

UNITED STATES

U.S. Congress.



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 26

OCTOBER 9, 1973 TO OCTOBER 17, 1973

(PAGES 33229 TO 34550)

turies are neither appropriate nor possible in our time. In an age of ideological schism the distinction between friends and adversaries is an objective reality. We share ideals as well as interests with our friends, and we know that the strength of our friendships is crucial to the lowering of tensions with our opponents.

When we refer to five or six or seven major centers of power, the point being made is not that others are excluded but that a few short years ago everyone agreed that there were only two. The diminishing tensions and the emergence of new centers of power have meant greater freedom of action and greater importance for all other nations.

In this setting, our immediate aim has been to build a stable network of relationships that offers hope of sparing mankind the scourges of war. An interdependent world community cannot tolerate either big power confrontations or recurrent regional crises.

But peace must be more than the absence of conflict. We perceive stability as the bridge to the realization of human aspirations, not an end in itself. We have learned much about containing crises, but we have not removed their roots. We have begun to accommodate our differences, but we have not affirmed our commonality. We may have improved the mastery of equilibrium, but we have not yet attained justice.

In the encyclical for which this conference is named, Pope John sketched a greater vision. He foresaw "that no political community is able to pursue its own interests and develop itself in isolation" for "there is a growing awareness of all human beings that they are members of a world community."

The opportunities of mankind now transcend nationalism, and can only be dealt with by nations acting in concert:

For the first time in generations mankind is in a position to shape a new and peaceful international order. But do we have the imagination and determination to carry forward this still fragile task of creation?

For the first time in history we may have the technical knowledge to satisfy man's basic needs. The imperatives of the modern world respect no national borders and must inevitably open all societies to the world around them. But do we have the political will to join together to accomplish this great end?

If this vision is to be realized, America's active involvement is inescapable. History will judge us by our deeds, not by our good intentions.

But it cannot be the work of any one country. And it cannot be the undertaking of any one Administration or one branch of government or one party. To build truly is to chart a course that will be carried on by future leaders because it has the enduring support of the American people.

So let us search for a fresh consensus. Let us restore a spirit of understanding between the legislative and the executive, between the government and the press, between the people and their public servants. Let us learn once again to debate our methods and not our motives, to focus on our destiny and not our divisions. Let us all contribute our different views and perspectives but let us, once again, see ourselves as engaged in a common enterprise. If we are to shape a world community we must first restore community at home.

With Americans working together, America can work with others toward man's eternal goal of a *Paxem in Terris*—peace abroad, peace at home and peace within ourselves.

CHILD HEALTH

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently President Nixon issued a proclamation designating October 1 as Child

Health Day. Few would disagree with the importance that proclamation attached to child health.

But as the Citizens' Committee for Children of New York pointed out, unfortunately the administration's performance in the area of child health does not support its rhetoric.

In a careful review of maternal and child health, school lunch, medicaid regulations, child development and other programs with child health components, the committee carefully documented the efforts of the administration to freeze or cut back vitally important initiatives for children.

In order that this analysis be available to my colleagues, and the public, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN OF NEW YORK, INC.,
New York, N.Y., October 1, 1973.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have read with interest your Proclamation designating October 1st as Child Health Day.

Although you "invite all citizens, agencies and organizations to join in such activities as will help alert all Americans to the vital importance of child health," we see no mention of the role which your Administration must take in promoting the health of the nation's children. It is both useless and pernicious to pretend that this problem can be turned over to the voluntary sector, to private citizens or organizations, no matter how dedicated, without increased support from the Federal Government.

On the occasion of Child Health Day of 1973, we of the Citizens' Committee for Children of New York believe it is appropriate to review the record of your Administration, a record which is not in keeping with your Proclamation's statement that, "One of our most important national responsibilities is the assurance of full and healthy development for the children of America."

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

Although the cost of health care rose three times as fast as the cost of living between 1967 and 1972, and we know that costs have continued to rise, the budget request for Maternal and Child Health for F. Y. 1974 which your Administration sent to Congress was \$244,144,000, the same amount as in the 1973 revised budget. It was inadequate then and is even more inadequate now. When Congress in 1973 voted an additional \$7.8 million, you vetoed the bill.

Your Administration had planned to impound \$1.1 billion of \$4.7 billion voted by Congress for health programs and at least part of that money was for health services to children. It was only as a result of court action that your impoundment plan was abandoned. How do these actions accord with your Proclamation's statement of concern for the health of children?

SCHOOL LUNCHES

Your Administration opposed increasing the reimbursement rate for school lunches in the appropriation bill before the Congress. Nutrition is an essential element in the health of a child but with the skyrocketing cost of food, many children of welfare and low income families will not receive an adequate diet. School lunch is the one nutritious meal these children can count on. As of April, 1973, 8.8 million children of low

income families were receiving free or low cost school lunches but without increased Federal aid, the School Lunch Program cannot survive. Already a few schools have stopped serving hot lunches and others may have to follow suit. It is now estimated that hundreds of thousands of children may be forced to drop out of the program because the amount they must pay has gone up. This in turn reduces the income of the lunch program and necessitates the substitution of alternate, less appetizing food which children don't like. Local communities do not have the funds to cover their share of the cost and this share is rising because the Federal subsidy is too rigid.

To compound the difficulty, you also opposed increasing the equipment assistance to schools which would enable them to purchase equipment necessary to the preparation and service of school lunches. The present allocation of \$16 million in Federal expenditures is less than half what is required to meet the needs of all the children who should be receiving school lunches.

Despite the soaring cost of food, the Department of Agriculture budget which you submitted to the Congress not only failed to provide for an increased reimbursement rate for the School Lunch Program, but also failed to include an escalator clause which would require adjustments in the Federal grant to keep pace with any future increase in food costs. It is our hope that the Senate School Lunch Bill, just passed, will not be substantially altered in conference and that it will soon be on your desk. A Presidential veto of this bill would be a terrible blow to the health of millions of children. We call on you, on Child Health Day, to pledge your approval of this bill.

MILK PROGRAM

Your Administration, in January 1973, proposed a cut in the national School Milk Program from \$95 million to \$25 million. The Department of Agriculture then proceeded to discontinue the subsidized milk program in all schools having a school lunch program, in violation of Congressional policy.

Surely you are aware of the fact that milk is an essential element in the diet of all children, and that providing milk at a cost many families can afford requires the assistance of the Federal Government. In recognition of this, the Agricultural Appropriations Bill now in conference, raises the milk subsidy back to \$97 million. We trust that you will not veto this bill.

SUPPLEMENTAL FEEDING PROGRAM

Your Department of Agriculture never implemented the supplemental feeding program until ordered to do so by a Federal judge. The court also ruled that the full \$40 million authorized must be spent on this two-year pilot project designed to test and evaluate various approaches to the feeding of pregnant and lactating women, and infants. We sincerely hope that you will pledge your Administration to full implementation of all health programs without further necessity for court action.

MEDICAL CARE

Your Administration testified before the Ways and Means Committee against extending Federal grants for both the Maternal and Infant Care and Children and Youth Projects. A nationwide study has shown that under the special Children and Youth Projects it costs less to provide medical services per child, per year, than under Medicaid. In New York City the data shows that in the neighborhoods served by the Maternal and Infant Care Projects, maternal and infant mortality have sharply declined. Fortunately, the Congress attached a one-year continuation of Title V as a rider to the Public Debt Limit Bill, which you felt obligated to sign. However, you failed to include in your budget the \$30 million needed to implement the

law. Thus, no new projects are possible this year.

NEW MEDICAID REGULATIONS

Your Administration has consistently proposed that families be required to pay Medicaid deductibles and premiums even when they are so poor that they are eligible for public assistance or Medicaid. To our great regret, Congress passed (as part of Public Law 92-603) provisions requiring a premium to be paid by all medical assistance patients (those who are not receiving public assistance but are eligible for Medicaid). The Law states that in addition to the premium, a co-payment or deductible *CAN* be imposed by each state on all services for the "medical assistance" patients and on the "optional" services (those not mandated) even for people receiving public assistance. Federally mandated services do not include such essentials as prescription drugs, dental care, hearing aids, eyeglasses.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has now proposed premiums at a minimum of \$1.00 a month for a family with monthly gross income of \$150 or less, regardless of the size of the family. A family of five or more with monthly gross income of \$350 would pay the same premium. Thus a mother and child not receiving public assistance but with a monthly income of about \$140.00 could still be required to pay a \$1.00 monthly premium in order to be included in a state plan.

These actions have been taken in spite of the fact that the cost of medical care continues to rise and the cost of living to soar.

It is hard for us to see how these premium requirements can be met since they use gross income as a base and fail to take into account required deductions, expenditures and taxes. What will happen to families and children and their health needs if these regulations are implemented? Will they be forced to go on welfare because they require medical care but are unable to pay the monthly premium?

E.P.S.D.T.

The Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment Program for Medicaid Eligible Children, which is part of Title XIX of the Medicaid Law, is one of the most hopeful signs on the horizon. Although the Law was passed and signed in 1967, the regulations were issued by H.E.W. only in 1971. Citizens' Committee for Children is devoting a great deal of time and effort in an attempt to get this program moving in New York City. The Congress mandated that each state reach every child eligible for Medicaid and that each child must be screened, diagnosed and, if necessary, treated. Penalties were included for non-compliance by any state. The Department of H.E.W. has failed to exempt EPSDT from the new premium regulations, and this may well deter parental use of appropriate medical services.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Your Proclamation stresses the importance of child development and three and one-half years ago, on February 19, 1969, you stated that,

"... many of the problems of poverty are traceable directly to early childhood experience . . . if we are to make genuine, long-range progress, we must focus our efforts much more than heretofore on those few years which may determine how far, throughout his later life the child can reach. . . . Much of our knowledge is new. But we are not on that ground absolved from the responsibility to respond to it. So crucial is the matter of early growth that we must make a national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life."

However, on December 9, 1971, you vetoed the Child Care Bill sent to you by the Congress. At that time you stated,

"I return herewith without my approval S. 2007, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971. . . . The most deeply flawed provision of this legislation is Title V, "Child Development Programs". . . . Neither the immediate need nor the desirability of a national child development program of this character has been demonstrated. . . .

"Given the limited resources of the Federal budget, and the growing demands upon the Federal taxpayer the expenditure of two billions of dollars in a program whose effectiveness has yet to be demonstrated cannot be justified."

The post of Director, Office of Child Development, Children's Bureau (H.E.W.), has remained vacant for the past 15 months. More recently, the Associate Director also resigned, so that this agency is now without any administrator. Is it possible that you do not want to fill these positions and if so, does this mean that you are not interested in child development?

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN (HEAD START)

Federal Law mandates that all Headstart programs for pre-school youngsters include handicapped children as 10% of their enrollments.

This is a most laudable goal but it requires that each Headstart center receive expert help and special equipment if these children are to benefit from their pre-school experience. Yet the financial support provided by the Federal Government is so minimal that the centers will be unable to give these handicapped children the assistance they need. The Agency for Child Development in New York City, for example, is receiving only \$100 per handicapped child, which is clearly insufficient to train the teaching staff, purchase special educational equipment and make whatever physical renovations may be necessary.

ADOLESCENT HEALTH CARE

One of the great unmet needs in this country is specific health services for adolescents. In New York City there is only one project where Federal money is being granted for adolescent health services and new programs cannot be added for lack of Federal funding. There is now no possibility of providing the necessary medical care appropriate to this vulnerable age group.

In conclusion, Mr. President, we at Citizens' Committee for Children welcome your Proclamation declaring October 1st Child Health Day. However, our organization and many others in the voluntary sector do not need to be alerted to the multiple problems which remain unsolved, nor do we need to be reminded that, as a nation, we have failed woefully to meet the health and developmental needs of our children.

We are painfully aware that the U.S.A. has a higher infant mortality rate than twelve other countries; that the President's Panel on Mental Retardation found retardation in 3% of all births; that 5 out of 7 physically and mentally handicapped children receive no care at all; that 12 million children need special care for eye conditions; that 50% of the nation's children under the age of 15 have never been examined by a dentist; and that 2 million children need special care for orthopedic handicaps.

It seems appropriate on this day to bring these matters to your attention and to ask for a full commitment by you and your Administration to reverse the present trends which are so damaging to the health of the children of our country. We have a long tradition of offering a helping hand to the children of other countries when their well-being is threatened. Surely we must now make a united effort to safeguard the health, the nutrition and the sound development of our own children.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Max Ascoli,
Chairman, Health Section.

BONNEVILLE UNIT OF CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, some of my colleagues have come to me with the draft of a letter they have been given by Dr. David C. Raskin, a member of the Sierra Club of Salt Lake City. Dr. Raskin has asked them to send this letter to Secretary of the Interior Rogers Morton in an attempt to scuttle the Bonneville unit of the Central Utah project. Central Utah is Utah's most important and comprehensive water resource development project and Bonneville is its indispensable unit.

Frankly, I am outraged. The letter is the ultimate in irresponsibility. It is not founded on facts. Early completion of Bonneville is imperative—clearly, vehemently: imperative—not only if Utah is to develop and grow in the future, but if our people now living in the State are to maintain the quality of life which they now enjoy.

At least 95 percent of the people of my great State are solidly behind this project. From long experience, they know its importance and their dependence upon it. Only last week the Utah State Legislature, Governor Rampton concurring, passed another strong resolution urging that those in authority pursue early completion of the Bonneville unit.

I am also incredulous. It is hard for me to understand how anyone who has lived in our water-starved State for even the 5 years that Dr. Raskin has been there, could want to endanger in any way a project which makes more water available for beneficial use in any part of it, and particularly, in the case of the collection and distribution system of the Bonneville unit, which would make water available for municipal and industrial use in Salt Lake Valley. Over 50 percent of the people in Utah live in the Salt Lake Valley and environs where water is now so short that a single poor water year would precipitate water rationing in many parts of the valley.

The Central Utah project is no quickly conceived, illogical scheme for the development of Utah's precious water resources. Its roots lie in the Colorado River Compact of 1922 when the four States of the Upper Basin—Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico—met with the lower basin States—California, Arizona, and Nevada, and signed a compact dividing the waters of the Colorado, that mighty river whose every drop of water is valuable beyond price because it flows through one of the most arid regions of the United States. It took another 30 years—until 1956—to plan the projects which would allow the States to use their share of the Colorado River waters, and to get through the Congress the overall authorizing legislation—the Colorado River Project Storage Act. The Central Utah project is the development, the construction of which, will assure to Utah its fair share of the Colorado River water. Completion of the Central Utah project has been a goal sought by several generations of Utah citizens.

The proposal which the Sierra Club, and a number of other environmental groups now advance, and which is sug-