

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 27

OCTOBER 9, 1970, TO OCTOBER 14, 1970
(PAGES 35917 TO 37262)

ities. Headstart parents and teachers have struggled and succeeded in proving that funds for early child development can make a difference. How, then, can we justify a reduced commitment at this time?

When Headstart was launched 5 years ago, its founders envisioned a comprehensive program which would meet a multitude of interrelated needs. Unfortunately, initial evaluations of the results emphasized cognitive and IQ gains to the exclusion of many other aspects of the program, and it is on this basis that Headstart has been largely judged. As we have begun to define our goals more realistically, however, it has become clear that some of Headstart's most significant achievements have occurred in other areas. In health care, for instance, a study by the Bureau of the Census revealed that more than 90 percent of the children enrolled in both summer and full-year Headstart programs in 1968 received medical examinations through Headstart. These examinations revealed a health problem in 35 percent of the children in full-year programs and in 43 percent of the children in summer programs. According to responses sent to the parents of children with health problems, 85 percent of those in full-year programs and 73 percent of those in summer programs received treatment.

The recently released Kirschner report—A National Survey of the Impacts of Headstart Centers on Community Institutions—reveals yet another role of Headstart as a change agent which has played a key part in influencing local institutions to become more responsive to the needs of the poor. According to the new Director of the Office of Child Development, Dr. Edward Zigler, this study is "one of the most important social documents of the past decade." The report surveyed 58 communities having Headstart and seven comparison communities not having Headstart, and the impact of the program was found to be tremendous—1,496 institutional changes were identified—1,055 in the field of education, and 441 in health. As Dr. Zigler comments:

Where there was Headstart there was tremendous community movement in respect to two important institutions which bear directly upon the lives of children and their families.

The controversial Westinghouse report found the degree of parental involvement and approval of Headstart to be significant, and thus confirmed that the beneficial effects of the program extend far beyond the confines of the child development center itself. It also taught us more about what we can reasonably expect from a short-term summer program, and led to a greater emphasis on full-year Headstart.

It is apparent that a great deal has been learned in the past 5 years about the needs of the young child, and the potential of early childhood development programs to meet those needs. The creation of the Office of Child Development reflected our recognition that Headstart programs must be coordinated with other early childhood programs if they are to achieve maximum effectiveness. We are on the verge of a real breakthrough in

the provision of services to insure equal opportunity to the Nation's children before they are crippled by the effects of poverty, discrimination, and neglect. And yet, appropriations for Headstart are threatened by drastic cuts.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting our distinguished Appropriations Committee's recommendation to restore the \$17.7 million which the House has cut from the President's Headstart request. Even this increase will meet the needs of only 31 percent of the children who could benefit from Headstart services. To do less would be criminal.

In the years ahead, however, we must set our sights even higher if we are to take full advantage of the lessons which Headstart has taught us. We can succeed in developing positive programs of great impact, but these efforts will not be enough unless they are accompanied by the full fiscal commitment required to meet the needs of all the Nation's disadvantaged young children.

IMPENDING WINTER FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, all of us are now aware, and many of us were warning months ago, about the impending crisis of a winter fuel shortage.

While there are, admittedly, a number of factors behind this growing problem, a major factor—and the least excusable factor—is the insistence by this administration of maintaining quotas on oil imports. Especially damaging to the upper Midwest are the quotas on Canadian oil without which our own refineries cannot possibly meet the needs of the schools, factories, and other institutions for residual fuel oil. In fact, the administration last spring actually cut the allowable inputs of Canadian crude into this district by some 150,000 barrels a day.

Mr. President, the situation in Minnesota is particularly serious, and I must admit that I am not encouraged by the administration's faint hope for a mild winter. While I, too, would like to wish a mild winter for my State, this is not an occurrence upon which I care to place much faith, and I would be greatly more encouraged by more Canadian oil for our refineries and by more sensitivity to the needs of our consumers, taxpayers, and businesses who will pay the price this winter for what could be an avoidable fuel shortage.

I think the problem was particularly well summarized in a recent editorial of the Minneapolis Star, dated October 8, 1970. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Minneapolis Star, Oct. 8, 1970]

A WINTER FUEL SHORTAGE

Suddenly, it seems, the nation faces the prospect of a winter fuel shortage. We have the assurances of Paul W. McCracken, chairman of President Nixon's Council on Economic Advisers, that "No homes this winter are going to be without fuel." But the admission that some industries may have to curtail operations occasionally this winter makes those assurances shaky.

The American people will be justified in asking how a nation with such an abundance

of energy resources could reach this point. Whatever system we have for meeting the energy needs of the people obviously isn't working the way it should.

Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans has announced the nation will undertake its first comprehensive study of the nation's mineral resources since 1950; another government commission currently is studying energy resources. We can hope that these studies will tell us what the resources are, what the needs are expected to be for a specified period and what steps are required to fill the gap, if any—call it a national energy plan.

In the meantime, we have to hope that the minimal Nixon administration response to the fuel crisis will be adequate and do as McCracken urged earlier—"pray for a benign weatherman this winter."

The administration's efforts have included steps to speed up the return of coal hopper cars, establishment of a joint board of top officers of several agencies to identify emergency problems and some changes in the oil import quota regulations which have been characterized as more important as a symbol than in substance.

Under normal circumstances, there is little justification for import quotas; with the nation facing a fuel shortage, they are outrageous.

A DEBT TO OUR PARENTS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, today, some of our young people are very critical of the United States. To them it seems that everything is wrong with the world and nothing is right. They blame their parents and grandparents for creating these problems and accuse them of not doing anything to solve them.

Recently, in a graduation speech, Dr. Eric A. Walker, president of Pennsylvania State University, quoted Northwestern University Prof. Bergen Evans, who had gathered some important facts about today's parents and grandparents. In just five decades—1919 to 1969—these people have increased our life expectancy, cut the working day, and vastly increased per capita output. They have cured diseases, greatly improved the standard of living, and fought three wars.

Dr. Walker's speech is significant in a time when criticism far outweighs gratitude. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the September 11, 1969, commencement address be printed in the RECORD.

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

MEET SOME REMARKABLE PEOPLE

923. Dr. Eric A. Walker, President of Pennsylvania State University speaking to a graduating class:

Not long ago an educator from Northwestern University by the name of Bergen Evans, a radio performer known to your parents, got together some facts about these two generations—your parents and grandparents. I'd like to share some of these facts with you.

These—your parents and grandparents—are the people who within just five decades—1919–1969—have by their work increased your life expectancy by approximately 50 percent—who while cutting the working day by a third, have more than doubled per capita output.

These are the people who have given you a healthier world than they found. And because of this you no longer have to fear epidemics of flu, typhus, diphtheria, smallpox, scarlet fever, measles, or mumps that they