

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91ST CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 5

MARCH 3, 1970, TO MARCH 11, 1970

(PAGES 5597 TO 7070)

forts at arms control. We must take honest risks in pursuit of peace and disarmament.

Second, we must set priorities which protect total human environment—our air, water, and land resources, our health, our homes, and our communities—not priorities which lead to faster planes, mightier weapons, and more ventures into space.

Third, we must make it clear that the unemployment caused by recession is no cure for the rising prices of inflation. Wage and price guidelines are preferable to having men and women thrown out of work.

Finally, the Democratic Party must insist that the Federal Budget reflect the priorities we proclaim. There is no room in our society for empty promises and false commitments.

These are the issues of people and peace. They are good ideas, they are good priorities.

But good ideas do not keep forever. Something must be done about them, or they become the seeds of revolution.

In 1976 America will mark its 200th anniversary. Two centuries ago Americans fought a revolution—not for the sake of hollow promises and empty slogans, but to insure for themselves and their children the opportunity to build on the basis of their common dreams.

We have built a great nation on the basis of those dreams, but we have not yet built a society where each citizen has an equal chance to reach his own potential, where life is acceptable for all Americans.

We may not reach those goals by 1976. We may never reach them at all. But at least we owe that chance to ourselves and to those who gave birth to this nation. At least we must help to insure that we are moving again in the right direction.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE,
FEBRUARY 24, 1970

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 anti-ballistic 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 \$1½ 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 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 the 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 85 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 less than 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.

CHANGING NATIONAL PRIORITIES

(By Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, February 24, 1970)

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate the opportunity which has been given to me by the National Policy Committee to outline my views on the priorities of our Nation. I am most heartened by the establishment of this Committee on National Priorities within the Democratic Party. In the past, I have believed that our Party has paid too much attention to the personalities in politics, much to the detriment of party policy formulation. I believe the existence of this Committee would change that imbalance and that these hearings and the recent publication of Democratic Party policy statements are healthful signs of a reviving Democratic National Party, a revivification which I hail.

National priorities concerns our perspective as to the conscious and unconscious commitments of our country's human and fiscal resources. It is an issue which has generated much debate, but little action. I think it is time for us to eschew the rhetoric of national priorities and take a hard look at what a change in national priorities demands.

From my perspective, I think we can take that hard look by first examining realistically our present national priorities; second, by assessing the actual limitations on a change in national priorities; third, by justifying what we think our new priorities should be and how they can be attained; and fourth,

by examining the role which the Democratic Party should play in changing priorities.

I. OUR PRESENT NATIONAL PRIORITIES

The best indicator we have of the country's priorities is the way it spends its money in the private and public sectors. I think it might shatter some illusions about what are national priorities if we analyze briefly some of our country's overall financial commitments.

The most commonly understood indicator of national priorities is the Federal budget. The fact that national defense, veterans payments, and interest costs from present and past wars consume more than 50% of Federal expenditures have been the reason why many of us assume that the Federal Government's number one priority is warfare and its various aspects.

If income security trust funds based on direct contributions of individual taxpayers are excluded, expenditures for health, education and community development make up not more than 15% to 20% of the Federal budget, and thus, human investment can be seen as a poor second priority to warfare investments.

In view of the many needs of our society, this ratio is certainly unacceptable; however, since government expenditures only represent 20% of the Gross National Product, it is important that we view the question of priorities in the wider perspective of national product accounts.

While Federal defense related expenditures have been increasing over the past years, I think that it is significant that defense expenditures have declined from 9.1% of the GNP in 1960 to 8.8% of the GNP in 1969 while Federal grants-in-aid have increased from 1.4% of the GNP in 1960 to 2.1% of the GNP in 1969.

In absolute terms, between 1960 and 1969 Federal grants-in-aid for such programs as education and manpower, public assistance and community development increased from \$6.8 billion to \$18.9 billion. For the same period, domestic transfer payments for such programs as Medicare, retirement benefits and unemployment benefits increased from \$20.6 billion to \$48.2 billion. Between 1963 and 1968, public and private expenditures for health, education and welfare nearly doubled by increasing from \$100 billion to \$163 billion.

Overall, between 1960 and 1969, Federal expenditures have increased from 18.4% of the GNP to 20.7% of the GNP, and expenditures for personal consumption have declined from 65% of the GNP to 61% of the GNP. This decrease in the percentage of personal consumption and increase in the GNP percentage of government expenditures can be partially attributed to the fact that in 1969 taxes on personal income amounted to 12.6% of the overall personal income, the highest proportion since 1948.

The impact of this change in funding patterns can be understood by reference to some community accepted random social indicators.

For example, in this period between 1960 and 1969, the number of persons classified as poor by the Social Security Administration decreased by an estimated 18 million persons, there was more than a significant decline in infant mortality rate, the death rate from hypertension and hypertensive heart disease declined by more than 20%, and the number of handicapped persons being rehabilitated doubled.

I think the first point that I wish to make about present national priorities is clear. *Under the leadership of the Democratic Administration in the 1960's, this country began to shift its priorities and it made this shift by increasing government expenditures and reducing the level of personal consumption.* This is corroborated by the Council of Economic Advisers who report that there will be very little Federal money available for new initiatives until 1975 due to long run

implications of the program commitments made in the 1960's.

II. LIMITATIONS ON CHANGING OUR NATIONAL PRIORITIES

This alleged lack of money available for further new initiatives underlies my second major point regarding our present national priorities; that there are limitations on further changes. Any further changes will be more difficult.

There are two direct ways of shifting priorities: either increase all programs—some more than others, as we did in the 1960's; or cut back on selected programs to aid other more desirable programs, as no one has done yet.

The gradual shift in priorities which occurred during the 1960's did not really hurt any one particular interest group. We had guns and butter. Tax increases were somewhat mitigated by increases in the level of individual income. The shift in the 1960's was relatively easy as compared to what a change in the dimensions of our present commitments will involve in the 1970's. I question whether in the 1970's the country will be willing to support either the increased taxes or cut backs in nonpriority programs on Federal and State levels which will be required, if we are to have a strong shifting of priorities.

With the present mood of the country, do you think the public is willing to pay the extra required taxes by forgoing the outlays for new cars, color televisions and cosmetics? We must not forget that America's number one priority is still, despite high taxes, personal consumption, which is more than 60% of the GNP.

There is also some doubt in my mind whether the political estate is willing to support a shift of priorities by the cut back method. For example, if priorities are to be shifted in the 1970's by cutting back in absolute terms rather than simply making smaller proportionate increases in the defense and space area, this may mean a recession in our defense and aero-space industries, a lot of high paid executives out of jobs, and many Congressmen, Senators and Governors pressing to keep Federal defense and aero-space contracts flowing into their states. I would hope a Democratic Party committed to a shift in national priorities could resist such pressures.

However, even if we assume that the public and political reluctance to significantly change the dimensions of our national priorities could be overcome, there are some other serious economic and manpower limitations which must be considered.

Our present rate of real economic growth has nearly ceased and manpower shortages in such priority areas as health are barely improving. Without a 4 percent growth rate and sufficient manpower to be employed in our priority areas an actual change in priorities becomes even more difficult.

III. WHAT OUR PRIORITIES SHOULD BE

The question now is where do we go from here. I, for one, think we, as a country, must begin to make the hard choices. Within the limitations I outlined, I think there are a number of human investments we must make now in order that the 1980's will not also see the country restricted in the commitments it can make, by decisions made in the previous decade.

Our first priority—end the war

The first investment necessary is, in a sense, a negative investment; we must stop investing our human and material resources in wasteful wars not related to our national interest. We, as Democrats, must wear the hairshirt of the Vietnam war and admit our own mea culpa. We were responsible for the escalation of our commitment and engagement and we must now take the lead in seeking our withdrawal from this miserable war.