

U.S. Congress



UNITED STATES

OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 8

APRIL 1, 1970, TO APRIL 10, 1970

(PAGES 9923 TO 11270)

of our economy can do the job alone. It must be a joint effort involving not only federal, state and local governments, but also the private sector, including profit-making organizations . . . this bill encourages private industry to become participants in the area of child development. At present such organizations (private schools) provide more than half of the pre-school and day care services available, and they are able to do it in areas where government services are not available and give services of equal or better quality at equal or lower cost than public programs. It obviously makes sense to use this tremendous potential."

The act also provides for evaluation of present programs and future needs, and for training of professional or paraprofessional personnel. It should need no larger funds than are presently being spent on child care and development programs. Sen. Murphy estimates the cost at \$123 million for fiscal year 1971 and \$125 million for fiscal 1972.

Disadvantaged children will be given priority, but the involvement of private enterprise will make such services available to children other than from low income families. Thus it is designed to help 12 million children of working mothers and not only the 3 million of preschool age whose mothers are very poor.

Will the Democrats support this bill? It is hard to see on what grounds they can criticize it, for it aims to improve the child care services for disadvantaged children and ease the lot of mothers on welfare, so that a larger number of them will be able to seek gainful employment. We can see no reason to object to bringing private enterprise (private schools) into the plan, if these schools "give services of equal or better quality at equal or lower cost than public programs." To socialists that idea will probably be abhorrent, but let them answer the question why 9 million working mothers who are not on welfare should be deprived of the child care and development facilities given to 3 million disadvantaged children.

We think any bill which aims to help working mother should be judged to the total number of those it will help and also by the criterion of cost. By both standards this Murphy-Prouty bill seems an excellent measure.

#### OIL POLICY HURTS MIDWEST

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, there has been widespread criticism of President Nixon's recent order limiting imports of Canadian oil. This action was the subject of an editorial published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on March 30, 1970. The Pioneer Press said that the President's "restrictive order will stimulate higher prices at a time when inflation control is needed. Southwest oil producers will be protected from competition at the expense of Midwest consumers."

The editorial also said that this "ill advised policy" is of "doubtful validity" because bringing in crude oil from Canada would not threaten our national security. I believe that the editorial effectively states the case for cancelling this unwise order, as a bipartisan group of 25 Senators from northern States has urged.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### OIL POLICY HURTS MIDWEST

A vigorous protest against President Nixon's order to reduce imports of low price crude oil from Canada has been made by a

bipartisan group of 25 senators headed by Walter Mondale of Minnesota. Among them are both Majority Leader Mike Mansfield of Montana and Minority Leader Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania.

This restrictive order will deprive refiners and consumers in Minnesota and the Midwest generally of needed supplies of Canadian oil now coming in by pipeline. It will stimulate higher prices at a time when inflation control is needed. Southwest oil producers will be protected from competition at the expense of Midwest consumers.

Senators from the entire northern tier of states all the way from Montana to the Atlantic coast, plus others in the Midwest and East, joined in the protest. They urge the President to defer implementing his order limiting imports to 395,000 barrels a day and to direct the State Department "to enter into immediate negotiations with Canada looking toward the prompt establishment of a freer exchange of petroleum."

The objection to the Administration action should be headed by the White House. The Midwest has been getting about 500,000 barrels of Canadian crude daily at prices 30 to 50 cents a barrel under what must be paid for oil from the Southwest. Canada wants to sell and the Midwest wants to buy. Washington should not discourage this natural commercial interchange. The United States oil industry already is over-protected by the government import quotas which prevent American consumers from buying cheap Middle East oil.

Another pertinent objection to the President's order raised by the senators regards his statutory authority for taking such action. Federal law gives the President power to restrict imports only when they "threaten to impair the national security." There has been absolutely no showing that bringing in crude oil from Canada is a threat to United States security—in fact the results point in exactly the opposite direction. Domestic reserves would be conserved. The restrictive order is therefore of doubtful validity.

The Administration has adopted an ill advised policy on Canadian oil which is unfair to Midwest Americans. It would be wise to accept the suggestion of the 25 senators, defer implementing the restrictive order and undertake instead to negotiate with Canada for "a freer exchange of petroleum."

#### EXPANSION OF DEFINITION OF ECOLOGY NEEDED

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Progressive magazine devoted its entire April issue to the subject, "Crisis of Survival." Many leading public and private figures addressed various aspects of the struggle to improve the quality of the environment and of life.

In "The Plight of the Cities," Mayor John V. Lindsay points out that conservation includes human resources as well as natural resources. The environmental problem does not stop at the city's edge.

In the fervor of the environmental movement we must not lose sight of the need to expand the definition of ecology to encompass the manmade and natural worlds. The obligation for man is to enhance greatly the quality of both.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE PLIGHT OF THE CITIES

(By John V. Lindsay)

The degradation of the environment is by now a familiar story: polluted air and water, a decaying physical plant, massive sani-

tation problems, sharp rises in congestion and noise that bring tension, lost efficiency, and incivility.

We are suffering from the mistakes of decades. Poor planning and runaway technology have bequeathed us staggering problems that until recently we have hardly seemed to notice. Marshall McLuhan writes: "If the temperature of the bathwater rises only one degree each half-hour, how will the bather know when to scream?" Urban pollution has accumulated just as imperceptibly for years, and only now is the scream being heard.

We now know that our cities have developed their own perverse ecology, each problem feeding another, often attracting "solutions" which merely shift the crisis from one area to another. The need now is to think in terms of total environment. No area of city government or industry can act any longer without regard for ecological consequences. Ecology cannot be thought of as a department of government or the job of a few, but as a web of values that permeates all urban thinking.

One point is clear: Technology produced the crisis and technology can end it—if we are thoughtful in using it and willing to pay the price. More expensive but less poisonous fuels are available, and more and more effective filters and gas traps are being developed. Techniques are known whereby garbage can be compressed or burned, with the recycling of potentially valuable waste into chemical by-products and building materials. We know how to package consumer goods in materials that save space and decay rapidly. Effective sewage techniques are old and familiar. All that is needed is the money and the will.

I do not mean that solutions will come quickly or easily, if only because of the enduring political habits of this nation. The cities have been shortchanged by the states and the Federal Government for so long that it would be surprising indeed if the same pattern does not evolve in the current environmental crusade. Already many are using the term "ecology" in its narrowest sense, as if the need to protect our resources is a kind of conservation that stops at city borders.

The city is the environment for a growing majority of our citizens. It would be as shortsighted to save the countryside at the expense of the city as it would be to allow ecology to grow into a middle-class whites-only movement. Lead poisoning, rats, the filth of the slums are just as much environmental problems as saving the redwoods and healing the scars of strip mining.

We owe a large debt to those individuals and groups, on campuses and around the country, whose missionary interest in ecology has now burst upon the national consciousness with the fervor of a crusade. But the sudden emergence of this issue may have raised some unreal expectations, the foremost being that ecology is somehow above politics, uniting Northerner and Southerner, Republican and Democrat, left and right. ("After all, no one is pro-pollution.")

After the political exhaustion of 1968, and the heavy drain of our war in Vietnam, the nation badly needs to feel a common sense of mission and unity. But ecology can hardly make our differences disappear. If, for instance, the left is given to believe that it must mute its peace activities for the sake of reclaiming the environment, if ecology is made to seem a cover for our differences rather than a coalition to solve one of them, then the movement is doomed to disillusion.

Where there are priorities there is politics, and the movement to reclaim our environment is no exception. That movement will require billions of dollars over a long haul, and that money will not be available until our expensive commitment in Southeast Asia comes to an end. Even then, extensive politicking will be necessary to sort out priorities