 1.....	25
7-10 to 1.....	1
8-10 to 1.....	1
12 to 1.....	4
15 to 1.....	5
10-15 to 1.....	1
12-15 to 1.....	1
12-16 to 1.....	1
15-18 to 1.....	1
Information not available.....	5

Adult-child ratio—4-year-olds:	States
7 to 1.....	2
10 to 1.....	11
7-10 to 1.....	1
12 to 1.....	8
14 to 1.....	1
10-14 to 1.....	1
15 to 1.....	8
12-16 to 1.....	1
15-18 to 1.....	1
20 to 1.....	8
15-20 to 1.....	2
Information not available.....	4
Adult-child ratio—5-year-olds:	
10 to 1.....	6
12 to 1.....	1
14 to 1.....	1
15 to 1.....	7
16 to 1.....	2
12-16 to 1.....	1
18 to 1.....	5
20 to 1.....	5
15-20 to 1.....	1
18-20 to 1.....	1
25 to 1.....	1
Information not available.....	12
Average of adult-child ratios required in child development programs—3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds:	
6 to 1.....	1
10 to 1.....	9
11 to 1.....	3
12 to 1.....	5
13 to 1.....	2
14 to 1.....	6
15 to 1.....	5
16 to 1.....	3
18 to 1.....	5
20 to 1.....	4
Information not available.....	5

Several private firms have overcome this rather forbidding array of rules and regulations and have organized programs in many States to provide child-care and child-development services. An example of two corporations' experiences are described in the following statements:

[From Compact, December 1969]

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE SEES PROFIT IN PRESCHOOLS

(By Edward T. Breathitt)

(NOTE.—Governor Breathitt is president of American Child Centers Inc., which is based in Nashville, Tennessee. An attorney, he was governor of Kentucky between 1963 and 1967 and previously served three terms as a state representative.)

The year 1969 was an eventful period for those Americans who have been concerned with the limited scale of efforts throughout our nation to meet the educational and social needs of children from three to six years of age. Private groups began developing programs in 1969 to serve these children, particularly the sons and daughters of working mothers. American Child Centers, Inc. is a major part of these private efforts.

This fall, we opened the first two centers. The first unit, owned and operated by American Child Centers Inc. (ACC), began operations last September 2 in Nashville, Tennessee. On December 1, our first franchised center began operating in Frankfort, Kentucky.

Sites are now being sought for additional centers, including ten which should be ready to open in 1970. These centers will be placed throughout the nation, ranging from Virginia to California. We will sell franchises to qualified investors who are interested in becoming involved in business efforts to meet some of the social needs of the United States.

SERVICES PROVIDED

The ACC package works in other ways to meet the objective of preschool education.

An insurance company in the mid-south, for example, has entered into an agreement with ACC to operate a child care service for women employees who have children between three and six years of age. The center will be located on the same block as the company's home office. A major manufacturer based in a seaboard state in the east has asked us to provide similar services for children of its employees. American Child Centers Inc. also will provide child care services, under contract, for public agencies.

Through these various avenues—company-owned centers, franchised operations, contracts with business and public groups and consultative services—American Child Centers will provide far more than baby-sitting services to children of working mothers and will be in the position to offer carefully developed child development programs for children enrolled in our early childhood education centers.

American Child Centers was formed in December, 1968 following a months-long nationwide research effort by the Nashville-based Southeastern Research, a private firm, which demonstrated the need for a program such as ours. Research indicated that there are 2.5 million children between three and six whose mothers work. The number will grow. Neither the public sector nor private business had made arrangements to provide sound, high-quality programs to serve these youngsters.

THE PROGRAM

The ACC program has been developed by professional educators versed in the pre-school field. These have included Dr. Otto Billig, professor of clinical psychiatry at Vanderbilt University's School of Medicine; Dr. Richard H. Hinze, former professor of education at George Peabody College for Teachers, who left his position as dean of the graduate division of Bank Street College of Education in New York City to become ACC's vice president for professional services; and Dr. Hollis A. Moore, Jr., academic vice president of Peabody College.

The American Child Centers' package will provide learning and living experiences for children within and around a building designed for young boys and girls. Inside the building, and on the playground outside, care has been taken to provide for the comfort, safety and health of every child.

The building was designed as a child development center, incorporating in it the knowledge and experience of leaders in child development and education. Floors are carpeted. Strict standards have been set for sanitation and health. The child-size equipment was designed by authorities in early childhood education. The staff of American Child Centers is selected carefully and is trained to give each child good experiences in child-to-adult relationships and to help develop sound child-to-child relationships. The adult-child ratio has been set at one adult to each group of ten children. The center director must be a college graduate, and American Child Centers stresses the value of a graduate degree for such persons.

Each director of a center will come to Nashville for two weeks of training. Manuals will be provided each director to outline effective methods of operating the center and to outline curriculum. The programs will be inspected by American Child Centers' personnel to assure efficiency of operations and adherence to our standards as set out in contracts and in the manuals.

Full-day service will be offered, as well as a morning nursery school-kindergarten and an afternoon program. Some centers will provide Saturday programs at hourly rates. The rates for ACC programs will vary, depending upon cost variances in different parts of the country. In Nashville, the weekly charge for full-day service is \$21.75; the

morning program costs \$14.50 (includes one snack and lunch), and the afternoon program costs \$12.50. There is a registration fee of \$25.

Each person developing a center will be provided building plans, site selection aid, equipment guides, operating and curriculum manuals and advertising and public relations support. Most ACC centers will serve 130 children, although plans and operating formats are available for both smaller and larger sizes.

An open-floor, team-teaching plan will be used. There will be a conference within each center daily in order to permit teachers to plan the program for the following day. In the Nashville center, Mrs. Earline Kendall, the center director, may observe the entire school from a loft in the front of the building. Parents, too, are invited to watch their children from the loft. Beneath the loft is an amphitheater for plays, films, television and for creative drama.

Areas in the building are separated by pieces of equipment and furniture which have been designed and selected to serve dual purposes. There are three teams within the center, each operating from its own sectional area. Joint use areas include the amphitheater, block area, art area, indoor physical education area and the outdoor play area. The sectional areas inside the building, because of the flexibility allowed by movable partitioning, change shape almost daily as the children and staff plan varying activities.

Outside, there is a wooden bridge, a concrete culvert, a seven-level treehouse, hills, trees, gravel paved driveways for wheel toys, grassy areas and native limestone rocks.

Among the activities at the center are programs in language development (listening, speaking, reading, writing), mathematics, sciences and social studies. An adult sits with the children at lunch as part of the American Child Center program of using this activity in the social development phase of the curriculum.

Considerable emphasis is placed on creative activity and aesthetic expression. The primary objectives of both the full-day and half-day programs are the optimal development of each child, socially, emotionally, intellectually and physically.

Currently, our program serves primarily the middle and upper middle income groups. Through agreements with either public agencies or private businesses, the ACC services could be made available to lesser privileged children. Essentially, the ACC plan is built around the idea that private organizations are able to deliver constructive social services.

The following statement was prepared by the Universal Education Corporation:
THE ROLE THAT PRIVATE ENTERPRISE CAN PLAY

Historically, many of this country's major achievements have resulted from federally-funded programs carried out by private corporations under contract with the government.

This has been the pattern in the nation's defense, agricultural and space programs, in the development of its transportation systems, and in many other projects that were vital in the building of America. The same pattern has applied also in education, even though in the nation's earlier priorities industry's contributions to education occurred on a somewhat smaller scale. But these contributions were nevertheless highly significant—in the development of textbooks, in the variety and versatility of classroom equipment, in the invention and marketing of the most advanced audiovisual teaching aids, in the development and testing of sophisticated learning systems, and in the provision of virtually all of the basic curricular materials for both public and private schools.

In the present order of our national priorities, education is rated higher than ever

before in history. Among educators, too, preschool education is rated far higher than ever before. In this area also, private industry, in accordance with traditional patterns, must play a major role.

Dozens of large and highly competent firms have already entered the preschool education field. They did so because they realized they had the people, the skills, the imagination and other resources to make major contributions in this area of great social need.

If I may be permitted to do so, I would like to use my own company as an illustration, simply because it is the one I am most familiar with.

The Universal Education Corporation has invested more than \$5,000,000 to date in developing preschool educational programs and systems designed to meet the needs of the country's children and parents. This effort, which has been under way for several years, has been carried out by a highly qualified staff working in consultation with many of the nation's leading experts in preschool education. The result of this effort and investment is the *Discovery Program*—a unique preschool educational service for parents and children.

The Discovery Program is designed to benefit all preschool children and their parents, regardless of their socio-economic status. *It should be made available to all children*, whether or not they are enrolled in Head Start day care centers or nursery schools. It is an essential educational supplement to all these.

The Discovery Program is offered through the company's chain of *Discovery Centers* now operating in New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut and Massachusetts. Our company plans to open over 300 more Discovery Centers throughout the nation by the end of 1972. Let me point out that these Centers are not franchised, but are operated wholly by the company so that the necessary quality control over the educational services can be maintained.

A Discovery Center is a cheerful place where children have stimulating and exciting learning experiences. They see specially produced educational TV puppet shows and educational sound films. They use the latest types of learning materials, as well as unique educational toys, some of which incorporate the best advances and the latest inventions of modern electronic and mechanical technology.

The staff of every Discovery Center includes learning specialists who assess each individual child's learning needs and prepare an individualized educational development profile on him. They guide and reinforce the child's learning, enabling him to move to higher levels of skill and achievement.

The learning specialists also supply the parents with continuing reports concerning the child's observed learning needs, and with learning materials and aids to take home so that the discovery process of learning continues throughout the week.

For private parent-consultation sessions, each Discovery Center staff also includes a professional specialist in child development and early learning who holds a doctoral degree.

The Discovery Center is, therefore, quite different from a day care service, a nursery school, or a counseling service. It can work hand-in-hand with all of these because it supplements what they do.

AVAILABILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF INDUSTRY'S RESOURCES

We urge the federal government to take advantage of the very considerable resources of talent, managerial skill and experience of private industry, and of the fruits of millions of dollars of investment which it is currently making available to the government in the area of preschool education.

In addition to these tangible assets and benefits, in its role as a contractor, private industry also offers an additional benefit: it can be held accountable for delivering a promised and contracted-for result. One of the great strengths of contract relationships between government and industry is that a corporation can be held accountable. It is legally obligated to perform against the terms of the contract; these terms specify budgets, timetables and outcomes.

Accountability is the key to performance, and private industry is built around the principle of accountability. Many of industry's greatest achievements in varied fields may be traced directly to this principle.

Private involvement in providing child-care centers can take a different approach from that described above. Many companies, plants, factories, and offices that employ large numbers of mothers of young children have found that it is to their advantage to make arrangements to provide child-care services as a benefit to their employee. This enables them to attract the stable, trained workers they need, and it results in a significantly improved attendance rate and production rate among mothers who no longer are burdened with unreliable babysitting situations and who, because they know their children are being well cared for can devote their full attention and energies to their work. The Skyland Textile Co., Morganton, N.C., the KLLH Corp., Cambridge, Mass., and the AVCO Economic Systems Corp., Dorchester, Mass., are operating model child-care programs of this type. Unions are also becoming involved—the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America operate child-care centers in Baltimore, Md., and Verona, Va., with other centers planned at Hanover and McConnellsburg, Pa., and one under construction at Chambersburg, Md.

Our bill, therefore, provides for this kind of private involvement as well. Any employer of 15 or more working mothers with children younger than compulsory school attendance age will be eligible to apply for a grant under the new consolidated Headstart program. As with all the services subsidized under the consolidated program, fees will be charged according to ability to pay.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota very much for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, as one who has worked with the gentleman from Minnesota for more than 3 years on the Education and Labor Committee, I am fully aware, as I am sure most of the Members of the House are, of the gentleman's deep involvement with the number of programs of which we are here seeking consolidation. He is one of the leaders in the field, and I appreciate what the gentleman has said.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I join in the colloquy here today. I assure the gentleman I am preparing some remarks to put in the RECORD which will support the position the gentleman is taking. I remind the gentleman, as I think he knows, that I am cosponsoring

this legislation with him. I do it gladly and I do it with enthusiasm and I do it because this legislation is the result of research and study and by some very competent people who have a strong feel for those things that need to be done in education. Those of us who have been teachers especially know the importance of early education and proper care.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman highly for his leadership in this regard. He has been a real inspiration and guide and leader in this area. I am glad the gentleman is taking the floor to discuss this problem, and through the important vehicle of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to let at least 60,000 people, if they will read the RECORD, know about this very important development in the Congress.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, for what he has had to say this morning. We are very pleased to have the illustrious gentleman as one of the cosponsors of this bill. He is one who has been equally concerned in this field. We are pleased and honored to have him with us on this piece of legislation.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also would like to express my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon for the effective leadership he has furnished in the effort that has produced the bill being introduced today. I am also proud to join as a cosponsor of this bill.

As the gentleman knows, it is my privilege to serve on the Select Subcommittee on Education which has been conducting hearings over a period of several months on legislation proposing the extension of more and better services to preschool children. These hearings have been conducted under the very able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

In the course of the hearings, the many specialists and many laymen who have come before the subcommittee have emphasized the truth of the President's remarks when early in his administration he emphasized the necessity of developing programs that will help to enrich the first 5 years of life. The legislation which is being introduced today is designed to provide an effective and constructive means of implementing the goals that have been so well set forth by the President.

Among the needs that have become very clear in the course of the testimony presented by various witnesses to the subcommittee has been the need to bring together many of the programs that are now being supported to some degree by Federal funds. There are a great many who have expressed themselves, who share the fear that I feel, that in this very critical area of furnishing services to very young children, unless we very quickly begin to move forward with a consolidation of the effort we are mounting, unless we take steps to avoid the inevitable duplication of effort and over-

lapping of responsibility, then, as well intentioned as these efforts are, they will really be doomed to failure.

So among the many excellent features of this bill is one which is designed primarily to consolidate programs that are underway. As my good friend from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) pointed out, this is to build on those which have demonstrated they have the greatest value and to extend from there.

Another important feature of this bill is that it moves in a step-by-step process so that we can grow as we learn how to grow and make the fullest and most efficient use of the limited resources that are available.

THE CONSOLIDATED PROGRAM

The Federal Government is currently operating at least 61 different programs which provide funds for child care or child development, either directly or indirectly. Among these, there are at least seven separate programs which provide funds for the operating expenses of child care centers or preschool education, some nine programs for training child development personnel, seven research programs, four food programs, four construction programs, and three loan programs. Only a few of these, however, are directly aimed at child development. Most were set up for other purposes, and day care or child development is only ancillary.

The result of this proliferation is a frustrating lack of coordination and direction at Federal, State, and local levels. In some areas, child care centers funded under separate Federal programs may find themselves in competition for the same children, while in other areas proposed centers which would serve children who desperately need preschool educational opportunities cannot get the necessary funds. At the Federal level, the current administration established the Office of Child Development within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—its purpose was to coordinate and serve as a point of focus for all programs having to do with the first 5 years of life. Headstart is now being administered by this Office, but the other programs are still distributed among the Departments of Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

At this point in time, no one really knows what the impact of this plethora of programs has been. In fact, under the previous administration, no system was developed even to assess regularly the number of children being served by these programs, the cost of the programs, or the number of personnel involved in them. The bill we plan to introduce, therefore, will call for a lengthy evaluation of the accomplishments and impact of these programs and will establish a system for continuing assessment. This assessment will give us the information we need to coordinate the 61 or more programs more effectively. In the meanwhile, however, our bill takes a major first step in this direction. The comprehensive Federal Headstart program established in this measure will be the

result of pooling some half-dozen programs now already in existence, all of which provide funds for providing child care and child development services for underprivileged children. These programs include Headstart, the preschool portion of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, day-care programs for the children of migrant workers, day-care programs for AFDC children, child welfare day-care services, and programs which provide day care for children of mothers enrolled in manpower training and employment programs.

Under the new arrangement, all the programs would be combined into a single effort administered at the Federal level by the Office of Child Development. The major responsibility for developing a national system of child care and child development services, however, would be located at the State level.

Each State would be allotted a portion of the funds available under the comprehensive Headstart program and would establish a State commission to develop a State plan for the utilization of these funds. It is these State plans that we hope will provide better than present methods for making the widest possible range of services to as many disadvantaged children and children of working mothers as may need them.

In operation, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Office of Child Development, would have the responsibility for allotting funds to the States according to the formula set forth in the legislation and for approving the State plans after checking to see that they meet the requirements established in our bill. Then, once the State plan was in operation, any potential sponsor of a child care or child development could submit an application for funds to the State commission in that State. The commission would review the application, together with other applications it has received, in light of the State's most pressing needs, its resources, and future prospects. It would then either approve or disapprove the application, depending on whether or not it was in keeping with the overall State plan for providing child development services. Finally, the Office of Child Development would grant funds for those applications approved by the State commission.

This process is designed to assure that the available funds will be used in the most efficient and most effective manner possible in each State. We have required that both urban areas with high concentrations of economically deprived people and rural areas which often get short shrift in child-care programs get an equitable share of the State's funds.

Finally, this process will mean that schools, churches, community action agencies, and other sponsors of child-care services will need to make only one application to one agency, and that their application will be considered as it compares with applications from other programs in the same State.

Following is a compilation, based on the best estimates of administration officials, of the 61 programs:

Agency and program	Program purpose	Program services	Funding	Program frees mother for work	Components eligible to operate	Service available to nonpoor	Renovation or construction money available	Program effect on children	Program budget
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY—HEW:									
Headstart (title II, Economic Opportunity Act).	A comprehensive early childhood development program for preschool children. Family involvement is included.	Health, nutrition, social services, education, parent participation as advisers and workers.	80 percent, Federal, 20 percent local (cash or in-kind).	Yes, day care.	Public nonprofit agencies, CAA's, religious groups, school systems, higher learning institutions.	Yes, 10 percent of participants may be nonpoor.	Only for limited repairs and renovation.	Direct, program specifically for children.	\$338,000,000.
Parent and child centers (title II, Economic Opportunity Act).	Center established to help families function effectively and for direct services to children.	Comprehensive child health care, children's social activities, parent activities (understanding child, attaining parental competence), general family social services.	80 percent Federal, 20 percent local (cash or in-kind).	Yes, day care.	(Same as Headstart).	No.....	do.....	Direct.....	5,000,000 (1969).
HEW—SOCIAL REHABILITATION SERVICE—COMMUNITY SERVICES ADMINISTRATION									
Social services to families and children receiving AFDC (title IV, Social Security Act).	Social services to needy families with dependent children to help the family maintain and strengthen family life.	Child care services, foster care, family planning, prevention or reduction of births out of wedlock, child protective, legal, and health services.	Federal Government pays 75 percent of state costs.	Yes, child care services.	State welfare agencies.	No.....	Limited to only very minor repairs.	Direct and indirect.	
Child Welfare Services (title IV, Social Security Act).	Grants-in-aid to State welfare agencies for (1) preventing or remedying neglect, abuse, delinquency; (2) protection and care for homeless child; (3) protecting children of working mothers; (4) providing for foster and day care.	Day care; foster care; protective services, institutional care; homemaker services; adoption placements.	Federal Government pays variable matching formula 33½-66½ percent, \$70,000 grant to each state.	Yes, day care.	State welfare agencies.	-----	-----	Direct.....	\$7,276,000 (day-care services).
Child welfare training grants program (title IV, Social Security Act).	Grants to institutions of higher learning to assist in training students in the field of child welfare. May also include training of volunteers to serve in child welfare programs.	Training personnel in the field of child welfare.	-----	-----	Institutions of higher learning.	-----	-----	Indirect.....	
Child welfare research and demonstration grants program (title IV, Social Security Act).	Grants to institutions of higher learning and nonprofit agencies or organizations engaged in research related to child welfare for research and demonstration projects in the area of new methods or facilities relating to child welfare.	Demonstrations in day care. Research in adoption, foster care, protective services, and policy formulation.	Cost sharing—Usually not less than 5 percent by grantee.	-----	Institutions of higher learning, public or nonprofit agencies and organizations.	-----	Only the most minor repairs.	do.....	\$2,725,588 (day-care demonstration and other projects).
Child care for the work incentive program (WIN) (title IV, Social Security Act).	Grants to State welfare agencies to provide child care services for WIN enrollees.	Day care services.....	85 percent Federal participation fiscal year 1969, 75 percent thereafter.	Yes.....	Any individual or agency that meets State child care standards.	No.....	No.....	Direct.....	\$56,140,000 (preschool and school age).
SRS—OFFICE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY									
Planning and preventive and rehabilitative services (title I, Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act Public Law 90-445).	Grants to State, public and private nonprofit agencies for projects for rehabilitative and preventive juvenile delinquency services.	Planning juvenile delinquency projects and programs.	-----	-----	State agencies, public and nonprofit organizations.	-----	-----	Indirect.....	
Training (title II, Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act Public Law 90-445).	Grants for training personnel in the field of juvenile delinquency.	Training personnel.....	-----	-----	State agencies, public and nonprofit organizations.	-----	-----	do.....	
Improved techniques and practices (title III, Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act Public Law 90-445).	Grants for development of improved techniques and practices in field of juvenile delinquency. Also for the provision of technical assistance to agencies and organizations.	Development of improved techniques and practices.	-----	-----	State agencies, public and nonprofit private organizations.	-----	-----	-----	

Agency and program	Program purpose	Program services	Funding	Program frees mother for work	Components eligible to operate	Service available to nonpoor	Renovation or construction money available	Program effect on children	Program budget
SRS—ADMINISTRATION ON AGING									
Foster grandparents program.	To employ low-income persons over 60 for purpose of establishing a continuing "grandparent" relationship with children under 17 (usually deprived) in an institutional setting.	Training of participants and maintenance of program.	Up to 90 percent Federal, 10 percent local (cash or in-kind).	-----	Any non-Federal public or private nonprofit agency.	Foster grandparents must be low income; children usually but not mandatory.	Only for minor repairs.	Direct and indirect.	
Retired senior volunteer program.	When program is started will recruit and train persons over 60 for community volunteer work.	Volunteers will serve in public agencies and institutions including day care centers and schools.	Up to 100 percent Federal.	Yes-----	Any public or private nonprofit agency or institution of higher learning.	-----	-----	do-----	
HEW—OFFICE OF EDUCATION									
Title I—ESEA-----	Federal aid to State for educational programs for deprived children. Program designed as comprehensive education program involving coordinated use of resources from other programs.	Special educational assistance to educationally deprived children.	100 percent Federal.	No-----	State and local education agencies.	Yes (most are economically as well as educationally deprived).	-----	Direct-----	\$58,012,000 (preschool and kindergarten).
Title I—ESEA Migrant Program.	Grant awards to State education department to assist in education of migrant children.	General instruction, especially teaching of English as second language. Health care, clothing and food.	-----	-----	State and local education agencies, private nonprofit agency, institution of higher learning.	-----	-----	Do-----	\$2,723,664 (1969).
Follow-through (title II, Economic Opportunity Act).	Designed to augment and build upon gains made by poor child in Headstart or similar programs in kindergarten through 3 years of schooling. Comprehensive program to meet child's instructional, physical and social needs.	Instruction, nutrition, health, social and psychological services. Parent participation is included.	80 percent Federal, 20 percent local (cash or in-kind).	No-----	Local educational agencies, community action agency, private nonprofit agencies.	No-----	May be used for renovation or repair.	-----do-----	\$58,000,000.
Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act.	Demonstration program to establish education development centers for handicapped children.	Diagnostic and therapeutic services for handicapped children. Educational and guidance services for parents.	90 percent Federal.	No-----	Public and private nonprofit organizations, universities.	Yes-----	-----	do-----	\$1,000,000 (1969).
Aid to State Schools for the Handicapped (title I—ESEA).	Provides grants to State to assist in education of handicapped children in State operated or supported schools for the handicapped.	Various developmental programs for handicapped children.	100 percent Federal.	No-----	State operated or state supported school for handicapped.	Yes-----	No-----	do-----	\$36,690,000 (preschool cannot be broken out).
Education for the handicapped (title VI A, ESEA).	Grants to States to assist in the initiation, expansion, and improvement of special education for handicapped children.	Special educational and related services for handicapped children at preschool, elementary and secondary level.	Based on number of 3- to 21-year-olds in State.	No-----	State and local educational agencies.	Yes-----	-----	do-----	\$4,000,000.
Research and demonstration projects (title III, Mental Retardation and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963).	Support for research and related activities for education of handicapped children.	Research activity for education of handicapped children.	-----	No-----	State and local education agencies, public and private nonprofit institutions of higher learning.	-----	-----	Indirect-----	\$2,806,888 (preschool and school age).
Educational research and related activities (Cooperative Research Act of 1954, as amended by ESEA).	Educational research and related activities for children of all ages.	Surveys, demonstrations, dissemination, and development of educational programs.	-----	No-----	Public and private nonprofit institutions of higher learning.	-----	No-----	do-----	\$4,716,883 (all ages).
College work study program (title IV C, Higher Education Act).	Promote the part-time employment of students from low-income families to pursue higher education.	Part-time employment of students in public or private nonprofit institutions.	80 percent student earnings paid Federal; 20 percent paid educational institution or place of work.	Yes (when employed in day care or Headstart program).	Institutions of higher learning.	No-----	-----	do-----	
Training program for early childhood educational personnel.	Awards to universities and State and local education agencies to conduct training programs to improve the qualifications of individuals serving in educational programs.	Training programs for people participating in elementary and secondary education.	Cost reimbursable basis.	No-----	States and local education agencies, institutions of higher learning.	-----	No-----	do-----	

Agency and program	Program purpose	Program services	Funding	Program frees mother for work	Components eligible to operate	Service available to nonpoor	Renovation or construction money available	Program effect on children	Program budget
PHS—HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION									
Maternal and child health grants (title V, Social Security Act).	Grants to States to reduce infant mortality and promote the health of mothers and children, particularly in areas of economic distress.	Maternity, clinics, family planning, visits by public health nurses, pediatric clinics, school health programs, immunizations, mental retardation clinics.	States must match 1/2 of Federal funds appropriated.	No.....	State health and welfare agencies, public and private nonprofit organizations.	Yes.....	No.....	Direct and indirect.	Not specific for preschool.
Maternal and child health research (title V, SSA).	Grants to improve the operation, usefulness, and effectiveness of maternal and child health programs.	Research projects for health programs emphasis on feasibility cost and effectiveness of comprehensive health programs. May include training of health personnel.	10 percent of total appropriation for research grants.	No.....	Institutions of higher learning, public and private nonprofit organizations.	No.....	Indirect.....	
Maternity and Infant Care (title V, SSA).	Projects to reduce infant and maternal mortality and to reduce incidence of retardation and other handicaps associated with childbearing.	Prenatal care, health care for infants with health problems, family planning services.	Federal pays 75 percent, 25 percent State and local.	No.....	State and local health agencies, public and nonprofit private organizations.	No.....	No.....	Direct.....	\$38,550,000 (total).
Crippled Children's Services (title V, SSA).	Grants to States for services to crippled children and for services for conditions leading to crippling.	Medical, surgical, corrective and diagnostic services. Hospitalization and aftercare is included. Grants made for special project to improve service. Training of personnel.	State must match one-half of Federal funds appropriated.	No.....	State and local health agencies, public and private nonprofit organizations.	Yes.....	No.....	do.....	\$58,000,000 (total).
Comprehensive Health Care for Children and Youth (title V, SSA).	Comprehensive health care to children of low-income families who would not otherwise receive the services provided.	Diagnosis and preventive services, medical and dental treatment, correction of defects, aftercare.	75 percent Federal, 25 percent State and local.	No.....	State and local health agencies, medical schools, teaching hospitals.	No.....	No.....	do.....	\$40,905,000 (preschool and school age).
Training of Professional Personnel (title V, SSA).	Grants for training of personnel for health care and related services for mothers and children.	Training in institutions of higher learning.	100 percent Federal.	Public and private nonprofit institutions of higher learning.	Indirect.....	
Migrant health program (Sec. 310, Public Health Service Act).	Grants to improve the health status of migratory farm workers and their dependents.	Medical, hospital, clinics, public health nursing, and other health services.	No fixed matching about 60 percent Federal, 40 percent State and local.	No.....	State and local health agencies, public and private nonprofit organizations.	No.....	Direct.....	\$8,000,000 (1969 program total, 25 percent under 6).
Regional medical programs (Title IX, Public Health Service Act).	Grants to assist in establishment of regional cooperative arrangements among medical schools, research institutions, and hospitals in fields of heart disease, cancer, strokes and related diseases.	Education, research, training, and related demonstration in patient care. Cooperative arrangements to avail to patients the latest advances in the field.	Medical schools, research institutions, hospitals.	Yes.....	Indirect.....	1,667,000.
Chronic disease programs (Public Health Service Act).	326,000.
Federal health programs service (Public Health Service Act).	To operate Federal employee health units on a reimbursable basis for Federal agencies.	General clinical work, physical exams, and immunization (in some circumstances services available to children.	Division of Federal Employee Health, HSMHA.	
National Communicable Disease Center (Public Health Service Act).	Center established to prevent and suppress communicable and preventable diseases, prevent the introduction of diseases from foreign countries.	Prevention and suppression of diseases and interstate transmission of diseases. Includes care and treatment of quarantine detainees.	National Communicable Disease Center.	No program specifically for children.
National Center for Health Statistics (Public Health Service Act).	Provides factual statistics for planning national health programs. Collects, analyzes and disseminates essential statistical data.	Collects, analyzes and disseminates data. Tests techniques and develops new techniques. Maintains working relationship on worldwide basis with health and health related organizations.	National Center for Health Statistics.	Do.

Agency and program	Program purpose	Program services	Funding	Program frees mother for work	Components eligible to to operate	Service available to nonpoor	Renovation or construction money available	Program effect on children	Program budget
Community Health Service (Public Health Service Act).	Stimulates, conducts, supports programs designed to increase the efficiency of utilizing health resources for quality health services.	Promotes, develops and supports comprehensive health planning, standards and evaluation activities. Increase adequacy and scope of health services and programs of comprehensive health care.	-----	-----	Community Health Service.	-----	-----	Indirect.	No program specifically for children.
National Institute of Mental Health (Title III, Public Health Service Act).	Administer direct and support programs for mental health for regions, States, communities and the Nation.	Research, training, technical and consultative services. Research, training and construction grants.	-----	-----	NIMHI States, institutions of higher learning, research agencies.	-----	Yes (grants for mental health centers).	do.	\$5,000,000.
Maternal and child health program of the Indian Health Service (Transfer Act of 1955).	Promote and upgrade general health of Indian population.	Comp health care for Indian children (as part of plan for all Indians includes) includes preventive, curative and rehabilitative act. Research, demonstration, training projects included.	100 percent Federal.	No.	Indian Health Service.	Yes (those who can be asked to pay).	-----	Direct.	Preschool amount cannot be broken out.
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (Public Health Service Act Sec. 441).	To foster, conduct and support research and training in basic biological and behavioral sciences relating to child health and development.	Intramural and extramural child health research, extramural grants and contracts for research and training.	-----	-----	NICHD, individual research, institutions of higher learning.	-----	-----	Indirect.	\$15,493,000 (estimated).
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY									
Migrants and seasonal farmworkers program (title III B, EOA).	Camp social services for farm labor families.	Basic education, job training, day care service.	100 percent Federal.	Yes, day care.	Public, private nonprofit agencies, institutions of higher learning.	No.	-----	Direct.	\$1,400,000 (day care).
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR									
Manpower Development and Training Act (Public Law 90-636).	To provide job training skills for displaced workers, unemployed and underemployed persons in skill shortage categories.	OJT and institutional training.	90 percent Federal.	-----	Public or private agency, institutions of higher learning.	No.	-----	Indirect.	Preschool, cannot be broken out.
On-the-job training program (title II, MDTA).	To provide onsite job training for unemployed and underemployed.	Job training, basic education, counseling.	90 percent Federal, 10 percent in kind.	-----	Public and private employees, labor organization, trade associations.	No.	-----	Indirect (individual training day care center.)	Do.
Operation Mainstream (title II, EOA).	To provide training and jobs for poor people, in rural and small towns, who have history of chronic unemployment.	Projects which provide jobs and concentrate on improving physical environment and facilities in community.	do.	-----	Public and private nonprofit organizations.	No.	-----	Indirect.	No training involved, preschool.
Work Incentive Program (title IV, SSA).	Designed to increase employability of persons receiving A FDC by using various Government programs.	Job placement, training, special projects for those who cannot be employed.	80 percent Federal, 20 percent in cash or in-kind.	Yes, day care under SRS.	Public and private nonprofit agencies (organ for public purpose).	No.	-----	Indirect and direct (day care).	Preschool training not reported.
Experimental, Developmental, Demonstration and Pilot Projects (title I, MDTA).	To improve techniques and demonstrate effectiveness of specialized methods in meeting manpower, employment and training problems of workers.	Grants to provide special or experimental programs for disadvantaged workers.	90 percent Federal, 10 percent in-kind.	-----	Public and private nonprofit organizations.	No.	-----	Indirect.	No figures reported on preschool projects.
Concentrated employment program (title I, EOA, title II, MDTA).	Brings together all available manpower programs under single sponsorship.	Provide multiple services to individuals—job placement, training, social services, medical and day care services.	100 percent Federal.	Yes, day care.	Public and private nonprofit agencies (usually CAA's).	No.	-----	Indirect and direct (day care).	\$6,374,196 (not all projects responded).
New careers (title II, EOA).	To provide training and jobs at pre-professional level for low-income adults in area of community services.	Training, employment, related education, career development.	90 percent Federal, 10 percent in-kind.	-----	States, public, and private nonprofit organizations.	No.	-----	Indirect.	-----
Neighborhood Youth Corps (title I B, EOA).	Provides useful work experience for impoverished youth.	In-school, out-of-school for drop-outs, summer (work experience), related training.	do.	-----	Public agencies.	No.	-----	do.	No records kept for training preschool act.
Special impact program (title I-D, EOA).	Special projects to serve as catalysts in developing employment opportunities and rehabilitating environment.	Promotes economic, business, and community development while generating and stimulating work experience and training projects.	90 percent Federal, 10 percent in-kind.	-----	Public agencies.	No.	-----	do.	No training (to date) re preschool activity.

Agency and program	Program purpose	Program services	Funding	Program frees mother for work	Components eligible to operate	Service available to nonpoor	Renovation or construction money available	Program effect on children	Program budget
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE									
School milk program (Child Nutrition Act).	Increase consumption of milk by children in nonprofit schools, institutions, camps, and day-care centers (confined with expanded food program in fiscal year 1970).	Cash payments to States including operating expenses.	-----	-----	State agencies	Yes	-----	Direct	\$103,595,000 (all children, 1969).
School lunch program—Child nutrition programs (National School Lunch Act, Child Nutrition Act).	To provide best possible nutrition for every child regardless of family's economic condition.	Cash payments to States, special assistance to schools in poverty areas, school breakfast program, administrative expenses, nonfood assistance (food service equipment).	-----	-----	do	Yes	-----	do	\$367,466,000 (all children).
Food stamp program (Food Stamp Act).	Provide increased nutrition to households with limited resources.	Issuance of stamps to households to purchase food. Family pays for stamps accord to income.	-----	-----	State welfare agencies.	No	-----	do	\$340,000,000 (total program).
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (sec. 32, act of Aug. 24, 1935).	Commodity program payments for surplus food items.	Funds used to purchase certain surplus food items for needy children and low-income persons.	-----	-----	State welfare agencies.	No	-----	do	\$386,214,000 (total program).
Special food service program for children (sec. 13, School Lunch Act).	Provide better nutrition for children in public and nonprofit private institutions for child in poor areas and areas with many working mothers.	Cash reimbursement for food, direct food donations from USDA, financial help to buy food equipment.	75 percent Federal.	-----	Public and private nonprofit agencies.	Yes	-----	do	\$5,750,000 (all children, 1969).
SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION									
Business loans (Small Business Act).	Loans to small businesses to strengthen small business sector of economy.	Loan guarantees, participation loans with banks and direct loans.	-----	-----	Small Business Administration.	Yes	Yes	Indirect (could be loans for day care).	
Lease guarantee program (Small Business Investment Act).	To guarantee leases so that small businesses can obtain space in desirable business areas.	Lease guarantee through private insurance companies or directly.	-----	-----	Small Business Associations participating insurance companies.	Yes	-----	Indirect	
Economic opportunity loan program (title IV, EOA).	Provides assist to disadvantaged people who want to start a business.	Guarantee of bank loans, direct loans, management counseling and assist.	-----	-----	Small Business Administration.	No	Yes	do	
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT									
Model cities program (Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966).	To improve the physical, social, and economic conditions of a large blighted neighborhood. Planning and supplemental grants and urban renewal projects are included.	Funds are made available to State and local organizations to plan a comprehensive improvement system for the target neighborhood.	-----	Yes; day care.	Public and private nonprofit organizations.	No (blighted area involved).	Yes	Indirect and direct.	\$10,565,000 (day care).
Neighborhood facilities program (HUD Act).	Grants to assist in financing neighborhood centers for health, social, recreational, or similar community services.	Financial assistance to establish neighborhood centers.	Up to 66% percent Federal and 75 percent in certain underdeveloped areas.	-----	Public agencies and private nonprofit organizations (through contract).	Yes	Yes	Indirect	Amounts for preschool not available.
Indoor community facilities for low-rent public housing projects (U.S. Housing Act, sec. 2).	Loans to local housing authorities to construct or acquire community facilities for low-rent housing.	Community facilities for health, social, educational purposes.	-----	-----	Local housing authority.	No	Yes	do	Projects not for specific age groups.
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR									
Kindergarten program for Indian children in Federal schools (25 U.S. Code 13).	Kindergarten classes for Indian children operated in Federal facilities.	Kindergartens	Direct Federal program.	-----	Bureau of Indian Affairs.	Yes (Indian children).	No	Direct	\$1,850,000 (kindergarten).
Johnson-O'Malley program of aid for public schools (25 U.S. Code 452).	Financial aid to public schools to provide kindergarten for reservation Indian children.	Financial aid to schools.	50 percent Federal for 33 units, full financing for 74 units.	-----	School districts	Yes	-----	do	\$2,300,000 (kindergarten).

The sponsors of this legislation feel that it is in keeping with the need for coordination which has been recognized by the Nixon administration. A special Headstart Advisory Committee, chaired by Charles Schultze, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget reported early in 1969 that:

In particular, there seemed to be agreement that the new Day Care programs now administered by the Childrens' Bureau should be considered for transfer to the new Office of Child Development.

The objectives of Day Care and Head Start are in many ways similar, though not identical. Much of the knowledge gained in the Head Start program could profitably be applied to the Day Care program. Budgetary and administrative flexibility would be increased if the two programs were administered together.

The Comprehensive Headstart Child Development Act of 1970 which is being introduced today will implement this recommendation of the committee.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Robert H. Finch, appearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty on June 4, 1969, outlined several steps being taken to improve coordination among the many child-oriented Federal programs.

The Office of Child Development will provide a point of coordination for early childhood activities throughout the Department. Communities will henceforth be able to relate to a single focal point within HEW, which has responsibility for the bulk of Federally assisted daycare and preschool programs . . .

In order to improve coordination, I am establishing a Board of Advisors on Child Development, which will be composed of senior officials of this Department in the areas of health, education and welfare. Through this device it will be possible to take a unified look at all early childhood programs. . . . The close coordination of these programs means expanded resources, increased research, greater flexibility, and the presentation of a rational and coherent picture of all that is going on in this field."

Our bill recognizes this need for coordination at the Federal level, but it goes further, in the sense that it extends its coordination to the States as well. Under our bill, an application will need to be submitted to only one office—the State commission—instead of the present six separate funding authorities, each with different rules, regulations, and eligibility requirements.

(Mr. HANSEN of Idaho asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. I thank the gentleman from Idaho.

As the gentleman has indicated, he serves on this subcommittee which is already in the process of beginning an investigation into this field. In addition, he has also served on the Republican Task Force on Education and Training which has been working on this problem which has resulted in the bill we speak on today.

I really do say that there is no other one person who combines all these qualities who has done as much as the gentleman from Idaho has already done in

working on this bill and putting his imprint on that which we have started down the legislative path by introduction today.

I really feel that, considering he is a Member who has been in the Congress but a very short period of time, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho has already made a very significant start in that which he has done not only on this bill but also with respect to other things. The work he has done on this bill has been truly significant, and we are grateful for his co-sponsorship.

[From the AFL-CIO Federationist]

THE UNTAPPED POTENTIAL OF DAY CARE

(By Mary Logan)¹

The problem of day care for children of working parents is one of the most important social needs today—and one with critical and far-reaching implications. Equally important is the need to provide care for children of mothers who could be working if these facilities were available.

Last year, according to Department of Labor statistics, 32 million women were working and were responsible for 37% of all goods and services produced in this country. About 10.5 million, or one-third of these women, had children of school age and 4 million had pre-school children under 6 years of age.

To fill this need, the entire nation has licensed day care centers to accommodate 531,000 children. Many of these offer only part-time care and many are in private homes.

The statistics do not exist for numbers of children whose mothers would go to work if day care were available. But by far the bleakest situation is occurring among families headed by mothers who are driven by economic necessity to work but cannot make proper day care arrangements for their children.

Studies in several large cities show that in many areas, from 30 to 40 percent of the mothers receiving public assistance are also working at part-time or full-time jobs. If satisfactory arrangements could be made for child care, many of these women would have an opportunity to seek better jobs. But the present shortage of day care facilities and the high cost of day care services make it nearly impossible for many women to terminate their public assistance. They simply cannot afford to pay for the care of their children while they work.

A vastly different picture exists when adequate child care facilities are established. Individual cases were highlighted in a major newspaper in a series of articles illustrating the potential uses and users of day care. One article said:

"Initially 20 welfare mothers, mostly with one preschool child, will be enrolled in an intensive four-week course in health, nutrition and child development at the training center.

"Among them will be Louella Barboza, a mother who never finished high school and never held a long-term steady job. She is separated from her husband and lives on welfare with her 2½-year-old son.

"I just plain want to get off of welfare, get a job and be on my own," she says. "But without a high school diploma I couldn't get the kind of work that would support me. I'd be just like I am now, always in the hole. You can't pay a baby-sitter and come out ahead."

"But with this program I can bring my boy to school, and they'll train me for work I can do. I don't need a diploma and it's good work. I like kids. I think it's going to work out just fine."

¹ Mary Logan is a staff member of the AFL-CIO Department of Social Security.

"Mrs. Sandra Marshall's family is one that is stronger today than two years ago. The 22-year-old Roxbury mother of three with two children in the Sunnyside Day Care Center, says, 'I was in a mess. I had the three little ones and I was just divorced. I was trying to work days and finish high school nights. I don't even remember how many different baby-sitters I had. It was terrific tension. It was terrible for the kids and terrible for me.'

"Mrs. Marshall is now a freshman at Boston State College. She is sure that she is on her way out of poverty, and because she no longer feels trapped by her children, she enjoys them more on evenings and weekends than she did before all day.

"This made a difference in their lives, I know. And in mine. I'm a better mother too. I'm just happier."

"For the employed mother, a day care center located at her place of work is more than a convenience. It also permits parents to maintain closer contact with their children and involvement in the kind of care the youngsters receive. On-site facilities allow families to relocate their residences without disrupting the day care arrangements. For employers, the center is a way to keep an adequate and stable working population.

"But work-located day care is the scarcest form in this country, although it is widely used in European countries. There are only a handful of such centers operating in the U.S. many of which are showcase centers. Another handful of demonstration projects are scattered about, on a small scale, to care for children of industry workers."

The lack of adequate day care facilities is partially reflected in the rising rates of delinquency, crime, drop-outs and even unemployment of marginal workers. And excessive time, money and effort is spent on the problems of juvenile delinquency and crime stemming from a generation of children growing up without proper supervision. The situation becomes a tragic absurdity when one compares the \$4 billion a year cost of the problems of juvenile delinquency to a \$200 million public investment in preventive child care programs scattered about government agencies.

Lack of appropriate day care also leaves its mark on business. The cost comes in the high rate of absenteeism and employ turnover among mothers who cannot find reliable care for their children.

Of the present federal sources of funding, most monies appropriated are earmarked for operations, administration and staff training. Scarcely any funds are available for construction of facilities. Often, the amounts that can be used for building are meager and are so tied up with restrictions that it is virtually impossible for a community to apply for them. At best, money is available for renovation. Those areas which would benefit most from such facilities are the least apt to have the kind of buildings which can be readily adapted to meet the required standards.

Congress acted recently to reduce public assistance rolls by setting up job training programs for welfare mothers. Under the Social Security Act, Work Incentive Program (WIN), the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP), and through the Economic Opportunity Act, provision is made for job training when "adequate child care" is available.

But funding for "adequate child care" is woefully inadequate. Other legislation concerning day care has charged various government bureaus, in a piecemeal fashion, with responsibility for developing their portion of day care programs. What is happening, however, is that day care funds are so widely scattered through the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity that it is nearly impossible for local communities

to understand either how they can apply for funds or how to qualify under various agency regulations.

For instance, child care is available under four programs, all of which are included under the administration of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, but are guided by different sets of regulations.

HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch has recommended that day care programs under his jurisdiction be transferred to the newly-created Office of Child Development. While undoubtedly a good idea, the details of these moves must be spelled out before any coordination can take place. And federal minimum standards for day care should be applied to any local child care arrangement using federal funds.

Other resources which may be used for the establishment of day care centers should not be legislatively ignored. At the present time, a bill has been introduced to amend Sec. 302 (c) of the Taft-Hartley Act to permit employer contributions to trust funds to provide for the establishment of child care centers for preschool and school age dependents of employes.

Private non-profit community groups, cooperatives and churches have attempted to maintain day care centers but can do so only on a very limited basis. The cost of day care per child is estimated at \$2,000 a year, an amount that few local private organizations—not to mention working parents—can afford to pay.

Federal funds and loans should be available to non-profit groups for construction of facilities and partial maintenance of these centers. At present, a section of the Economic Opportunity Act authorizes federal assistance to non-profit organizations for day care. But, as for other day care authorizations, no funds have been appropriated.

Legislation has been proposed to strengthen and improve the educational component in public and private non-profit day care centers. No action has been taken on this as yet.

Several other bills have also been introduced, all dealing with deductible costs of day care from income tax. These bills, which offer a variety of formulae, have remained dormant.

To meet the child care needs of youngsters from a variety of family situations, a coordinated network of different daytime programs should be built under public, voluntary and non-profit proprietary auspices. Among the most important of these are:

Day care for pre-schoolers in centers, family daytime homes, and parent and child centers;

Supplemental short day development programs such as Head Start, nursery schools and kindergartens for pre-school children;

After school and vacation programs for older children.

The obvious need for coordination of information, funding criteria and day care standards as well as the especially urgent need for adequate federal funding for construction, maintenance, staff training and administration cannot be neglected.

While there is supposed to be a national commitment of the critical needs of a child in his "first five years of life," it is peculiarly remarkable that the administration's budget for HEW calls for a \$10 million decrease for child care under the WIN program.

The most obvious recommendation for legislative action on day care would be to provide federal funds for day care strictly on the basis of local need. At present, the system ties day care to job training programs and removes this service when a mother is gainfully employed. An alternate structure should be set up which permits day care service to continue with payment based on a sliding income scale.

Legislation and appropriations are desperately needed to provide for construction of day care facilities.

Responsibility for day care development should be centralized in one agency. Eligibility requirements and application procedures should be clearly spelled out and made available to communities through regional and local government offices.

Minimum federal standards for licensing should be enforceable through withdrawal of funds in the case of failure to comply.

Until an adequate omnibus day care law is enacted, existing statutes should at least be put to work in their original intent through adequate appropriations.

[From the Saturday Review, Sept. 20, 1969]

DAY CARE, NOT BABY-SITTING

A CORNERSTONE of the President's new welfare program proposed last month is greatly expanded and improved day-care services, especially for preschool children. If Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) funds are to be dropped and welfare mothers encouraged to take jobs, as the President proposed, care must be provided for the young children involved.

In his speech and message to Congress, Nixon called for day-care centers that would offer "more than custodial care; they would also be devoted to the development of vigorous young minds and bodies." Child development specialists greeted the statement with enthusiasm for its recognition of the cognitive and emotional needs of young children, but with skepticism about its implementation.

Day-care facilities across the nation have always been notoriously inadequate—overcrowded, understaffed, with poor physical facilities and lack of educational materials—and new programs in recent years have hardly touched the problem.

The latest of these—the Work Incentive Program (WIN)—seems to be in serious trouble at the end of its first year. Apparently a prototype for Nixon's plan, WIN aimed to train welfare recipients for employment and to provide day-care facilities for their children. When the program was enacted, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare estimated that more than one million children would receive day care by 1972. The Bureau of the Budget called for \$35-million for day care during WIN's first year; Congress appropriated exactly half that amount. But only 85,000 children received care in WIN's first twelve months, at a cost of less than \$11-million.

The problems seem to lie chiefly at the local level—state legislatures unwilling to change existing laws that hamper the program or to appropriate the state's 25 per cent share of the funding. Lack of sufficient funds means lack of trained personnel and the danger of second-rate custodial programs.

The WIN program is only one of several still floundering in their early stages. Parent and Child Centers for mothers and children under three are still in the pilot stage, as is the Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) program, an attempt to coordinate into a common framework all federal child-care programs within a community. Even the new Office of Child Development (OCD) is still enmeshed in bureaucratic struggles with the Children's Bureau and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Meanwhile, private and federal efforts are drawing business and industry to provide day-care services for employees and the community. The Day Care and Child Development Council of America (1426 H Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005) helped launch a child-development center for pre-school children of working parents at the KLH Research and Development Corporation in Cambridge, Massachusetts. A more broadly based community-oriented child-care facility is the

Twin Cities Area Child Care Center at Benton Harbor, Michigan.

As Jule Sugarman, director of the OCD said, "Day Care is the hottest property right now." But the problem is so vast, the number of children to be served so great, that only full funding and the aggressive commitment of federal and local authorities can hope to alleviate it. So far neither has been available in sufficient quantity.

STATEMENT BY JAMES GALLAGHER, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PLANNING, RESEARCH AND EVALUATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DECEMBER 3, 1969

I concur heartily with the position that early education is potentially one of the most important areas which will rapidly expand in the near future. Early education is an idea whose time has come.

Evidence suggests that adult intelligence and later school success are substantially influenced by the experiences in the early years. It is gratifying to note that we are prepared to act upon this knowledge.

Let me be specific. Over the past decade, evidence has accumulated in the behavioral sciences as to the relative malleability of the child in his early years. Long-held beliefs in the relatively set pattern and pace of a child's development have had to yield in the face of increasing evidence that environmental circumstances play a role in the shaping of both the developmental course and rate at which the abilities required for competence emerge.

Recent evidence about such things as the damaging effects of a barren institutional environment on the development of infants and beneficial effects of a well-paced, stimulating early environment on some seriously deprived children has had a dramatic effect upon developmental theory, which in turn has begun to affect practice. In this respect, an early careful study by Dr. Samuel A. Kirk, reported in his book *Early Education for the Mentally Retarded*, illustrates growth potential even in those youngsters who lag behind substantially in early development.

J. McV. Hunt in *Intelligence and Experience* collected the evidence for the necessity of sequential interactions with the environment in intellectual growth. That is, if the objects or people in the child's environment do not provide enough challenge to stimulate his mind to further growth, the child will not develop optimally. You should know, however, that the specification of just the right kinds and amounts of stimulation, a step that would enhance educational applications, is now in the beginning stage.

Whereas Hunt's book focused on the possibility of affecting the child via modifying the environment (as opposed to passively awaiting the unfolding of inborn capacities), it did not say which conditions at what times would make particular increases in the intellectual capacities of children.

Benjamin Bloom's book, *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics*, went further. Dr. Bloom maintained that the environment exerts its greatest impact during the time of the child's most rapid development. He maintains that as much intellectual development takes place by 4 years of age as takes place during the rest of the elementary and high school years. Again, however, you should know that his book did not tell us what experiences are appropriate for what developmental stages, nor what environmental conditions provide the experiences which optimize development.

At this time, the overriding objective of early education probably should be stated as broadly as "optimal development in every child between birth and 6 years of age," although I note that the population to which this bill is addressed is the 3- to 5-year group.

In the youngest children, of course, "optimal development" cannot be easily subdivided into categories. The younger the child, the more artificial the usual distinctions between his health, education, and welfare; between pre-reading, pre-mathematical skills or even between emotional, motivational, cognitive, physical and social growth. To dissect the infant's playing with his toys, for example, and to classify his playing in terms of whether it promotes physical, cognitive, or motivational growth is simply not fruitful. In the case of 3 year olds and older children, however, these categories take on more meaning. The daily activities in a nursery school or day school have objectives that are primarily educational if we use *educational* in the broad sense of organizing experiences to achieve some particular objective in the behavioral sense.

Given the evidence that I have briefly described on the importance of the early years to the child's intellectual development, it seems clear to me that any proposal for day care programs should explicitly include a strong commitment to educational goals. This is especially true in the case of economically disadvantaged children, where early environmental enrichment specifically planned to reach specific goals offers a promising route to reducing educational disadvantages at the time of school entrance.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 10, 1969]

MRS. JONES AND DAY CARE

A certain Mrs. Jones (who asked us not to use her real name) is earning \$3,656 a year as a privately employed trainee clerk under the UPO-Labor Department Concentrated Employment Program. CEP also provides \$2,000 a year to pay for day care for the youngest of her five children. Part of a prospective \$1.3 million cut in Labor Department grants to UPO may force the curtailment of the CEP day care program now providing for 600 children. Without the program to train hard-core unemployed for self-sufficiency, Mrs. Jones would stay home to take care of her child, receiving \$2,904 a year in welfare funds. Mrs. Jones would receive \$752 less a year and the long term drain in annual public funds would be \$904 greater. But much more is involved than this arithmetic, although the money differences to Mrs. Jones and the public are not negligible. There is also the cost to Mrs. Jones of her self-esteem and the shattering of her hopes for independence. Officials are working to minimize the impact of the cuts to avoid sending Mrs. Jones' child home.

The timing of the cut is curious. It comes at a time when the Nixon administration is advocating the development of programs like CEP as part of its new approach to welfare. The country's ability to get women off the welfare rolls and onto gainful employment depends in large part on the availability of child care facilities. There would seem to be every good reason to expand, rather than contract, such a program.

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1969]

RESCUING CHILDREN BEFORE SCARS OF POVERTY BECOME INDELIBLE (By Lisa Hammel)

BARTON, Vt.—This town of a little more than 1,000 people in the northeast corner of the state has a scattering of stores on the main street that ends suddenly in cows. Traditional New England white clapboard houses thin out on the edge of town, nestling singly in rising hills that are green velvet under summer sun.

About 100 yards along a quiet road that leads off from the main street is an old farmhouse half surrounded by shadowed woods. At the back of the farmhouse is a playground, filled on a sunny day with children racing around on tricycles, swinging vigorously, pushing doll carriages, running and laughing.

An onlooker would assume that it was a nursery school until he noticed something a little odd: most of the children would be too young for school, for among them are infants gurgling on blankets and fat-legged little toddlers lurching happily across the playground.

If the visitor had been glancing over the fence last summer, he would have observed something even stranger, and not a little disturbing: children obviously old enough to walk, who did not seem able to; children silent and sullen in a corner of the yard; children listlessly playing with the equipment; children grabbing violently and greedily at the toys, as if they would never have another chance at them.

For this is not a nursery school. It is an experimental center for deprived children of very poor families in this area. And the children range in age from infancy up to 3.

The Barton Parent and Child Center, as it is called, is one of 36 pilot projects begun in 1967 as a unit of Project Head Start to deal with the physical, intellectual and emotional problems of disadvantaged children under 3.

The federally funded project had its beginnings in the discovery that many children entering the Head Start program for 3- and 4-year-olds were suffering from the results not only of medical and nutritional neglect, but of intellectual and emotional neglect as well.

HELP MUST COME EARLY

To prevent children from being seriously crippled in their later development, many experts had begun to believe something would have to be done from the moment the child entered the world, and even before, in prenatal care.

The 36 centers, each awarded a renewable one-year grant of \$175,000, are scattered in urban and rural areas throughout the 50 states—including one center on an Indian reservation and another in a migrant workers' camp.

Each has a slightly differing point of emphasis, according to the needs of the community it serves, but there are a few factors common to all. The primary focus is on helping the babies and little children through physical care and affectionate and stimulating attention; the secondary focus is generally on helping the parents or the mothers in whatever ways they seem to need it most.

In this sense, the Vermont operation can be considered typical.

The center is situated in what Vermonters call the Northeast Kingdom—a rather ironic designation for three depressed counties in the northeast quarter of the state near the Canadian border. In Orleans County, of which Barton is the center, and where there are probably more cows than people, the per capita income is about \$1,600 a year, less than half the national average.

The poverty in this area ranks with that of Appalachia, with one additional disadvantage. The winters here are long and bitter, and there are families that cannot afford to heat their dilapidated, dirt-floor shacks. There are few jobs, and these are generally seasonal and poorly paid.

The Barton Parent and Child Center found that it could not even begin helping the children until the chaos in the lives of the 70 or so families it had enlisted in the program was ameliorated a little.

The 10 to 12 family aides hired by the center spent much of their time at first introducing fearful and disorganized mothers to some of the basics of housekeeping, while the professional staff utilized connections with antipoverty agencies and other state operations to relieve some of the worst of the hunger and other physical needs that poverty isolation and ignorance had produced.

Linda Wright, one of the family aides, went to visit one of her more secure families on a recent morning.

Mrs. Wright, who, like all the other aides, is a mother herself and comes from the area, has had a sufficient taste of poverty to understand it from the bone out.

All of the aides were given preliminary training in subjects that ranged from health care to children's games—a training that continues as they work at the center with the youngsters, who generally each come one day a week, or go around to visit their assigned quota of families and play with the children in the homes.

The home of Gerry Renard, a sagging yellow clapboard house with an overgrown front yard, just off the main street of Barton, was said to be among the best of the houses that the P.C.C. families live in.

A WOMAN WITH ADVANTAGES

Mrs. Renard has several other advantages. She has a husband who lives with her, unlike about 85 percent of the mothers, and who is employed, in a local sawmill. And she is within walking distance of stores. Many of the families live on back roads miles from a town and are too poor to afford any kind of transportation.

The small kitchen with its tattered linoleum where her four children, aged 1 to 4, awaited Mrs. Wright's visit, was crowded with a large table on which lay a mammoth pile of dirty clothes that Mrs. Renard endlessly sorted. In the next room her elderly stepfather sat silently, leafing through newspapers. An overwhelming and acrid smell of dampness filled the rooms.

The children played, a little restlessly, with the bag of toys Mrs. Wright had brought. At one point, William, the 4-year-old began violently beating the toy figure of a child.

He explained, when questioned, that he was hitting it because "her cried."

The aide said later that the Renard children were wildly destructive with the toys at first, but eventually they had come to understand that Mrs. Wright would bring the bag of goodies back with her each week, and they began to play more calmly with them.

Some of the mothers like to watch or join in when the aide comes on her weekly visit, but some, it was reported, are so jealous of the attention being paid to the children, it is difficult for the aide to do anything.

The children of these families, it was explained, are rarely talked to or played with by their parents. Often communication is limited to a beating.

What kinds of differences has the program begun to make to the children of the 70 or so poor families in the area who are involved in the project, most of them for about a year now?

Penny Wetherell, whose year-old daughter attended the center, now works there under the aegis of the Youth Corps. She said that when she first came the children seemed "so pathetic" she didn't think she could continue.

But she did, and after a while children who "didn't know how to play and didn't even know what a fairy tale was" began to be more responsive.

There were health bonuses too.

"They started gaining weight," she said, "and got color in their cheeks and, many of them who couldn't, learned to walk. We also potty-trained most of them. I think just love and understanding makes that much difference."

Denise LeTourneau, who started last summer as an aide and is now supervisor of the center, said that at first the children "were very shy and sort of closed within themselves."

"Within just two weeks," she said, "the change was so big."

PLAY AND SPEECH IMPROVEMENTS

The hyperaggressive children, she said, began to play better in groups. The inarticulate children, who "weren't asking for anything—just pointing or grunting," began to speak.

"And they all got a lot cleaner," she said. Washing and baths are a regular part of the program.

"At the beginning," Mrs. LeTourneau continued, "there really weren't any make-believe games. It took some time for them to begin to play imaginatively.

"They are just starting to build barns and castles or use a block as an animal or a truck. And the girls are just starting to play house or mothers."

"The sense of fantasy," said Mrs. LeTourneau, "developed through reading books to them and also by visiting with them and playing with them in their homes."

"Before," she added "they didn't have anyone but the mothers."

[From Manpower, August 1969]

DAY CARE—SMALL FRY POSE BIG PROBLEM
(By Gloria Stevenson)

She was raising her five children alone. She had no job skills and only a ninth grade education. To get herself off welfare, she enrolled last year in a clerk-typist training course run by the District of Columbia Concentrated Employment Program. During this time, she earned \$30 a week, \$18 of which went to a babysitter who cared for her two preschool-age children.

Today she earns \$4,360 a year in an office job and is sending her two youngest children to a day-care center sponsored by her employer. The cost to her is \$3 a week for each child.

A second mother has been a secretary-stenographer for the same employer since 1963. Recently, she had to take several months off because she could not find a babysitter for her 3-year-old son. "Finding someone reliable is very hard, and very, very expensive," she said.

Meanwhile, her family lost several paychecks while her office lost the talents of a good worker. "She had been here for a long time and she knew where things were better than anybody else," her supervisor said. "I'm not exaggerating when I say her services were needed desperately." Today, her son is enrolled in the day-care center, she is at work again, and her office is back to its old efficiency level.

Both of these mothers work in Washington, D.C., for the U.S. Department of Labor, which sponsors the day-care center their children attend. The center makes it possible for the two women to hold jobs. It also is shedding some light on the problem that almost made it impossible for them to work—a problem familiar to millions of other working mothers and would-be working mothers.

THREE QUESTIONS POSED

The Labor Department day-care center, the first established by a Federal agency for children of its employees, is a 2-year experimental and demonstration program. Its primary purpose is to explore the feasibility and value of employer-sponsored day-care facilities.

Specifically, the program seeks answers to these questions:

Will an employer-sponsored center aid in recruiting employees from inner-city poverty areas?

Can such centers reduce employee absenteeism and other problems resulting from inadequate child care?

What impact will such a center have on the development of the children attending?

The answers will have national implications. A Bureau of Labor Statistics survey shows that in March 1967, the latest date for which figures are available, over 10 million mothers were working and 4.1 million of them had children younger than 6. Yet, a year ago, the Children's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimated that licensed day care in homes and centers was available for only about 530,000 youngsters.

Day care is an essential element in the Work Incentive Program, which seeks to move welfare recipients into jobs or skill training. Without low-cost day care, many mothers on welfare may find it impossible to take advantage of job or training opportunities.

"Hopefully, the lessons learned in the establishment and operation of the Labor Department's experimental day-care center will serve as guidelines for other employers who may want to consider setting up their own facilities.

HOSPITALS MOST ACTIVE

While day care may be sought for other reasons—a mother may be too ill to care for her children, for example—the majority of children who need this service are those of working mothers. But relatively few employers have developed child-care facilities.

According to the Women's Bureau, hospitals have been leaders in day care, setting up some 100 centers. Several shopping centers have set up facilities, as have various universities and private companies. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and management in the men's clothing industry have opened one center in Verona, Va., are constructing centers in Baltimore, Md., and Chambersburg, Pa., and are planning several others in Pennsylvania and the Midwest. Another facility has been opened for children of employees at the Plant Industry Station of the Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Center in Beltsville, Md.

The Labor Department's day-care center opened in October 1968 and is located just a few blocks from the Department's main office building in Washington. It is open Monday through Friday from 7:45 a.m. to 5:45 p.m. Parents drop their children off before going to work in the morning and pick them up at the end of the workday. Operated by the National Capital Area Child Day Care Association under contract with the Department, the center is directed by Ann Adams, a former Head Start teacher, with two teachers and several aides. A social worker, psychiatrist, and nurse visit the center regularly.

As Mrs. Adams explains, "This is an educational as well as a custodial program. We try to stimulate the all-round development of the children. We have activities to help foster their intellectual, emotional, physical, and social growth." Music, science, language training, and indoor and outdoor play are regular activities. The children take occasional field trips to monuments and museums in the District of Columbia, and they have also been treated to a train ride—a first for most of them.

Educational activities have been made part of the program as an example of what would ideally be included in a top-quality facility. Officials connected with the center point out, however, that educational activities are not mandatory in day-care programs.

PARENTS INTEREST STRESSED

Parents are encouraged to work closely with the teachers and the social worker affiliated with the center. They are expected to eat lunch with their children at the center and chat with the teacher once a month. Parent meetings at which Mrs. Adams or one of the consultants speaks are held monthly. The National Capital Area Child Day Care Association considers these meetings so important that cabfare is provided for parents who would find it a financial hardship to attend.

The center is open to children ages 2½ to 5½. Although only 30 youngsters were enrolled initially, the center's capacity is 60, and enrollment will be expanded during the second year of operation. Nearly half of the children attending now are those of disadvantaged women who could not work un-

less low-cost child care was available. The rest were selected from among departmental employees at all salary levels whose day-care arrangements were inadequate.

The new employees were recruited through the District of Columbia Concentrated Employment Program, Opportunities Industrialization Center, and Work-Training Opportunity Center of the Public Welfare Department. Parents who were already employed in the Department were selected by a special committee composed of representatives of the Department, the union that represents Department employees, and the National Capital Area Child Day Care Association.

Parents pay a sliding fee for the service, ranging from \$1 a week for those whose total family income is under \$4,000 a year to \$25 a week for those making more than \$15,000. These funds help defray costs not covered by the Manpower Development and Training Act funds allocated to the program.

First-year costs for the center are averaging about \$1,800 per child. This will be reduced by about \$200 in the second year when the number of children attending is increased. Much of the center's costs go toward staff salaries, educational material, and consultant fees. Officials connected with the program explain that the center's expenses compare favorably with other child-development day-care centers which are custodial rather than educational.

Although the program's success in relation to its overall objectives is not yet known, most of the parents are quite pleased. One indication of the center's popularity is the turnover rate of less than 20 percent, a figure officials affiliated with the program consider extremely low.

Calvin Shields, supervisor of two Labor Department employees whose children attend the center, has noticed that both mothers are relaxed now because they are confident their children are getting good care. "It has freed their minds to know that their children are well taken care of," he said.

Mothers also report that their children are pleased with the arrangement. Mrs. Jacqueline Davis, a teller in the Department's credit union, says her daughter Cheryl is enthusiastic—possibly too enthusiastic—about the center.

"Cheryl loves the kids and loves the teachers," Mrs. Davis says. "She's proud of the things she makes and paints. In fact, I think Cheryl might like the center too much. She never wants to leave. She fights me every afternoon when I go to pick her up."

Most parents say their children are improving their language skills and broadening their horizons of knowledge through the program. Ernest Dixon, one of the three male employees whose children are currently enrolled, talks about his daughter Kimmie's progress:

"There's no question that she's learning a lot at the center. She speaks better, and she's more aware of things around her. With the babysitter we had before, she was taken care of—period. Now she's learning."

The most pressing problem parents have experienced to date has been transportation—either bringing the children from home to the center or getting themselves from the center to work on time. Transportation arrangements have been especially troublesome for employees who do not work at the Department's main office building, but at one of its other buildings around the city.

In one case, the problem was solved by simply changing the working hours of the mother by 15 minutes. Parents, the center's staff, and Labor Department officials are weighing other ways of handling the problem. One solution being considered is establishment of smaller satellite centers nearer the Department's other buildings.

Other changes also are being considered for the second year of the program. One strong possibility is that the minimum age limit for eligible children will be reduced. It has been found that many disadvantaged mothers with children younger than 2½ would be able to work if appropriate child care were available.

An intensive, 8-month evaluation of the center's success in meeting its objectives is now underway. If the study shows that such centers are both effective and feasible, it may point the way to the solution of one of the major problems of the work-place and the labor market.

[From the Washington Post, March 1969]
DAY-CARE SHORTAGE HURTS JOB TRAINING
(By William Raspberry)

Don't talk to Maurice Knighton about welfare recipients not wanting to work. He knows better.

But if you want to talk about how society seems to be doing all it can to see to it that welfare recipients remain on the dole, that's something else again.

Knighton is president of the Sequential Computer Corp. at 6507 Chillum pl. nw. His firm is training 120 former welfare mothers as data transcribers under two Manpower Act programs.

The training program is a success, according to Knighton, the Labor Department and the women themselves.

But a number of women have had to leave the program because they can't find day-care facilities for their children.

"It's really a very serious problem for us," Knighton said. "I'd say that at least 85 per cent of these women are the sole support of anywhere from one to four children, mostly from newborn infants to 5 and 6 years old.

"There just isn't any adequate day-care service available to them, so they end up leaving the children with older relatives or in some cases virtually unattended.

"The result is accidents, lost time when the babysitters don't show up, full days lost sometimes when the children have to go to the clinics. Some of our women have actually moved so they could be close enough to a day-care center to get on the waiting list."

In an attempt to see what could be done about the problem, Knighton assigned his assistant, Michael Zajic (pronounced Zike), to explore the possibilities.

What Zajic found was that most of the legislation directed at training the hard-core unemployed takes note of the need for day care and often provides for payment for day-care services. But it does not provide for creating day-care facilities, and the problem is that there simply aren't nearly enough to go around—only some 3000 slots when more than 100 times that number are needed.

The Welfare Department will reimburse mothers for babysitting services. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has some money available for upgrading established day-care centers. "But no government agency," Zajic said, "seems to have the authority, the ability and the money to establish a day-care center."

As a result, only between 6 and 7 per cent of Knighton's trainees have their children in day-care centers. The rest are being taken care of on a catch-as-catch-can basis.

It is a particular problem, he said, because most of the trainees have had almost no previous work experience and, as a result, no experience at procuring sitter services. The absence of adequate day care is the chief reason for the high turnover rate among the trainees, Knighton said. About 20 of the first 60 enrollees have left the program.

Knighton thought he had come up with an ideal solution to the problem.

There is in the warehouse district where his offices are located a vacant restaurant

that could be converted into a day-care center capable of handling up to 60 children.

In addition, next door to the restaurant is another vacant building that would be used for expanding the center. Knighton has an option on both buildings.

"We contemplated a Class A center that would meet the most stringent requirements for nutrition, health care, education, cultural experiences and the rest," he said. "We had in mind to operate on a nonprofit basis, with the mothers paying as little as \$1 a week per child on a sliding scale based on income. We believe we could do it at 25 per cent less than any other Class A center in town and still provide a full-time registered nurse, trained teachers and one staffer for each five to seven children."

Knighton said he was willing to put \$10,000 of the company's money into the center.

The problem is that he needs at least \$25,000 to renovate the buildings as well as some operating funds. The money, as far as he can tell, simply isn't to be had.

A part of the reason is that much of the pertinent legislation simply assumes the existence of day-care facilities. Another is more philosophical. There is the rather middle-class notion that children under age 3 are better off at home with their mothers.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 11, 1969]
A MOTHER MUST STAY ON RELIEF AS DAY-CARE STRIKE GOES ON

(By Francis X. Clines)

It is not on the negotiating table, but the grievances in the continuing strike at the day-care centers now include the fact that Mrs. Arthur Mae Maxwell cannot get to her job as a teacher's assistant at Public School 66 in the Bronx this week and so must stay on welfare.

Another of the growing list of problems caused by the nine-day-old shutdown of 103 centers is the fact that Mrs. Maxwell's 3-year-old son, Ronald, cannot get into his favorite room, the one full of toys at the rear of the Mollie Perlibinder Sunshine Nursery School, at 1440 Bryant Avenue.

"The blocks," Ronald said in yearning, after being permitted to peer at the toys through a window of the desolate center where 55 preschool children normally are playing, singing, snacking, reciting and napping through their mothers' work day.

An estimated total of 12,000 mothers and children depend on the centers and now, with the wage strike into its second week, the hardships are worsening. Negotiations continued yesterday, and the one consensus reported was a sympathy for the working mothers who need the centers.

"I can't let him roam streets," said Mrs. Maxwell, who has received welfare aid through the summer, expecting to resume her job with the opening of school. "And I can't afford a private baby sitter," she continued as the boy skipped past a lot full of trash. "So we're both home."

Dozens of calls describing problems similar to Mrs. Maxwell's are being received each day at the Day Care Council of New York.

"We can offer little more than sympathy," said Mrs. Marjorie Grossett, executive director of the council, who noted that even before the strike thousands of children were on waiting lists for the centers, which were full with a total of 8,000 children.

Some mothers are paying \$30 a week and more for a private sitter to avoid absence from jobs which, like Mrs. Maxwell's, are low-income. Meantime, three-way labor negotiations are inching along among local 1707 of the Community and Social Agency Employees, the city, which pays most daycare costs, and the Day Care Council, representing the centers.

Mrs. Maxwell, like most of the persons served by the centers, has a limited income—less than \$60 a week without welfare assist-

ance—and is the sole support of her two children, Ronald and 6-year-old Veronica.

"Why can't I go to school today?" Ronald asked yesterday at the breakfast table as he watched his sister prepare for grammar school. Mrs. Maxwell finished dressing the boy in a gold-colored sweater and matching trousers and the three walked to the girl's school, locking their apartment.

WARNING ON LOITERERS

"It's three and a half rooms for \$88 a month," Mrs. Maxwell said. "And I've yet to see the half room."

In the street there were sullen-looking loiterers near a liquor shop. "Stay out of their face," she said to Ronald, in warning him to keep close.

"He doesn't know about junkies and winos," she explained. "But there they are, and I hope to be out of here by the time he's old enough to be tempted."

Mrs. Maxwell described the last several years since her husband left as a mixture of factory and clerical jobs interwoven with welfare aid.

"We're separated," she said. "We tried getting back, but the money is always a problem. He's a truck driver and can't seem to get steady work."

"My whole life now is helping my kids," she said as she went about a morning watching Ronald play on the sidewalk, cautioning him when he got too close to a sleeping dog, taking him by the hand across a main street, Freeman Avenue, and down to the day-care center.

VISIT TO UNUSED CENTER

It was empty except for the director, Mrs. Isabella McCloud. "I'm waiting for Ronald and all the others," Mrs. McCloud said as Ronald went into the backyard to peek into his playroom.

"We're a family here and this strike has caused no bad feelings with us," Mrs. McCloud added, as Mrs. Maxwell nodded agreement.

Outside, after promising Ronald he would have the blocks to play with again soon, she pointed toward the corner, where three burnt-out buildings stood in a row, their ground-floor stores abandoned and vandalized.

Instead of playing there, Mrs. Maxwell insisted, Ronald needs the center.

"My boy learns discipline there," she said. "He gets along better with other kids, he gets a hot meal. He's not just safe all day, he's getting ready for school with certified teachers giving classes."

Mrs. Maxwell, who said she has known nothing but poverty since her childhood in Mississippi, strongly supports the strike, which in part, is seeking a \$6,000 minimum wage for maintenance workers who now start at \$3,900. "It's crazy the city is fighting over that kind of money," she said.

"This neighborhood is a crime," the mother declared, slapping away some litter Ronald had picked up. "But the day-care is good because it frees me to struggle against this."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 9, 1969]

CARING FOR CHILDREN OF WORKING MOTHERS
(By Susan Hunsinger)

BOSTON.—Mrs. Brenda J. Roberts of Dorchester, mother of three, went on welfare because she could not afford to work.

"When my kids were little," said Mrs. Roberts, "there were no day-care facilities available that I could afford. So I went the round of baby-sitters, while I worked first as an elevator operator, then as a factory worker, then as an office girl. Finally I gave up and went on welfare; I couldn't make enough to pay for the baby-sitter and pay the rent."

Like many mothers who need to work, Mrs. Roberts is caught up in a vicious circle.

The circle goes around like this: In order to contribute to the full or partial support of her family, a mother needs to work. In order to work, she needs someone to care for her children. In order to pay for decent care, she cuts deep into the benefits from her work.

ARRANGEMENTS FELL THROUGH

Mrs. Gwen Morgan, wife of the former president of the KLH Research and Development Corporation, described the situation which led her husband to start a day-care center for children of company employees: "He saw people constantly moving in and out of poverty," she said.

"Mothers earning good pay and enjoying life in their work community would suddenly be forced to give up their jobs and go on welfare when their tenuous child-care arrangements fell through," said Mrs. Morgan. Now she is day-care coordinator for the Massachusetts Office of Planning and Program Coordination.

So far only two groups have access to any extensive federally supported day-care programs—the handicapped and those who qualify for Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and are enrolled in the Work Incentive training program (WIN).

According to Mrs. Morgan, even the new Nixon welfare-reform proposals, while advocating a minimum floor on income for the working poor, limit requests for expanded day-care facilities to current welfare recipients enrolled in job-training programs. In his Aug. 11 message to Congress, the President called for day care only "as a bridge for current welfare recipients to work."

NIXON'S PROGRAM SCANNED

"What the President's proposing we're already doing through the WIN program," commented Mrs. Morgan. "I thought he was strong at the beginning on income supplements for working people. But I was alarmed when he got to day care: He was only talking about welfare people. You shouldn't have to get on welfare to get off it."

Yet, says Mrs. Morgan, "if we are really serious about waging war on poverty, we need to think about providing a day-care program for people who are not yet poor . . . to help prevent the not-yet-poor from sliding into poverty."

She suggests a sliding-scale tuition for day-care centers, in order to "assure that public money goes only where it is needed, without pushing families off the ladder toward security the moment they reach Rung 2."

State welfare department officials say they would like to subsidize day-care facilities to serve potential and former, as well as current, welfare recipients. "But we don't have the resources," said John McManus, director of Child and Family Services for the Massachusetts welfare department.

Last spring the Massachusetts legislature allocated \$4 million for day care to match the 75 percent available in federal funds through Title IV(A) of the Social Security Act, as amended in 1967.

"But \$4 million is not much money when, by Federal law, the state must provide day care for children of WIN mothers," said Miss Louise Noble, regional director of the United States Children's Bureau.

That is, while Title IV(A) allows states to extend day-care services to potential AFDC applicants, it requires that these services be furnished to current recipients enrolled in WIN.

The shortage of day-care services is already holding back some mothers from enrolling in job training, according to John Perez, day-care coordinator for WIN in Massachusetts. "Mothers are reluctant to send their kids just anywhere."

Hence, before extending day care to potential recipients, "let's make sure we can

take care of the AFDC mothers first," said Henry Tiberio, core director of day care for the Massachusetts welfare department.

(As of July, 1969, there were 1,650 AFDC mothers enrolled in WIN in Massachusetts. Mr. Perez estimates that 30 percent of their children were placed in day-care centers.)

Mr. Tiberio also says that states must heed the provision in social security law which requires that services extended to some non-welfare recipients be extended to all.

The Massachusetts welfare department is currently seeking a federal waiver of this provision in order to set up a model-cities demonstration day-care facility that would extend services to nonwelfare recipients exclusively in the Boston area. "This pilot project would give us some idea of the volume of interest and need for day care," said Mr. McManus. "Based on our findings, we could then move to provide services elsewhere in the state."

He warns, however, that the state must improve the quality of day-care facilities not just increase the quantity. "Too rapid expansion of day care may put a lot of kids under a lot of roofs, but it may not expand their horizons."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 14, 1969]

CHILD-CARE FACILITIES FOR WORKING MOTHERS FOUND INADEQUATE

(By Susan Hunsinger)

BOSTON.—The hand-painted sign on the gate of a community day-care center says "Child's World. For working mothers. Reasonable rates." So far the sign has attracted plenty of working mothers. But although the rates are reasonable, few mothers can afford to pay them.

One applicant is a divorcee who works in the First National Bank of Boston. Another is a young Puerto Rican mother who is working until her husband comes to join her from Puerto Rico.

Still another is a woman whose older children now take turns missing school to babysit her infant child while she works.

None of these women is on welfare. But none of them can afford the full \$15 per week charged by the center. And none of them, by definition is eligible for support from the State Welfare Department, which pays the child-care fees for welfare mothers in job-training programs.

HALF OF WOMEN EMPLOYED

Who needs day care? "Income per se has very little to do with it," says Mrs. Gwen Morgan, day-care coordinator for the Massachusetts Office of Program Planning and Coordination. "What you need to know is whether the mother needs day care in order to get the job and keep it."

The need for subsidized day care hence extends beyond those mothers on welfare, or aid to families with dependent children (AFDC).

"The most significant fact is that 50 percent of American women are now employed," Mrs. Morgan adds. Even as many as one-fifth of the mothers of very young children (under three years of age) are working, according to the United States Department of Labor.

And most of these women work because they need to. According to a 1965 survey of 6 million working mothers by the U.S. Women's Bureau, almost 9 out of 10 work for "economic reasons." Of this group, 22 percent provide the sole support for their families.

"Over against the millions of children of working mothers who need good day care, it is estimated that licensed day-care facilities are available for less than 500,000," reported the Department of Labor in April.

"I know of no community in this region which says it has adequate resources for day

care," says Miss Louise Noble, Northeast regional director of the U.S. Children's Bureau.

As of May, 1969, there were 5,647 children in licensed day-care centers in Massachusetts.

"We'll probably see an expansion of 3,000 to 4,000 by the end of fiscal 1970," says John McManus, director of Child and Welfare Services for the State Welfare Department. The State Legislature made this expansion possible last spring when it allotted \$4 million to place more AFDC children in private nonprofit centers.

CHILDREN OUTNUMBER FACILITIES

But even assuming that facilities will be available for 10,000 more children, day care would still elude a majority of the eligible children in AFDC families. And the new expansion would not even begin to affect the children of the working poor, or those who would not be above the poverty line if the mother did not work.

According to Mrs. Morgan's estimates, at least 40,000 AFDC children need day care in Massachusetts, not to mention at least that many children among the working poor.

To date there has been no systematic statewide, much less nationwide, survey of the market for day care. One obstacle to such a survey is that so few Americans have experienced day care. "It's very hard to conceive of your need for something that doesn't exist," says Mrs. Morgan.

What is needed, she says, is a consumer test of day care in a community where it is already established. This would help determine the potential use of day care, assuming it was available and accessible in distance and cost.

DAY-CARE CENTERS PREFERRED

The Massachusetts Committee on Children and Youth (MCCY) conducted a limited survey in 1966 of the popularity of day-care centers in seven selected areas of the state.

When asked where they would prefer to leave their children, more than 51 percent of the mothers favored the group day-care center over other options, such as the home of a neighbor or relative or a community playground. But only 6 percent of the mothers actually used group day-care centers.

This "apparently was due to the costs and/or inaccessibility of existing centers," the MCCY concluded.

"Good child care is expensive," says Miss Noble. She estimates its range from \$35 to \$40 per week.

The Children's Bureau says the average mother who pays for child care actually pays between \$10 and \$15 per week, but this rarely covers the full cost. The difference between the real cost and the actual fee paid is lost—either in the quality of the service rendered, or in the quantity who can be served.

NEED SEEN FOR OTHER SERVICES

Not every working mother needs, or wants a day-care center. Over half of the mothers now working find someone, often a father or other adult relative, to care for the children in their own home.

For those who do seek child care outside their homes, says Miss Noble, "It's not just day-care centers that we need, but a variety of services to meet different needs." These include special care for infants, homes for small groups of children, and after-school care for school-age children.

At the same time, Miss Noble stresses that many mothers who work, or want to work, now lack access to any kind of organized day care.

"The lack of adequate day-care services is threatening the future of our children," says Mrs. Katherine B. Oettinger, former chief of the Children's Bureau. "We have swept this problem under every conceivable rug."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 7, 1970]

SOMEONE TO MIND THE BABY

(By Maya Pines)

"I know a lot of people say that mothers shouldn't work," Vice President Humphrey stated recently. "But I have been brought up to believe that what is, is." He called the lack of adequate day-care facilities for young children one of the greatest problems of tomorrow's America.

The trend is clear: more and more women are going to work. One out of every four mothers of children under the age of 6 is in the labor force; the number of such mothers has doubled since 1950. More than 4 million preschoolers have mothers who work, including 1,600,000 children under the age of 3.

Yet the nation has resolutely ignored the problem. American women remain almost totally deprived of opportunities to make satisfactory arrangements for the care of their children while they are working. As a result, millions of youngsters are being damaged emotionally, intellectually and sometimes physically during their most formative years.

Behind the paucity of services for young children lies the fear that providing good day-care facilities might encourage even more women to go to work—a fear entertained by male workers who wish to avoid competition and by moralists of both sexes who believe woman's place is in the home.

There are a few signs that this atmosphere may be changing. In Cambridge, Mass., for example, a manufacture of hi-fi equipment has just set up a demonstration day-care center for the children of its employees in cooperation with the U.S. Children's Bureau and the employes themselves.

The KLH Child Development Center, Inc., will be owned and operated by the children's parents. When it opens on Feb. 1 it will run from 7 A.M. to 3:30 P.M. to coincide with the parents' work day. It will take children between the ages of 2 and 6. Mothers will be free to come eat with their children during their own lunch hours. The center plans to offer all the educational advantages of a good nursery school, at a price the parents can pay, since the company will provide about 15 per cent of the cost and the Children's Bureau, two-thirds. It is meant as a replicable project—one that could be copied in many different kinds of industries.

"This is the beginning, we hope, of a trend," declares Mrs. Richard Lansburgh, president of the National Committee for the Day Care of Children. "A tremendous acceleration will take place in the coming years. We'll need money for training, for personnel, so that these programs are constructive for children—not just baby-sitting!"

While management started the KLH center, in Baltimore a union is taking the lead. Not surprisingly, it is a union largely dominated by women—the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union, makers of men's clothing, which plans to open centers for some 2,000 children in 15 areas of Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware and North Carolina.

"We're the originators of this plan, because we operate in small towns where the membership is 100 per cent female," explains Samuel Nocella, vice-president of the ACWU and manager of its Baltimore region. "We've experienced some acute problems—absenteeism on the part of women, and nervous breakdowns, which are very frequent among them. And we've found that at the bottom of it there is always a child. The mother becomes anxious, worried about her child, she calls home or stays away from work, and unless she has parents or somebody close to her to take care of her child, the child may really be in bad condition. So why not do

what people have been doing for a long time in Europe, for example in Sweden, and provide child-care centers?"

The Amalgamated is now supporting a bill in Congress to include child care among the benefits that can be negotiated for in union agreements, and day-care centers may become a standard item in collective bargaining next year.

In the long run, however, this is a problem that can only be met by the government on a nationwide scale, declares Jacob Potofsky, president of the ACWU. "This step, creating day-care centers for working mothers, is the first taken by any union—and it is long overdue," he says. Just as his union pioneered in unemployment insurance in the twenties, and saw it included in the first Social Security Act 12 years later, "today we have the same hope that government will assume the responsibility throughout the land of creating proper facilities for the young children of working mothers, for they are the future of our country."

The government's role in day care was prominent only during World War II when it became not merely acceptable, but positively patriotic for mothers to work. Suddenly enough nurseries and day-care centers blossomed, with government aid, to care for about 1,600,000 children. But nearly all these centers were closed at the end of the war. Today, when the number of working women exceeds the World War II total by 6 million, licensed public and voluntary day-care centers have shrunk to one-sixth their wartime capacity. They have also changed their orientation. Instead of opening their doors to all, they tend to concentrate on families with serious emotional or social problems. Their waiting lists are staggering.

State and Federal authorities will soon be forced to enter the day-care field on a large scale for the first time since World War II. A new amendment to the Social Security Act will compel thousands of mothers on welfare to enter work training or take jobs, and some facilities will have to be set up for their children while they work. However, since its goal is not to provide services to children but to cut welfare costs, the new law may lead to cheap custodial arrangements in many states. The law makes no provision for the children's education. As the National Committee for the Day Care of Children puts it, "Our country will then be in the anomalous position of giving some children a headstart, while giving others a push backward."

Day care must be recognized as a public utility for all children, some experts believe. "The new law again puts the emphasis on the underprivileged, on the welfare population, on troubled families," worries Professor Florence Ruderman, a Brooklyn College sociologist who recently completed a large-scale survey of day care for the Child Welfare League of America.

"Day care is needed on all levels of society—by the most normal families and by the middle class, as well as by others," she declares. "It should be available to the entire society, just like our public schools, parks, playgrounds and libraries."

According to Mrs. Lansburgh of the National Committee for the Day Care of Children, there is still tremendous resistance to the idea of day care. "Did Planned Parenthood have a more difficult selling job? We think not," she says. "Their resistances are verbalized and conscious; ours are not. Day care is threatening to many people—it says mother isn't in the home and there's nobody to make life nice and secure. Therefore, forget it, ignore it, pretend there's no need for it. Also, few people know the massive size of the problem or the serious consequences of neglect."

"I don't believe that all women should go to work," she adds. "But I do feel that in 1968 women should have the choice, the free-

dom to choose whether they wish to use their intelligence, ability, training and education without penalizing their families." She points out that in Maryland alone, 400 nurses would be working today if they could find day-care services that they would trust for their children. Meanwhile hospital patients suffer from the critical shortage of nurses.

Just as professional women who want to work should not be made to stay home, women who are on welfare should not be made to go to work, Mrs. Lansburgh declares. "There should be a free choice for both," she says. "This choice does not exist in this country today."

Altogether the nation's public and private licensed day-care facilities—many of them beyond the means of poor people—can accommodate only 450,000 children. Mothers, thus, are forced into all kinds of informal or "black market" arrangements.

Millions of "latchkey" children, for instance, find nobody at home when they get home from school in the afternoon. Carrying their house keys around their neck or in their pockets, they wander about or play without supervision, until their parents come back from work. Sometimes a neighbor or an aunt is supposed to look in on them.

Few families can afford to hire a private nursemaid. In New York City, the going rate for a competent nanny is anywhere from \$60 to \$90 a week, if she can be found. Even middle-class parents often leave their children with untrained and irresponsible household help who may do the child great harm.

An estimated 38,000 children under the age of 6 are left without any care at all while their mothers work, according to Katherine Oettinger, former chief of the U.S. Children's Bureau; many of them are just locked up in their homes. Twice as many preschoolers are looked after by a brother or sister not much older than they are.

Children under 3 are generally not admitted into the licensed day-care centers because they are considered too young. For many working mothers, the only alternative that remains is "family day care." In theory this does not sound too bad: The mother leaves her child with a woman who takes in several other children at the same time, for a small fee.

But a recent study in New York City showed what family day care is really like. Though the city has an established licensing procedure for family day-care homes, only 25 such homes have been licensed in the entire city. By contrast, 25,000 children—more than half of them under the age of 6—are parked in a variety of unlicensed homes.

One of the interviewers for the Medical and Health Research Association of N.Y.C., which did this study, still has nightmares about some of the places she visited. Many of the day-care "mothers" were physically ill, she reports—and their illness was the very reason for their doing this kind of work. Several were drunkards.

She recalls a harassed 20-year-old girl who had previously worked as a salesgirl but had lost her job because of a severe anemia which left her always tired. The girl lived in a crowded home with many relatives, including three small children, and took in three other children for day care. She had lost control over the six children to the extent that she did not even bother to find out what part of the house they were in. One youngster, aged 4, did nothing but cry all day long, sitting alone on the top step of the porch. The girl said he was "spoiled."

In most of the family day-care homes the children's routine was breakfast, TV, lunch, nap, and TV. One-third of the homes had no play materials of any kind. In 25 per cent of the homes the children were never taken out-of-doors. As many as 84 per cent of the homes were rated inadequate because they violated the Health Code, or because the children were severely neglected.

Throughout their study, the interviewers were assailed by desperate women who begged them to help find good day-care services for their children. They would try any trick to attract the interviewers' attention, hoping it might somehow lead them to space in a day-care center. The study's associate director, Milton Willner, a social worker with long experience in day care, concluded that two kinds of programs were urgently needed: a training program for women who would run licensed family day care for up to five children in their homes, bolstered by periodic inspections to make sure they provided enough play materials, nap facilities and fresh air; and many, many more day-care centers, including some for children under the age of 3.

The years from birth to 6 offer a unique opportunity to break the cycle of failure that awaits America's poor children. The first four years of life are the most important time of all—the crucial years that determine a child's later personality and intelligence, according to modern psychologists. During these years, a child's environment plays a decisive role.

Now that private companies, unions and the Government are becoming more aware of the urgent need for day care, they have a chance to set a new pattern for such services. Until now, education has never been day care's forte. "If there are qualified teachers, it's a nursery school; if it's custodial, it's day-care," has all too often been the working definition of the difference between the two. Unless the new day-care centers offer a truly effective educational program, they will waste their opportunity to make a major improvement in the lives of millions of children.

[From Parade magazine, Mar. 5, 1967]

WHO TAKES CARE OF YOUR CHILDREN?

(By Sid Ross)

The scene would have made the most hardened person weep.

Entering a large frame home, a New Albany, Ind., health inspector brushed past the middle-aged woman who owned the house and headed upstairs. There, in a barnlike, badly lit, foul-smelling room, he saw a series of cages fashioned from inverted baby cribs and plywood partitions and padlocked at the top.

Inside each was a small child.

There were 15 in all. Each enclosure was so cramped that the child could neither stand up nor stretch out. One girl slept with her knees under her chin, unable to extend her legs. A 5-year-old boy was asleep on his knees, his head bent forward, touching the floor.

The inspector charged the "nursery" owner, Mrs. Juanita Yingling, 50, with cruelty to children. When she came to court a few months later, authorities discovered that she had recently been released from a mental hospital and was in her son's guardianship. Welfare authorities, in charge of inspecting nurseries, confessed Mrs. Yingling had been operating for years without inspection.

Cases like this point up a shameful and serious problem in our society. At a time when more and more mothers are in the labor force, and an increasing number of women are compelled by economic pressure, widowhood, separation or divorce to find jobs to support themselves and their families, facilities to care for their children are nothing short of deplorable.

A NATION'S SHAME

Recognizing the problem, President Johnson two weeks ago called for federal support of day care for children under age 3 in Child and Parent centers. "The human needs of many American children are not being met," says Sen. Abraham Ribicoff (D., Conn.), an advocate of federal assistance for day-care

centers. Adds Mrs. Marianna Jensen, director of the National Committee for the Day Care of Children: "The extent of the neglect, the dangers and the welfare of hundreds of thousands of children should make us hang our heads in shame."

While the U.S. has some excellent public-sponsored facilities for children of working mothers, such as those in New York City and in California, and some equally fine church and privately run institutions, these can accommodate only a handful of children.

According to census figures, there are an estimated 13 million children under 14 whose mothers work. The total includes 3.8 million under 6, 1.6 million under 3. Many of these are cared for by relatives or by babysitters in their own homes. But some 2.7 million need day care outside the home, and only about 300,000 can be handled in public and charitable centers and licensed family day-care homes.

The result is a vast babysitting "underground"—a network of informal operations, where a housewife charges \$2 to \$20 a week to "mind" children in her own home. Legally, in many states, such operations are subject to licensing or other regulation, but most are completely uncontrolled, and many are not even known to authorities. Even when operated with the best of intentions, they seldom offer more than the barest care and run with complete disregard of health and safety regulations.

Thus, Chicago authorities recently found one ramshackle house with 49 children aged 3 months to 11 years crowded into the basement. Twenty of them were kept in a single eight-by-nine room. They were wearing their coats because there was nowhere to hang them. There was only enough chairs for half to sit down.

In another Illinois case, officials found five children being cared for by an 80-year-old blind woman. And in Garden City, Mich., a Detroit suburb, 14 children were hospitalized with tuberculosis, apparently triggered by an employee who had not passed a health exam.

Even worse than the underground, however, many children, studies show, are actually left to care for themselves. Besides "latch-key" children—those who come home from school to an empty home—an estimated 38,000 children under 6 are left all day without adult supervision.

Actually, one reason for the day-care problem is that the tremendous need for day-care institutions has leaped upon us so swiftly. Women only began to enter the work force in great numbers during World War II, but since then the number has jumped half a million a year. Today one woman in three with children under 18 holds a job. At the same time, the U.S. still thinks a woman's place is in the home. If she wishes to work, this belief holds, it's up to her to make arrangements for her children.

THE COST OF CARE

In truth, of course, many women today are forced to work through economic necessity: Divorced or separated, they are the sole support of their families. Many can scarcely afford the average \$10 a week underground facilities cost, let alone \$15 to \$20 a week and more charged by commercial day-care centers. They'd like to take advantage of the cheaper public centers, but the demand is too great.

The day care problem, however, cuts across social and economic classes. Among the most neglected of all are children of college students. Usually living on a shoestring budget, with the wife working to support her husband, students resort to all manner of underground amusements.

Most of the underground centers are operated in ordinary residences, and the operators limit themselves to caring for one or two children. It's when five to ten children

are involved that the violations become more important.

Rules of fire safety are frequently violated. Few underground operators have even considered fire drills, and their homes do not meet even the minimum precautions, such as doors that open outward. In Columbus, O., PARADE visited a center on the third floor of a frame house, reached by a narrow stairway. In the event of fire, the operator could never have evacuated the children.

Health rules, too, are violated. In few cases do the operators or their employees, if any, take physical examinations. Nor do the children themselves receive any health care. Meals furnished are neither nourishing nor filling. When parents send lunches, little care is given them. "Can you imagine what happens to a tuna sandwich after four hours in one of these places?" one expert asked PARADE. Moreover, lack of facilities, such as play space or equipment, makes for a stultifying day.

Study of a single location best helps you to understand the inadequacies of day care. Chicago, for instance, according to the Welfare Council there, has an estimated 184,000 children of working mothers. Fewer than half are cared for in their own homes by relatives; about 18,000 are cared for at home by babysitters; another 15,000 stay with relatives in their homes. About 14,000 (including 600 under 6) shift for themselves. The remainder—about 50,000—are in need of some form of day care.

To cope with this flood, the city has one public day-care center, 13 Community Fund centers, 15 operated by churches and 60 commercial centers—total capacity, 3700. There are an additional 234 licensed day-care homes, which can accommodate 621 children.

ONE CITY'S FLIGHT

The Welfare Council recently surveyed Chicago's day-care needs neighborhood by neighborhood. In low-income Englewood, with an estimated 7000 children in need of care, there was one commercial day-care center and four licensed day-care homes—total capacity, 87 children. The Grand Boulevard area was said to need space for 1300; it could accommodate 99. Rogers Park could take care of 105 out of 600—but it shared its facilities with adjoining neighborhoods.

PARADE spent several days visiting underground operations in Columbus, O. Following newspaper ads, "Female Babysitting Wanted" and "Children Boarded," a reporter posed as the father of a 3-year-old in need of all-day care. At the first place he was told the child could "play with toys all day or watch TV" and he would get a hot lunch or snack. The fee was \$10 a week. The next woman promised good care for \$12 a week—"but only if he's out of diapers, they're too much trouble." In a third case the ad led to a dingy, depressing, smelly home. The woman said care cost \$15 a week.

None of the three was licensed, since Ohio laws do not cover licensing of commercial day-fare facilities. Owners bristled at the very idea. They protested that they "liked children" and didn't see why they needed to be inspected. Comparing notes with working women, later, the reporter found their experience jibed with his. They said it was almost impossible to find a licensed place or one with reasonable rates.

What can be done to help such working women?

Almost all authorities contacted agreed that there must be more facilities, better facilities and a more unified approach to the problem—with the federal government playing a much greater role than it does now. A few believe that the U.S. should copy the Scandinavian countries with a nationwide network of low-cost nurseries.

Almost no one believes that merely enforcing licensing procedures will eliminate

the problem, since it would only drive many establishments out of business and increase pressure on those remaining. Instead some experts believe a federal or state subsidy should be given nonprofit or even commercial institutions to help them expand or improve.

A number of commercial facilities now in operation drew praise from experts. The ABC Nursery in Chicago, which handles 73 kids, is one. But some experts feel the solution is neither commercial nor government facilities but nurseries operated by companies who employ a great number of women.

One example is at the Rochester Clothing Company, New Bedford, Mass. The owner, Carl Giordano, established a nursery two years ago as a means of luring women employees in New Bedford. The nursery has a capacity of 100 children, usually runs about half full. A practical nurse is in charge, and Giordano's daughter and three assistant teachers help out. It operates from 7 to 4:15. Children get light breakfast, two snacks and a hot lunch. There's a supervised play time and some instruction. Giordano figures it costs about \$10 a week a child, and is worth it.

To many persons, of course, such an operation is anathema because it encourages more women to take jobs outside the home. This kind of philosophy has torpedoed greater subsidies for day care programs by Congress with charges of "federalized baby-sitting." Charles Tobin of the New York State Welfare Conference recently declared that "Unlimited day-care services . . . will weaken family ties by encouraging mothers to pursue activities which do not strengthen family life."

Yet most experts agree that the true victims of the day-care mess today are children—and that the mothers of these children are playing a vital role in the American economy. "The availability of modern child day-care services is no longer an individual convenience," Vice President Humphrey says. "It is a community and national necessity."

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 14, 1969]

DAY-CARE FACILITIES URGED FOR ARLINGTON PRESCHOOLERS

The number of working Arlington mothers with pre-school children has risen so sharply that a community effort to provide day-care centers is urgently needed, according to a study committee of the Arlington Health and Welfare Council.

In a 34-page report sent to the County Board and Human Resources Commission, the citizen study group called for two pilot day-care centers, a county coordinator of child care and more stringent rules for operation of existing facilities.

There was no estimate given of the cost of providing such programs because the committee recommends a better use of existing facilities and services, particularly in the area of health and education, said Mrs. M. Patton Echols, chairman of the preschool child-care committee.

At present, Arlington day-care centers accommodate an estimated 847 children. Of the existing facilities, seven are private, profit-making enterprises, four are non profit community-run centers, and two are federally subsidized. The county runs no centers.

Surveys of public schools alone show that Arlington has a higher percentage of working mothers—in one school, 67 per cent—than the national average of 33 per cent. The report indicates the number will grow even faster with the advent of proposed high-rise apartment buildings.

Mrs. Edward L. Kahn, general chairman of the committee, noted that the program is geared toward a geographic and economic cross section of the county.

The report emphasized that the concept of the program is to provide "total day care as a community service rather than a service to poverty families" alone.

The report suggests the possibility of subsidizing some of the tuition costs on a sliding fee scale based on income and the number of children.

The report also says that day-care centers should not be "baby-sitting" services alone, but should concentrate on preparing the preschool child for school.

(Mr. DELLENBACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, which is now holding extensive hearings on the President's family assistance plan, I am especially cognizant of the narrow margin separating the working poor from those on welfare—the narrow line between economic independence and economic dependence.

The key purpose of the family assistance plan, which I cosponsored, is to reform the welfare program so that it motivates work rather than encouraging dependence. Today, I am cosponsoring the Comprehensive Headstart Development Act of 1970, which is an essential part of this concept.

A recent study of families on welfare in New York City shows that seven out of 10 mothers on welfare would prefer to work. Moreover, six out of 10 mothers on welfare with preschool children said that they would prefer to work if day care were available.

If, in the 1970's we are to bring off welfare the two-thirds of the AFDC mothers who could not attain independent economic status in the 1960's, we have to see that there are adequate child-care centers to take care of their children.

At the present time there are 61 Federal Programs providing funds for day care and child development in seven different departments and agencies. These 61 programs reach a total of 642,040 children. It is estimated that there are approximately 3 million children aged 3 to 5 coming from poor families who would be eligible to take advantage of day-care services. If we are going to effectively alleviate this gap in services, it seems to me that we have to first consolidate and coordinate these 61 programs.

President Nixon has committed his administration to the first 5 years of life. To accomplish this we need to be sure that the child development programs are based on a strong, coordinated foundation. Without this, I do not believe any program can be successful. The Comprehensive Headstart Child Development Act of 1970 will establish such a foundation. Further, it will provide the Congress with an improved scrutiny over Federal efforts in this area.

Briefly, this bill will provide for increased research into the process of child development; additional facilities to house child-care centers; training for teachers and paraprofessionals who work with these children; an effective evaluation procedure to provide Congress and the public with accurate, relevant information as to the impact of these programs; and a major step in consolidating

and coordinating the 61 present programs.

When dealing with young children the importance of parental involvement and volunteer services cannot be overemphasized. This bill encourages participation from the private sector by including businesses, teenagers, and older Americans. In addition, the new arrangement would place a joint administrative responsibility on the Federal and State governments.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in associating myself as a sponsor of the Comprehensive Headstart Child Development Act of 1970, which is being introduced today.

To meet the pressing needs of early childhood care and child development is a task which must rank high among our national priorities. To meet the specific child-care needs of more than 10 million working mothers with young children is a challenge which must be met in the interests of both the Nation's economy and the well-being of millions of children whose mothers must be away from home.

With the notable exception of such programs as Headstart, the efforts of Government to meet child care and development needs have been laudable in intent but often lacking in necessary coordination. The proliferation of various programs, which this legislation seeks to correct, has resulted in confusion and discontinuity at Federal, State, and local levels which has generally reduced the effectiveness of each program. Let me cite some examples, as follows:

Some programs permit Federal funds to pay 100 percent of the program costs, while others provide 90 percent, 80 percent, or 75 percent, and still another program allows Federal-aid funding for only 8 percent of costs.

Existing legislation often defeats its own goals. Under one program, for example, a welfare mother is eligible for federally aided child-care services while she completes a manpower training program, but is no longer eligible when she completes training and is ready to take a job. All too often she is forced to go back on welfare.

Eligibility requirements, based on family income, vary from program to program. Cut-off points often seem quite arbitrary, especially to the poorly paid working mother of preschool children who finds she is ineligible for such services since she is not poor enough.

It would be paradoxical, indeed, for this Nation to implement a proposed welfare system which requires a mother to take work without first providing adequate child-care facilities. It is difficult enough to meet today's employment needs because of the unavailability of a large part of the labor force for this very reason. To provide a subsidy for the care of children of working mothers, especially if the custodial function is combined with learning and development opportunities, is consistent with the needs of today's transient society and our desire to help our children achieve their full potential.

The inconsistencies are remedied in the legislation being introduced today. Six Federal programs providing child care, child development, and Headstart services will be brought together into a single overall program under the guidance of HEW's Office of Child Development. One set of standards will be applied at Federal, State, and local levels. Eligibility for services will be extended not only to the economically disadvantaged but to middle-income working mothers, who will be charged fees according to fee scales set by each State.

Each State will assess its own needs and design programs and services which best fit its local situations. The bill further creates a vital research arm, the National Institute for Early Childhood Development and Education, and provides funds to train personnel.

In particular, I commend the provisions of the bill which involve employers and industry in the development of child-care programs.

Within the constraints of existing legislation, several States have already made considerable progress in laying the groundwork for a coordinated approach to child development services. I am proud to say that Massachusetts is one of those States. I believe our experience will be of interest to my colleagues. Accordingly, I am inserting herewith in the RECORD an article by Mrs. Gwen G. Morgan, day-care coordinator in the Office of Planning and Program Coordination of the Massachusetts Executive Office of Administration and Finance. It follows:

STATE ACTION TO IMPROVE CHILD SERVICES
(By Gwen G. Morgan)

Because of his concern over the fragmentation and lack of continuity of programs—particularly day care—for children in Massachusetts, Governor Francis W. Sargent created by Executive Order, on September 26, 1969, a Governor's Advisory Committee on Child Development.

"Massachusetts has had a commitment to day care for a long time," said Governor Sargent. "Our Massachusetts Committee on Children and Youth has had a day care committee since 1962. Yet in spite of all our interest and our rich professional resources, our systems for delivering services to children have made little progress. There are gaps; there are overlaps; and there is a wasteful and potentially destructive competition for the same funds. All our meetings, all our reports and all our speeches have not added up to much increase in our programs for children."

There is ample evidence that the Governor's concern over fragmentation is well placed. More than 13 public agencies are involved with some aspect of child care, and 89 per cent of the day care in the state is provided by a variety of private agencies. Bits and pieces of federal and state legislation have led to the establishment of a few too-narrow programs, haphazardly distributed, with the best services sometimes going to families in more affluent communities. We have programs for the blind, programs for the deaf, programs for the retarded, programs for the disturbed, programs for the disadvantaged, programs for children of mothers in job training, programs for children of welfare recipients, programs for children of working mothers. And, of course, we have our private nursery schools for the middle class. The result is that children are being segregated by category; children are moved from program to program as categories of eligibility change; children being in programs

and then are dropped. Our programs are not being designed to meet needs as perceived by users. We have a chaotic administrative situation with too little communication between agencies, and no one is "responsible for being responsible" for what happens to families seeking service. What is needed is a generic system of services to children and their families, distributed equitably across the state on a geographic basis, but our various systems at present are not organized toward this goal.

There are more than 500,000 working women in Massachusetts, but only 33,000 places in licensed day care of any kind, most of it half-day programs. We have no solutions to the problems of children younger than three who need care or of older children after school hours. Our failure to plan for a healthy environment in which our urban children can learn and grow helps to cause later school failure, emotional disorders and severe health problems. These preventable problems exist in spite of all the solid evidence that positive attention to the crucial early years can lead to significant improvement in cognitive, physical and emotional development.

There is a new interest in child care programs at the federal level, where an Office of Child Development has just been created. Federal programs, however, are still fragmented in a variety of agencies. Because of the scarcity of resources and the need for more continuity and breadth in children's programs, Massachusetts' Commissioner of Administration and Finance, Donald R. Dwight, has established the coordination of state and federal programs for children as a high priority goal for the state. Based in the Office of Planning and Program Coordination of his department, an interdepartmental task force on child care has been meeting during the last year to take first steps toward planning together. Now, Governor Sargent has established the Governor's Advisory Committee on Child Development to continue, with broadened representation, the planning of the interdepartmental task force. The Advisory Committee will include 13 state agency heads or their representatives, 12 representatives of service agencies and professional groups and 12 parents of children using or needing day care.

UNRESOLVED ISSUES

The committee will discuss some of the still-unresolved basic issues in day care. What are the priority target groups needing day care? What is the total need? How much of it can be met? How much must an adequate day care program cost? Should families pay fees? Should the service be provided by the public or private sector? What is the appropriate agency? What is the role of private industry? What is the optimal staffing pattern for day care? What different kinds of staff are needed? What is the role of staff at each level? How much and what kind of training is needed for directors of day care programs, day care teachers and other supportive staff? What agency should provide the training for each? Who validates the training? What is our total manpower need for day care? How can day care be financed—both capital costs for physical facilities and operating costs? Out of the committee's deliberations will come goals, objectives and a state plan against which departmental involvement in day care can be measured.

Another committee responsibility will be developing the kind of structure which is necessary before an effective system of children's services can be created. Here the Advisory Committee will be responsible for the state-level aspects of the Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) program. The 4-C program is a federally-conceived process in which local public and private agencies develop a structure for cooperating among themselves. The Committee will encourage the development of such 4-C planning coal-

tions in each of the state's 37 service areas, each including the balance of public officials, providers and users which the 4-C guidelines suggest. Real coordination will only take place when those people at the local level—where the programs are and where the needs are—work together. The state-level Advisory Committee will develop criteria for state recognition of an area 4-C group, will review local proposals for recognition and will provide information and assistance to help local groups to meet state and federal criteria. The Committee will serve as a focus for information on all aspects of child care and on the 4-C program.

Supplementing the work of the Committee, the individual departments have taken steps toward better child care. The Department of Community Affairs has just trained a staff for a new project of technical assistance to local people who want to organize a 4-C system in their areas. For the first time, the Welfare Department has a substantial state appropriation to provide day care services with 75 per cent federal reimbursement. The department has developed new procedures for contracting for this service with responsible local agencies, guaranteeing a reasonable per child cost for a certain number of children rather than making vendor payments for services rendered to specific children as in the past. By this contracting, the department will avoid becoming another competitor and can instead cooperate with the local community in order to expand, improve in quality and link up the existing network of service. Contracting is also a useful tool in coordination, allowing different public and private agencies to support the same program. The existence of broad-based local 4-C groups developed in relation to a rational state plan will be invaluable to the Welfare Department and the other state agencies as they move into an expanded child care program. Well-organized and inclusive 4-C groups can help solve the problem of harmful competition for funds.

The need for child development programs is so great, and their quality so important, that it will not be possible to meet the need without developing a method for combining our public and private resources. Massachusetts, under the leadership of Governor Sargent, is beginning to develop procedures and policies to improve the state's services to children, with a new emphasis on the unmet need for day care. The new Governor's Advisory Committee represents a partnership of public and private agencies, a partnership of users and providers of service and a partnership of government and citizens. It is only by these kinds of partnerships that the enormous gaps in our services to children can begin to be filled.

The Community Coordinated Child Care—4-C—program, described in the preceding article, is quite similar in concept to the State commission approach taken in the legislation which I am co-sponsoring. In fact, it is probable that many States with strong existing 4-C operations will choose to utilize the 4-C committee as the nucleus of the new State commission.

Therefore, I believe it is appropriate to insert a brief "fact sheet," prepared by the Day-Care Child Development Council of America, which tells what the 4-C program is and how it functions:

FACT SHEET—THE COMMUNITY COORDINATED CHILD CARE—(4-C) PROGRAM

1. What is the 4-C Program?

A system under which local public and private agencies interested in day care and pre-school programs develop a method of cooperating with one another on programs, services, staff development, and administrative activities.

In the remainder of the 1969 fiscal year Regional 4-C Committee will select the pilot communities. The program will be conducted as a pilot program in 18 communities located throughout the country.

2. What is the background of the 4-C program?

The 4-C Program is being developed on the federal level by the Federal Panel on Early Childhood in response to a Congressional directive (Section 522-d of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1967) to the Secretary of HEW and the Director of OEO to develop mechanisms for coordination of day care programs at the federal, state and local levels.

3. What is the purpose of the 4-C Program?

To assist communities in organizing presently diverse and fragmental services into comprehensive programs of support for families and children.

4. What are the objectives of the 4-C Program?

(a) To provide comprehensive and coordinated quality child care, child development, and supportive family services to the maximum number of families.

(b) To develop the most efficient, effective, and economical methods for coordinating both existing and new child care programs.

(c) To insure an effective voice in policy and program direction for parents of children enrolled.

(d) To mobilize the resources of the community so as to assure maximum agency commitment to provide expanded quality child care and to insure efficient and effective use of such resources.

(e) To simplify administrative relationships between local programs and state and federal governments.

5. What are the benefits of the program to a local community?

(1) Expansion and community of services. Often as the situation or needs of a family changes, child care arrangements must be terminated or disrupted. The 4-C Program can provide greater flexibility in placement.

(2) Better use of human resources, i.e., specialists. The 4-C Program aims for a wider use of specialists for all programs—big and small—to lead to comparable costs and uniform standards for any given service (medical, dental, social services, etc.) from program to program.

(3) Common purchasing unit. Food, medicine, toys, equipment, etc. . . . can be purchased at a greater reduction in cost when bought in bulk orders.

(4) Improved transportation. Pooled resources will result in better transport of children and parents.

(5) Joint Program Activities: Many activities which can only be possible where a large number of families are involved can be established.

(6) Staff Development: Personnel referral systems to permit the transfer of staff from one program to another and training programs for all personnel can be established.

(7) Reduced administrative overhead. By bringing all administrative function under one unit, it will be possible to reduce administrative costs.

6. Who participates in the planning and coordination process?

Federal Level: Federal Panel on Early Childhood (Representatives of Health, Education, and Welfare, Economic Development Agency, Housing and Urban Development, Office of Economic Opportunity, Bureau of the budget, and Agriculture Department).

Regional: Federal Regional 4-C Committees (Representatives of HEW, DOL, HUD, OEO, USDA.)

State: State 4-C Committees (Representatives of State departments of HEW, Employment, Economic Opportunity, and other interested public and private agencies.)

Local: Local 4-C Committee (public and private agencies interested in day care and representatives of recipients of services.)

ROLE OF THE PARENTS

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain how this bill relates to the important question of parent participation.

Several witnesses appearing before the Education and Labor Committee recently have suggested that one of the best, and most economical ways to prevent severe deprivation among the children of economically disadvantaged families would be to reach the parents. As Polly Greenberg points out in a recent article appearing in the December 1969 issue of *Compact*:

Actually it isn't possible to discuss parent participation in early education in terms of should we bring parents into it or shouldn't we. At present, parents or parent substitutes not only participate in the day and night care and the early education of most children in the nation under six, but are the exclusive providers of same. Private school nurseries and kindergartens, Headstart, church preschools, commercial jointly-owned preschools and day care, special education programs for young children (retarded, deaf, etc.) play groups run by recreation departments, coops, city, county or other day care centers, lab schools and so forth, all added together, service considerably fewer than half of the country's eligible candidates. For better or for worse, in sickness and in health, parents without standard English, college degrees, teacher's certificates, child study courses or any other "qualifications," are providing decision-making, policy-planning curriculum, administration, staff, facilities and finding for all aspects of their children's care and early education. . . . The issue, it seems, is . . . Should we have professional participation in early education?

The bill being introduced today makes several provisions relating to this very important question.

First, it continues to emphasize the involvement of parents in the planning and operation of Headstart programs, and permits this parent involvement to be extended to any programs which might be funded under the consolidated program.

Second, parents can serve both as volunteers in any of the programs and can be trained as paraprofessional aides.

Third, it is a significant departure from other proposed child development programs. This bill, specifically authorizes State commissions to plan for programs for adolescent girls and expectant mothers who are economically deprived to prepare them for their future role as the main provider for their children's care and early education. Without such programs, many of these future mothers might not have an opportunity to learn the basic fundamentals of nutrition, child development, and child care. Yet armed with this kind of knowledge it is possible that many, if not most of them, will be able to provide healthy, stimulating environments for their babies, even though they may be economically deprived.

Programs of this sort could operate in conjunction with obstetric clinics, in the public schools, in community programs or in any other setting where future mothers can be reached. An additional feature of such a program might be the involvement of adolescent girls as volunteers in organized child development programs—not only would their assistance

be welcomed, but also they would have an opportunity to observe and participate in helping young children grow and learn.

Lastly, the bill also specifically provides for efforts to improve children's home environment. Several still-experimental programs have been conducted along these lines and have shown great promise. Simply, what they do is to send someone into the home on a regular basis to "play" with the child. Not only is this special attention and stimulation of great benefit to the child himself, but it has been found that gradually other siblings, then parents, neighbors and their children are gradually drawn into participation in the activities begun by the visiting teacher. Eventually, the parents are often able to take over the task of providing this kind of educational stimulation.

I would like to add to the RECORD at this point several articles and excerpts from witness testimony which indicate the high potential of parent involvement:

LOW-COST STATE STRATEGIES WITH A NEW LOOK

(By Polly Greenberg)

(NOTE.—Mrs. Greenberg has been a senior consultant with the Educational Services Division of the General Learning Corporation since 1968. Prior to that time, she served as the director of teacher development and program for children for the Child Development Group of Mississippi (CDGM), a statewide Head Start program run by the poor people of the state. Her book about that experience, entitled *The Devil Has Slippery Shoes* (MacMillan: 1969), has been reviewed as a major publication on both education and the war on poverty.)

Much has been written about why early education is good for children. Much has been written about parent participation in early education. Less has been said about:

Why it would be advantageous for many children to receive richer experiences and more careful guidance in personality growth from their parents, rather than to be put in teacher-dominated early education programs;

Why it would be advantageous for many educational decision-makers to take the route of technical assistance to parents in providing low-cost improved care and enrichment 'programs' soon, rather than waiting for the day when it would be feasible to implement elaborate, expensive, comprehensive service-type, professionally run statewide early education programs; and some concrete ways to do the former;

Why it would be advantageous for educational decision-makers to use parent involvement in early education as a relatively easy low-cost strategy for producing a well-informed pressure group to push for innovations in all dimensions of public education: curriculum, staff development, facilities, parent participation and administration;

Why it would be advantageous for educational decision-makers to support the development of educational choices and to support processes through which parents as well as professionals could become familiar with many differing approaches to education.

ALTERNATIVES FOR ENRICHING HOME DEVELOPMENT

Research indicates that in the earliest years (birth to five or six years), children are more influenced by family than by peers or any persons outside the family. A great deal is known about the kinds of personality strengths and capabilities that help a person cope constructively and creatively as he moves toward mental health and maturity. We even know quite a bit about environ-

ments and techniques that promote or hinder the development of desirable characteristics such as initiative, independence, etc.

If infants and young children learn most from families and if we want young children to learn more of certain things, common sense indicates that we should make plans to share what professionals know about helping kids grow up well with their families. All families. The process of preparing some of what we know in various kinds of packages, the process of promoting parental use of these packaged aids to help a child become a better person through daily living, and the process of giving technical assistance to families as they attempt to launch their "programs," would be a unique and exciting early education project for a creative state to develop.

Actually, it isn't possible to discuss parent participation in early education in terms of should we bring parents into it or shouldn't we. At present, parents or parent substitutes not only participate in the day and night care and the early education of most children in the nation under six, but are the exclusive providers of same. Private school nurseries and kindergartens, Head Start, church preschools, commercial family-owned preschools and day care, special education programs for young children (retarded, deaf, etc.), play groups run by recreation departments, co-ops, city, county or other day-care centers, lab schools, and so forth, all added together, service considerably fewer than half of the country's eligible candidates. For better or for worse, in sickness and in health, parents, without standard English, college degrees, teacher's certificates, child-study courses or any other "qualifications," are providing decision-making, policy-planning, curriculum, administration, staff, facilities and funding for all aspects of their children's care and early education.

Purists can haggle over distinctions between day care and early education. Early educators can develop varieties and hybrids. In spite of all flusters, flurries and fads involved in the current focus of attention on the subject, parents continue to care for kids, and kids continue to learn that which their lives contain. The issue, it seems is: are states going to set up systems so that professionals will be able to join parents? Should we have professional participation in early education?

Educational decision-makers can dismiss nagging doubts relating to lowering professional standards. There are no professional standards in homes, which is where the action is for most babies and little children. Thus, the addition of some inexpensive experience purchased from early childhood people, and even a small sprinkling of booster dollars, could not threaten minimum standards. Can states help parents learn to value the services they presently provide for their children? Can states help families learn to improve the services they provide?

There are a number of low-cost ideas states can consider regarding aid to families for improving educational services they give their children.

GUIDEBOOKS FOR PARENTS

For example, a state could produce soft-back guidebooks for parents' use in daily living with children. Guides would not exclusively or even primarily be workbooks to teach numbers, colors and letters. The materials would not merely be programs to "teach your baby to read." Skills like these are of very superficial importance when compared to the essence of quality child development programs. The chief objective of all major approaches to the education of young children is to help a child strengthen his strengths so that he may become a more fulfilled human being. A person able to deal with colors, letters and numbers, but knowing nothing of human skills such as feeling, initiative, independence, sharing, fairness, creativity, curiosity, resourcefulness, perse-

verance, ability to cooperate yet not capitulate, democratic processes, problem-solving, decision-making or organizing time and work would not add much to the world.

Therefore, curriculum guides for parents would include behavioral objectives common to most quality early education and child-care programs such as laboratory, college campus and private school nursery programs—distinguished special programs such as those of Deutsch, Hess, Peabody College, Bank Street College, Head Start and Montessori. For these programs have many common objectives and values.

There already are hundreds of books and articles stating facts and theories of child development. What would this project add? The problem is that these publications do not isolate behavioral objectives and arrange clusters of suggested activities, conversations and techniques of working with children accordingly. These should not be set up as sessions or lessons. Parents, relatives (including children) and babysitters should be given tips on how to spot and use learning moments that occur during any encounter with a child anytime. This syllabus for parents would include the same kinds of detailed things to do with infants—again, in terms of developing specific qualities, as well as infant language and experience enrichment.

States have access to the resources required to develop these child development curriculum guides. State departments of education, health or welfare could appoint joint committees or some other means could be devised to coordinate early education projects. A handful of child development and Head Start authorities could list general objectives and outline subject matter specialties to be covered. This document could be announced the way federal agencies announce requests for proposals. Competitive proposals might come to the funding source from private consulting firms, learning corporations, universities, private and public preschools or day-care centers, industries, city or county agencies. A system could be devised similar to that used by the Peace Corps or the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) when they want training courses designed and implemented or materials created. The development of various alternative models could be funded so that uniformity would be avoided. Of course, developmental costs could be even further reduced if a number of states pooled money.

Once developed, the packages would be usable in all states at a unit price not much greater than that of a paperback book. One of the standards set would be that early education do-it-yourself kits would have to be designed for use in rich, poor, rural or urban settings, and in any racial or ethnic situation. Clever designers could do this. At present, these groups on the fringes of education are under-used under-achievers. They have great potential. They need pushing.

PROMOTION

The next cost to the state would be heavy promotion for use of these ideas and activities in every home. Demonstrations of their usefulness with babies and small children could be held on TV at several times of day. Live demonstrations could be conducted in each neighborhood in public schools, churches, community centers or other appropriate places. Welfare workers, agricultural extension agents, health workers and community workers in other programs could help spread the word and demonstrate the choices. Flyers could be sent home with school children, welfare checks, real estate tax statements or in any number of ways. States have excellent avenues of dissemination at their fingertips. Few people in America are unreachable if sincere enough efforts are made to reach them.

The third cost to the state in this particular plan would be all but a token of the purchase price of the curriculum for each interested family. Families probably should make a small commitment to trying the material. This could be 25 cents or an amount determined by a sliding scale.

TRAINING UNEMPLOYED PARENTS

The final cost to the state would be the training and salaries of unemployed parents desiring full- or part-time jobs (possibly in training programs funded and developed as the guidebooks were by competing outside groups) to demonstrate the alternative materials. No doubt an imaginative state could get some Education Professions Development Act (EPDA), Manpower or other training monies for some of this. Or it might convince cities and counties to cough up salaries and money for materials for families.

A generation of children hopefully would get a somewhat richer environment and somewhat more insightful care while a system for comprehensive early education for all children is being evolved. Besides helping children now, this program could provide all parents in all socio-economic groups a chance to learn about educational options they never knew existed. This is an all-persuasive community education program.

Furthermore, it could provide the early education field with an untapped reservoir of manpower for two growing specialties in education: preschools and community schools. Opinion leaders from every walk of life could be selected and trained in a new paraprofessional position to tempt their neighbors into partaking of better free education for their children. Poor people need jobs and can be far more effective in influencing their neighborhoods than middleclass missionaries coming in from the outside improving people.

Not only the disadvantaged are disadvantaged as far as enjoyable jobs in the school system go. Many middleclass mothers need part-time jobs. They are home sighing for something to do part-time while their children are little, yet it's a rare school system which will hire two part-time mothers to fill one elementary school teacher's slot or bend in any way to solve its own manpower shortage or to make use of this dormant, frustrated middleclass talent.

TOY LIBRARIES

A second way states could hasten improved early education at home would be to invest in implementing the Glen Nimmicht and Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development toy library idea, now being tried on a small scale. This accompanies the Children's Television Workshop, but could beneficially be established even where the TV program isn't piped. Another dimension of this could be roving residents trained in the language/experience approach to reading readiness, who would help parents develop their own programs. The Anacostia Reading Project (Washington, D.C.) has community reading assistants of this kind in eight public schools. Again, parents should participate in the why as well as the how of this enrichment project. And again, peers of each socio-economic, racial and neighborhood parent group should be trained as toy librarians and community reading readiness assistants.

A READING READINESS PROGRAM

A third state project could be to help young children develop a love of books (one part of reading readiness). Parents could be trained to do home story reading and enticement work. They could learn to teach parents, babysitters or brothers and sisters to do this. These parent trainers could learn to put on story times several times a day at local libraries and in bookmobiles.

If this plan is not realistic because there are not enough libraries and bookmobiles,

or if they are too forbidding and storefront facilities in neighborhoods are needed, or if there is not a wealth of beautiful books for the very young in the libraries, we have a clue concerning why children are not learning to read easily when they reach public school. State agencies interested in early education could funnel funds into more plentiful and more tempting facilities, and more delightful books, as well as into salaries for story tellers. Queens Library in New York City has wonderful neighborhood story-telling sessions. The Weston Woods, Conn., Children's Carousel has old school buses, fixed as combination libraries and theatres with red-carpeted steps to sit on, that show filmstrips made from outstanding children's books. If transportation is a problem, states could hire transportation organizers to help families arrange car pools. In some cases school buses may be needed.

PARENT COOPERATIVES

A fourth type of early education improvement project is a group project, but is otherwise similar to the first suggestion in that the chief expenses are developing competing packaged programs, training a cadre of community residents of all kinds to teach others how to use them, advertising the project effectively and purchasing the packages for users. Some materials would be required. In rural areas transportation costs might be involved. This model would be block, neighborhood, creek, plantation, or county sub-section co-ops, run by parents, with no paid teacher. Parent cooperative preschools have functioned for years. These are some variations that probably have not been tried.

Co-ops could be all-day care or half-day play groups. They could serve the mother who works full time but has a week day off (waitresses, nurses and many others work Saturday instead of on a particular week-day). They could serve part-time working mothers or those attending school or engaged in civic projects. If the children of five families were involved, each mother (or substitute) would serve one day a week. Her home would be the facility. If ten families were involved, each family representative would serve one day in two weeks. This could be sold to parents on the grounds that:

Models of alternative kinds of early education, complete with objectives, techniques, content and materials, would be available free for their selection. They learn about early education and make a decision about their children.

Children would be helped by this program. If parents want to work, this would be to their advantage, as they would get many free days from this without babysitting costs.

If parents are now paying for babysitting, this would be to their advantage as it would be better for children and it is free.

Duty day would be easy and fruitful as session plans would be furnished.

TV and neighborhood workshops could be conducted by parents trained as technical assistants to co-op operators, or individual on-site help could be given. This is yet another para-professional job: co-op staff trainers.

Every public, private and parochial school in a state, as well as all kinds of day-care centers, could receive state aid to put on a daily one-hour preschool program after regular hours for the child and the person taking care of him. Saturday programs could be held. Materials and session plans prepared as described earlier would focus this particular curriculum on showing children's escorts how to offer enrichment activities at home. Group leaders would be parents, who, as in all above models, are a new breed of community preschool paraprofessionals. Group leaders would see alternative packaged programs demonstrated, make decisions and receive training in the use of the pro-

gram they select. As above, parents would participate extensively in selecting group leaders and program. This program would not be entirely unlike that of the Parental-School-Community Involvement Program of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

BUILDING A VOLUNTEER AND STUDENT STAFF

Another slightly more expensive but still low-cost program states could develop would require facilities, possibly transportation and one trained preschool teacher as supervisor of a volunteer staff, plus the development of suitable session plans and certain materials as above. When new facilities were to be planned for construction, preschool classrooms would be planned in. Or facilities money would be made available for the renovation of churches, homes, stores, apartments, offices or other space. There are learning corporations and consulting firms specializing in day care and early education facilities which could prepare this component for states. It is not necessary for all buildings to look alike to qualify as public schools—a fact evidently unknown to elementary and secondary school builders. Together the parents, students and supervising teacher would study and select the program that makes sense to them from the prepared educational cafeteria. Project Follow Through operates something like this.

The supervising teacher would be given an orientation emphasizing how to present program choices to parents and students. For example, one choice would be whether this should be a half- or full-day program. If the program is to provide comprehensive services, how this extra component will be funded should be discussed. The supervisor's briefing would also include her new role as support, guide, quality control and resource to students and parents working with small groups of children. She will go over the do-it-yourself home-enrichment guides explained previously. The supervisor is leader of a parent and pre-parent educational awareness project, as well as a pre-training program for the vast number of now nonexistent day-care and early education teachers we will hopefully need in the future.

The volunteer staff would consist of college, high school, junior high school and upper elementary students. The former two could serve as assistant teachers and the latter two as teachers' aides. There is, of course, much evidence to suggest that children react extremely favorably to leadership from older children and very young adults. This is also an excellent strategy for getting males into work with young children. Students would be assigned on a regular schedule by their schools as in K-12 practice teaching. Relevant seminars and workshops would be offered to all students participating in the pre-parent or early education experience. Montgomery County, Maryland, has a program similar to this. During the seminar, students would select simple roles or curriculum components to specialize in. Content, technique and process for seminars could be designed by the same experienced educational affiliates referred to before. Video-taping, Peace Corps training techniques, T-grouping, analysis of personal teaching performance and other modern instructional methods should be included.

As much as possible, a representative of each enrolled child's family would be included in the seminar and as a classroom volunteer. Thus, students would gain experience in working with parents.

Most furniture, playground equipment and toys would be made by the parent/student group, using patterns and materials included in the packaged program as well as their own. Civic groups and members of the community could be involved in this project. Head Start was intended to do this, but it only happened in a few localities.

HOME CENTERS

Still another approach open to an innovative state is the Virginia Burke/Mitchell Ginsburg concept developed in New York City of user/provider day care. A provider could be given training, curriculum, some materials and salary for operating a good day-care program with educational enrichment in her home. This could be a half-day session if preferred. Users are parents whose five children fill the quota in each small home-like center. Users get some training, too. This training would stress that the quantity of time parents spend with their children is not the determining factor in whether or not the child is getting good care and education. The determining factors are the quality of what you do and how you relate when you are with him and the quality of care he gets when you are not with him. Users' training would include how to use the do-it-yourself syllabus discussed earlier.

SOURCES OF FUNDING

States could work with industries, hospitals and unions, if appropriate, to develop day care funded partly by the state, partly by the employer as a fringe benefit and partly by the parent paying tuition or matching money as with Blue Cross. The quality of care and early education would be better and the price lower than what is currently available to most working parents. Maximum feasible parent participation would be maintained by establishing parent planning groups at the outset to choose between programs prepared, as in all other instances presented above, by universities, existing good programs, consulting firms, learning corporations and so forth. Each program would include facilities options, staff selection and training options, administrative options and options regarding forms and degrees of parent involvement, as well, of course, as options on the actual daily program for children. Costs could be kept down if the group made most toys, furniture, and playground equipment, and if children brought lunch so kitchens were not required. As before, staff costs could be reduced but desirable ratios continued if assistants were students and parents.

Apparently no state is ready to provide a uniform system of quality day care and early education complete with all related services to every eligible child. But it doesn't have to be all or nothing. Perhaps this very unreadiness will prevent the basic errors built into public education as it stands today. These are monolithic methods controlled by a minority group (professional educators) so that creative change from the inside is repressed, and from the outside—well, outsiders cannot even get an experimental foot in the door. Upon reflection, it seems that far from being a second-rate make-do way to start state aid to early education, a battery of experimental programs like those above would be better than another slick system lowered into the midst of uninvolved neighborhoods. Programs like 4-C could be developed to coordinate purchasing and training for all centers in an area. Pilot comprehensive service centers could be established.

PRESSURE FOR IMPROVEMENT

Probably children would get more from life and from public education if they came better prepared. Probably parent participation is good for children so home and school can tie together. But from the viewpoint of the educational planner, there is a much more powerful purpose in providing early education with high parent involvement soon. It is a strategy for developing pressure groups which can join with creative educators in pushing for improved education at all levels. Parents who have come through the various educational awareness programs outlined above will be far more educationally attuned, astute and unapathetic. They will

give public education more service, support and pressure for innovation.

Why don't parents now pressure for any of the many major kinds of changes that are discussed in impressive professional journals? Because for the most part parents have not seen experimental facilities, curriculum, staff development, administration and parent participation. Educators have effectively excluded them from learning about alternatives. Because parents are essentially ignorant of the exciting ideas in the world of teaching and learning today, of course, cannot pressure for anything specific. Therefore, school personnel are relatively safe. Or they would be, except that by now growing numbers of communities are feeling so excluded from the educational decision-making process that in frustrated rage they are demanding control; no specific changes, just control. Within a decade school systems everywhere will have to cope with what the front lines are living through now.

One might ask why parent participation is necessary to bring universities, educational consulting firms, regional education laboratories, learning corporations, many types of agencies, all kinds of successful individual institutions, persons, programs, projects, techniques, tools, materials, methods and media into greater prominence. Education needs people who are realistic about how irrelevant much of public education is and realistically skeptical about the possibilities of ever altering the status quo. But the other outfits, most notably the learning corporations, started in the early sixties for explicitly this purpose, have goods and services to sell to a market which needs them (school systems) but which will not budget their bureaucracies an inch to take what they need. Without demands, nothing will change. School systems will never change unless someone else demands. This is the big mistake learning corporations made. They didn't know that they needed parents. Without parents there would be no power to propel them to center stage, and all they could do would be what they do now: lurk in the wings.

The area of early childhood education is explored but unexplored territory. A state taking advantage of it to set precedents for parent education, parent participation at all levels, use of paraprofessionals, competing and contrasting kinds of programs aided with state funds, technical assistance to education from many sources and public funds to expand private schools would be far better equipped to solve some 1-12 problems in the seventies than its neighbors. Educators sincerely wishing to innovate at existing public school levels might want to establish new patterns in the unbloodied field of early education. They could then devise means of letting new ideas grow on up into adjacent and related school systems.

SELF-HELP APPROACH: PARENTS AS TEACHERS

(By Ira J. Gordon)

(NOTE.—Dr. Gordon is professor of education and director of the Institute for Development of Human Resources which he organized as a research group within the College of Education at the University of Florida. He received his Ed.D from Teachers College, Columbia University.)

What does it take for a child to do well in school? There are a number of obvious answers including good curriculum, good teachers, good physical plant and up-to-date textbooks, all of which have been the concern of school boards, taxpayers, educational researchers and administrators for years. Another answer has been that the child himself—his intelligence, his needs, his physical health, his level of maturity—influences his learning.

Both answers, however, have overlooked the role of the home and street as contribu-

tors to the child's learning and as continuous forces in influencing his desire and ability to learn. Although educators have long acknowledged that parental interest is useful and although we see movements in the direction of parental involvement, we have only recently begun to examine and use the home as a learning institution.

Many concerned professionals, especially those involved in education for the disadvantaged, have a tendency to write-off the home and to assume that school must take over all the many roles formerly played by the family. The current sharp debate over sex education is a case in point as to what happens when home and school vie, rather than cooperate, in the education of the child.

HOW HOME INFLUENCES LEARNING

What do we know about the way in which homes affect learning? How do they influence the child's scholastic performance? And what can we do about it? The work of the behavioral scientists who investigated the first question suggests many factors which influence school achievement. First there are the broad ecological factors such as the quality of housing, the level of income, the composition of the family, the social class and ethnic background of the family. The second and third sets of factors relate more to the way in which parents behave. Many of us are well aware that such labels as "social class" or "poverty level income" are far too broad to really tell us much about what a parent does and how a parent feels about the education of his child. When we examine the particulars, we find that those children more likely to do well in school come from homes which: (1) have planned cultural activities within them, (2) have taken advantage of the variety of community resources, such as nursery schools and kindergartens, zoos and parks, museum and libraries, (3) provide the child with academic guidance in the home, (4) make books, magazines and other intellectual tools available, (5) include the use of many abstractions and reasoning types of sentences in family language. This type of home also provides the child with frequent opportunities from the very earliest years to hear his parents talk and to talk with them even in such simple settings as around the dinner table.

Of special significance is the fact that in the type of home described above, the parents see themselves as teachers of their children. They recognize a responsibility and, more than that, they recognize that what they do in the direct instruction of the child influences how he will grow. Parents in such a home, for example, when shopping in the supermarket make it a point to show things to their toddler or child in the cart, point out labels, colors, shapes and names and to answer as best they can the numerous questions posed by the young child.

The homes of children who "make it" seem to be characterized by a certain emotional climate. There is an order, consistency and a set of home routines. The child has some predictability as to how his behavior will be received. This does not mean that parents are always in perfect agreement, but that generally the child can count on receiving somewhat consistent guidelines concerning his action. The chances are the mother (1) will be emotionally secure, (2) will have a good deal of self-esteem, (3) will trust the school, (4) will devote time to the child and (5) will have a set of organized work habits. A major personality factor which seems to effect learning is the parents' own "belief in internal control." A parent who has such a belief feels that he has some control over his own life and his own destiny, rather than believing himself to be a victim of chance, fate and circumstance.

If the above factors influence how a child performs in school, then changing the school conditions of children growing up in homes

in which the above factors are absent will not make enough difference for many of these children. One of the reasons why various compensatory education programs have not lived up to the hopes of their supporters may be because they were primarily school-oriented. Home improvement was minimal. There were no systematic programs for educating parents to change the factors described above and no techniques for helping parents see the home as a learning center.

HOME ORIENTED TRAINING

The general psychological literature in the first half of the 1960's indicated that intelligence was modifiable, that the early years were the most pliable and that infants were far more capable of learning than we had believed. Armed with these notions and with the belief that a successful program of long-term change in child performance required modification of the home as a learning setting, we developed a Parent Education Program to investigate whether a new paraprofessional person—a parent educator—could be recruited, trained and placed in the field; could be accepted on a continuing basis by mothers; could teach mothers a set of specific activities which would enhance the intellectual and personal development of the child. We also wanted to determine whether such a program could be disseminated and used elsewhere.

The program began in July, 1966 with first year support from the Fund for the Advancement of Education. Funds for the period July, 1967–August, 1969 were supplied by the Children's Bureau. The investigation is currently supported by the National Institute of Mental Health.

Our basic approach was to select disadvantaged women, train them in techniques of child stimulation and adult teaching, assign them to mothers of three-month-old babies and have them visit these homes once a week until the child was two years old. We began with babies this young because we believed that patterns of mother-child interaction are set early and this age would offer an opportunity to influence the interaction in a positive fashion.

Fifteen women were initially employed to make periodic home visits to 150 homes. As the project developed, an additional six half-time parent educators were employed. Families were added as the first group of youngsters reached the age of two, until a total of over 300 families in a cluster of north-central Florida counties were involved. These black and white families were from rural and small town settings as well as from the city of Gainesville.

As a basic part of the project, we developed learning tasks that mothers could use with children between three months and two years of age. These materials, in booklet form ("Intellectual Stimulation for Infants and Toddlers") have been widely disseminated to parent and child centers, university, community and private day care centers, interested professionals and parents.

A PRACTICAL APPROACH

During the entire program, weekly observational information was gathered in the homes. These data, plus tests of babies and mothers, show that we accomplished our objectives of influencing mother-child interactions in the home and fostering child development. The program is practical, accepted by parents and does lead to change.

During the past year we have developed a combined small-group learning approach with a weekly home visit for children between the ages of two and three. The program for two-year-olds combines a small group center with the home visit procedure. Each child spends two 2-hour sessions a week in a home learning center located in the home of a project mother who has converted a room in her home into a preschool. She is employed full-time and has five chil-

dren at a time in the home, with a maximum of 20 children over a four-day week. The work in the home is directed by a parent educator and is supervised periodically by a faculty member. The parent educator works in the center with two groups of children and visits their homes, teaching the mother activities parallel to those occurring in the center. She takes with her appropriate material and teaches the mother a specific activity to do with her child. In this way the mother's feeling of involvement, of seeing herself as a teacher, of having something practical to do are all enhanced, and she is not placed in the role of client or sympathetic bystander. She is intimately involved in the education of her child.

THE FOLLOW-UP

Based upon our Early Child Program, we began in September, 1968 our Follow Through Model as a part of the Follow Through Program of the U.S. Office of Education. We are currently working with 11 communities scattered from Tampa, Florida to Yakima, Washington.

The procedure involves the employment of two non-professionals per classroom to work as parent educators. They opened half their time making visits to each child's home. They carry with them specific learning materials, teach the parent how to conduct a learning activity and explain why it is important. Such a home visit differs from home visits previously made by school teachers who were mostly concerned with learning something about the background of the family and in securing the mother's cooperation. The parent educator carries back to the school the concerns and questions of the parent, thus serving as a liaison between teacher and parent. Parents are encouraged to visit the school and volunteer their services in the classroom. In this program, parents do not serve as observers. Because of what they have learned during home visits, they are able to serve as helpers in the classroom working with children other than their own.

The parent educators spend the other half of their time in the classroom working with individual or small groups of children under the direction of the teacher. They assist the teacher in the development of specific learning materials to be sent to the homes of children, in diagnosing individual needs and general classroom activities and in classroom and child observation.

THE PROGRAM AND THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

The program looks simple. There are three basic steps: First, employ and train non-professionals from the community to be served; second, develop specific materials related to what is known about cognitive development and what is known about the particular children; third, teach the mother so that she gains verbal facility, changes the intellectual and educational climate of the home, develops feelings of self-esteem and control, learns work habits and devotes time to her child. When children reach school age, the program is modified to include use of parent educators in the classroom as well as in the home so that school practices become more individual and curriculum planning includes knowledge of the home. Parents become partners instead of observers and recipients. Home and school can then both change to provide the type of environment which should lead to higher motivation, self-esteem and achievement.

However, we have learned that for any program to be successful it cannot confine itself to changing a single element in the total home situation. Working with parents is a complex process involving not only the educational but also the ecological variables described earlier. Simply carrying a learning task into the home, without being concerned about the health, nutrition, housing, eco-

nomic and other life forces which affect that home, will not do the job. Further, if we change only some of the home behavior and leave the school as is, this will be insufficient. To change the school also requires changes in the education of school personnel and involves colleges and universities. Our faculty furnishes consulting services to the Follow Through communities, and we conduct a summer workshop, supported by Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) funds, to train local personnel.

The developing university-school relationships are in themselves of great importance. Because our staff works directly with teachers and parent educators, visits homes in the communities, observes classrooms and helps in the preparation of teaching material, the undergraduate and graduate education of prospective teachers is being influenced by what we learn. Thus, home, school and university are all involved in change, and each influences the others. For maximum benefit, a "systems" approach must also include increased opportunities for employment, increased opportunities for better housing and medical services and for involvement in school and community affairs.

To implement such a parent education program beginning in the first months of the child's life and extending into at least his elementary school years requires that we change our concept of schooling. Funds need to become available to school systems for systematic programs of education that do not begin at age five or six and are not confined to the normal school day or school calendar. We need to extend our education system downward. This does not necessarily mean bringing very young children into the school building, but it does mean a responsibility on the part of local boards and state departments for the education of the very young. Further, it means that what goes on in the school building cannot end at 3:30 in the afternoon but that parent programs, the use of parts of the building for day care and the organization of parent groups may make the building a community center.

Certification and employment standards using this model would mean a serious investment in "differentiated staffing" and the development of career ladders for nonprofessionals, ranging from classroom aide to parent educator, teacher associate and teacher. In addition, funding patterns which guarantee some security to nonprofessionals on other than a year-to-year basis are critical. The present programs are all part of the federal operation and should become part of the regular school operation as soon as they have been well investigated. This means retraining the regular staff of curriculum supervisors, guidance counselors and principals. It also means the involvement of the school board so that a successful program is not dropped when federal funding stops. If federal money comes to the state in block arrangements, then personnel in the state departments of education will need to allocate these funds so that school systems which develop effective programs for the parents of very young children and follow them up with systematic home-school projects will be able to fund them on a long-range basis.

What amounts of money are involved? Two of the major advantages of this Parent Education Program are its relatively low overall cost and the way funds are used. The Infant and Early Child Stimulation Programs and the Home Learning Center Project are all university research projects, so that service and research costs are not easily separated. Staff costs for service and research for the years 1966-69 were approximately \$300,000. Over half (\$160,000) was for salaries paid to the parent educators who would otherwise have been on welfare, unemployed or in low-level jobs. Since we served over 300 families, many for two years and some for all

three, depending upon their assignment to experimental groups, the cost per family per year is less than \$1,000, including research. Follow Through costs above regular classroom costs are virtually all staff and staff development expenses.

Thus, the major use of money to implement an effective program of parent education is in staff salary, with the great bulk going to disadvantaged people who become paraprofessionals. This is not a high-cost gadgetry program where money is spent on things, but a program where the money spent stays in the community, develops the people who work in it and develops the parents with whom they work as well as helping their children. It is a community self-help operation in which funds, instead of flowing out, remain to be reused as they are fed into the general economic pool within the community and school district.

Although the program has been in existence for too short a time for any predictions to be made as to the impact on dropout rates, remedial problems and the like, some of the information we receive from school systems indicated that although the Follow Through child may be in kindergarten or first grade, the effects of his experience are also seen on older children in the family who develop a more positive attitude towards school. It is clear from our first year (1968-1969) in six communities that the program is widely accepted by the parents. This fall, evidence indicates that these parents want this program to continue and see value in it for themselves and their children.

Sister Mary James, S.S.J., administrator, community teacher program, Project Unique, Rochester, N.Y., testified before the Education and Labor Committee on December 10, 1969:

The Community Teacher Program is . . . a specially designed intervention program focused directly at attempting to alter the aptitudes and attitudes of disadvantaged children in the direction of enabling them to perform more adequately in school.

Presently, we have 11 teachers who teach classes in 40 inner-city homes. There are 260 children presently enrolled and 40 mothers acting as aides. Each teacher holds eight classes per week and sees each child twice a week for approximately two hours and fifteen minutes per session. The curriculum pivots around two of the children's needs: to be accepted and to achieve. We are striving to help each child know who he is, to feel important and to take pride in his accomplishments.

The objectives of the program follow:

1. To sharpen cognitive, verbal and perceptual abilities of children from environments offering limited opportunities for intellectual stimulation.
2. To contribute to the physical, social and emotional growth of these children.
3. To improve the parent aide's self image and participation in the child's learning experiences.

The founders of the Community Teacher Program firmly believe that parents must know what their children's education includes and must participate in it. Mothers and fathers are the first teachers in a child's life and they are the primary agents in providing their children with the opportunities to grow and learn, to appreciate, to build and to increase their knowledge, skills and potential. Mothers of small children are busy—sometimes too busy to concern themselves with blocks and puzzles and games. Mothers who live in the ghetto are busy with many other concerns; also—bill collectors, and inspectors, clinic appointments and inadequate housing conditions. It is understandable that they treat the immediate problems rather than spend time playing and talking with their babies. However, young children learn

consciously and unconsciously from those who live with them and they learn to develop according to the demands and expectations of adults who are significant to them. These "significant" adults are mothers and fathers and if we are to understand and meet the needs of these "disadvantaged" children we must make a large investment in helping mothers understand the importance of the learnings children acquire in their early years and we must also help them contribute positively to the development of these learnings.

Our Parent Aides are the mothers or grandmothers in the homes in which we teach. We presently have forty eight aides, one-third of whom are on welfare roles.

These aides come from a wide range of economic, educational and occupational settings. All of them live within the boundaries of inner city. About one-third of the aides have worked with us for the two year period. During the present school year we lost several and had to begin the search for other interested mothers. The major reason for losing these women is moving!

As urban renewal sweeps the city, more homes are being destroyed and families are lost in the maze of destruction—construction, illness, maternity and acceptance of full-time jobs were also cited as reasons for losing mothers.

Present Aides meet together about one evening every six weeks. These meetings were held to keep them in touch with each other, inform them of certain principles related to young children and encourage them to become very involved in their child's interests and skills. The aides are at various stages of development and many of them are able to assume leadership roles in the program. Others participate only with much direction and still others, approximately four or five, show little enthusiasm and ability to work well with the child.

In addition to these meetings, the teachers spend time planning the future events and activities with their aides, and do extensive homevisiting to the homes of children whose mothers are not aides. Their visits provide an opportunity for mother and teacher to talk in general about the program, its goals and progress and in particular about her child, his interests, problems and development. Many teachers have also held evening meetings in the parent aides home for parents of children who attend class at that aide's house. These meetings have been particularly successful and enjoyable. Perhaps, the more familiar atmosphere of meeting in a home in their own neighborhood and the company of neighborhood mothers contributes to the lively conversation engaged in at these meetings. This open agenda type meeting has drawn exchange on various topics: children's eating habits, bedtime problems, the "good" and "bad" of television, older children's teasing younger siblings and the all-time favorite "fighting."

One of the remarks heard repeatedly was . . . "how good it is to have a night out to myself."

During the latter months of the '69 school year, the community teachers requested more time to plan and work with their parent aides. In an effort to provide some opportunities for this, we used one to two hours each Monday in May and found that these were very valuable sessions. By simply asking a parent aide: "What activities would you like to include in the program in the next few weeks?", teachers received dozens of ideas of the activities most enjoyed by the aides and also discovered which activities the mothers felt were the most important for the children. Language time and trips seemed to receive the highest rating. These experiences prompted the teachers to request more association with the aides on a regular basis during the next school year. One suggestion

which seemed to receive all of teachers' approval was to use one-half of our Monday In-Service for Parent Aide sessions. Further explanation will be given this in our recommendations appending this report.

In order to receive more reactions from parent aides and other parents involved in the Community Teacher Program, we undertook taped-questionnaire interviews with twenty four parent aides in May, 1969. These tapes are on file at the Community Teacher Office, 46 Moran Street. It is our impression that the Community Teacher Program has successfully demonstrated the feasibility of home instruction for both young children and their mothers. Our observations, evaluations of the children, taped interviews with parents and teachers, and multiple questionnaire support our belief that the Community Teacher Program has contributed effectively to:

1. An increase of knowledge and skills in the children which will enable them to meet the school situation with greater ability and flexibility.

2. An increase of knowledge and skills in the teachers which will enable them to better understand the needs of young children and contribute more positively to their development.

3. An increase of knowledge and skills in the teachers which has enabled them to understand how young children learn, the effects of deprivation on learning and how to meet the challenge of teaching in such an innovative setting as the Community Teacher Program.

Interviews with kindergarten teachers in six inner-city schools clearly support our hope that children who participated in the Community Teacher Program entered school quite prepared and maintained gains throughout their kindergarten year.

Presently, Dr. A. P. Scheiner, Pediatrician, and Lynn Cramer, social worker have seen and made reports on fourteen of our children. Two are reported to be mildly retarded while twelve fall within the normal intelligence category but are functioning below their capacities due to environmental handicaps. Nine of the thirteen also exhibited a variety of physical disorders and follow-ups will be done on these children. Two children have been recommended for the Day Care Center for the Handicapped, one child has been placed in a more structured nursery school and five children were placed in the special class within our own program. Efforts are now being made to work closely with the Convalescent Hospital for Children and the Neighborhood Health Center to initiate a program of health-education services on a family continuity basis. (Data available at Community Teacher Office, 46 Moran Street, Rochester, New York.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentlemen from Oregon and Idaho for their initiative and effective leadership which have produced "The Comprehensive Headstart Child Development Act of 1970." I am proud to join my colleagues in cosponsoring this bill.

The Nixon administration has committed itself to the first 5 years of life. There have been several bills introduced already in this Congress which attempt to obviate the inefficiencies and shortages of present child-care services—the President's family assistance plan is among them—but a more comprehensive approach than any found in legislation heretofore is needed to alleviate the gap between child-care needs and available services. More places in child-care programs must be provided for underprivileged children. Steps must be taken to

assure that the children of mothers who are already working or who may be forced to work to balance the family budget, will receive sound, healthful care and educational and social development, not merely custodial care.

The total child care capacity in the United States at present is under 650,000—there are 3 million disadvantaged preschool age children—full year Headstart can care for only one-quarter million; of 12 million children under age 14 whose mothers worked, in 1965, 8 percent—nearly 1 million—looked after themselves—most attended school and were without supervision after school, while only 2 percent—265,000—were cared for in day-care centers, nursery schools or similar facilities.

The lack of adequate facilities is a major obstacle blocking the development of child-care centers. Thus far, many day-care and Headstart programs have relied upon space owned by churches, nonprofit organizations, and commercial enterprises. Speaking before the Republican Task Force on Education and Training, Mr. Lawrence Feldman, executive director of the National Day-Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., said:

There is a tendency to say "put 'em in church basements" . . . but this has not proved to be a realistic approach in the past and will be even less so in the future. Headstart has just about exhausted the communities' stock of easily used spaces of this nature—churches, Sunday schools, storefronts. Sometimes this is because the kind of space used for older children for a few hours each week is wholly unsuitable for younger children on a full-time basis—the size of the rooms, the toilets, the cooking facilities and a variety of other factors may make a building unsuited for long-day activities—even a building which may not be obviously dilapidated.

In many areas of the country, suitable existing facilities to house child-care centers can no longer be found, and often when they can be located, there are insufficient funds to pay for them. Experts estimate that some rural areas and some ghetto areas are completely lacking in suitable facilities for early childhood programs; whereas most suburban and nonghetto urban areas do have significant amounts of usable space in community buildings and private facilities which are often unused during the prime hours of early childhood programs.

To alleviate this facilities crisis, our bill proposes a number of measures. Unlike existing programs, after consolidation, the Comprehensive Headstart Child Development Act will provide funds for construction of new facilities in addition to renovation or leased facilities. But we do not propose that the Government make outright grants for construction of new facilities. Our major emphasis is on child development not facilities' construction, and the provisions of our bill follow this line.

Applications for assistance can include the construction of facilities if it can be shown that construction will be more economically advantageous than rental or lease—this means that if applicants cannot find suitable facilities to rent or lease they may build new ones.

We also require that an applicant consider a variety of building designs and techniques—the new technology has made possible many things not done under conventional plans. The physical facilities in which we place our children are factors in the formation of their growth and development patterns. The physical environment of a child affects to a considerable degree his potential and the extent to which it is utilized. Testifying before the Education and Labor Committee, Richard Neutra, a Los Angeles architect stated:

The architect's biologically and psychosomatically well-advised arrangements cannot be overestimated. Education at this early age, in these early phases of life consists largely of environmental offerings. The child himself is a sensitive consumer, but of course is unable to program or even vaguely request certain most necessary provisions. Any square foot geometricity and ordinances have in this case only a minimum of significance. . . . With the working mother reaching overwhelming frequency, as in this nation and abroad, then the prelinguistic, the early and earliest education through the *environment away from home* becomes an eminent health factor. This preschool period is more important, perhaps, than anything else including even nutrition, in this matter of public welfare that most favors a generation of coming years . . .

Federal assistance here may be in the form of grants or loans, but total Federal funds cannot exceed 50 percent of the total construction cost.

No more than 15 percent of the State's allotment shall be used for construction and no more than 2 percent of the State's allotment shall be used for grants for construction. The reason for such limitations is the fact that construction is so expensive, relative to providing services for children—the cost of erecting one facility against the cost of providing child care at the average of \$1,700 per child per year.

Funds shall be made available not only through Federal grants, but loans and loan guarantees, or a combination of such methods. A new mortgage insurance program, similar to the one that spurred nursing home construction, will be established to assist private profit or nonprofit organizations which meet licensing requirements in getting mortgages to finance the construction of new facilities when deemed necessary. This mortgage insurance program will be a boon in face of the shortage of child-care facilities and the reluctance of private lending institutions to finance private profit or nonprofit child-care centers.

As an example of construction financing, New York passed landmark legislation to provide for the financing of new day-care centers and to make space available for day-care centers in State and municipal buildings. The new law authorizes the House Finance Agency to issue \$50 million in notes and bonds and to fund mortgage loans of up to 100 percent for the construction and equipment of the nonprofit day-care centers. The law also encourages financial assistance from savings banks, insurance companies, and private lenders, by guaranteeing loans from these sources at 80 percent.

Finally our bill proposes an increase in the funds authorized for the neighborhood facilities program operated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This program has made an important contribution to meeting the need for facilities in inner cities through the financing of multipurpose community service facilities, which provide a focal point for the provision of community services for low- and moderate-income people in the neighborhoods where they are concentrated. The multiservice neighborhood center is seen as the heartbeat of the neighborhood—a place where individual, family, or group problems are understood and dealt with creatively. It is conceived as a one stop social service activity center; a meetingplace for people to air their feelings and to tackle neighborhood and community problems together. The location of the multipurpose center in the neighborhood rather than downtown enhances the accessibility of services to the people and indeed the reverse.

In tackling the facilities crisis, we must consider the problem of standards. This is a very difficult one, indeed. Our bill requires that the Federal interagency day-care standards be met by all applicants.

I return to Mr. Lawrence Feldman's experience in the field of day care for an example of the difficulty of knowing what action to take in various situations:

The question of standards is a tough one. In Harlem, for example, I recently saw a community day-care center operating in a storefront. Operated by a neighborhood group dedicated to providing the best they could, this situation was nevertheless appalling—huge gobs of plaster were falling down from the ceiling on the children, a teacher had been injured the week before. But this center was open because no one would take the political risk to assume responsibility for closing it down. But even here, where the physical conditions were obviously so very bad, I felt an ambivalence . . . because of the desperate need.

At this point, I would like to insert an article illustrating standards versus desperate need, "Law Doooms Care Project," by William Raspberry, also a knowledgeable article concerning the adaptability of the child to his environment and his learning ability and potential, "An Ideal Environment for Learning" by Dwayne E. Gardner:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1969]

LAW DOOMS CARE PROJECT

(By William Raspberry)

Rosa Lee Gainey, who rents a large house on Kenyon Street, thought she had solved a lot of problems.

She and her sister needed work. Their elderly mother needed someone to be with her around the clock. Several neighborhood women needed day care for their children.

So Mrs. Gainey, whose children are grown and gone, set up a small-scale day nursery.

"We had ten children and we were charging \$12 a week to pick them up, take them home, feed them and take care of them all day while their mothers worked," she said. She and her sister each grossed \$60 a week, the mothers were able to hold regular jobs and Mrs. Gainey's own mother had the care she needed.

"I thought things were working out pretty well," she said. "We weren't making much money, true enough, but it wasn't too bad.

"Then somebody reported us to the city,

and the first thing we knew, the people from downtown were telling us that we didn't have enough windows and the rooms were too small and we didn't have a fire escape, even though all the children were on the first floor."

What Mrs. Gainey didn't know was that as soon as she took in the sixth child, she has become an "institution" under District law and was subject to the same rules that govern convalescent homes and similar institutions.

Officials told her that she could keep five of the children, but no more. That wouldn't permit her to earn enough to stay in business, however.

As a result, several of the mothers had to give up their jobs, even though Mrs. Gainey's place on Kenyon Street was a lot better than their homes. Mrs. Gainey herself is working as a domestic in Bethesda and earning \$55 a week.

Her duties include taking care of her employer's children.

"That's how it is, I guess," she said. "We can get all the jobs we want taking care of white folks' kids, but we can't do it for our own people, and they're the ones that really need it."

The city doesn't deliberately set about to force people like Mrs. Gainey out of business, even if it must seem that way sometimes. It's just that the Bureau of Licenses and Inspections and the D.C. Health Department are concerned about the health and safety of small children, and their rules are pretty strict.

Too strict, perhaps, to be altogether realistic. Frame houses, for example, are out of the question. Houses with masonry walls and wooden joists are all right—if they have automatic sprinkler systems complete with alarms that ring the Fire Department. Run afoul of the rules of either agency, or of the Welfare Department, and you're out of business.

Some of the rules are based on such practical considerations as fire hazards, but many seem that the choices are between a not-quite-adequate day care center and the sort of middle-class homes one sees on television.

The real choice may be between a day nursery that isn't too bad and a bad home that will become worse when the mother is forced to quit work and go on welfare.

It is becoming more widely recognized that hundreds of Washington welfare mothers would gladly go to work if they could find someone to care for their children. The supply of day-care facilities, unfortunately, doesn't begin to meet the demand.

Tom Taylor, head of the National Capital Area Day Care Association, sees both sides of the problem. He knows the importance that early stimulation has for later education. He knows the value of good nutrition and adequate play space and all the other things that make for a good day nursery.

But he also knows what the real choices are. He is currently heading a committee set up to review day-care standards for the city. "But the truth is, we'll probably wind up tightening as many standards as we relax," he said.

What Taylor and the Day Care Association ought to consider is some sort of quickie training program to teach interested women how to run small nurseries. The city would cooperate by relaxing some of its requirements. There are plenty of women who would love that kind of work, and hundreds more who need the service.

The real solution, of course, is modern, well-equipped day care centers that include nurses, nutritionists and educators. Taylor is working toward that end.

But in the meantime, people like Mrs. Gainey could perform a most useful stopgap service if the city would let them.

AN IDEAL ENVIRONMENT FOR LEARNING

(By Dwayne E. Gardner)

(NOTE.—Dwayne E. Gardner is chief, Program Management Branch, Division of State Agency Cooperation, Office of Education.¹)

Excellence in early childhood education demands thoughtful planning of programs and places, for people. As in all educational endeavors, human needs must govern programs and facilities in the creation of an environment for learning.

The physical environment should be comfortable, spacious and stimulating, enhancing the relationships among children, teachers, parents, administrators and the community. Working together for the benefit of the child, family, community and staff should be supported by an optimum physical environment reflecting the early childhood program. Unquestionably, the facilities will not obstruct teaching and learning but will provide the proper setting and the necessary tools to encourage each child to do his best.

Quantitative and qualitative factors, as well as the organization of space, constitute the physical learning environment. Space of sufficient size and with appropriate dimensions is the quantitative requirement. The environmental treatment of the space and the proper use of equipment and materials make the qualitative factor.

DESIGN IMPORTANT TO LEARNING

Greater distinction in design is needed between facilities for very young children and for those in the lower elementary grades. Essentially, as the nursery and kindergarten school is an extension of the home, it should, therefore, ideally be located nearer the child's home than would an elementary school and would reflect the image and the scale of the home. Here, children and adults will live, play and work together; here children may learn and grow.

The child's living-learning experience is most meaningful when his environment responds to his needs. Physically and psychologically, the child is quick to react to environmental conditions. Because of the influence upon the child's attitude, space and color, texture and light ought to be used to provide an appropriate learning atmosphere and guide the behavior of the child. Too many of the existing early childhood learning spaces are flat-floored, flat-ceilinged boxes, devoid of any stimuli for work and play.

Proper and adequate facilities will accommodate a learning program that becomes part of the total educational enterprise, accepted and integrated as an important and necessary experience for all. Whenever it is needed or would be useful, the school building or learning center should be available to the community. Such additional use may require some modifications in initial design or would have to be taken into consideration in remodeling plans. Modifications must accompany, not detract from, improvement.

In many cases undoubtedly, facilities could be chosen that are better suited to the educational program, but there is a danger of overdesign. A viable facility cannot be tailored to a program, but must allow for modifications resulting from changing goals, emphasis, curriculums, communities and personnel or just for the changes stemming from the inventiveness and imagination of the competent teacher. Thus the physical environment remains responsive to changing needs and needed changes.

The early childhood facility essentially is a place of freedom—freedom for the child to be himself, yet to achieve self-discipline;

freedom to experiment and investigate; freedom to try many things, to do them poorly, and to make mistakes at least once. Permissive and pleasant, the atmosphere will sustain, without serious disruption, the varying moods of room situations; happy and austere, joyful and serene.

There will be a place for playing and space for contemplation; space for groups of differing sizes and space for privacy. The facility might include many shapes and spaces, tall, low, large and small, and with this spatial variety, a variety of finishes and materials. Materials will not all be durable, antiseptic and unyielding. With such variation some materials will be hard, some will be soft, will give, will be pleasant to touch, feel, look at. Nor need the space be immaculate. Indeed some messiness may be desirable, for an obsession on the part of an adult for orderliness may inhibit initiative and kill creativity. The facilities for early childhood programs must be relaxed and comfortable.

Such qualitative conditions as illumination, heating, cooling and ventilating and acoustics, should be of greater concern. Although we do not yet know as much as we should about good climate control for children, research is continually providing new and more relevant information.

Surroundings should inspire, please and satisfy their occupants. Since most occupants are children, the physical environment should be child-oriented and child-sized.

SPACE: ORGANIZATION, FLEXIBILITY, ACCESSIBILITY

The primary ingredient for a quality learning environment is space. Space with appropriate dimensions, not the brick and mortar, is the heart of a good living-learning environment. The organization of the space, the placement within of centers of interests, dictates the flow of the learning activities. A well-organized and efficient space reduces confusion, disorder and discipline problems. Thus, sufficient areas are program-organized to accommodate the learning activities in a functional manner.

Again, the physical environment should support and enhance, not restrict, all learning activities. Since the activities will change frequently, flexibility in the design and organization of the space is needed to permit easy adjustment to these changes. Flexibility means more than just being able to move some partitions or visual screens; the mechanical services—heating, cooling, ventilating, lighting, plumbing—also must be subject to alteration. Too much flexibility, however, leads to a lack of commitment and character.

Versatility of spatial and environmental factors is inherent in all good architecture. Variations in scale, volume and texture not only guide attitudes but channel enthusiasm along appropriate paths. Thus the young child is made aware of, and responds to, these variations. He feels free to skip and laugh in permissive open areas where floors respond to the beat of feet; yet he is quick to adjust to the quiet and contemplative activities of individuals and small clusters of children.

Adaptability is a highly valued characteristic of the physical environment. The early childhood program requires that the site and the space, as well as the furniture and equipment, be so adaptable as to permit activities to expand, shrink, disappear completely or even move outdoors. Portable or movable furniture permits rapid changes. Likewise, when space is designed to facilitate movement, carts, cabinets, screens, bookcases and work tables can all be made part of an easily modified setting that takes on new dimensions as new demands are met.

Space and its contents should be accessible. True, the design of space must be versatile and flexible and the furniture and equipment within it adaptable to changing needs, but, most important, the principal re-

sources—the learning tools—must be immediately available for use, with objects and materials displayed to invite use and spark interest and curiosity. Overly complicated objects or those things in bad repair, or things simply out of reach are likely to frustrate the child; an overabundance of materials in one location tend to overwhelm rather than to stimulate him. An independent, self-stimulating environment can be achieved only when children are able to reach objects of choice and spontaneously commence their activity.

Although, in considering making maximum use of available space, it is found that some area can be used for more than one type of learning activity, it is prudent to remember that the nature of the instructional program for the beginning child is such that only infrequently can the same area be put to multi-use.

A learning environment wherein it is recognized that simplicity and beauty are compatible with functional use of space, and that they are important in contributing to the emotional fulfillment of each child, permits both educational utility and aesthetic satisfaction. The fluid quality of space with an appropriate use of color and texture becomes a learning tool.

Safety measures are more than the basic protection from harm by fire, protection from traffic and other modern hazards. Those who design and organize space should give due consideration to the health and safety of each occupant. The requirements of the physically handicapped should receive particular attention so that these children may be comfortable and independent.

Many acoustical problems may be anticipated because of the great variety of activities that take place simultaneously within the same space. Yet it is possible to determine, within reasonable limits, those materials, shapes and conditions that produce good acoustics. Much of the unwanted noise can thus be dissipated at its point of origin by using materials with good acoustical properties.

The human body does not adjust readily to extreme variations in temperature. Proper balance, uniformity, and control of the physical environment through good heating and cooling devices increase the physical comfort of the occupants. There is reason to believe that good temperature and humidity control increases the productivity level of children. Since it costs more to cool air, there is a tendency to close in the space, make it more compact, increase the insulation, reduce the perimeter, and reduce the amount of window area. Rightly, however, cooling of the space should not be bought at the expense of other amenities and human needs.

Visual comfort, compatible with the task, results from many factors other than the quality of footcandles and the level of illumination. Although the use of artificial illumination has become more prevalent, it is considered important still to have controlled daylight. The ability to see outdoors may have some effect on the emotional and psychological development of children. We should not be too quick to separate ourselves from the natural environment. Nor should we avoid the variation in lighting and temperature which may be necessary for the best results in the learning process.

Wherever possible, space should be arranged to permit simultaneous indoor-outdoor use where the teacher can supervise groups of children in both areas.

The physical environment of any early childhood setting must not only contain quality and quantity of site, facilities, equipment and materials, with serve the neighborhood as a whole.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) and the other

¹ This article was written by Dwayne E. Gardner in his private capacities. No official support or endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education is intended or should be inferred.

distinguished cosponsors of H.R. 15776, the Comprehensive Headstart Child Development Act of 1970, in their remarks on this important legislation.

What we are trying to do in the legislation we have proposed is lay a solid foundation, including research, staff training, coordination, evaluation, and facilities, to support the kind of carefully planned early childhood structure we envision.

Too often in the past, when a need has been great, the Federal Government has acted imprudently and made promises and commitments it could not deliver.

This was the case with title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We were promised that major social changes would result from enactment of this program when in fact there was no theoretical basis for supposing that this would be the case.

The developers of Headstart tried to indicate in advance how little was known. They tried to caution on how little could be expected from such programs, but we boasted that somehow in 6 weeks in the summer we were going to undo all the problems which had developed over 5 years of life.

Child psychologists and others who have studied the nature of human development, maintain that there is simply not enough known about how children grow and learn to predict what effects child development programs will have on them.

We have created a National Institute for Early Childhood Development, in our bill, to help us gain a better understanding of early childhood development and the effect organized programs have on this process.

The Institute will formulate research and test programs to permit us to act as rapidly as possible with the most effective use of available resources.

It will coordinate research conducted under other Federal, university, and private auspices and disseminate information.

And it is directed to assure that the results of this research and development are reflected in the conduct of programs affecting young children.

We realize that some problems are so pressing that we must meet them on the basis of what knowledge we now possess. That is why our bill is designed to meet immediate needs, but places strong emphasis on a carefully planned step-by-step approach to future expansion of day-care activities to assure well designed and prudently administered programs.

Dr. James O. Miller, Director of the National Laboratory on Early Childhood Education, has argued cogently and convincingly for the establishment of a National Institute to serve as a focal point for research into early childhood education and development. His views were set forth in great detail in a paper entitled, "The National Laboratory—A Critical Period of Initiative." Following are excerpts from his paper:

In essence, the decision [in 1965] to mount a massive preprimary educational program for the disadvantaged highlighted our woefully inadequate resources to meet the challenge.

(1) *Inadequate Knowledge of Processes Underlying Development.* Despite the knowledge and evidence concerning the importance of the early years for developing competency, knowledge concerning the relevant underlying processes was lacking. Such information is essential for developing sound educational intervention. It must be remembered that only four years had passed since Hunt's compilation of the diverse evidence supporting the effects of environmental conditions upon intellectual functioning. In the main, his evidence was scientifically circumstantial, as was Bloom's 1964 work. Given the validity of their syntheses, major efforts remain to be undertaken to fill the knowledge gaps concerning the developmental processes underlying intellectual functioning and the supporting systems necessary to nurture growth. By 1965, hardly enough time had elapsed to identify the specific relevant variables, to understand the underlying processes, and to translate this information into tried and proven educational models.

An essential first priority in the months and years ahead must be a concentrated effort to understand the underlying processes of early development as they relate to individual competency. Production of such knowledge can best be accomplished in the context of a planned and systematic attack designed to serve the development of early educational models. The power of such a commitment lies in the explicit continuous feedback which a mission-oriented system can marshal. There can be no equivocation on the importance and necessity of extending the relevant knowledge base.

Guidance for deploying our effort and resources to the most relevant areas of investigation must come from systematic synthesis and integration of present knowledge with a sound conceptualization of tactics to be employed in a program of basic research.

(2) *Poor Program Definition and Specification.*—The social urgency of the problems of disadvantaged children led us to implementation of programs long before the data were in to support their efficacy. Programs were initiated on the assumption that anything was better than nothing at all. Consequently, these endeavors reflected the full gamut of philosophy, content and methods without a solid foundation of fact or proven results. The criticism is not of program diversity. The strategy is necessary to meet the needs of a heterogeneous population. Such pluralism, however, implies carefully planned strategies and well documented justification for the total program. In most instances, heterogeneity of programs was the result of little knowledge of the best that was available and without readily available guidance of models to follow.

The essential contribution of these programs was to educate the nation as to the importance of the early years and rally opinion in support of the possibility of beneficial results. However, such a laissez-faire philosophy toward implementation and program development led to such heterogeneity that sound evaluation was impossible. Reports of benefits were in the main impressionistic, hardly a sound basis for developing future policy. The inadequacy of programs and implementation points up to the necessity of an integrated effort to provide early educational models appropriate for implementation in a variety of contexts.

An iterative strategy must be employed which will provide early educational models based on the best information available at that point in time. The strategy must include means to incorporate new knowledge being produced. This implies program pluralism and responsible flexibility based upon a comprehensive integrated system of research and development.

(3) *Inadequately Trained Staff and Training Capabilities.*—Program quality is in part

a function of the personnel who must implement the instruction. In 1965, as in 1969, the story was too few personnel available with adequate training, nonexistent preservice training capabilities, and inadequate inservice training commitment or support.

In summary, a crisis in staffing exists now. The immediate problem of providing adults to man classrooms was met by using inadequately trained personnel. The need for appropriate inservice training and using innovative models was advocated in that paper. Both preservice and inservice capabilities have lagged far behind demonstrated need. Those training programs which are being developed reflect little understanding or conversance with available substantive knowledge, the children or needs to be served. The meager resources available for development of training programs appear to be distributed on the basis of inappropriate criteria.

Preservice and inservice training must be closely related to the development of sound program models. Demonstration facilities must be available where these models can be shown in operation. Inservice training must be available in the reality context of the work situation. New patterns of career development utilizing untapped resources, such as the community colleges, must be employed if this problem is to move toward solution. Without a unifying force which can demonstrate the power of an integrated national program, the outlook in this area appears dim indeed.

(4) *Nonexistent or Inappropriate Objectives.*—A great deal of confusion existed in 1965 as to the objectives of the educational program for Head Start children. The same condition exists for children from other environments, but we will make the point specifically with programs targeted for the disadvantaged. Confusion over objectives has not yet been resolved and, unfortunately, the confusion has a profound effect upon the development of adequate instructional programs, as well as preservice and inservice training programs for classroom personnel. The confusion apparently involves priority of objectives as well as their appropriateness. Many have seen the federally sponsored preprimary educational efforts as directed toward eradicating the social problem of poverty. Specifically, the prime objective of the program was to offer more job opportunities for the poor. Others have seen the programs as a means towards providing political leverage and power for the disadvantaged.

While these objectives may be laudable from a social viewpoint, they are neither necessary nor sufficient for early childhood educational programs. While specific program objectives may vary from individual to individual and from group to group, the focus in early childhood education must be upon the child and those immediate support systems and conditions which will optimize the development of the individual and provide the social competencies necessary for responsible environmental mastery. Clearly, such a statement needs greater explication and refinement to establish clear set priorities and criteria by which attainment of specific objectives can be judged. However, the child and his immediate ecology is clearly the orientation, pointing to the primary target of responsibility, an orientation which is necessary if we are to be serious about the mission.

The problem of objectives becomes more critical as we move to specific program models. Without a clear statement of objectives, instruction, methods and techniques take on a smorgasbord flavor. With untrained classroom personnel and a heavy reliance on paraprofessionals, classroom experiences are meager in content and the emphasis soon degenerates to issues of classroom control and behavior management.

Clear statement of overall objectives, as well as specific objectives, are important for instructional continuity and progress. Clear statements are fundamental to the development of early childhood educational models which are appropriate for implementation in many settings. It is essential for evaluation.

(5) *Inadequate Evaluation and Instrumentation.*—The problems of evaluation and instrumentation are closely associated with those discussed previously. Three needs can be readily identified as essential to the field and high on the list of priorities for systematic development.

(a) *Instrumentation.* The field is in desperate need of adequate instruments to measure a wide range of child performance behavior. These instruments should be so designed and constructed that they will provide diagnostic information prior to educational intervention, be usable for assessing progress, and be adequate for reliable measurement of attainment of terminal behaviors. They should be carefully constructed to provide information concerning the processes of development.

(b) *Systematic ecological observation.* Program effects should be observed throughout the child's ecology. Changes in that ecology, particularly in the support systems which nurture and encourage his continued development, should be systematically recorded as an index of program effectiveness.

(c) *Theoretical models of change.* We need a calculus of change which will provide reliable means of assessing progress over time. There is a strong possibility that the lack of results in some of our interventions are intrinsic to our means of analysis and errors of measurement rather than lack of efficacy in the educational intervention itself. Measuring and assessing change is a critical problem in the area of evaluation.

These three major areas touch at the output end of the evaluation continuum while little attention has been placed at the input end. Essential to evaluation is the development of criteria. In terms of child performance, development of adequate behavior criteria was implied. However, nothing has been mentioned concerning cost effectiveness, social impact, and other areas of concern which are particularly important for decision makers prior to installation of programs. It is my firm conviction that these problems can best be attacked and resolved within the context of a comprehensive program which mandates this line of inquiry and development.

(6) *Indecisive Funding and Support—The Federal Role.*—No one would construe the federal role in education as one simply of defining need and initiating programs for which the state and local authorities in due course would take responsibility. Yet, even a casual reading of the record would lend substance to such an interpretation. No one would seriously contend that the role is simply to turn back funds to the states which the federal government could more efficiently collect. Yet, there is evidence to support such a definition. Few would argue that the role of the federal government is to assume responsibility for control of education in the nation. Yet, some would make the case that we are well along on such a course. It is precisely the ambiguity regarding the federal role, however, which gives rise to indecisiveness concerning funding, mechanisms for support and those functions and institutions appropriate for reaching national objectives and priorities.

The field of early childhood education, perhaps because of its dependence upon federal support at this point in its development, has been particularly vulnerable to federal capriciousness. Head Start is a notable example of the problem. Funding schedules have been constantly violated causing havoc at the program level. Recruitment and retention of high quality staff has been impossible under

conditions where promises made were broken because funding schedules were not met. Research and development work cannot be divided into neat annual packages conforming to federal bookkeeping procedures, an imposition which has militated against significant achievement and breakthrough. A fair test of the efficacy of educational programs cannot be made when premature and inappropriate evaluation is imposed. These nagging and persistent problems may well be alleviated when the role of the federal government is clearly defined and it assumes the responsibilities which can only be met on a national level.

Many of the difficulties and criticisms of the federal role in education appear to revolve around federal activity at the implementation level, a state or local prerogative. Head Start has experienced this problem, as have various titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Direct support of programs at the implementation level will always raise the question of control and responsibility.

Unfortunately, the federal record of support of the role which it so clearly must assume—production of knowledge and systematic translation of that knowledge into soundly tested programs—is meager and spotty. It has been estimated that approximately one-half of one per cent of the federal expenditures on education have gone into this specific national responsibility.

Krathwohl (1969) has compared this record with the 3 percent investment in research and development on the part of other sectors of the economy. Less than one-twentieth of that one-half of one per cent has been earmarked for the field of early childhood education where it is most critically needed. Tragically, this condition persists despite declarations on the part of the present administration and the previous one to the effect that interests of children under six were a first national priority. Meager and unreliable federal involvement in its prime educational function will continue the fragmented efforts toward solution of the most critical problems of education in general, and early childhood education specifically.

If we accept the doctrine of state and local control over and provision of educational services (implementation level), the role of the federal government in education must be to provide the means of developing comprehensive exemplary programs in targeted educational areas of need. Specifically in the field of early childhood education, the federal government must support a comprehensive and integrated program organized to produce and translate knowledge into a variety of testable early educational models, demonstrate their efficacy, and provide advisory services for their installation, maintenance, and evaluation. This program of exemplary leadership can only be implemented at the national level with major support coming from the federal government.

A CONSTRUCTIVE STEP

Krathwohl (1969) advocated in his AERA Presidential Speech the establishment of a series of national institutes for education focussed on significant educational problem areas. Nowhere in the field of education is the need more essential, the instrumentality and means more available, nor the time more critical than early childhood. I propose the development of a National Institute on Early Childhood Education. The National Laboratory would be the substantive core for the Institute. Clearly, we must bring order and a concentrated effort to a field which has such high social priority. Early childhood education, so new to public support, offers a golden opportunity to establish fresh patterns of attacking educational problems. We must develop institutions which are anticipatory and future oriented rather than merely respondent if we are to make significant

progress on educational problems of national scope. This institute would be the focal point of the national commitment to early childhood. Autonomous in organization, its major function would be to develop the national perspective through its integrated program and activities.

I see such institute as having five functional capacities: four of which require direct substantive action. They are: (1) A research capacity which would be charged with the production of knowledge and applied experimentation. The focussed research mission would be the exploration and understanding of the developmental processes underlying individual competency. Applied experimentation would be concerned with altering these processes where desirable through educational intervention. (2) A development capacity which would translate knowledge and results of experimentation into effective comprehensive models for controlled application. (3) A diffusion and installation capacity which would provide the capability to rapidly move developed early educational models into field practice. The major means would be through demonstration centers and advisory services. (4) A resources production capacity which would include the operational and support capabilities necessary for the previous three functions. It would include information retrieval and dissemination, media production, communications, development of support technology and a variety of storage systems.

The fifth functional capacity is the key to a focussed national effort in early childhood education. It is the integrative function. All of the action elements of the Institute, whether they be university based, field based, in the private sector or centrally located, can go on in isolation as has been the case thus far. What we desperately need is the power to integrate all of these efforts on some rational and data oriented basis. The integrative function includes the capability to analyze the needs of the field and to conceptualize these needs into alternative strategies for problem solution. Essential is the ability to integrate existing knowledge and synthesize this knowledge for potential development and application. The ability to establish institutional policy in light of determined needs, engage in systematic planning for appropriate allocation of productive resources and evaluation of effectiveness are all central to functional integration.

AND NOW—BOUNDARIES

It is interesting to note in the discussions surrounding man's recent landing on the moon a number of comments which downgraded the achievement as simply a technological and engineering feat of little scientific moment. However, the knowledge base accumulated over hundreds of years much of it attributable to scientific exploration and discovery, was indispensable to the "technological" feat. In turn, because of the accomplishment, the laser beam reflector, the seismograph and the solar wind experiment have contributed materially to our scientific knowledge of the moon, our own planet, and perhaps the development of our entire solar system. The 80 pounds of rocks which were returned are eagerly being sought to add scientific knowledge about the origins of the moon and its geological makeup. The status jockeying over the relative importance of science and technology seems a bit absurd.

At least two important lessons should be apparent. First, the accumulated time necessary for development of an adequate knowledge base to undergird such an achievement is matched only by the breadth and depth of essential knowledge which must be gained. Secondly, the exquisite interdependence and implicit bilateral feedback between technological accomplishment and scientific achievement provides an ex-

cellent example to emulate. The question is not who is the master and who is the servant, but how can the two be harnessed to serve each other.

The overriding objective of the National Laboratory is to develop comprehensive early childhood education models based upon existing evidence concerning the processes underlying the development of competence, including means for self correction consistent with relevant new knowledge, and appropriate for installation under a variety of conditions. This objective embodies a recognition of the sine qua non of interdependence between the technological and scientific. Further, it requires that model specifications include provision for up-date mandating continuous two-way feedback. It also provides the necessary pluralism appropriate to the context of application. It is my contention that such an objective can only be achieved with federal support at the level of a national effort, that it is consistent with the role the federal government must play in education and a first order priority of need in the field of early childhood education.

It is in light of this major objective that the terms "comprehensive" and "integrated" used throughout this paper should be given substantive meaning. By comprehensive program, I mean one which includes all those necessary functions to move knowledge from need through discovery, to field use and application. In the context of the overarching objective of the National Laboratory, a comprehensive program means (1) discovery of the processes and their parameters underlying the development of competency in early childhood through a focussed research effort, (2) describing the effect of educational intervention on changing the parameters of these processes under applied experimentation, (3) translating this knowledge and other which is relevant into early childhood educational models for controlled testing, (4) testing and demonstrating developed models and the procedures for their implementation, (5) providing advisory services for on-line installation, and (6) maintaining the support systems and services necessary for the preceding functions.

An integrated program is defined by three major qualities: (1) it is conceptually logical; the needs—means—ends are apparent, intrinsically sound and appropriate to the source of support and the field of endeavor, (2) the program is internally consistent, reflecting consonance of goals and objectives, functional processes and structural organization, and (3) there is organizational integrity; providing autonomous governance, administrative responsibility and public accountability.

As the Laboratory moves to a comprehensive and integrated program, several functional capabilities require immediate attention and priority for development. Essential to attainment of the Laboratory's objectives is the ability to attain productive equilibrium between functional integration on the one hand and structural differentiation on the other. The substantive effort required for program integrative capacity is a first priority to which we must address ourselves. It is in the context of priority and phasing that I would like to discuss the functional organization necessary for a comprehensive and integrated program rather than by means of a detailed listing of these elements.

PROGRAM INTEGRATION CAPACITY

Needs Analysis—Conceptualization.—Fundamental to a comprehensive program is the ability to provide an analysis of need and on the basis of this analysis to conceptualize alternative strategies for solving existing and potential problems. The first order of business in such an endeavor is to produce educational and social status data, state of

the art analyses over the range of problems of concern to the program and such other summaries of current policy, etc., as will provide an adequate foundation for planning and policy determination. Initially, this work is present and past oriented but becomes future oriented when alternate strategies are conceived for solution of present and future problems.

Anyone who has recently engaged in preparing a state of the art paper in early childhood has come face to face with the lack of status data on current practice. We have little knowledge of the extent of early childhood programs, location, productivity and content of training programs, to say nothing concerning quality of these operations. We know precious little about patterns of support, qualifications of personnel, staffing patterns or needs. These kinds of data are essential for future projection, yet they are practically nonexistent.

Through our resource production program we will make a concerted effort to gather pertinent data from the existing, but scattered sources, and begin systematic collection of pertinent material to the field. The substantive scholarly work necessary for projection and conceptualization requires the assistance of recognized authorities in specialized fields of endeavor. We will develop a working environment, the necessary technical support and resources, which should be attractive to productive scholars. We will implement a visiting scholar program where investigators will join the professional staff at the Laboratory headquarters for periods of time to concentrate on and become immersed in a problem area of need.

Synthesis—Integration.—Closely related to the previous capability, but differentiated in terms of use and source material, this capability is directed toward assays of existing knowledge rather than existing practice or status and distilling inferences and leads for potential application. Targeted reviews of research associated with the processes underlying the development of competence are badly needed for research direction, as well as substantive input to the evaluation program and development of instruments. In addition to the input to research planning, such contributions would form the basic foundation for a strong evaluation capability.

The visiting scholar program would be used to support regular members of the professional staff as previously outlined and provide breadth and depth of scholarship. In addition, a program of fellowships for younger and promising investigators will be instituted supporting both capabilities. These fellows will have the opportunity to work with senior men who might not otherwise be available. The regular professional staff, visiting scholars and fellows will form a continuing community and focal point for research and professional leadership in the field. Periodic substantive seminars will provide access for professionals in the field.

Analysis—Conceptualization and Synthesis—Integration provide the substantive foundation for planning and evaluation and are, therefore, assigned to that office to foster careful integration of the work. In our effort to broaden the substantive competence and integrated capacity of the Laboratory, these will form primary targets for immediate staffing.

Program Planning.—The overall planning strategies which a comprehensive and integrated program must take are iterative in nature. The mutually exclusive conditions of inadequate knowledge of the processes underlying the development of competence and the demand for installation of early childhood education programs force the development of models which are the best approximations conceivable. Work to improve the approximations must continue simultaneously. Thus, the planning staff is faced with the inevitability of change but also the prob-

lems of accommodating and making use of change productively. Planning must be sensitive to the course of work within the program, as well as to external events, in order to provide the articulation of resources necessary for productivity. Obviously, planning is not an isolated or disjunctive activity, but must be totally immersed in the program as a central integrative function.

Program Evaluation.—Central to the development of early childhood educational models are specifications for evaluation. These include child performance, effectiveness of delivery systems, cost effectiveness evaluation, social impact effect, to name but a few. These problems require the development of new evaluative strategies as well as collation of diverse but applicable methods to the specific problems enumerated. In addition to concern regarding the productive output of the Laboratory, evaluation must be concerned with monitoring the internal processes of the program. Of particular concern is the development of quality criteria for a number of different functions which cannot be judged by the same set of referents. Thus, evaluation takes on a set of substantive tasks over and above a simple "watch dog" role. In essence, a comprehensive evaluation capability is the handmaiden of planning and essential to the integrative function.

Policy Determination.—From an organizational standpoint, constituting the Board of Governors is the first order of business. This Board will assume legal responsibilities for the program, take responsibility for its support and set policy consistent with mission objectives and the functions of the Laboratory. They will be assisted in their responsibilities by a Science Advisory Council and a Professional and Lay Advisory Council. The former will periodically review the research efforts for quality and relevance to the mission. The latter will take prime responsibility for advising the Board of Governors on diffusion and installation operations and the broader aspects of social and field needs. The Board of Governors will be made up of leaders from the professional, business and labor communities who have records of responsible decision making experience.

RESEARCH CAPACITY

The component centers of the National Laboratory represent a focussed programmatic research effort engaged in substantive study of the processes and their parameters underlying the development of competency in early childhood and describing the effect of educational intervention in changing the parameters of these processes under applied experimentation.

Ultimately, the focussed programmatic research capability will have to be augmented to provide the necessary flexibility required in a comprehensive program. The carefully planned research program implied in a programmatic approach is not always amenable to interruption for the production of specific knowledge. Yet, in a comprehensive effort, a particular question at the project level may need immediate attention in order that the substantive work can proceed. We expect to develop a solicited project capability in due course of time.

DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION

A major commitment during the first phase of reorganization is the development of the Laboratory's first prototypic early childhood educational model for controlled testing and demonstration. The centralized activities require staff to integrate the model elements produced by the component centers and other sources. Time and space will not permit delineation of the model specifications at this point. Suffice it to say that the general specifications call for specific knowledge of process, as well as the soft ware and usual support materials and information. In order that the major centralized work of the

Laboratory can proceed, it is essential that the team charged with this responsibility be recruited and organized immediately. Planning for the implementation of the demonstration function must proceed simultaneously.

In another paper I advocated that the field make a much heavier investment in the community college for preservice training. Such involvement could provide more adequate career development programs and the mechanism for differentiating levels of competency. In addition, I proposed the creation of a minimum of six regional teacher-demonstration centers which would be the main diffusion instrumentality of the national comprehensive and integrated program herein discussed. These centers would demonstrate the models emanating from the research and development effort and would serve as headquarters for inservice helping teams. Sites for these centers would be chosen on the basis of direct access to the environment containing the on-line programs being served. The inservice helping teams would be charged with the responsibility of outreach, advising local systems on installation procedures.

RESOURCES PRODUCTION CAPACITY

To undergird the entire program, information storage and retrieval, media production, technological development, and various data banks are necessary. ERIC presently provides the capability for information retrieval and storage and, to a limited degree, dissemination of information.

A full range of media production capabilities are envisioned as necessary to support the work of the program. Mass production of films, records, manuals, etc., is not the work of the program, however. Rather, it will be limited to initial production and development which must be an integral part of the on-going operation. Knowledge of program requirements and the substantive process must be an integral part of the production staff's repertoire.

The development of a communications network, which serves not only the program but the field as well, is essential to the success of the Laboratory. This capability will include editorial and writing skills which can translate information into appropriate form for a variety of audiences. The back-up support of media specialists is an intrinsic part of this capability.

Several witnesses who testified before the Education and Labor Committee regarding legislation pertaining to the period of early childhood have also commented upon the critical need for developing a strong theoretical base. Excerpts from their testimony follow:

Jule Sugarman, Acting Director, Office of Child Development, December 1, 1969:

Early childhood programs are being created and operated on an inadequate base of knowledge. There is general agreement that the early years have great importance in the growth and development of the child. There is also general agreement that high proportions of children from economically disadvantaged families begin to show developmental deficits very early in life. There is far less agreement on what constitutes effective intervention to improve the opportunities for development of such children. At the time of the great expansion of programs for preschool disadvantaged children began, curriculum and techniques had been developed largely on the basis of experience with children from advantaged families. There has been an impressive array of experiments in curriculum and techniques for disadvantaged children financed from Federal and foundation funds during the last ten years. Some of these suggest promising leads to more effective programs. Virtually

all of these approaches, however, have been tried only in a limited number of laboratory like situations. None have been replicated and tested on substantial numbers of children in a wide variety of circumstances. None have been adequately evaluated as to their enduring effects over a long period of time. In fact the whole state of evaluation technology and its utilization is highly unsatisfactory at present. It was understandable that the compelling needs of young children should be recognized and responded to on a massive basis. It was also predictable that the inadequacies of our knowledge would limit the impact of that intervention. As we enter the 1970's we are still seriously deficient in (a) our understanding of how children develop, (b) the causes and nature of deficits found among disadvantaged children, (c) the techniques for appraising the state of development and (d) the design and delivery of programs and curriculum to prevent or overcome developmental deficits.

Sheldon H. White, Professor of Education, Harvard University, November 20, 1969:

I would hope that in the future there can be a program of research and development activities which might eventually place early education on a more secure footing. Specifically, there is a need for: (1) careful comparisons of the effectiveness of different kinds of teaching techniques with different kinds of children; (2) the development and testing of prototype programs in early education; (3) the orderly and effective dissemination of successful prototypes into general use; and (4) background activities designed to recruit resources and personnel necessary to such development. All such research and development activities have been authorized and all are in existence already but, in my judgment, what had emerged has been variable in quality and incomplete in coverage. . . . About background information, the government has followed a passive policy towards basic research, accepting applications for research grants and selecting some for funding primarily on the basis of scientific merit. This is a sound way to promote scientific development, but being passive, it does not guarantee the delivery of research information that may be badly needed for program development. Funds might be made available to allow the government to commission needed pieces of background research. . . . In general, then, I believe that research and development should be an important part of early education work in the future, with organization to make all the pieces coherent and comprehensive. Only in this way can we make early education more effective, significantly effective, in the development of the child.

Jerome Kagan, professor of human development, Harvard University memorandum to the committee, November 18, 1969:

Evaluation of changes following educational interventions.—There are several advantages to be derived from sophisticated evaluation of innovative programs, whether they be for infants, children or adolescents. First, good evaluation permits us to discover which experimental interventions are accomplishing the desired goals. Second, evaluation acts as a restraint on a completely laissez-faire approach to curriculum. There is a special danger in the continuing demand for local control of infant and preschool day care centers. These community groups are likely to resist any state or federal rules regarding curricula. But if announcement of evaluation results inform the public as to which programs are facilitating the growth of young children, this knowledge can act as an incentive to centers to inquire about, and perhaps adopt, the practices of those centers. Finally, it is important to evaluate

not only the traditional intellectual components of growth but also motivational factors and, if possible, the effect of interventions on the attitudes and structure of the community.

It is recommended that the Federal Government appropriate funds to accelerate research in the area of evaluation. One possibility is to establish a National Evaluation Center to be housed at a leading university or on federal property. The goals of the center would be to construct instruments and procedures to assess intellectual and motivational growth in children from infancy through adolescence.

Research on reading.—The ability to read has always been recognized as the central skill to be attained in the opening years of elementary school. However, we still do not know how a child learns to read or the cause of reading disability. Research efforts in this area are scattered and our best social scientists are not working on this problem. It is recommended that the Federal Government accelerate research in this area by allowing the Office of Education to initiate more large scale integrated work on reading in major research centers in the country.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons the budget doubled in 10 years is that a multitude of new programs has been superimposed upon an already overloaded Federal Establishment. It is all but impossible for anyone to grasp the magnitude of the bureaucratic monstrosity, with its thousands of programs, many of which duplicate and overlap others.

If we are going to solve at least some of the problems which confront us and at the same time avoid a financial crisis, we must begin to bring order out of chaos by eliminating unnecessary programs, consolidating duplicating programs, and establishing new programs only where it is obvious that they can do the job better and at less cost than the existing programs that they would displace.

One of the problems with which we are faced is the hard-core unemployment and accompanying poverty that persists in the midst of widespread and long-continued prosperity. Part of this poverty results because many mothers of small children can neither accept available jobs for which they are qualified or train for jobs for which they are unqualified. Some of these mothers are widows, others are divorced, and others have been abandoned by their husbands. There are also many women, including a large number of teenagers, who have borne children out of wedlock.

An effort to assist these mothers in a constructive manner and at the same time an attempt to straighten out some of the bureaucratic mess is a measure which I have cosponsored. This bill is H.R. 15776, the Comprehensive Headstart Child Development Act of 1970, which would provide a consolidated, comprehensive child development program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I want to take a few minutes to briefly outline the major provisions of the bill.

The measure provides for the consolidation of various child care programs now included in Headstart, the preschool portion of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the migrant day care program of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the day care pro-

visions of Title IV of the Social Security Act, and the manpower programs of the Department of Labor. It would provide for the establishment of the National Institute for Early Childhood Development and Education, which would conduct research and test findings through federally controlled programs and coordinate the research that is being conducted by other Federal, university, and private agencies.

Appropriation of funds would be authorized, under the Educational Professions Development Act, for training or retraining both professional and nonprofessional personnel. Repayment of college loans would be forgiven if the graduates accept employment in child development programs. Tuition grants would be provided to cover the cost of inservice training programs for personnel who wish to upgrade their skills.

An important part of the proposed legislation would be a comprehensive and thorough evaluation of Federal programs pertaining to child development. There are presently at least 61 programs that deal with child care to some extent, scattered throughout the Departments of the Interior; Agriculture; Labor; Health, Education, and Welfare; and Housing and Urban Development; the Small Business Administration; and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

These programs cover such matters as adoptions, business loans, clothing, community facilities, counseling, crippled children, day care, education, employment, English as a second language, family planning, foster grandparents, handicapped children, health, home-maker services, illegitimacy, Indians, infant mortality, institutional care, job training, juvenile delinquency, legal services, mental retardation, migrant and seasonal workers, neglect and abuse, nutrition, physical environment, protective services, psychological services, recreation, social activities, and visiting nurses. Certainly there is a tremendous amount of waste that could be eliminated and a lot of redtape that could be done away with in such a conglomeration of items.

A mother with a small child may have all sorts of governmental help available to her, but the average welfare recipient of limited education cannot find her way through the wilderness of programs and the maze of regulations. It is essential that we streamline the confusing system of child care services so that women can accept employment or train for it and know that their children are receiving proper care while their mothers are gone.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time that we started taking mothers off relief rolls and putting them on payrolls, thus making them useful members of society rather than career welfareists. Once they started supporting their children through their own efforts, they will set better examples for these youngsters, who will in turn seek something higher than relief when they are old enough to start out on their own. H.R. 15776 is an important step in the right direction.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

AUTOMOTIVE AIR POLLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on July 31 of last year, I introduced H.R. 13225, legislation to ban the sale of the internal combustion engine unless stringent new emissions standards could be met. The purpose of this legislation was to force the American auto industry to develop a nonpolluting engine.

This legislation, the amendment I offered on the floor of the House in September to accomplish approximately the same objective, and the hearing I held in New York City in connection with this question appear to have played a significant role in giving national focus to a question which just last summer was primarily the concern of residents of California.

RESPONSE TO LEGISLATIVE BAN OF INTERNAL COMBUSTION ENGINE

	Male (percent)			Female (percent)			Total
	Under 30	30-65	65 and over	Under 30	30-65	65 and over	
Favor.....	91.9	94.6	90.3	95.5	98.1	94.1	95.2
Opposed.....	8.1	5.4	8.7	4.5	1.9	5.9	4.8

The auto is responsible for 60 percent of air pollution in the United States and up to 92 percent in urban areas. It is clear that the public mood is not for modest modifications in current approaches to pollution control, but for radical departures to stem the mad momentum of environmental destruction. The auto must be cleaned up if the problem of air pollution is to be solved.

The intensity of the feelings of the residents of Lower and Middle Manhattan on this subject is revealed not only in numerical results of the poll, but in the following additional remarks which were written in on the returned questionnaires:

I am going to have to leave the city because of the pollution.

Emphatically.

Everyone I know agrees this is necessary. The air pollution makes it difficult for me to breathe and sleep at nights.

Immediately.

Private automobiles should be banned from Manhattan and other large cities.

I favor any recommendations of Ralph Nader.

Start with buses.

STATE DEPARTMENT REMARKS ON SAIGON GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

The extent of that concern in New York City can be found in the results of my December constituent questionnaire which found a 19-to-1 ratio in favor of legislation to ban the internal combustion engine. I received over 8,000 replies to this one-question questionnaire.

The wording of the question was based upon that of a national public opinion poll taken last fall and read as follows:

I NEED YOUR HELP

The automobile industry does not appear to believe that most people are really concerned about automotive-caused air pollution.

Exhaust from the existing kind of automobile engine, the internal combustion engine, causes air pollution. I have introduced legislation to outlaw the sale of the internal combustion engine effective in 1978 in order to force auto makers to develop other engines.

By casting your ballot on this question, you can let the auto industry and the Congress know where the people of New York stand.

Please complete, stamp and mail the questionnaire before December 30.

Do you favor legislation to ban the internal combustion engine?

The results revealed that middle-age respondents were more supportive of a legislative ban and that women were more favorably inclined than men. The respondents included 51.2 percent women and 48.8 percent men.

The breakdown of the results by sex and age groups follows:

man from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I have recently been corresponding with the State Department on the subject of the South Vietnamese Government. Because of the informative nature of the replies I have received from Mr. H. G. Torbert, Jr., Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, I think they are worthy of public attention. While not all of my inquiries were answered to my complete satisfaction, I want to commend Mr. Torbert for his efforts.

His letters reveal much that is sobering, and even discouraging, about the Saigon government and our relationship with it, and help one to understand the sometimes dubious activities of a political system so recently exposed to democratic practices.

The correspondence follows:

NOVEMBER 13, 1969.

HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The structure and functioning of the South Vietnamese government are prime topics of debate and concern. President Nixon and you are often accused, as were your predecessors, of trying to "prop up" the government in Saigon. The critics say that if the South Vietnamese government would become less corrupt,

broaden its base, and become more responsive to the people, greater progress in the Vietnamization of the war could be made.

My own thinking on these issues would be aided considerably if you answered for me the following questions pertaining to the South Vietnamese government and our alliance with it:

CORRUPTION

1. How prevalent is corruption in the present government?
2. What is the gross loss, in monetary terms for FY 1969, of American military and economic goods due to corruption on the part of the South Vietnamese?
3. What steps is the United States taking to reduce this corruption?
4. What steps has the Thieu-Ky government taken to reduce corruption among its own officials?
5. What progress has been made in these efforts in the past year?
6. Is there any evidence that Thieu and Ky are themselves involved in the corruption?

POLITICS

1. Have Thieu and Ky made efforts to broaden the base of their government? If so, what are they?
2. What is the United States doing to encourage Thieu and Ky to broaden their political base? What progress has there been in these efforts?
3. What is the make-up of the present cabinet? What was the effect of the last reshuffling of cabinet positions?
4. What groups, ethnic, religious, or political, are excluded from the political arena?
5. What is the present number of political prisoners?
6. Are there any leaders of political factions in jail? If so, how many and who are they?
7. What is a "neutralist" in the South Vietnamese context? Can any one run for political office?
8. Finally, what is your assessment of Thieu as a political leader? Is he effective? How active is the political opposition? Is Thieu dedicated more to the establishment of a responsive and responsible government or to staying in power?

Your response to these questions should clarify the situation considerably. Both the critics and the supporters of our policy are interested in the current status of the government we are defending. Only an objective statement describing present conditions of the political fabric of South Vietnam will raise the level of debate in this country from one of exchanging accusations to one of reasoned interpretation of established facts.

I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 5, 1969.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of November 13 concerning the Government of South Viet-Nam. The questions you raise are pertinent ones, and we welcome the opportunity to answer them.

You mention first the problem of corruption. There is no doubt that this problem is a serious one in Viet-Nam. President Thieu and other high Vietnamese officials have acknowledged this and over the past year and more have taken increasingly effective measures to reduce or eliminate corruption in government ranks.

For example, the Inspectorate, an autonomous fourth branch of government provided for in the Constitution, has now been in existence about a year and has begun to make its influence felt. Its investigations have led to the dismissal, transfer, or dis-

ciplining of a number of civil and military officials, and it has recommended that the Executive prosecute others charged with more serious offenses. The Executive has on its own taken action against corrupt and ineffective officials, including trial and imprisonment of several officials (up to and including the rank of province chief) in recent months. These punitive actions have, we believe, been salutary.

Equally significant are the procedural means of fighting corruption, and here U.S. advice and assistance has been of major importance. Our advisors have helped the Government of Viet-Nam to revise and simplify its import-licensing procedures, reduce port congestion and customs clearance time, and step up tax collections. The Vietnamese authorities have also simplified administrative procedures for various public services. All these measures have served to reduce the opportunities for, and incidence of, corruption.

While we do not have figures on the gross loss of U.S. economic and military goods due to corruption, we do believe there has been a substantial improvement in this situation. For instance, actions by ourselves and the Vietnamese government cut the loss rate for AID-financed project commodities from 15% in 1967 to about 7% by the beginning of this year. For the Commercial Import Program, the rate of loss and diversion has been reduced from an estimated 6% in 1966 to less than 1/2%.

Despite such progress, much remains to be done about the problem of corruption, and we believe it requires redoubled efforts by all of us, Vietnamese and Americans alike. I assure you we intend to do all we can to see that these efforts are made.

We know of no evidence whatsoever that the President or Vice President are themselves involved in corruption. Quite the contrary, their public reputations for honesty are excellent.

I turn now to the questions you pose about the Vietnamese political situation.

Since he took office, President Thieu has made major efforts to broaden the base of his government by including in his cabinet representative political figures with personal or organizational followings of their own; at the same time, he has sought to maintain or increase the efficiency of government operations by appointing ministers with specific technical qualifications. Needless to say, it has not always been possible for him to realize both of these goals in every respect. From May 1968 until September of this year, his Prime Minister was Tran Van Huong, a highly respected civilian political leader and one of the President's leading opponents in the 1967 election. On September 1 President Thieu appointed a new cabinet, with General Tran Thien Khiem as Prime Minister. In the process of forming this cabinet, President Thieu offered ministerial positions to a number of political leaders; while some accepted his invitations, others declined for reasons of their own. We understand that one who declined such an invitation was Senator Tran Van Don, who in recent months has often taken positions critical of President Thieu. The present cabinet does, however, include several well-known political figures, including two unsuccessful vice-presidential candidates; the leader of a winning slate in the 1967 Upper House election; and a respected former Deputy Prime Minister in previous governments. Like its predecessor, the Khiem cabinet is balanced from the standpoint of religious and regional representation. Three of the 31 Ministers and Vice-Ministers (including the Premier) are ranking military officers. (For your information, I am enclosing summary biographic data on members of the present cabinet.)

President Thieu has also moved to broaden the base of the government at the village and hamlet level by strongly encouraging an

expansion of local self-rule. Some 90% of the country's village and hamlets now have elected administrations, which have in turn been given greater responsibilities and resources as well as assistance by the central government. We believe this program has been particularly successful in generating further support for the government in recent months.

The United States believes that President Thieu's goal of broadening his government, both nationally and locally, is a highly desirable one and we have conveyed our views on this subject to him by appropriate means. At the same time, we recognize the problems which President Thieu and his government face in a society which traditionally has offered few opportunities for responsible and constructive political activity and whose constitution and democratic institutions are of recent origin.

The problem of political prisoners is a complex one, especially since the term "political prisoners" itself is frequently misused. The Vietnamese government is faced with having to distinguish between those engaged in what might be considered here as legitimate political dissent and those who are known or suspected to be active on behalf of the enemy in wartime. The vast majority of prisoners in South Viet-Nam (aside from common criminals) are in the latter category; the exact number in the former category, i.e. those who might more properly be called "political prisoners", is not known but is believed to be quite small. We do not know of any leaders of political factions in jail except possibly for Mr. Truong Dinh Dzu, who, although he leads no particular political organization, did run second in the 1967 presidential election. (He was prosecuted for later actions involving statements he made to the press several months after the election.)

No ethnic or religious groups are excluded from political activity in South Viet-Nam, and indeed, many such groups are conspicuously active on the political scene. The only political groups or individuals excluded are those who are communist or pro-communist, i.e., those who support the attempt by Hanoi and the Viet Cong to overthrow the legal government by violence and terror.

In the Vietnamese political context the terms "neutralist" and "neutralism" have highly unfavorable connotations; they have been used by persons who advocate the removal of the present government by extra-constitutional means and collaboration with the Viet Cong. It is presumably for this reason that the 1967 election laws excluded "pro-communist neutralists", along with communists, from running for office. There are no other political or ideological limitations on the eligibility of candidates to run for office. Legitimate neutralist political activity is obviously permitted, as recent actions by certain political figures in Saigon have indicated.

Finally, in answer to your last question, President Thieu's actions over the past year or more would seem to indicate that he is indeed dedicated to the establishment of a "responsive and responsible government", as you put it. He and his colleagues have improved the effectiveness of the government significantly, have mobilized the population more effectively in its own defense, and have expanded security, economic activity, and local self-government in the countryside. They have done this in cooperation with a vigorous and independent National Assembly and within the over-all democratic framework established by the Constitution, despite inexperience and very difficult wartime conditions. Legitimate opposition exists and is expressed openly within this framework.

We think these efforts by the South Vietnamese leadership of all persuasions and at all levels are worthy of our continued support and encouragement. Both we and they recognize that serious problems remain,

some of which you touch on in your questions. We intend to cooperate with the Vietnamese and to assist wherever we can as they meet these problems.

I hope the above will be useful to you in considering this matter. If I can be of further assistance, please let me know at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

H. G. TORBERT, Jr.,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

SUMMARY BIOGRAPHIC DATA ON MEMBERS OF SOUTH VIETNAMESE CABINET APPOINTED SEPTEMBER 1, 1969

Prime Minister and Minister of Interior: Tran Thien Khiem. Born Saigon, 1925. Buddhist. Military officer, 1946 to the present, with rank of full general since August 1964. Chief of Joint General Staff, 1962-63; commander of III Corps Tactical Zone, 1964. Participant in military coup which overthrew Ngo Dinh Diem in 1963 and in coup of January 1964 which installed Nguyen Khanh. Ambassador to the United States, 1964-65, and to the Republic of China, 1965-68. Minister of Interior since May 1968; in addition, Deputy Prime Minister in charge of Pacification and Reconstruction, March-August 1969.

Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Education: Nguyen Luu Vien. Born Vinh Binh province (southern Viet-Nam), 1919. Buddhist. Physician and professor of medicine. Medical officer with the Viet Minh from late 1940's until about 1951. Signer of the "Caravelle petition," requesting reforms in the Diem government, 1960; imprisoned 1960-61. Member, Council of Notables, 1963-64. Minister of Interior and Deputy Prime Minister in cabinet of Tran Van Huong, 1964-65. Civilian member of the National Leadership Committee (Directorate), 1966-67; also Deputy Prime Minister for Social and Cultural Affairs, 1966-67.

Minister of State for Cultural Affairs: Mal Tho Truyen. Born Kien Hoa province (southern Viet-Nam), 1905. Buddhist. Retired civil servant. Began civil service career in 1924. Chief of administrative services in Long Xuyen province for the Viet Minh, 1945-46. Subsequent career included positions as director of cabinet in Ministries of Economy, Foreign Affairs and Interior 1946-55, and as inspector of administrative and financial affairs in the Presidency from 1955 until his retirement in 1960. President of the Association for Buddhist Studies, 1956; Vice-president of the General Association of Vietnamese Buddhists, 1959; and founder of the Southern Buddhist Studies Association, 1964. Member of the Council of Notables, 1963-64. Vice-presidential running-mate of Tran Van Huong in 1967 elections. First appointed Minister of State in the Huong cabinet, May 1968.

Minister of State for Reconstruction and Development: Vu Quoc Thuc. Born Nam Dinh province (North Viet-Nam), 1920. Catholic. Economist and scholar; licentiate in law from the University of Hanoi and Ph. D. in economics from the University of Paris. Assistant dean, faculty of law, Hanoi, 1951-53. Minister of Education in the Buu Loc government, 1953-54. Governor of the National Bank of Viet-Nam, 1955-56. Dean of the faculty of Law, University of Saigon, 1957-63. Author of several specialized legal works and economic studies. Unsuccessful candidate for Upper House of the National Assembly, 1967. Head of the Post-War Planning Study Group, in collaboration with Dr. David Lilienthal, since February 1967. Originally appointed Minister of State in the cabinet of Tran Van Huong in May 1968, and continues in that position.

Minister of State (without portfolio): Phan Quang Dan. Born in Nghe An province (central Viet-Nam, north of 17th parallel), 1918. Buddhist. Physician, graduate of the

University of Hanoi and holder of Master of Public Health degree from Harvard University. Long political career, dating from at least 1940. Minister of Information 1948-49. Early opponent of Ngo Dinh Diem; only opposition candidate elected to the National Assembly in 1959, but not permitted to take his seat because of alleged violation of electoral laws. Arrested by Diem in 1960 and held without trial until June 1963; then sentenced to seven years' imprisonment, but released after Diem's overthrow. Elected to the Gia Dinh provincial council in May 1965 by a large majority and chosen by the council to serve as its chairman. Chairman of the National Political Congress in 1966 and elected to the Constituent Assembly from Gia Dinh province later that year; had active role in drafting of the present Constitution. Survived an assassination attempt in December 1966. Running-mate of Phan Khac Suu, third-place finisher in presidential election of 1967.

Minister of State (without portfolio): Nguyen Tien Hy. Born Hanoi (North Viet-Nam) 1915. Physician, educated in Viet-Nam. Formerly associated with the anti-French and anti-Communist *Dai Viet* party, established in the late 1930's. Signer of the "Caravelle petition," 1960, together with Nguyen Luu Vien (above). Member, Council of Notables, 1963-64. Minister of State for Education in the government of Phan Huy Quat, 1965. Unsuccessful candidate for Upper House of the National Assembly, 1967.

Minister of Foreign Affairs: Tran Van Lam. Born Cholon section of Saigon, 1913. Catholic. Pharmacist. Elected to Saigon City Council, 1952. Government delegate (regional administrative officer) for southern Viet-Nam, 1954-56. Member and president of Constituent Assembly elected 1956, which subsequently became National Assembly, and president of latter until 1957 at which time he became majority leader; re-elected in 1959. Resigned to become Ambassador to Australia, 1961-64 (concurrently Ambassador to New Zealand, 1962-64). Elected to Upper House of the National Assembly as leader of a ten-member list of candidates, September 1967. Member of finance and foreign affairs committees and later chairman of the interior committee, until taking leave from Upper House to assume present position.

Minister of Defense: Nguyen Van Vy. Born Hanoi, 1916. Buddhist. Military officer, beginning approximately 1940, with extensive experience in infantry and airborne units and also in staff assignments. Military advisor to the Vietnamese delegation at the Geneva Conference, 1954. Political exile in France, 1955-63. Returned to Viet-Nam late 1963 and rejoined Vietnamese Army; served as chief of staff at the Joint General Staff from November 1966 until appointment as Minister of Defense in the cabinet of Nguyen Van Loc, November 1967. Has continued in that position to date. Promoted to lieutenant general, October 1967.

Minister of Justice: Le Van Thu. Born Saigon 1915. Buddhist. Lawyer, with degree from the University of Hanoi, and former journalist. Officer in the French Army, 1939-43; customs official, 1943-45. Active in the resistance against the French, 1945-51. Publisher and editor of a daily newspaper and a weekly magazine in Saigon, 1952-56. Attorney, 1952 to date, and for a time chairman of the Court of Appeals. Member of the Council of Notables, 1963, and of the High National Council (and chairman of its constitution-drafting committee), 1964. First appointed Minister of Justice in the Huong cabinet, May 1968, and continues in that capacity.

Minister of Economy: Pham Kim Ngoc. Born Hanoi, 1928. Investment banker. Served for six months with the Viet Minh at the age of 17. Graduate of the London School of Economics, 1955. Employed by *Credit Com-*

mercial, largest commercial bank in Viet-Nam, 1955-68 (deputy director-general, 1959-68). Served briefly as Deputy Minister for Economy in 1967 and as special assistant to the Minister of Economy in 1968. Organized own investment and banking firm, The Saigon Trading Company, in 1968.

Minister of Finance: Nguyen Bich Hue. Born Hue (central Viet-Nam), 1924. Buddhist. Educated in France, where he received law degree, 1951; graduated from Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies, 1953; and from Ecole National d'Administration, 1955. Employed by the National Bank of Viet-Nam, 1956-69, rising to director-general (1968). Author of numerous articles on economics and monetary affairs.

Minister of Revolutionary Development: Tran Thanh Phong. Born Vinh Binh province (southern Viet-Nam), 1926. Buddhist. Began military career at officer candidate school in 1951 and rose through infantry-command and staff assignments to become division commander; chief of operations of the Joint General Staff (1965); and chief of staff, JGS (1967). Promoted to rank of major general, 1966.

Minister of Information: Ngo Khac Tinh. Born Ninh Thuan province (central Viet-Nam), 1923. Buddhist. Pharmacist. Served in the National Assembly, 1957-63 and as its deputy secretary-general, 1960-62. Unsuccessful candidate for the Upper House of the National Assembly, 1967. Recently associated with the Revolutionary Social Humanist party.

Minister of Chieu Hoi (Returnee Program): Ho Van Cham. Born Thua Thien province (central Viet-Nam), 1932. Confucianist. Physician; studied medicine in Hanoi and Saigon, with degree from the latter university in 1959, and interned at St. Luke's Hospital, New York, 1964-66. Member of the Vietnamese Army medical corps since 1958; author of many articles on military medicine. Unsuccessful candidate for Upper House of the National Assembly, 1967. Member of the Revolutionary Dai Viet party.

Minister of Land Reform, Agriculture and Fisheries: Cao Van Than. Born Saigon, 1932. Holds law degree from the University of Paris and master's degree in economics from the University of Pittsburgh. Advisor to President Thieu, prior to appointment to this position in revised cabinet of Tran Van Huong, March 1969.

Minister of Public Works: Duong Kich Nhuong. Born My Tho (southern Viet-Nam), 1932. Buddhist. Hydro-electric engineer, educated at the University of Grenoble in France. Government experience in the Directorate-General of Planning, 1957-59, and as director of cabinet of the Ministry of Public Works and Communications, 1963-64. Also in private employment, most recently as director of the Tan Mai Paper Mill Company, 1969-69.

Minister of Communications and Post: Tran Van Vien. Born in Cholon district of Saigon, 1932. Buddhist. Engineer; graduate of the National School of Telecommunications in Paris. Previous positions: Head of the National School of Post and Telecommunications, Saigon; regional postmaster for southern Viet-Nam; Director of Telecommunications.

Minister of Health: Tran Minh Tung. Born in Saigon, 1930. Catholic. Physician and specialist in internal medicine. Graduate of the medical school of the University of Hanoi, 1955. Member of the Army medical corps, with the rank of colonel; previously assigned as commandant of the Army Medical School. Also secretary-general of the Vietnamese Medical Association.

Minister of Social Welfare: Tran Nguon Phieu. Born in Gia Dinh province (southern Viet-Nam), 1927. Buddhist. Physician, with medical degree from the University of Bordeaux. Member of military medical corps for 17 years, rising to the rank of lieutenant

colonel. Unsuccessful candidate for Lower House of National Assembly, 1967. Served as Secretary of State for Refugee and Social Affairs in the cabinet of Nguyen Van Loc, 1967-68, and as special assistant to the Minister of Health, Social Welfare and Relief, 1968-69. One of principal organizers of relief measures after Communists' Tet offensive of early 1968.

Minister of Veterans' Affairs: Pham Van Dong. Born in Son Tay province (northern Viet-Nam), 1919. Buddhist. Former Army officer. Joined French Army in 1939 and fought against the Japanese in Viet-Nam and southern China. Rose to become division commander, deputy corps commander, and commander of the Capital Military District (Saigon and vicinity). Retired in 1965 with the rank of major general. Subsequently associated with several veterans' organizations and with the National Salvation Front, a political organization founded in 1968 by Senator Tran Van Don.

Minister of Labor: Dam Sy Hien. Born Nam Dinh province (North Viet-Nam), 1914. Confucian Buddhist. Lawyer and economist. Civil servant in North Viet-Nam from 1945 until 1954, when he fled to the South. Subsequently worked as staff member of the Vietnamese Confederation of Labor (CVT) and participated in many ICFTU and other international labor conferences. Minister of Social Welfare in Khanh and Huong government, 1964-65. Appointed Minister of Labor in Huong cabinet, May 1968, and continues in that position.

Minister of Ethnic Minority Development: Paul Nur. Born Kontum province (central Viet-Nam), 1925; member of the Bahnar tribe of the central highlands. Catholic. Former school teacher and civil servant. Teacher and headmaster of elementary school in Kontum, 1943-58. A leader of the Highland Autonomy Movement, as result of which he was imprisoned by the Diem regime, 1958-63. Deputy Province Chief of Kontum for Montagnard Affairs, 1963-65. Special Commissioner for Montagnard Affairs, 1964-67. First appointed to present position November 1967.

Minister of State at the Prime Minister's Office: Nguyen Van Vang. Born in Kien Hoa province (southern Viet-Nam), 1915. Career civil servant, 1946-69, with experience as district chief, province chief, special assistant to the president for Chinese affairs, and government delegate (regional administrative officer). Served with Inspector General's office from 1965 until his appointment as Minister of Revolutionary Development in the Huong Cabinet, March 1969.

Minister of State for Parliamentary Relations: Cao Van Tuong. Born in Hue (central Viet-Nam), 1916. Catholic. Holds degree of licentiate in law. Served with the Viet-Minh, 1946-51. Civil servant in the Ministry of Labor, 1952-56. Elected to the National Assembly in 1956 and served for a time as its deputy chairman. Legislative advisor to the Lower House of the present National Assembly before his appointment to this position.

In addition to the 24 men listed above, there are seven vice-ministers who are considered members of the Cabinet:

Vice-Minister of Economy (for Industry): Pham Minh Duong. (Southerner)

Second Vice-Minister of Economy (for Commerce): Tran Cu Uong. (Northerner; Buddhist)

Vice Minister of Finance: Ha Xuan Trung. (Central Viet-Nam; Buddhist)

Vice Minister of Education: Tran Luu Cung. (Northerner; Buddhist)

Second Vice Minister of Education: Nguyen Danh Dan, M.D. (Northerner; Buddhist)

Vice Minister of Interior: Le Cong Chat. (Southerner, Confucianist)

Vice Minister of Information: Le Trong Cut, attorney. (Central Viet-Nam Buddhist)

DECEMBER 16, 1969.

H. G. TORBERT, Jr.,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional
Relations, Department of State, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TORBERT: Thank you for your letter of December 5. Your efforts in answering my questions are greatly appreciated. Several issues I raised, however, are still unresolved in my mind.

With regard to my question of "What is the U.S. doing to encourage Thieu and Ky to broaden their political base?" you replied only that "we have conveyed our views on this subject to him by appropriate means." I am wondering what "appropriate means" are? The question is what specific steps have we taken to encourage the South Vietnamese government to broaden its base.

With regard to the cabinet formed on September 1, you state that it is "balanced from the standpoint of religious and regional representation." This does not indicate its political orientation, which has been regarded in the American press as being more narrowly and loyally pro-Thieu than its predecessor. Did not the reshuffling reduce rather than enlarge Thieu's political base?

Third, you state that the number of political prisoners is "small." Could you indicate a numerical figure? A *New York Times* article of October 25, 1969, gave a figure of about 5,000 noncommunist political prisoners. Does this coincide with your estimates? What is our position on their imprisonment, and what specific steps have been taken by the U.S. Government to have them released?

Concerning Truong Dinh Dzu, what was the nature of the statements he made that resulted in his imprisonment? What was he charged with? What is our position with regard to his imprisonment, and has the U.S. Government made any efforts to have him released?

Finally, on the question of a neutralist, what is the difference between a "pro-communist neutralist" (your phrase) and a person advocating a coalition government of communist and non-communists? Is the latter apt to be punished for his views?

Your comments on the above questions would be appreciated.

I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1970.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: I am writing in response to your letter of December 16, in which you raise a number of questions about my reply of December 5 to your earlier letter concerning the political situation in South Viet-nam.

On the general subject of "broadening" of the Government of Viet-Nam, I am sure you recognize that this is a matter of Vietnamese domestic politics. Of course, insofar as it relates to that government's ability to carry out more effectively the South Vietnamese people's current struggle against Communist aggression and subversion, it is a subject in which the United States, as Viet-Nam's principal ally, has an obvious interest. When I mentioned our having conveyed our views "by appropriate means," I was referring to our expression of this interest in communications and conversations undertaken through normal diplomatic channels and contacts.

In this manner we have indicated support of various programs and courses of action which in our opinion would contribute to further strengthening of the Vietnamese government's political base and popular follow-

ing. We have, for example, noted our support of expansion of responsible local government, which I described to you previously. As another example, we also have offered our assistance to President Thieu's proposed new land reform program, which we believe can make a further significant contribution.

With specific regard to the Vietnamese cabinet reorganization effected on September 1, 1969, we were of course sympathetic to President Thieu's declared hope of forming a new cabinet which would be as broadly representative as possible but which would at the same time enhance governmental efficiency and improve executive-legislative relations. We also realized, however, that all these goals would not be easy to achieve.

It is difficult to measure the extent to which any cabinet represents a "broadening" or a narrowing of a national leader's political base, particularly in a governmental system such as Viet-Nam's where primary executive authority is vested in the President rather than in the Prime Minister or the Cabinet. In the recent reorganization, press attention here focused mainly on the replacement of a civilian prime minister and proven vote-getter, Mr. Tran Van Huong, by a military man, General Tran Thien Khiem. Less often noted, however, was the addition as Ministers of State of another vote-getter, Dr. Phan Quang Dan, and a respected Southern civilian, Dr. Nguyen Luu Vien, who appears to speak for much of the same constituency as Mr. Huong. (Minister of State Mai Tho Truyen, Mr. Huong's running-mate in 1967, remained in the Cabinet.) As I noted in my previous letter, President Thieu reportedly asked still other representatives of political groupings—including some of those in the "opposition"—to join the government, but they apparently declined for reasons of their own, perhaps relating to their own personal political ambitions.

I turn now to the questions you raise on the subject of "political prisoners." I regret that the information available to us does not provide an adequate basis for a reply to your inquiry in numerical terms. Part of the problem here is that of defining the term "political prisoners", as I described in my previous letter.

While we recognize that this problem is essentially an internal Vietnamese matter, we do not of course condone arrests and detentions on purely political grounds (i.e. as a result of what would normally be considered legitimate political activity) and have made our views known in appropriate fashion. We feel the Vietnamese authorities are aware that shortcomings exist in the administration of justice in South Viet-Nam and are making serious efforts to remedy such shortcomings. These include efforts to clarify existing laws and decrees, to speed the disposition of cases and the release of suspects against whom there is insufficient evidence to warrant prosecution, and to expand and improve detention facilities and procedures. We have generally encouraged and supported the Vietnamese in these efforts and we are rendering specific technical and other assistance where we usefully can.

According to the information we have on the case of Mr. Truong Dinh Dzu, he was convicted in July 1968 on charges of committing "acts aimed at weakening the anti-communist spirit and struggle of the people and the armed forces," in violation of Article 17 of Decree Law 004/65, dated July 19, 1965. These charges derived from statements Mr. Dzu made to the press in April 1968 in which he apparently advocated a "coalition government" with the National Liberation Front.

Without in any sense attempting to defend or otherwise pass judgment on the Vietnamese government's actions in this case, I think it is important to recognize the con-

notation of the term "coalition government" in the present Vietnamese context. To most politically-aware Vietnamese, the term recalls the experience of non-communist nationalists who in good faith participated in Ho Chi Minh's coalition government of 1946 but who were quickly repressed and in many cases executed by the Communists. Many Vietnamese are equally aware of the Communist concept of coalition government as it has been applied elsewhere, notably in Czechoslovakia after World War II.

In regard to our position concerning Mr. Dzu's imprisonment and the question of his being released, his case is of course a matter between the Government of Viet-Nam and one of its own citizens. We have nevertheless followed the case closely and have noted to the Vietnamese authorities our interest in it. I assure you we will continue to do so as appropriate.

I cited the phrase "pro-communist neutralist" in my letter of December 5 in response to your question: "Can anyone run for office?" the term is not ours, but rather a literal translation from the Vietnamese laws—voted by the Constituent Assembly—which governed the 1967 Presidential, Upper House and Lower House elections. The complete text of the relevant clause (identical in the three electoral laws) is as follows: "The following persons will not be allowed to be candidates: . . . Those who have directly or indirectly worked for communism or pro-communist neutralism or worked in the interests of communism." To the best of our knowledge, the question whether advocacy of coalition government with the Communists is tantamount to "pro-communist neutralism," within the meaning of the 1967 electoral laws, did not arise. I would point out, however, that in recent weeks some prominent public figures in Viet-Nam have openly and freely advocated a "third force" domestic government and a "neutral" foreign policy for the Republic of Viet-Nam. I think it possible to conclude, therefore, that within the Vietnamese political context, advocacy of "neutralism" is not automatically interpreted or regarded as "pro-communist neutralism."

I hope that this information will be useful to you in your further consideration of this matter.

Sincerely yours,

H. G. TORBERT, JR.,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

HON. JOSEPH P. ROSTENKOWSKI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Joseph P. Rostenkowski, former collector of customs, passed away at Frank Cuneo Memorial Hospital on Sunday, February 8, 1970.

He was the alderman of the 83d ward from 1931 to 1955. He was also ward committeeman and served continuously in that capacity from 1936 to 1960. When he retired, he was appointed by President John F. Kennedy as collector of customs of the port of Chicago.

His first elected office was as State senator from the 27th senatorial district of Illinois to the 57th general assembly. Twenty-five years later, his son DAN served as State senator from this area for 6 years.

Mr. Rostenkowski was a pioneer in organizing various activities for young people in the Polish Roman Catholic Union. He served in the U.S. Army during World War I and was also an active member of

the American Legion. He was a member of the La Salle General Assembly, Knights of Columbus, Lafayette Council, Northwest Kiwanis Club, and Loyal Order of the Moose.

Mr. Rostenkowski served as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1936, 1940, 1944, 1948, and 1952. While serving as alderman in the city council, for 25 years, he was chairman of the committee on schools, chairman of the licenses committee, and the important rules committee.

He is survived by his son, Congressman DAN ROSTENKOWSKI and two daughters Marcia and Gladys Rostenkowski.

The body will be at the Stanley Funeral Home, 3060 North Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Ill., on Tuesday and Wednesday with funeral services on Thursday morning at 10 a.m. at the St. Stanislaus Koska Church, 1351 West Evergreen, Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I join all Members in extending our deep condolences to our beloved colleague, DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, on the passing of his father.

PRESERVATION OF THE QUALITY OF OUR ENVIRONMENT

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the matter of the improvement of the quality of our environment and the preservation of our heritage has become a national issue and a national concern.

To respond to this challenge requires a national commitment and Congress has clearly demonstrated its intent and its determination to act to solve this problem of pollution of our air, water, and land.

In this connection I am today introducing a bill to establish a major new public agency to promote the improvement of the quality of our environment through the establishment of at least six regional national laboratories to conduct research into all aspects of pollution and to provide information upon which decisions affecting the environment may be made.

I am pleased to join Senator HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., of Tennessee, and Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, in sponsoring this bill. A companion bill is being introduced in the Senate.

The concept of this bill and the network of laboratories it would authorize originated in Oak Ridge, Tenn., where much environmental research is underway in the laboratories of the Atomic Energy Commission.

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION TO PROCEED

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense has informed me that approval has been obtained from the administration and the Bureau of the Budget to proceed with the construction of military family housing. This is an exception to the general reduction in

Federal construction announced last September.

The President announced, on September 4, 1969, that he had directed all agencies of the Federal Government to put into effect immediately a 75-percent reduction in new contracts for Government construction. Although the intention of this construction reduction was, at least in part, to "release resources of homebuilding" in order to meet the great need for more housing, the application of this reduction delayed the construction of more than 2,800 units of family housing for the military.

I wrote Secretary Laird on September 15 as follows:

I am extremely concerned about the impact on the Military Construction Program of the construction cutbacks announced by President Nixon on September 4.

The Committee has heard ample evidence from Department of Defense witnesses of the pressing backlog of construction needs, estimated at \$19.6 billion. The inability to meet these needs degrades the efficiency and effectiveness of the Services' operations. Past experiences with freezes directed to the Military Construction Program, the Reserve Forces Facilities Program, and the Family Housing Program indicate that as a result of such freezes, needed facilities are built in a less-than-adequate manner, at higher cost, or both.

More important is the effect on the morale and well-being of our servicemen of inadequate housing, both family housing and bachelor housing. This Committee has often voiced the suspicion that the housing needs of members of the Armed Services and of their dependents are given a lower priority than those of their fellow citizens who are civilians. If the Administration feels that adequate housing of our citizens rates a high priority, then this ought to be reflected in greatly increased budget requests for military family housing and bachelor quarters, not in a freeze on this construction.

Testimony before this Committee on the fiscal 1970 budget request indicates that the estimated deficiency at the end of fiscal year 1974 for married personnel entitled to quarters amounts to 121,600 units. There are a mere 4800 units requested in the family housing construction budget this year. I urge you to make the strongest efforts to have the Family Housing Program excluded from any construction freeze and to proceed with a reasonable program in this area without further delay.

I am glad to report that Secretary Laird has persisted in his efforts to have military family housing excluded from the freeze. As a result, the Budget Bureau is releasing some 2,840 family housing units, in addition to the 2,422 units which the Department of Defense had scheduled for construction, for a total of 5,262 homes to be awarded in fiscal year 1970.

There is still a large housing deficiency to be met in order to adequately house military families. It is estimated to be as high as 120,000 units. I hope that the release of this housing in fiscal year 1970 and the somewhat more generous request for 8,000 units in fiscal year 1971 represents a decision by the administration to provide adequate housing for the families of military personnel. In my view, this is important not only to insure that military families receive adequate housing but to show the many dedicated personnel who serve in our Armed Forces that, in spite of much of the rhet-

oric which has become currently fashionable, we do appreciate their diligence, their dedication, and their service.

DEMOCRAT STATE OF THE UNION REBUTTAL

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Democrat state of the Union rebuttal yesterday was fairly interesting. After 1 year, President Nixon is to blame for the inflation created by their 8 years of spending, Vietnam after their 8 years of war, and pollution that hardly raised its ugly head in the past 8 years, but now has become a great political issue.

The most interesting challenge, however, was laid down by at least two of their staff when they charged that farm subsidies were responsible for the high cost of groceries. This may sound good to the woman on the other side of the grocery counter, but I wonder if they would be interested in meeting the situation head on.

In order to keep prices down for the consumer, this Nation is importing \$500 million more livestock and dairy products than it exports. We wonder if they would be willing to place some sort of embargo on these imports and give the American farmer the American market for his product. If he had this, he would ask no subsidy or no support from the Federal Treasury.

Livestock and dairy production is responsible for 70 to 75 percent of the farm income of the Middle West and yet most of the one and a quarter billion dollars worth of meat and dairy products imported is in direct competition with products produced in our Midwest.

Let us not condemn one side of the coin without turning to the other side to get the full reason for some of these measures. Agriculture does not want these subsidies. All agriculture asks is a free chance at a free market where the consumer is not subsidized by excessive agricultural imports.

WHY HANOI FIGHTS ON

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed at the statement of my colleague, the junior member of the South Dakota delegation in the other body in his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee last week when he attacked Maj. James "Nick" Rowe for making public statements to the effect that Hanoi has been using speeches from U.S. Senators and other men of influence to bolster the enemy morale.

In my article in the February 1970 issue of the Reader's Digest entitled "From Hanoi—With Thanks," there is a documentary report on how Hanoi has been using these statements, the facts of these statements, the marches, and moratoriums to prolong the war through bolstering morale of their people by using these quotes and these facts.

In addition to the documentary is the statement of Edmund A. Gullion, dean of the Fletcher School of Law Diplomacy, Tufts University, entitled "Why Hanoi Fights On." Before becoming dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Edmund Gullion served the U.S. Department of State in many posts in Europe, Africa, and the Far East. He was deputy chief of the American mission in Saigon from 1950 to 1953, and Ambassador to the Congo from 1961 to 1964. Mr. Gullion recently visited South Vietnam with a delegation from the Citizen's Committee for Peace With Freedom in Vietnam.

Gullion's statement follows:

While Hanoi broadcasts its thanks to the Americans who march in protest against the war, there are other Americans who see the repetition of a grim and familiar pattern. Hanoi moves by the same calculations which paid off for it in the defeat of the French in 1954.

As the late Ho Chi Minh once told the French: "You will kill ten of our men and we will kill one of yours. And in the end, it will be you who will tire of it." French power was shaken but not shattered by the defeat at Dienbienphu. What broke France was the collapse of will on the home front. The French were fighting to preserve a hold in Vietnam. The Americans fight to preserve the right of the South Vietnamese—the vast majority of whom fear and reject Hanoi—to choose and live by their own government. But North Vietnam, having seen one Western power worn down by sapping tactics on the home front, is sure the same strategy will pay off again. Indeed, this is what the declarations in the Hanoi press and radio are all about.

In Vietnam today, the enemy grows weaker as our side grows stronger. The situation is still precarious but President Nixon's Vietnamization plan shows real signs of working. The bitter paradox is that Hanoi grows more resolute as American will seems to waver here at home. (This would appear to be wishful thinking on the part of Hanoi, in view of the recent Gallup poll and the resolution by the House of Representatives strongly supporting the President's plan.) If the enemy believes that public opinion will force an immediate American pullout, he has no reason to negotiate at Paris or anywhere else. So long as he believes the "peace-marchers" are marching not for peace but for him, he will carry on the fight, and more American and Vietnamese men will lose their lives.

The documentary report from the Reader's Digest is as follows:

"End the war now!" "Get out of Vietnam!" Such cries are heard in peace demonstrations across America today. For the most part, they are voiced by sincere, well-meaning citizens who genuinely want peace. But an anxious public, however sympathetic with every American's right to dissent, should nonetheless ponder the real effect of such demonstrations. To what degree do they prolong the war by comforting Hanoi with the false assurance that the United States is rapidly losing its resolve to defend South Vietnam and will soon abandon it to the communists?

Hanoi itself has provided the answer—with a calculated arrogance that clearly explains its intransigence at the Paris peace talks. Here, traced from 1966 to the present, is a sampling, in somewhat condensed form, of the abundant evidence from North Vietnam's own information sources. The record shows that the enemy not only is closely informed about the demonstrations in the United States, but is also counting on them to help him win the war.

The North Vietnamese newspaper Nhan Dan, February 27, 1966:

In America the debates on the Vietnamese problem will become increasingly fiercer. The U.S. imperialist rear will be the scene of great confusion, which in turn will exert great influence upon the morale of the U.S. servicemen on the front line. That is why the Johnson clique is very perplexed and afraid, faced with the ever stronger anti-war movement which, like a sharp knife, is stabbing them in the back.

Radio Hanoi, November 6, 1966:

The Vietnamese people hail and support the struggle waged by the American people against the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam, said Dr. Le Dinh Tham, chairman of the Vietnam Peace Committee. "This struggle is a valuable encouragement and backing for the Vietnamese people, who sincerely thank the American peace fighters for their efforts to strengthen their solidarity with the Vietnamese people and coordinate their struggle with them."

Radio Hanoi, November 8, 1966:

The Vietnamese people highly value the protest movement of the American people. We praise the American peace champions who courageously turned the courts which were trying them into forums to condemn the war. We praise the American journalists and writers who, in defiance of repression and threats, valiantly exposed the crimes of the Johnson clique in Vietnam.

Radio Hanoi, February 15, 1967:

It is clear that the American people's protest movement has become a real second front against U.S. imperialists on the very soil of America. It is the largest, most stirring, and the best organized mass movement in U.S. history.

Radio Hanoi, October 17, 1967, 4 days before the "peace march" on the Pentagon:

The South Vietnam People's Committee for Solidarity With the American People has announced its program to establish relations with and contact all progressive organizations and individuals in the United States who want to acquaint themselves with the situation in Vietnam. The committee sent a message to the National Mobilization Committee and the Students Mobilization Committee in New York:

We warmly hail your struggle from 16 to 21 October. Our struggle will certainly grow more powerful, and in coordination with your struggle it will certainly be capable of compelling the U.S. Government to put an end to its aggressive war. May the October 21 struggle [the day of the march on the Pentagon] mark a new development in the American people's movement for an end of the U.S. war. We wish you brilliant success.

Speech by Truong Chinh, Chairman of the National Assembly of North Vietnam and No. 2 man in the ruling party politburo, August 1968, approximate:

We are currently taking advantage of the contradictions between the doves and the hawks in the American ruling class.

Radio Hanoi message to the National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, January 23, 1969:

We were deeply impressed by the successful march on Washington during the Presidential inaugural day to welcome the victory of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation and demand the withdrawal of all American troops. We extend to you sincere thanks. We hope that we would further coordinate our activities for peace and real independence in Vietnam.

Letter to American students from Tran Buu Kiem, former head of the Vietcong delegation to the Paris peace talks, October 6, 1969:

We greatly admire the active and massive participation of the American youths and students in this fall movement. You are entering a new, seething and violent struggle phase. We hope that you all will pool your efforts in achieving great success, thus further accelerating the common movement of the American people against the war.

Message to American people from North Vietnamese Premier Pahn Van Dong, October 14, 1969:

This fall, the broad masses of the American people, encouraged and supported by many peace- and justice-loving American personalities, have again started a broad powerful drive to stop the war. The Vietnamese people fully approve and warmly hail your just struggle. We are firmly confident that with the solidarity and courage of our two peoples the struggle of the Vietnamese people will end in total victory. I wish your fall offensive a brilliant success.

Radio Hanoi, October 14, 1969:

In response to Nixon's call for unity, the U.S. people have manifested a fierce opposition attitude. The U.S. people's autumn struggle is placing the Nixon Administration in an extremely difficult, embarrassed situation. We consider this struggle the most realistic support for the Vietnamese people's fight against the United States.

Message from Xuan Thuy, chief of Hanoi's negotiating team in Paris, October 17, 1969:

I should like today to send warm greetings to all Americans and all persons who took part in the October 15 movement. We consider that these legitimate actions are of a nature both to make the Paris conference progress and to demand of the Nixon Administration the complete and rapid withdrawal of the GIs.

Broadcast from Hanoi to Communist troops in the South, October 21, 1969:

All deceitful tricks and threats of the Nixon clique cannot check the American people's will. In their valiant and persevering struggle, the American progressives will certainly win glorious victories. The Nixon clique will certainly be completely defeated in Vietnam.

Statement of the Government of North Vietnam, November 6, 1969:

The Vietnamese people hail the honest-minded Americans who, for the sake of peace, justice and the true interests of their people, have courageously denounced the plans for prolonging the war in Vietnam and strongly demanded a quick and total withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam.

Broadcast to the Communist troops in South Vietnam, November 11, 1969:

Deeply moved by the American progressives' struggle for the great cause, we can realize our great responsibility more clearly. The Americans are struggling for their own interests and Vietnam's interest right on American soil. As for us, what must we do to coordinate with the U.S. people's struggle? Let us further stoke the fire of victory on all battlefields. We must be determined to fight the U.S. aggressors until complete victory.

Broadcast to Communist troops in the South, November 13, 1969:

A struggle which took to violence on 15 October 1969 will break out even more fiercely on 15 November. It will be coordinated by the New Mobilization Committee to End the

Vietnam War, one of the largest anti-war organizations in the United States. This struggle will have more violence and be on a much larger and more elaborate scale in all U.S. cities and state capitals. The seething struggle of U.S. youths, students and people is urging us to arise and win final victory for the fatherland.

Speech by Prof. Hoang Minh Giam, North Vietnamese Minister of Culture, November 14, 1969:

We highly evaluate the great efforts of various U.S. anti-war organizations and well-known notables who had the initiative to organize the Moratorium Day, demanding the immediate return home of all U.S. troops with slogans suited to the American people's urgent needs and just aspirations. We enthusiastically welcome the peace-loving Americans who have stood up and struggled violently and bravely against the U.S. Administration's stubborn attitude in prolonging the war of aggression. Moreover, we regard the U.S. people as our comrades-in-arms, animated by the common goal of opposing the Nixon Administration's aggressive policy and war. The fall offensive drive of the American people has made more prominent our people's just cause and made our people more resolute.

Communist broadcast from South Vietnam, November 15, 1969:

The "fall offensive" is sweeping the United States of America. We express our militant solidarity with and gratitude to the true sons and daughters of the United States. With all of our hearts we wish to thank our American friends.

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM IS IN DEEP TROUBLE

(Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the Selective Service System is in deep trouble. Late last year the President came to the Congress and asked for a one-sentence change in the Selective Service Act. He said this would give him the necessary authority to "reform" the Selective Service System.

At that time a number of Members of Congress argued that the System needed comprehensive revision, and that Congress should take the time to do a thorough—not a patchwork—job.

No, said the President, this would take too long. The administration, he assured us, had studied the System carefully and was confident that with the authority to institute a lottery it could make the System workable and equitable.

Now, 3 months after enactment of the change, during which there have been three draft calls, it is apparent that the System is in worse shape than ever.

The grand pronouncements of fairness and certainty now ring hollow as inequities are discovered and young men find that as long as they are in the prime draft age group, nothing is certain. In fact, the only thing certain about the administration's draft "reform" is that it was poorly planned.

When the program was proposed by the administration the Congress was told that the new selection process, though not completely without flaw, would reduce the uncertainty experienced by all young men liable to the draft.

The institution of a 1-year liability period went some distance in achieving that goal. But the effect was to compress years of uncertainty into that shorter period.

In Michigan, for example, young men who hoped the administration's lottery would remove much of the uncertainty from their lives now find themselves more uncertain than ever.

Confused by conflicting statements from the Pentagon, Selective Service headquarters and State headquarters, and in some instances even local draft boards, they are now appealing for clarification, information, some solid facts that will help them plan their lives.

The heart of the new selection machinery was the lottery.

The merits of this system, it was explained, were several:

All eligible young men were to have equal probability of being selected, thus making the system fairer.

In addition, that probability would be known at the beginning of the year, thus allowing individuals some basis upon which to make plans for the future.

The administration went further and declared:

Registrants whose birth dates will appear in the top one-third of the random birth date sequence will have a high probability of being drafted; those in the middle one-third, an average probability of being drafted, and those in the bottom one-third, a relatively low probability of being reached for induction.

Recent statements by State Selective Service directors across the country indicate that this statement bears little relation to the actual workings of the lottery system. The administration's guide that purports to lessen uncertainty about one's chances of being drafted now appears ludicrous in light of State estimates that project all eligibles being called for induction, regardless of their position in the lottery.

This projection was echoed just recently by General Hershey. In a newspaper interview, he said that the White House erred in its estimates that men with high lottery numbers would be safe from the draft. Men with the highest number, he is quite certain, will be inducted before the year is out.

Whether or not in the course of the year these estimates prove accurate, one result will be the same: the certainty promised those young men eligible for the draft will have been denied them.

In fact, uncertainty and confusion typify the administration's draft lottery. There is quite convincing evidence too that the present system is still far from equitable.

The Defense Department claims the available pool is several times larger than the number needed to be drafted. On the other hand, many State selective service officials claim they will have great difficulty meeting quotas on the basis of 30 lottery numbers per month. A rate that would result in 360 birth dates being called over the year.

Several boards reached quite late numbers before the temporary limitation was announced by the Selective Service System while other local boards ap-

parently have an excess of low-number eligibles.

Defense Department officials claim the situation will improve when June graduates enter the pool. Others point out that this possibly could lead to men with high numbers being inducted early in the year with college graduates with low numbers being passed by if draft calls are substantially reduced.

Caught in this morass is the young man who is trying to put some order to his life under the new system.

He is asking, "Where do I stand?" and no one can answer.

Obviously no fault lies with the State Selective Service directors. They are given quotas on a month-to-month basis and merely draw from their available pool of eligibles.

The blame must be attributed to inadequate preparation by the administration. Apparently little thought was given to the likely consequences of meeting Defense manpower requirements through Selective Service administration of the lottery system.

There is ample evidence of the lack of coordination between the two operations. A Congressman need only refer the same constituent's letter to the two departments and observe the disparities in reply to realize just how appalling this situation is.

In the last session of Congress, the President's direction in draft reform was accepted. Now Congress must reassert its initiative in this area.

Hearings should be scheduled in the House early this session to consider the major reform we had intended to handle last session.

We should consider carefully national standardization of deferments. I personally feel that deferments, with the exception of those for family hardship, should be eliminated.

We should look anew at the quotas ascribed to States and to local draft boards. They are anachronistic and should be abandoned.

The imposition of a lottery over the framework of draft board quotas can only serve to distort the system. Any way you analyze it, a quota system combined with a lottery works to the advantage of some young men and to the disadvantage of others because of variations in the distribution of draft eligible men by birth dates across the Nation.

If we are going to call young men by birth dates, then men born on the same day should go into the service at the same time, no matter where they live. Instead of State and local manpower pools we should consider the national manpower pool.

It is clear now that the draft, despite administration reforms, remains plagued with inequities, clouded with confusion. Our young men deserve to have the facts; facts about the selective service and where they stand within that system.

Congress must act to truly reform the system, and at the same time make sure that each young man has the information that will enable him to make wise decisions about his future military service.

Congress should begin that overdue

study of the draft system at an early date and enact comprehensive reform as soon as possible.

Congress should not be a party to the continued confusion over the administration's draft system.

MILITARY IMPORTANCE OF IRRADIATION PRESERVATION OF FOODS

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have learned, much to my dismay, that the Army plans to terminate its research and development activities in the preservation of foods by ionizing radiation. This action is in direct contradiction to the repeated assurances I have received from responsible Army officials over the past decade, the most recent only last September, of the determination of the Army to see this program through to fruition, because of the great potential value of irradiation processed foods for use in military rations. There was no disagreement with the 5-year food irradiation program which the Army submitted last September although I would have preferred to see an increase in funding to cover new accounting for facilities and installation support as well as inflation. Now the Army proposes to terminate the entire program at the end of the current fiscal year—1970—without ever realizing the yield from an input in excess of \$35 million.

I am convinced it would be a great mistake for the Army at this juncture to terminate or even curtail its portion of the national food irradiation program. Setting aside the general scientific and humanitarian potential, the anticipated benefit of the food irradiation preservation process of the military remains unchanged from the time General Hertford testified back in May 1955, before the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He stated then:

Radiation sterilization can thus provide a fresh sterile product or a cooked sterile product with far better taste and textures than available from conventional canning and other preservative methods.

In March 1960, Gen. Herbert B. Loper, in testimony before the same subcommittee said:

The Department of Defense is particularly interested in radiation processing as a means of improving subsistence for the fighting forces * * *.

It is my firm belief that the Army would be derelict in not exploiting the food irradiation process for the benefit of our military personnel. Certain foods like large hams and roasts cannot be maintained in a highly acceptable, fresh-like, ready-to-eat form for long times by any other food preservation method known today except refrigeration. Irradiation preservation would permit the need for refrigeration space—and attendant costs—to be eliminated or allow it be used to provide other forms of subsistence like fresh fruits and vegetables which cannot be preserved by any means other than refrigeration.

Unquestionably costs and budgetary

limitations are primary considerations. But the total cost picture must be analyzed.

Prof. Walter Urbain, of Michigan State University, recently sent me a copy of a speech he delivered last October in which he showed that the Defense Department could have saved approximately \$12,000,000 in 1 year had irradiated meats been available for the Southeast Asian theater. It is obvious that the ultimate dollar savings the Defense Department would realize worldwide each year would be many times the additional research and development costs required to bring irradiated foods into the ration system.

Over and above the dollar savings, the statement by General Ely before the subcommittee in March of 1962 adds further impetus to this program:

In regard to this question of the benefits to the military, there are, also, I am sure you realize, some intangible benefits that you can't put in terms of dollars. When you have troops operating as individuals or small units, well removed from their kitchens or in an area where there is a shortage of water, foods that are prepared by these methods (irradiation) can give answers to the feeding problems that you can't obtain nearly as well by other methods.

I am familiar with the many problems besetting the Army in attempting to select R. & D. priorities in times of austerity in funds and manpower. However, the ultimate weapon is man; our military machines and armaments are only as effective as the men, physically nourished and psychologically motivated, who operate them. Good, wholesome food is vital to the military man. The high dose food irradiation process, in spite of temporary setbacks in the proof of wholesomeness, has been shown not only to be scientifically feasible but also to have the potential for dramatically upgrading the quality of military subsistence while reducing costs.

It must be noted that we have been dealing with a fortuitous set of circumstances in providing subsistence for our men and our allies in Southeast Asia. There we are involved in a limited war in a region where we have naval and air superiority. At great logistic cost and effort, we have been able to provide the Armed Forces in most instances with foods preserved by refrigeration. I often wonder what subsistence problems we would have to face if we were committed concurrently to conflicts in several widely dispersed theaters where we could not always assure such naval and air superiority. It is under circumstances such as these, where supply and resupply are indeed most difficult, that these prepackaged, ready-to-eat, irradiation preserved foods would be a great boon to our fighting men. It would be shortsighted indeed to turn our back on the unique advantages of this new food preservation process.

From time to time I learn of the interest of the military of other countries in food irradiation. Many of our allies look to us for leadership—and in time of emergency they would be better prepared for their role in our mutual defense if they could have irradiation processed foods upon which their forces could subsist. The Soviet Union recognizes the merits of irradiation processing. It has

announced its use on a broad scale, even including its cosmonauts.

I am convinced that the Army must persevere. It has done an outstanding job with its excellent team of scientists in the world's finest facility for research in food irradiation. It must not quit now when success is within its grasp. I am convinced from all I have heard and read, and from statements by the Army Medical Department in the June 1965 hearings by the Joint Committee, that irradiation sterilized foods are wholesome. All that is needed is the compilation of additional evidence which will reassure the Food and Drug Administration on this issue.

The Army seeks to justify its proposed termination of the program on the basis of the high investment risk involved in obtaining sufficient scientific evidence to convince the FDA. It is precisely this same argument which persuaded us to undertake this high-risk, high-payoff program in the first place. It is the Government which must sponsor programs like this simply because private enterprise cannot. Except for final proof of wholesomeness, the Army has solved all other major high-risk scientific and technological factors in this program—flavor, texture, color, and packaging. There is no doubt that the wholesomeness of irradiated foods will also be proved—witness the statements by the Army Medical Department as recently as July 1968, that irradiation sterilized foods are wholesome and the steadily growing list of irradiated foods approved by health authorities in other countries.

The latter is particularly significant, because of the nonmilitary, basic public health potential of this program for an overgrown, undernourished world population. National nutritional needs have been the subject of recent congressional hearings and an extensive White House Conference. Both the Congress and the administration are publicly committed to improving the nutritional status of our people. Because of their longer shelf life, irradiation processed foods can ease distribution problems in our supply system and materially assist in this venture. There is no doubt that the trend today is to devote more of our resources to the health and welfare of the individual citizen.

The Army's food irradiation program is perhaps the most innovative of all the food programs in the Nation and one of few which meets significant military needs while offering the promise of major civilian application in furtherance of national policy. To terminate it is contrary to that policy—indeed it is contrary to good sense. To transfer it to another Government agency at this time would likely so delay its progress, through loss of momentum and the assembled highly competent, dedicated, scientific, and managerial personnel, as to essentially kill the program. Such a suggestion is totally unrealistic and unacceptable.

I consider the Army's food irradiation program to be too important to be sacrificed on the altar of budgetary economies. I urge the Army to proceed full speed with a program which has as its goal provision to the military consumer in the 1970's of an assortment of high

quality irradiation preserved meats, poultry and related foods.

I plan to pursue these objectives both during the Armed Services Committee hearings on the Defense Department's budget covering the Army's high-dose food irradiation program and the Joint Committee's authorization hearings covering the AEC's low-dose food irradiation program.

SALLY MAE NOMINATED FOR CAMPUS QUEEN

(Mr. ERLNBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. ERLNBORN. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, called the attention of Members of Congress to a letter he had received from the Liberal Arts Constituent Assembly of the University of Texas at Arlington. The gentleman noted that the assembly reported that many financial institutions in the Dallas-Fort Worth area were not making student loans, and he charged that bankers were "still holding students hostage in order to increase profits."

It seems to me that Congressman PATMAN's conclusions demonstrate a lack of consistency and are wanting solid ground on which to stand. On the one hand, he asserts that the guaranteed student loan program offers commercial banks still another "get rich" opportunity; and, on the other hand, he chastises banks for not participating in the program. If the guaranteed student loan program does indeed provide what the gentleman apparently considers to be an unconscionable profit, would it not then follow that not only banks but credit unions and savings and loans would be vying to make these loans—and that students then would have no difficulty whatsoever in getting loans?

I do not argue with him that lending institutions profit by making these loans, although I find no evil in efforts by profitmaking organizations to provide a return to their investors. I would also agree with the gentleman that the Federal Government should not bear the lion's share of the financial burden involved in putting the young people of this country through college. My question is, Should we castigate the banks, which have made 87 percent of the loans under this program, or should we direct our criticism at credit unions and savings and loans for not getting more involved?

I believe we and our young people would be better served by directing our attention, our energies, and our actions to finding an answer to the problem and getting to the business of a workable solution.

Last week, the Evening Star printed a column by Sylvia Porter showing what has been accomplished by the guaranteed student loan program. Miss Porter reported that, since the first loan was made in 1966—just 4 years ago—\$2 billion have gone into the pockets of 2,500,000 collegians. The cost to taxpayers, the Office of Education advises me, was \$112,000,000. This means we have made one Federal dollar do the work of 20. To my way

of thinking, this is making the Federal dollar work. And no other Federal program that I know of has reached as far to serve so many at such small cost.

Moreover, this program has achieved this success in spite of the difficult market conditions of the past year or two which have created drastic shortages in money for housing and other forms of credit.

Why then do some college students find they cannot get the money they need?

It is because these loans lack liquidity for the lender. They are relatively long-term loans for small amounts and involve considerably more paperwork than do home mortgages and other credit transactions. As a consequence, they are not attractive to the secondary money market—to those large investors who purchase loans in lots from lenders, thus providing them with new funds with which to make more loans.

What is needed is a Student Loan Marketing Association, a Sally Mae for the student loan program, patterned after Fannie Mae—Federal National Mortgage Association—and Ginny Mae—Government National Mortgage Association—for the home loan program.

Sally Mae would have the power to hold pools of student loans, acquired either from an originating lender or a subsequent holder, and to issue its own securities. The original lender would continue to service the loans, that is, process applications and make collections. Student loans, void of the administrative burden that accompanies them, would thus become a profitable investment for retirement funds, pension and welfare funds, endowment funds, and the like; and adequate moneys would become available for those young people who need to borrow to go to college.

Mr. Speaker, I include the February 2, 1970, column on this subject by Sylvia Porter in the Evening Star in the Record at this point:

STUDENT PROGRAM LIVES!

(By Sylvia Porter)

To the surprise of many, the federal-state guaranteed student loan program is still alive. Actually it is expanding in the face of the tight credit situation.

This is the major program, launched by the Higher Education Act of 1965, to help middle-grade students from middle-income families finance their way through college, business, trade, technical and vocational schools. Below are some guides to getting one of these low-interest, deferred payment, educational loans—but first, are some up-to-date facts and observations.

Last summer this program was drying—because the maximum lenders could get on the loans was 7 percent and they had to give exceedingly generous repayment terms as well. As interest rates rose far above 7 percent on much safer loans, there seemed no hope for the program unless it was sweetened considerably.

Finally the White House got behind and pushed through a law which permits the Secretary of Health, Education & Welfare to make a "special allowance" to lenders of up to 3 percent above the 7 percent charged to students. In short, students still get 7 percent insured loans—but lenders can earn up to 10. The incentive payments were made retroactive to Aug. 1 and President Nixon urged lenders to make loans for the 1970 school year.

This has been the record to now:

In the first six months of fiscal 1970, \$570 million was loaned and the target for all of 1970 is \$794 million, highest since the program began. Since fiscal 1966, 2,500,000 loans have been made totaling \$2 billion. Lenders got an incentive payment of 2 percent in the August-September period and 2 1/4 percent in the September-December quarter, making their returns 9 and 9 1/4 percent.

Of the total of loans, 87 percent have been made by commercial banks; 98.3 percent have gone to students from families with adjusted incomes of under \$15,000; 79 percent to students from families with incomes under \$9,000.

Now, pressure is mounting for a law to create a new government corporation which would have access to Treasury funds with which to buy student loans from private lenders in order to free the lenders to make more loans. The corporation would be called Student Loan Marketing Association.

The program has survived despite overwhelming odds. It is filling a great need, is gaining recognition, is likely to play a much broader role. Now to details for students.

You are eligible for a loan regardless of your family's financial status if you are in good academic standing at an approved institution. The loan is made to you, not your parents.

You can borrow up to a maximum of \$1,500 per academic year, but your total may not exceed \$7,500 at any time. Your maximum rate is 7 percent plus an insurance premium of 1/4 percent prepaid on each loan. If your family's adjusted income is under \$15,000, the government will pay the total interest while you're in school. All of you will pay the full interest during the repayment period.

Your repayment begins between nine and 12 months after you leave school and is normally scheduled for five to 10 years.

You may apply at any one of 20,000 participating institutions across the country—banks, savings & loan associations, credit unions, pension funds, insurance companies, eligible schools. The loan is made at the discretion of the lender, though. Before you even begin, it would be wise to ask your college or school financial aid officer for guidance.

You also may get vital information from the "Director, Higher Education" in regions I to IX in these headquarter cities: Boston, New York, Charlottesville, Atlanta, Chicago, Kansas City, Mo., Dallas, Denver, San Francisco.

This program is the best financial source for the nonscholarship student of the middle-income family. If you are eligible, start tracking down a lender now.

EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW?

(Mr. MANN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on the architecture of the magnificent building occupied by the Supreme Court of the United States appear these words, "Equal Justice Under Law." Seldom in the history of our country has any large segment of our people doubted the promise which this language holds forth. But now, Mr. Speaker, a large segment of our Nation is questioning this promise. They are questioning it because certain agencies within the executive branch of our Government are not seeking evenhanded justice throughout this land. Courts traditionally deal with litigation which is brought before them in accordance with established procedures, but there is a

clear indication that our courts, notably the Supreme Court, are legislating, and in the process are tyrannically ordering immediate implementation of their newly proclaimed laws. Such unreasonable enforcement falls upon those unfortunates who happen to be in court when the newly made judicial law is announced. Is there no duty upon the Court to see that evenhanded justice is meted out in like manner across the width and breadth of this land? If the argument should be made that the Court is only equipped to enforce its pronouncements in cases actually pending before it, then it immediately becomes the duty of the Executive, through the Attorney General, to see that all are treated alike. It likewise is the duty of the Executive to see that my tax money and the tax money of the people of my State is properly used by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to work its fanatical will in the North and in the East and in the West, rather than almost solely in the South.

The Chronicle, of Clinton, S.C., published in its edition of February 5, 1970, an article by Thurman Sensing entitled "South Pulls Itself Upward." I include this article at this point in the RECORD:

SOUTH PULLS ITSELF UPWARD

(By Thurman Sensing, executive vice president, Southern States Industrial Council)

The progress the Southern states have made in the last three decades can be attributed in part to changing attitudes toward the region among people elsewhere in the nation. For many decades after the Civil War, the South was the poor relation of the rest of the country. It was treated in a discriminatory fashion. No "foreign aid" or anything of that sort was granted to the South in the late 19th and early 20th century as it struggled to regain its economic place in the nation. The benefits known by such defeated nations as Germany and Japan were never lavished on the part of the United States that had known civil war.

Pulling itself up by its own bootstraps, the South rebuilt its financial institutions and commercial organizations. It persuaded national manufacturing companies to invest in the region. It was a long, slow process, but in the 1940s the South began to surge ahead. The quality of its state government improved dramatically, and the Southern states, with their strengthened economies, started to devote a much larger share of their revenues to education, both basic and higher. The vexing problem of freight rates, which retarded commerce, was eased. The federal government paid more attention to Southern ports. Industrialists elsewhere in the country gained a new appreciation of the ability and responsibility of the region's labor force and recognized that Southern legislatures were industry-minded and eager for progress through investor-owned enterprises.

The result of all this has been a wonderful forward movement on the part of the Southern states continuing from the 1940s now into the 1970s. Patterns of Southern industrialization are changing, with more highly skilled and complex industries relocating in this region and making better use of the schools, colleges and universities of the South.

One reason the south has progressed is that its people believe strongly in local government and in other basics of the American political tradition. This region has few hippies and other dissenters from American ideals.

The universities are not factories of ideological unrest, which, tragically, is the case in some areas such as the Northeast. State

governments are not dominated by the union bosses, who are virtual political czars in some Northern states. Thus opportunities for further advancement, through the free enterprise system, are extraordinarily good in the Southern states.

Unfortunately, there are elements in the nation with a profound sectional bias against the South. There are those who want to radicalize the South and to punish it for not taking the ultra-liberal tack espoused in some influential intellectual circles. These elements have urged a double standard of judgment and justice. They would make the South's lot far harder than the lot of any other area.

We see this today in the determination to impose on the Southern states requirements for teacher transfers and busing of school children that are not made elsewhere. We see Southern school districts ordered to meet disruptive and virtually impossible timetables which are not imposed elsewhere in the nation.

It is tragic, shocking and almost incredible that after so many years of Southern progress there should be an effort made to plunge Southern schools into chaos while the schools of other regions, with the same mix of students, should escape serious government interference.

Several Southern governors have made this point in recent days, and their appeal for equal justice should be heeded by fairminded Americans in every state. The governors aren't refusing to alter school systems according to court order; they are simply saying that if one type of school system is to be made mandatory for the South, the same system should be ordered for Massachusetts, Illinois, California and the other states. If a time-table is set for Atlanta, it should be set for Boston and Pittsburgh.

The United States can't have two sets of federal laws—one oppressive of the Southern states and one leaving the other states to do as they please in school arrangements. Constitutionally, the schools are the business of the states and local government. But the federal courts have ruled otherwise. It is intolerable, however, to see court orders issued that deprive the Southern states of equal justice under the law—that impose conditions of chaos on this region while leaving the schools in other areas virtually free of interference.

The unequal orders issued by the courts in recent weeks threaten to undo much of the progress made in the South over a period of many decades. The situation should offend the sense of fair play of the entire American people.

RELIEF FOR FLORIDA SCHOOLS

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Florida congressional delegation are working in unison in an effort to find relief for Florida schools and those in other States from oppressive court rulings which threaten educational programs. Toward this end, a number of bills have been introduced which are designed to obtain relief if enactment can be obtained. These include proposed laws as well as constitutional amendments. These have as a basic objective relief from forced busing and a guarantee of freedom of choice in school selection. They would also insure against continued discrimination toward southern schools by requiring the same rulings to be applied nationwide. This is not now done.

One constitutional amendment would

specify reappointment of Federal judges at 6-year intervals and a requirement that they have prior judicial experience. Another amendment would make it unconstitutional to force a person to do or perform any act "against his will when required on the basis of race, color, or national origin." The third amendment would make it unconstitutional for the U.S. Government to deny freedom of choice to any parent in the selection of a school for his child directly or by means of a condition to the receipt of Federal financial assistance.

A meeting also has been held by the Florida delegation with Governor Kirk and other school officials. At this meeting the Governor was requested, as the titular head of government in Florida, to seek a joint conference with President Nixon for full and complete discussion of school issues in an effort to obtain a constructive solution. If it is found that the President is not available for discussion of the school problem, the group will seek a meeting with Vice President AGNEW and his special committee which is being formed to assist the South in solving school problems.

The bills which I and others have introduced are as follows:

H.R.—

A bill providing that discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or national origin is prohibited

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) no person shall be refused admission into or excluded from any public school in any State on account of race, creed, color, or national origin.

(b) Except with the express approval of a board of education having jurisdiction, a majority of the members of such board having been elected, no student shall be assigned or compelled to attend any school on account of race, creed, color, or national origin, or for the purpose of achieving equality in attendance or increased attendance or reduced attendance, at any school, of persons of one or more particular races, creeds, colors, or national origins; and no school district, school zone or attendance unit, by whatever name known, shall be established, reorganized, or maintained for any such purpose, provided that nothing contained in this section shall prevent the assignment of a pupil in the manner requested or authorized by his parents or guardian.

H.R.—

A bill relating to the policy with respect to the application of certain provisions of Federal law

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the policy of the United States that guidelines and criteria established pursuant to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and section 182 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966 shall be applied uniformly in all regions of the United States in dealing with conditions or segregation by race in the schools of the local educational agencies of any State without regard to the origin or cause of such segregation.

H.J. RES. 1054

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to freedom of choice in attending public schools

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America

in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"No citizen shall be compelled against his will to do or perform any act required on the basis of race, color, or national origin."

H.J. RES. 1055

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to freedom of choice in attending public schools

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"The right of any citizen to be assigned to the public school of his parents' or guardian's choice if a minor, or to the public school of his choice if an adult, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States either directly or by means of a condition to the receipt of Federal financial assistance."

H.J. RES. 1047

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appointments of Supreme Court and other Federal judges be required to be reconfirmed every six years, to require five years' prior judicial experience as a qualification for appointment to the Supreme Court, and to require retirement of Federal judges at the age of seventy years

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of final passage by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No person may serve as a judge of the Supreme Court or of any court ordained and established under section 1 of article III unless the Senate reconfirms his appointment to that office during the last year of each period of six calendar years beginning after the year of his initial appointment, except that for the purposes of this article a judge holding office on the date of the ratification of this article by a sufficient number of States shall be deemed to have been initially appointed as such on the date of ratification.

"SEC. 2. No person may be appointed as a judge of the Supreme Court who, at the time of his appointment, has not served for at least five years as a judge of a court of record of a State or of a court provided for in section 1 of article III.

SEC. 3. No person who has attained the age of seventy years may serve as a judge of any court of the United States but any person who ceases to serve as a judge of such a court because he has attained the age of seventy years shall continue to receive the compensation to which he was entitled as a judge."

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. The Nobel Prize is awarded yearly to those who had most benefited mankind the preceding year. Since the first awards were made in 1901, Americans have received 11 Peace Awards, 24 medicine-physiology, 12 for chemistry, and 20 for physics. Americans are the leading recipients in each of these fields.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for Monday, February 9, and Tuesday, February 10, on account of death in the family.

Mr. McDADE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for February 5 indefinitely on account of influenza illness.

Mr. HALL for today and tomorrow, February 9 and 10, 1970, on account of official business with Committee on Armed Services.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SCHERLE, for 1 hour, on February 17, for the purpose of eulogizing the late Honorable Ben Franklin Jensen; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARVEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. MACGREGOR, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. DICKINSON, for 60 minutes, February 18.

Mr. DELLENBACK, for 60 minutes, today.
The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. HAMILTON, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. ALBERT, for 60 minutes, on February 10.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, for 60 minutes, on February 17.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 60 minutes, on February 24.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BETTS in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. QUIE to extend his remarks on S. 2214 prior to passage today.

Mr. JARMAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARVEY) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. McEWEN.

Mr. KEITH in four instances.
 Mr. HOGAN.
 Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.
 Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. CONTE.
 Mr. SCHERLE.
 Mr. PELLY in two instances.
 Mr. RAILSBACK.
 Mr. MCKNEALLY.
 Mr. MORSE.
 Mrs. MAY in two instances.
 Mr. HORTON in two instances.
 Mr. DELLENBACK in three instances.
 Mr. POFF.
 Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
 Mr. SCHADEBERG in two instances.
 Mr. BROCK.
 Mr. WHALLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOWARD in two instances.
 Mr. JACOBS.
 Mr. STOKES.
 Mr. LONG of Maryland.
 Mr. FARBERSTEIN in three instances.
 Mr. VAN DEERLIN.
 Mr. OTTINGER in three instances.
 Mr. SCHEUER in four instances.
 Mr. ANDERSON of California.
 Mr. ULLMAN in 10 instances.
 Mr. MOLLOHAN in three instances.
 Mr. RARICK in three instances.
 Mr. RYAN in three instances.
 Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.
 Mr. JONES of Tennessee.
 Mr. KYROS in three instances.
 Mr. FOUNTAIN in three instances.
 Mr. PUCINSKI in 10 instances.
 Mr. MANN in two instances.
 Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.
 Mr. DULSKI in six instances.
 Mr. KASTENMEIER in two instances.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a compilation of the hearings, reports, and committee prints of the Senate Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations entitled "Planning-Programming-Budgeting", to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 10, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1621. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the status of the acquisition of selected major weapon systems, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1622. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on U.S. assistance to Guatemala; Department of State, Agency for International Development, Peace Corps, and Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1623. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969 (H. Doc. No. 91-223); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1624. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of certain banks of the Farm Credit System supervised by the Farm Credit Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969 (H. Doc. No. 91-224); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1625. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on employee personal property claims settled under 31 U.S.C. 240-242, during calendar year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 241(e); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1626. A letter from the Federal and State Cochairmen; Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission; transmitting a report on the activities of the Commission for the period July 1, 1968-June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. EVINS: Select Committee on Small Business. Problems facing the tool and die industry (Rept. No. 91-832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 914. A bill for the relief of Hood River County, Oreg.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10068. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain contracts entered into by the Secretary of Commerce (Rept. No. 91-834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15143. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide the grade of lieutenant general for an officer serving as the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-835). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15142. A bill to authorize any former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to recompute his military retired pay under certain circumstances (Rept. No. 91-836). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. ZWACH, and Mr. KARTH):

H.R. 15770. A bill to provide for conserving surface waters; to preserve and improve habitat for migratory waterfowl and other wildlife resources; to reduce runoff, soil and wind erosion, and contribute to flood control; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 15771. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to ban glue and paint products containing toxic solvents, when they do not meet certain specifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15772. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 15 per centum increase in annuities and to change the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 15773. A bill to provide disability insurance coverage to certain individuals who are totally disabled as a result of service-connected disability and are retired on disability from the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 15774. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG (for himself and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 15775. A bill to amend section 120 of title 23, United States Code, to increase to 75 per centum the Federal share of projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DELLENBACK (for himself, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. AYRES, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. BUSH, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. ESCH, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. MYERS, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RUTH, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. WYDLER):

H.R. 15776. A bill to provide a consolidated, comprehensive child development program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EILBERG (for himself, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 15777. A bill to provide assistance to local educational agencies in constructing needed school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 15778. A bill to establish a structure that will provide integrated knowledge and understanding of the ecological, social, and technological problems associated with air pollution, water pollution, solid waste disposal, general pollution, and degradation of the environment, and other related problems; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 15779. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 15780. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to confer standing on private persons to sue for relief from pollution; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 15781. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (by request):

H.R. 15782. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 15783. A bill to extend the life of the Public Land Law Review Commission in order that the Commission may study proposals and recommend legislation for the protection of the environment; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McKNEALLY:

H.R. 15784. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 15-percent increase in annuities and to change the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 15785. A bill to strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 15786. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to give the Interstate Commerce Commission additional authority to alleviate freight car shortages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15787. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to restrict contracts for services relating to the positions of guards, elevator operators, messengers, and custodians; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 15788. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include the provisions of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15789. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to extend protection against fraudulent or deceptive practices, condemned by that act to consumers through civil actions, and to provide for class actions for acts in fraud of consumers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUILLLEN:

H.R. 15790. A bill to prevent the reduction or loss of veterans' compensation and pension benefits as the result of increases in social security or railroad retirement benefits attributable solely to the general benefit increase provided by the Social Security Amendments of 1969; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 15791. A bill to amend section 3287 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the crediting of prior active commissioned service in any armed force to officers appointed in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 15792. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 15793. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the making of grants to medical schools and hospitals to assist them in establishing special departments and programs in the field of family practice, and otherwise to encourage and promote the training of medical and paramedical

personnel in the field of family medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUTH:

H.R. 15794. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by adding a new title, which restores to local school boards their constitutional power to administer the public schools committed to their charge, confers on parents the right to choose the public schools their children attend, secures to children the right to attend the public schools chosen by their parents, and makes effective the right of public school administrators and teachers to serve in the schools in which they contract to serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 15795. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 15796. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide medical and dental care in service facilities for certain persons on the same basis as for a member of a uniformed service who is on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15797. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15798. A bill to safeguard further the rights of armed service members whose military careers must be terminated by reason of illness or injury; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15799. A bill to amend section 1682 of title 38, United States Code, so as to modify the number of classroom instruction hours under the farm cooperative program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15800. A bill to amend chapter 31, section 1502(a) of title 38, United States Code, to provide that Vietnam era veterans shall have the same basic entitlement to vocational rehabilitation as do veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15801. A bill to authorize reconsideration of the eligibility of certain former members of the Armed Forces for disability retirement; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15802. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to provide mustering-out payments for certain members discharged from the Armed Forces after August 5, 1964; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 15803. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H. Con. Res. 501. Concurrent resolution requiring that any individual employed in a facility which serves food in the Senate or the House of Representatives be tested periodically for tuberculosis; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Con. Res. 502. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Interior prescribe and implement regulations for the harvesting of northern fur seals to insure quick and painless death before skinning; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 828. Resolution to amend rule XLIV of the House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 15804. A bill for the relief of Amalia Delfina DeLaRoca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 15805. A bill for the relief of Warren Bearcloud, Perry Pretty Paint, Agatha Horse Chief House, Marie Pretty Paint Wallace, and Pera Pretty Paint Not Afraid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 15806. A bill for the relief of Solomon Simtab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

284. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to funds to implement child feeding programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

285. Also, a memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to doubling the foster grandparents program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

286. Also, a memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to establishing a national cemetery in the Commonwealth; to the Committee on Veteran's Affairs.

287. Also, a memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to providing for an increase in social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

288. Also, a memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a cost of living index formula in social security benefit payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

289. Also, a memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to making all persons eligible for medicare coverage upon reaching age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

290. Also, a memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to basic social security benefits on the 10 highest years of the worker's earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

291. Also, a memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to increasing retirement allowances to certain widows under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

292. Also, a memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to removing the restriction on the amount of income a person may earn while receiving social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

293. Also, a memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to administration of the Federal old age assistance program by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through the social security system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

387. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to the budget for fiscal year 1971; to the Committee on Appropriations.

388. Also, petition of L. W. McPhaul, Avondale, Colo., relative to the people's rights concerning water; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.