

U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 4

FEBRUARY 20, 1970, TO MARCH 2, 1970
(PAGES 4247 TO 5596)

LARGEST WHEAT PRODUCER

There is nothing strange or unusual about the creation of such a commission. Kansas by far the largest producer of wheat in the nation was the third state to establish such a program. Oregon was the first. This was in 1947. Nebraska followed in 1955 and Kansas in 1957. Colorado and Washington established their commissions in 1958. Idaho and North Dakota in 1959 and South Dakota in 1961. The last two were Montana and Oklahoma. Thus all of the Pacific Northwest states have commissions and all but one of the great plains states. The missing one is Texas, which is prevented from establishing a commission by a provision of its constitution.

Rates of taxation vary from state to state. Kansas and North Dakota have the lowest, one-fifth of a cent per bushel. Nebraska and Washington have one-fourth of a cent. South Dakota, three-tenths, Colorado has two-fifths and Idaho and Oregon one-half of a cent.

In Kansas, North Dakota and South Dakota any grower can receive a refund of the tax simply by making an application. In Kansas general satisfaction with the law on the part of growers is indicated by the fact that over the years less than one percent of those who have paid the tax have asked for a refund. I understand that substantially the same situation exists with reference to the Dakotas.

Wheat growers are not alone among agricultural producers in their efforts to expand and develop markets for their products, at their own expense.

Among the first were the citrus producers of Florida. The list is far too long to include here, but it covers producers of beef, dairy products, poultry, soybeans, feed grains, rice, dry beans, potatoes and many others. In all, something like forty groups are involved.

WHEAT STATE

Kansas is the premier wheat state. Wheat is by far its most important crop. In 1969 it produced 305 million bushels, only two million less than the record breaking crop of 1952, which was produced on four million acres. Substantially half or more of our total crop acreage of the state was planted to wheat during the decade of the sixties. It brought in more money during that period than any other agricultural product except beef cattle.

With wheat in trouble all over the world this is no time to destroy a program which costs Kansas Wheat growers practically nothing. It has worked in the past and will continue to benefit wheat producers. Next week I will point out some of the achievements under this law up to date.

SENATOR MONDALE URGES REORDERING OF NATIONAL PRIORITIES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, there is no greater task facing the country today than the establishment of a responsible set of national priorities.

Earlier this week the Committee on National Priorities of the Democratic Council heard testimony from Members of Congress on the question of priorities. The junior Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) presented a particularly eloquent statement at that hearing.

Expressing his concern about the "set of national priorities that places hardware above humans," Senator MONDALE called for a shift of resources from marginal military projects to vital human programs, such as early childhood development programs for deprived children.

I commend Senator MONDALE'S

thoughtful statement to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE

Let me begin by saying how much I support the review of national priorities your Committee is conducting, and how grateful I am to be able to participate in it.

This review is long overdue. America can no longer afford to let the Pentagon have a hammerlock on federal revenues, while programs such as education, and health that seek to meet our nation's pressing human needs are forced to fight for the leftovers. This approach, which has characterized the budget making process no matter which political party has controlled the Executive Branch, must be changed.

The Senate began a serious review of national priorities last summer when it analyzed and debated for two months a military authorization bill containing such far reaching and expensive commitments as the antiballistic missile system, the new manned bomber, and additional nuclear-powered aircraft carriers. While this exercise did not produce any immediate modifications in the Pentagon's plans, it raised a number of fundamental and yet-unanswered questions about military requests. I, for one, was hopeful that the President's pronouncements and budget requests would reflect this emerging dissatisfaction with past priorities.

Obviously, this has not occurred. Since that historic Senate debate took place, the President has vetoed an HEW-Labor appropriations bill containing an additional \$1¼ billion for desperately needed education and health programs and submitted a Budget that includes no important reductions in military procurement goals, and proposes—of all things—to escalate spending for the ABM by reportedly adding \$600 million or more for phase II of the system.

While the President has reduced the cost of Vietnam both in terms of funds, and more importantly, lives, and has reduced his budget requests for the Department of Defense from last year's level, he has *not* acted to control Pentagon spending for non-Vietnam purposes. Thus, new weapons systems with limitless capacities to absorb funds are receiving high priority and under the Administration's budget would steal the "peace dividend" our human programs so desperately need.

I am deeply concerned about this set of national priorities that places hardware above humans. The Budget's heavy emphasis on start-up costs for ABM's, MIRV's, and SST's will cripple needed nutrition, health, education and environment efforts this year, and threatens to continue stunting human programs throughout the foreseeable future. History warns us that a renewed arms race and its predictable cost overruns will both shake the delicate balance of terror in our nuclear world, and starve other government programs of needed funds.

America must not ignore either of these warnings. We must begin at once to shift our resources from a fascination with military gadgetry to high priority investments in human beings.

Let us begin with young children. Of all areas of unmet human needs, our unwillingness to provide help to deprived children is perhaps our most tragic and costly mistake.

There are at present about 6 million disadvantaged children under age six. Most of them are growing up without adequate nutrition and health care, and without the active mental and intellectual stimulation that is necessary during these early years.

As a result, many of these children are very depressed, withdrawn, and listless. Child

development specialists who have worked with some of the children report that it is difficult in the beginning to get them to smile or show interest in anything around them. Young children in many of these homes are considered well-behaved if they sit quietly in a corner during the day, instead of talking, playing, and exploring.

Yet the critical effect of the first years of life has been well documented. We know, for example, that about 50 percent of an individual's intellectual development takes place between conception and age 4. These early years are the formative years; they are the years in which permanent foundations are laid for a child's feelings of self-worth, his sense of self-respect, his motivation, his initiative, and his ability to learn and achieve.

We know, moreover, that a child's intelligence is not fixed once and for all at birth, and that children are most eager and often most able to learn during their early childhood years. As Dr. Benjamin Bloom, an authority in early childhood learning, concluded:

As time goes on . . . more and more powerful changes are required to produce a given amount of change in a child's intelligence . . . and the emotional cost it exacts is increasingly severe.

I would like to underscore the role that inadequate nutrition plays in perpetuating this cycle of poverty. As a member of the Select Senate Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, I have had an opportunity to hear expert testimony about the tragic and permanent effects of nutritional deficiency during pregnancy and the first few years of life. Presently, there is no Government program that deals adequately with the critical nutrition needs of infants from the period before birth until they reach school age. Pediatricians have pleaded eloquently before the committee for national recognition of disaster—mental as well as physical—which befalls undernourished infants.

For example, Dr. Charles Lowe, chairman of the Committee on Nutrition of the American Academy of Pediatrics, testified before the Nutrition Committee that:

Severe malnutrition suffered during childhood affects learning ability, body growth, rate of maturation, ultimate size, and if prolonged, productivity throughout life.

Dr. Lowe stated further that:

In effect, the quality and quantity of nutrition given during the first formative years of life may have the effect of programming the individual for all the years of his life. Malnutrition during the last trimester of pregnancy and certainly during the first months of life may seriously compromise ultimate intellectual achievement.

Fortunately, most American children have the benefit of a stimulating, secure environment in their early years. Most of them receive the physical and mental nourishment that is necessary for full development.

But poor children under age six arrive at school without these same advantages. Many of them may have suffered irreparable damage in their early years. Many have not received sufficient nutrition, health care, and intellectual stimulation.

Research reveals quite clearly the costly and lasting effects of deprivation in these early years. It reveals, for example, that as early as 18 months of age, disadvantaged children start falling behind middle-class children in tests of language development, and general intelligence. It reveals, furthermore, that this intellectual gap between poor and non-poor children that appears so early in life tends to grow larger over time.

I want to emphasize the point at which differences begin to occur between the abilities of poor and non-poor children. This point is not birth. Testimony which I have heard—particularly examples from projects in Mississippi and the District of Columbia—

suggest that nature distributes intelligence fairly equally among infants, poor and non-poor alike. It is only later—typically between the ages of one and three—after hunger and deprivation have made their impact—that differences in abilities begin to develop.

Records show, for example, that poor, black infants in the Mississippi Delta who scored an average of 115 on a Developmental Quotient test at age one had fallen to an average DQ of 35 by age 4. This decline can be prevented. The Infant Research Project in Washington, D.C., by providing tutors for children in the early years, was able to maintain the IQ's of impoverished children at an average of 105 from age 1½ to age 3, while the average IQ of a control group of poor children who did not receive tutoring fell 17 points in this period. This is not just another "interesting statistic". It represents the difference between a person's ability to do satisfactory college work or only marginal high school work.

We know how to prevent a great deal of this deterioration from occurring. Hundreds of projects such as the one I mentioned in Washington, D.C., and the Parent and Child Centers that are providing Head Start experiences to poor children below age 3 are producing very promising results. Even the study by Westinghouse Learning Corporation which found that an eight week summer Head Start program for 5 year old poor children does not save a child for the rest of his life—and has been cited by critics of child development efforts as proof that "nothing works"—recommended "offering intervention programs of longer duration, perhaps extending downwards toward infancy."

I believe the evidence is indisputable that comprehensive early childhood programs must be made available, on a voluntary basis, to all impoverished families with young children—beginning with medical and nutritional assistance to pregnant women and infants. Our present failure to do so is causing human misery, and wasting human ability.

The alternatives are very clear—more generations of school dropouts, functional illiterates, unemployables, welfare dependents, and more expensive yet necessary programs like the Job Corps that seek to remedy these problems later in life.

The most humane, economical and efficient way to give every citizen a fair opportunity to exercise his rights is by preventing poverty from causing this near irreparable damage during early childhood.

Substantive child development programs could have a tremendous impact on the quality of American life. They could give poor children the tools to gain a better life. They could insure that opportunities can be seized, and rights can be exercised by all.

Just last week the Senate concluded a long debate on the problems surrounding de facto segregation arising from adventitious events such as residential patterns. One can try to dismiss these problems summarily by citing Fair Housing laws, and saying that the poor can escape the problems of ghetto life by moving elsewhere. I fought hard to get this legislation passed preventing racial discrimination in the sale and rental of housing, and I think it is important. But I realize that other factors, such as poverty, unemployment, and the lack of low income housing outside the ghetto can make these laws irrelevant to the poor.

Equal opportunity requires more than open housing, integrated schools, or fair employment practices. Equal opportunity requires an equal start—from the very start. Making substantive child development programs available to poor families is one very important way to insure their equal start.

I was encouraged last year when the President declared a "national commitment to the crucial early years of life." I thought this

commitment might mean that a greater urgency and higher national priority would be attached to early childhood efforts.

A year has now passed since this declaration was made. Unfortunately, the rhetoric rings hollow. Despite some bureaucratic window-dressing, and modest funds for research, the Budget recommends a mere one per cent increase in Head Start funds. As a result, this promising program, including its Parent and Child component, will continue reaching only about five percent of the poverty stricken children who need it.

It haunts me to think of the millions of children whose potential is being severely compromised simply because we are unwilling to make the necessary investments. Our indifference to the needs of poor children, whether measured in humane or financial terms, cannot be justified.

We absolutely must change national priorities which allot only one-half the funds to Head Start as are allotted for the hurried deployment of phase two of an untested and potentially dangerous ABM system.

FORCED INTEGRATION

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, underlying the swing in sentiment which resulted in the passage of the Stennis amendment last week was the growing conviction that it was unfair to force integration resulting from de jure segregation and to ignore de facto segregation.

But a deeper question arises in the minds of more and more Americans: Is it moral for society to apply to children the force which, if it were applied to adults, men would know immoral?

Vermont Royster writing in the February 26, 1970, issue of the Wall Street Journal discusses the moral implications of forced school integration dispassionately and with considerable good common sense.

I ask unanimous consent that his observations be printed in the RECORD.

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

FORCED INTEGRATION: SUFFER THE CHILDREN (By Vermont Royster)

"Surely it is time to face up to a fact that can no longer be hidden from view. The attempt to integrate this country's schools is a tragic failure."

The words of Stewart Alsop in Newsweek will serve as well as any. They are startling, honest and deeply true. Whatever anyone else says otherwise, however shocked we may be, we know he is right.

The proof lies in the fact that Congress, in a confused sort of way, has made it clear that it no longer thinks forced integration is the way to El Dorado. Since Congress is a political body, that in itself might be evidence enough. But Mr. Alsop has also put the statement up for challenge to a wide range of civil rights leaders, black and white, ranging from Education Commissioner James Allen to black militant Julius Hobson, and found none to deny it. Beyond that, we have only to look around ourselves, at both our white and our black neighbors, to know that the failure is there.

But that only plunges us into deeper questions. Why is it a failure? And why is it tragic? Why is it that something on which so many men of good will put their faith has at last come to this? Where did we go wrong?

And those questions plunge us yet deeper. For to answer them we must go back to the beginning. It is the moment for one of those

agonizing reappraisals of all our hopes, emotions, thoughts, about what is surely the most wretched of all the problems before our society.

A SIMPLE PROPOSITION

We begin, I think, with a simple proposition. It is that it was, and is *morally* wrong for a society to say to one group of people that because of their color they are pariahs—that the majesty of law can be used to segregate them in their homes, in their schools, in their livelihoods, in their social contacts with their fellows. The wrong is in no wise mitigated by any plea that society may provide well for them within their segregated state. That has nothing to do with the moral question.

In 1954, for the first time, the Supreme Court stated that moral imperative. Beginning with the school decision the judges in a series of decisions struck down the legal underpinnings of segregation.

Since emotions and prejudices are not swept away by court decisions there were some white people in all parts of the country who resisted the change. But they were, for all their noise, in the minority. The great body of our people, even in the South where prejudice had congealed into custom, began the task of stripping away the battens of segregation. Slowly, perhaps, but relentlessly.

Then some people—men of good will, mostly—said this was not enough. They noticed that the mere ending of segregation did not mix whites and blacks in social intercourse. Neighborhoods remained either predominantly white or black. So did schools, because our schools are related to our neighborhoods. So did many other things. Not because of the law, but because of habit, economics, preferences—or prejudices, if you prefer.

From this came the concept of "de facto" segregation. This Latin phrase, borrowed from the law, describes any separation of whites and blacks that exists in fact and equates it with the segregation proscribed by law. The cause matters not. These men of good will concluded that if segregation in law is bad then any separation that exists in fact is equally bad.

From this view we were led to attack any separation as de facto segregation. Since the first attack on segregation came in the schools, the schools became the first place for the attack on separation from whatever cause. And since the law had served us well in the first instance, we chose—our lawmakers chose—to use the law for the second purpose also. The law, that is, was applied to compel not merely an end to segregation but an end to separation by forced integration.

It was at this point that we fell into the abyss. The error was not merely that we created a legal monstrosity, or something unacceptable politically to both whites and blacks. The tragedy is that we embraced an idea *morally* wrong.

That must be recognized if we are to understand all else. For what is wrong about forced integration in the schools is not its impracticality, which we all now see, but its immorality, which is not yet fully grasped.

Let us consider.

Imagine, now, a neighborhood in which 95% of the people are white, 5% of them black. It is self-evident that we have here a de facto imbalance. We do not have legal segregation, but we do not have integration either, at least not anything more than "tokenism."

Let us suppose also that for some reason—any reason, economics, white hostilities, or perhaps black prejudice against living next door to whites—the proportion does not change. The only way then to change it is for some of the whites to move away and, concurrently, for some blacks who live elsewhere to move into this neighborhood. One is not enough. Both things must happen.