

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 31

NOVEMBER 9, 1971 TO NOVEMBER 15, 1971

(PAGES 40015 TO 41376)

(4) an assessment of the policies and structure of existing and proposed interstate planning and developments affecting such policy;

(5) a review of State, local, and private policies, plans, and programs relevant to such policy;

(6) current and foreseeable needs in the areas served by policies, plans, and programs designed to carry out such policy, and the steps being taken to meet such needs; and

(7) recommendations for programs and policies for carrying out such a policy, including such legislation and administrative actions as may be deemed necessary and desirable.

(b) The President may transmit from time to time to the Congress supplementary reports on urban growth which shall include such supplementary and revised recommendations as may be appropriate.

(c) To assist in the preparation of the Report on Urban Growth and any supplementary reports, the President may establish an advisory board, or seek the advice from time to time of temporary advisory boards, the members of whom shall be drawn from among private citizens familiar with the problems of urban growth and from among Federal officials, Governors of States, mayors, county officials, members of State and local legislative bodies, and others qualified to assist in the preparation of such reports.

APPENDIX B

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1970—PUBLIC LAW 91-524

To establish improved programs for the benefit of producers and consumers of dairy products, wool, wheat, feed grains, cotton, and other commodities, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Agricultural Act of 1970".

TITLE IX—RURAL DEVELOPMENT

COMMITMENT OF CONGRESS

SEC. 901. (a) The Congress commits itself to a sound balance between rural and urban America. The Congress considers this balance so essential to the peace, prosperity, and welfare of all our citizens that the highest priority must be given to the revitalization and development of rural areas.

LOCATION OF FEDERAL FACILITIES

(b) Congress hereby directs the heads of all executive departments and agencies of the Government to establish and maintain, insofar as practicable, departmental policies and procedures with respect to the location of new offices and other facilities in areas or communities of lower population density in preference to areas or communities of high population densities. The President is hereby requested to submit to the Congress not later than September 1 of each fiscal year a report reflecting the efforts during the immediately preceding fiscal year of all executive departments and agencies in carrying out the provisions of this section, citing the location of all new facilities, and including a statement covering the basic reasons for the selection of all new locations.

PLANNING ASSISTANCE

(c) The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Congress a joint progress report as to their efforts during the immediately preceding fiscal year to provide assistance to States planning for the development of rural multicounty areas not included in economically depressed areas under authority of the Housing and

Urban Development Act of 1968. The first such annual report shall be submitted not later than December 1, 1970, and shall cover the period beginning August 1, 1968, the date of enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, and ending June 30, 1970.

INFORMATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

(d) The Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Congress a report not later than September 1 of each fiscal year reflecting the efforts of the Department of Agriculture to provide information and technical assistance to small communities and less populated areas in regard to rural development during the immediately preceding fiscal year. The first such annual report shall be submitted not later than December 1, 1970, covering the period beginning July 1, 1969, and ending June 30, 1970. The Secretary shall include in such reports to what extent technical assistance has been provided through land-grant colleges and universities, through the Extension Service, and other programs of the Department of Agriculture.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

(e) The President shall submit to the Congress a report not later than September 1 of each fiscal year stating the availability of telephone, electrical, water, sewer, medical, educational, and other government or government assisted services to rural areas and outlining efforts of the executive branch to improve these services during the immediately preceding fiscal year. The President is requested to submit the first such annual report, covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, on or before December 1, 1970.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

(f) The President shall report to Congress on the possible utilization of the Farm Credit Administration and agencies in the Department of Agriculture to fulfill rural financial assistance requirements not filled by other agencies. The President is requested to submit the report requested by this section on or before July 1, 1971, together with such recommendations for legislation as he deems appropriate.

Approved November 30, 1970.

SUPPORT FOR COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently two very prestigious groups of individuals familiar with the needs of children and experienced in the field of child development expressed their overwhelming support for the comprehensive child development bill now in conference.

The National Association for the Education of Young Children at their recent convention in Minneapolis, Minn., adopted a resolution urging the President to support this proposal and seek adequate funding for it.

A number of leaders in education, health, day care, and civil rights signed a statement—which appeared as an advertisement in the Washington Post, sponsored by the Children's Lobby—urging Congress to finish work on the bill and the President to sign it.

Both groups called for legislation that will provide developmental day care opportunities, on a voluntary basis, with parental participation and eligibility for children from all income levels.

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

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

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 9, 1971]

MEMORANDUM

To: The President of the United States and the Congress
Subject: The Comprehensive Child Development Act

FACTS

On February 19, 1969, President Nixon called for a "national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for a healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life."

On April 9, 1969, the President said, "I again pledge myself to that commitment."

This year, House and Senate action, with bipartisan leadership and support, passed Comprehensive Child Development Bills (S-2007 and H.R. 10351) and they are now in Conference Committee.

The differences between the two versions can be quickly reconciled.

The Comprehensive Child Development Act will result in one of the best investments the nation can make in its future.

It will provide a comprehensive program of educational, nutritional, and health care to those preschool children whose parents believe they need it.

It will allow a child's participation to be completely voluntary on the part of the parents.

It will give parents a real voice in the planning and operation of the programs.

It will offer quality day care service to the working women of America so that their families may have an adequate standard of living.

It will extend the enormous experience and success of the Head Start program.

It will deal with the problems of America's latch-key children.

It will reduce school failures.

It will build healthier children.

ACTION NEEDED

The Conference Committee must resolve the differences at today's meeting.

Both Houses must pass the bill.

The President must sign that bill.

We urge that the Comprehensive Child Development Act be passed to fulfill the President's pledge and the commitment by the Congress.

Robert Aldrich, M.D., Vice Pres., Health Affairs, University of Colorado; Joyce Black, Pres., New York City, Day Care Council; Arnita Boswell, Prof., Social Work, University of Chicago; Urie Bronfenbrenner, Prof., Human Development and Family Studies, Cornell University; Jerome Bruner, M.D., Director, Center for Cognitive Studies, Harvard University; Richardo Callejo, Attorney, Spanish Speaking, Sur-Named Political Assn., San Francisco; Eli E. Cohen, Exec. Sec., Natl. Committee on Employment of Youth; and Raymond Cohen, M.D., Past President, Texas Pediatric Society.

Manuel Diaz, Jr., Vice Pres., New York City, Urban Coalition; James Dumpson, Dean, School of Social Work, Fordham University; Marion Edelman, Washington Research Projects, Action Council; Donald Fink, M.D., Former Dir., American Academy of Pediatrics Consultation Service; Marcus Foster, Ph.D., Superintendent, Oakland Public Schools; Glenn Gibson, M.D., Pediatrician, Baton Rouge; Elinor C. Guggenheimer, Policy Council, National Political Women's Caucus; and Dorothy I. Height, Pres., Natl. Council of Negro Women.

Francis Keppel; Reginald Lourie, M.D., Pres. Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children; Sanford Matthews, M.D., Regional Pediatric Medical Coordinator, Atlanta; Joseph Monserrat, Member, Board of Education, New York City; John Niemeyer, Chairman, Day Care and Child Development Council of America; Josephine Nieves, Dir., Puerto Rican Studies, Brooklyn College; Julius Richmond,

M.D., Dir., Judge Baker Guidance Center, Harvard University; and Mrs. Alexander Ripley, Vice Pres., California Children's Lobby.

This advertisement sponsored by The Children's Lobby, Jule M. Sugarman, President, 112 East 19th St., New York, N.Y.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN,
Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF
YOUNG CHILDREN IN CONVENTION IN MINNEAPOLIS,
MINNESOTA, NOVEMBER 5, 1971

RESOLUTION NUMBER 2

Whereas the President of the United States of America has voiced his commitment to meeting the needs of all young children in this country and

Whereas President Nixon has admirably placed in the Office of Child Development the position of Child Advocacy and the responsibility for implementing the recommendations of the 1970 White House Conferences on Children and Youth and

Whereas the nationwide need for comprehensive child development services for many young children can be provided only through bold Federal legislation and appropriations.

Therefore, be it resolved by the National Association for the Education of Young Children in convention in Minneapolis, Minnesota this fifth day of November, 1971.

That the President of the United States put aside the differences between his administrative proposals and the Comprehensive Child Development amendments to the Economic Opportunity bills. Specifically

(1) that programs be established to serve children from all income levels based on ability to pay

(2) that the protection of Head Start and Follow Through be assured

(3) that communities of 5000 or more be assured of having the opportunity to go directly to the Federal government for funds

(4) comprehensive standards at least equal to those provided by the 1968 Federal Interagency Standards for Day Care be upheld.

That President Nixon take a vigorously supportive posture toward the passage of this bill with the above listed components and the allocation of appropriations

That he advise Secretary Richardson of his determination to immediately serve the needs of young children by this most constructive action.

VETERANS MUST STILL WAIT FOR
GOOD HOSPITAL CARE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, all of us remember the shocking conditions of neglect in our veterans' hospitals that were exposed in the spring of 1970. Congress acted immediately to correct the most serious problem of totally inadequate levels of professional staff and hospital workers, to assure patients the treatment and care they deserve. However, it now appears that Congress was mistaken in its assumption that the enactment of increased appropriations would necessarily result in an improved staff-patient ratio commensurate with the serious need in our veterans' hospitals.

In 1970 it was revealed that while community hospitals averaged 2.72 staff members per patient, there were only 1.5 staff members for each patient in Veterans' Administration hospitals. It is contended that this VA hospital ratio now stands at 1:8:1 nationwide.

However, what is at first glance an encouraging improvement, proves on closer

examination to result in large measure from statistical gamesmanship employed by the Office of Management and Budget. In fiscal 1971, VA hospitals operated at an average level of 84,500 inpatients per day. But for fiscal 1972, the OMB ordered the VA to reduce bed patients to an average level of 79,000 daily—meaning that almost 47,000 fewer hospital patients could be treated this fiscal year. That is one way to improve the staff-patient ratio, but a method that Congress has firmly refused to accept.

It is well recognized that the VA medical service serves as a major resource for medical education, training, and research, and that it has played a vital role in America's health care system, caring for over 7 million veterans last year through its network of 165 hospitals, 202 independent clinics, and 65 nursing homes. But it is also clearly evident that this extensive health care system has been critically underfunded and understaffed.

With the enactment of Public Law 92-78 this past summer, Congress tied a \$279.9 million increase in the original VA medical care budget for fiscal 1972 to a firm mandate that the VA maintain a minimum daily patient load of 85,500. In addition, the President has called upon the VA to take the lead in rehabilitating veterans returning from Vietnam with drug abuse and narcotics addiction problems—estimated by the VA Medical Director to have reached over 50,000.

But rather than permitting an offensive to be launched to meet these health care objectives on behalf of our veterans, the OMB has repeatedly ordered a retreat. Last year, Congress increased the VA's proposed budget with the intention that an additional \$105 million be used primarily to hire more staff. However, the OMB ordered the diversion of these additional funds to pay for equipment purchases, management costs, dental services, and certain salary increases.

To counter this directive, Congress rushed through an \$8 million supplemental appropriation, which enabled the VA to hire 8,600 new employees, including 802 physicians.

But just as this forward step toward improved medical care for our disabled veterans was being taken, the White House and the OMB called a halt. Refusing to release \$71 million of the funds appropriated by Congress for VA medical care in the current fiscal year, the OMB has prevented the VA from hiring over 11,000 more hospital personnel. And on August 15, the White House ordered a 5-percent employment reduction in the VA Department of Medicine and Surgery. This order has wiped out any significant personnel increases hoped for this year and has confronted the VA with an extensive morale problem among present hospital personnel.

But it is the patient in the VA hospital and the veteran waiting to be admitted for required treatment who have suffered from these administration actions. It is clear that, in general, our VA hospitals are making every effort to provide patients the treatment and care they need. But the odds are heavily stacked against these hospitals being able to substantially

improve and expand medical care to meet the extensive health problems of our older veterans and those returning from Vietnam.

There are over 15 million World War II veterans, among whom the need for quality medical care continues to increase. And the number of Vietnam-era veterans being discharged this year is expected to increase by 300,000 over the recent annual rate of 800,000. Ten of fifteen percent of all patients treated in VA hospitals are Vietnam-era veterans.

However, it is reported that two of every five veterans applying for admission to VA hospitals are being rejected. And the admission waiting list of veterans with non-service-connected health disabilities and illnesses has more than doubled since the beginning of 1971—from 2,861 to 7,176. It is estimated that this category of health problems accounts for 65 percent of the care the VA provides.

In the face of rising public concern over this denial of hospital inpatient treatment to our veterans, the Office of Management and Budget has recently permitted a partial release of VA medical care funds appropriated by Congress. It is claimed that this action will allow the VA to raise the hospital daily inpatient load to 85,500—the level mandated by Congress for the current fiscal year. However, the 4-month delay in releasing these funds will actually result in a daily patient level average over the full year of only 83,000. And it will mean that present VA hospital staffs, already overworked, will have to care for many more patients each day, because of the continued withholding by the OMB of funds appropriated for substantial increases in hospital personnel.

I firmly believe that America has an absolute obligation to provide the best possible medical care to those who have served our country and contributed to the national defense. Long-term veterans' medical care is as much a part of our defense costs as the short-term emergency care given on the battlefield.

I call upon the Office of Management and Budget to release all the funds that Congress has felt are so vital to achieving an effective medical delivery system for our veterans. It is unconscionable that this administration should seek to achieve fiscal savings at the expense of health care for those who have put their lives on the line for their country.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT OF THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, on October 23, 1971, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTROYA) stated in his address before the Coalition Conference of Spanish-speaking Americans that—

Across America, our young men return from the Indochina adventure. All have given their share and more. What rewards and responses do they find? Minimal ones. Frustrating ones. Grudging ones. They were adequate for utilization as cannon fodder in Asia, but are rarely considered good enough to qualify for equal treatment back home. . . . In higher government pay-grades, we