

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 111—PART 14

JULY 28, 1965, TO AUGUST 9, 1965

(PAGES 18497 TO 19742)

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## WORLD HUNGER AND FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, one of the few really bold, pioneering international efforts by any government over the last decade has been our American food-for-peace program.

Under Public Law 480, we have sent out more than \$13 billion in surplus commodities to help feed the hungry peoples of the world. Our sales for soft currencies have stabilized foreign food prices and added to scarce supplies on their private markets. Our food donations, distributed through foreign governments and the fine work of our private charitable agencies, provide school lunches for 40 million children each day, 40 million children throughout the world who now have a chance to grow sound bodies and sound minds.

Altogether we have saved millions of all ages from hunger and malnutrition, from disease and death. What is more, we have used our food, and the local currencies paid for it, to build schools and roads, to make loans for private investment, to help support the Peace Corps, and to perform countless other good works.

And this program has also brought major benefits to the United States. It has developed new markets for the American farmer. It has reduced the costs of our storage of surplus commodities. It has eased our balance of payments by providing foreign currencies to pay overseas government expenses.

All of these achievements, and more, we owe to the wisdom and skill of the men who sponsored and who administer our food-for-peace program.

I am very proud that my predecessor here in this body, now Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, had the vision to propose this type of program long before Public Law 480 became law, and was the main guiding, creative spirit which made this program a basic part of the farm programs of this Nation.

But for all its accomplishments, Public Law 480 stands today in urgent need of revision and reform. Eleven years have gone by since its adoption. It has been amended time after time, yet events have moved faster still, until today we have a program which, despite its unmatched accomplishments, needs to be reshaped in fundamental ways.

We have already helped millions, but the food-for-peace program is no longer big enough for today's needs. And if present trends continue, it will be far too small and far too inflexible to meet the needs of the future.

We have increased our emphasis on quality foods, yet still more must be done to develop and supply cheap vitamins and proteins to those suffering from malnutrition.

We have done much ourselves, but we must encourage other nations to make a greater contribution.

We have used food for peace to stimulate economic development in poor countries, but we must point the program even more strongly in this direction.

Finally, we have run an effective program, but in the future we must overcome the fragmentation of its administration by creating some high-level authority strong enough to plan a coordinated attack on the problem of world hunger.

As I have studied this program during the past months, I have been gratified to see many of these difficulties being recognized, and plans being made to cope with them. For the past several months, a special interagency task force, has been studying the program, and the results will shortly be available to President Johnson. The Department of Agriculture, the Agency for International Development, and the Food for Peace Office have all been alive with new ideas and exciting proposals.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] and the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER and Mr. NELSON] have given this whole question constant attention, and the Senator from South Dakota has introduced bold new legislation for a more effective worldwide war against want.

All of this activity, all of this ferment of ideas, is a strong indication that Congress will soon be faced with some fundamental decisions about the future of the food-for-peace program.

First of all, Mr. President, I am convinced that future needs will require us to increase the size of this program, and to allow flexibility for the use of commodities not necessarily in surplus.

For one of the grim facts the world must face is the actual increase in the number of human beings who go without enough to eat every day. What we have is a hunger explosion, and its cause is all too clear—in the poor countries of the world, recent statistics indicate that population is growing faster than agricultural production. In Latin America, for example, food production expanded 6 percent in the last 5 years. But population grew more than 11 percent. Before the war less-developed regions exported 11 million tons of grain to the wealthy countries; today they must import 25 million tons of grain from us. A recent report from the Department of Agriculture spells out the frightening truth—"the less-developed world is losing the capacity to feed itself."

Today 10,000 people will die of hunger or malnutrition in the poor countries of the world. Tomorrow 10,000 people will die, and on and on. As population grows further, this hunger explosion will grow too, to catastrophic proportions, unless men everywhere act strongly and act soon.

I hardly need to point out the contrast, Mr. President, between this sad prospect and the record of American agriculture.

An Indian peasant can hardly produce enough to feed himself. But an American farmer grows enough food to feed himself and 30 other Americans, and to

feed them four times as much as the Indian gets.

The problem of the poor nations is underproduction, and ours is overproduction. They suffer from starvation; we from overweight. They save their pennies for bread. We spend \$149 million a year for dietary foods, reducing preparations, and synthetic sugar.

With this record of phenomenal agricultural achievement the American farmer could do far more in fighting the world hunger explosion. And he clearly has the will to do far more.

Yet if the present program remains unchanged, he will not be able to do so. For our food for peace program is still based on the negative principle of surplus disposal—that we should give only our leftovers which we cannot use ourselves. This means that many people overseas feel we are just dumping, rather than carrying out a great and humanitarian international program.

And today, under present agricultural policies, our surpluses are shrinking even as world needs are growing. In the last 4 years, our stocks of wheat in storage fell about 600 million bushels, and our stocks of feed grains dropped by 41 percent. Indeed, some experts say that our surpluses have already become dangerously low for our national reserve needs. And the President has wisely called upon the Congress to set aside portions of these surpluses for needed national food reserves.

In 1964 a shortage of dry milk available for donation drastically reduced our ability to supply needed protein under the food for peace program.

In short, unless we go beyond the philosophy of surplus disposal, I fear we will soon have no choice but to cut down our food for peace program, just when world needs demand that we expand it.

Mr. President, I am convinced that we must consciously plan for greater agricultural production, so that after filling the needs of the dollar market at home and abroad, we will have enough to carry out a program large enough to meet world needs and American responsibilities. After all, any intelligent farmer or businessman plans his production several years in advance, and the Government should do no less. And in cases where, despite this setting of future targets, production falls still short of needs, our Government must have general authority to buy commodities in the marketplace for use in this program. This will raise prices to the farmer, encouraging him to grow more of those products which are most in demand.

If we can make these fundamental changes, we may see the day when we can spend some of the money which we now use for idling acres and storing surpluses to feed hungry peoples.

I support the present principles embodied in current farm legislation. I should like to see the income of our family farmers increased. I recognize under present circumstances the necessity for reducing production and paying the costs of storage, unless we are able to devote the vast agricultural productive power of this country to meeting the needs of starving people around the world, unless we can use our resources to

help these nations obtain viable economies and establish stable democracies. I would much prefer the latter course. I am sure that if this Nation continues to ignore the latter course and continue to do too little to meet the needs of starving and hungry people, history may write a harsh indictment of American society.

We are by all odds the richest Nation in the world, and we are living at a time when the American farmer can only be described as an economic miracle man, when his productive capacity is the marvel of the world; yet our money is being spent on idling acres, reducing production, at a time when thousands of people a day are dying of hunger, and perhaps hundreds of millions are having their growth stunted or are living under circumstances of malnutrition. I do not see how anyone who has any concept of what our Judeo-Christian society stands for can be confronted with that fact and be satisfied.

But, Mr. President, the amount of our shipments is not the only question at issue. Just as important is the quality of the nourishment that we provide. Our corn meal can help to fill empty stomachs, but unless we supplement it with needed proteins and vitamins, the children we feed will not grow into healthy men and women.

The effects of severe malnutrition are shocking and often irreversible. In developing countries, from 10 to 25 percent of preschool children suffer permanent damage, not only to their physical development, but also to their mental development because of deficient diets.

Yet, such tragic human waste can often be avoided at very low cost. Research by our Department of Agriculture has uncovered new ways of mixing animal and vegetable proteins, plus vitamins and minerals, to provide minimum adequate diets. For example, at a cost of 16 cents per child per year, we can fortify nonfat dry milk to protect children from deficiency in vitamins A and D.

An intensified war on malnutrition would call for increased American production of dry milk and vegetable proteins. The soybean would be in greater demand, along with peanut and cottonseed oils. And our food processing industry would play a large role.

So just as we must plan our production to grow enough total food, we must plan also to grow the right kinds of food, those foods which can supply the proteins, the vitamins and minerals which young children all over the world so desperately need.

I have emphasized the need to expand and reshape our efforts. But, Mr. President, we must also encourage other wealthy countries to join us in waging this war against hunger and malnutrition.

Until recently, few other nations made significant efforts in the field of food assistance. But today we find many are beginning to see the importance of this type of endeavor. Under the World Food Program of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, 39 countries have already contributed com-

modities, and we are moving toward a wider sharing of this responsibility.

Yet, though it is rapidly expanding, the world food program remains modest when compared to our own efforts—its goal is \$275 million in donations for the next 3 years.

We can encourage further contributions by other rich nations if we support an increase in this amount. I think it is a fine thing that at the Food and Agriculture Organization Council meeting at Rome 3 weeks ago, the United States tentatively offered to continue supplying 50 percent of commodity requirements under the world food program. But this offer only extends to donations up to the maximum of \$275 million. I believe that we should encourage the program to go beyond this, by pledging that we will match, dollar for dollar in commodities or in cash, any contributions by other nations which go beyond the present target.

Such a pledge would mean channeling a slightly greater proportion of our food assistance through the world food program. In return, we would be bringing others to assume the share of the responsibility which is rightfully theirs.

Yet, if we expand our program and increase the quality of our food, if we bring other nations to play a larger role, our efforts will still be futile in the long run unless we place top priority on our only reasonable, long-term objective—to stimulate rapid economic development in the poor countries themselves.

It is clearly in our economic interest to do so. A recent study indicates that for every 10 percent the less developed countries increase their income level, they expand their dollar purchases of our farm products by 16 percent. Italy, Japan, and now Nationalist China, have already moved from the status of food aid recipients to major dollar customers for our farm exports.

Thus, in promoting economic development, we best serve the long-term interests of American agriculture.

We also best serve the interest of world peace. For as President Johnson has said:

Our island of abundance will [not] finally be secure in a sea of despair and unrest, or in a world where even the oppressed may one day have access to the engines of modern destruction.

Unless the poor countries make significant progress in building better lives for their people, we will surely see an unprecedented wave of bloodshed, violence, and revolution sweep most of the world, and Communist and other dictatorial governments may well follow in its wake.

The food for peace program can assist in economic development, by keeping down food prices and allowing poor countries to spend their foreign exchange for machinery instead of food. But in the long run, economic growth in developing countries will depend on how they increase their own food production. If only their industry expands, factory workers will have more to spend on limited food supplies, and this will cause prices to rise. Increased food prices will then force wages upward, beginning

an inflationary spiral which will bring economic development to a rapid halt, and lead to food riots such as we have seen recently in India.

Thus, the situation is clear. Without agricultural progress within the poor countries, without balanced growth of agriculture and industry, they can have no sustained economic growth.

Even worse, without this agricultural progress there will be mass starvation, for food donations from advanced countries could never fill all of the increasing need.

In connection with this problem, I also do not feel that we can ignore the need to find some way to slow down the growth of population. I am happy that political and religious leaders everywhere are more and more recognizing this fact. But, even if we take strong steps in this direction, there is still a desperate need to improve food production in poor countries. It is necessary to prevent increased starvation; it is necessary to promote economic growth. And, strange though it may seem, it is only through improving their own agriculture that these countries can, in the long run, grow into major dollar importers of American farm products.

We must make certain, therefore, that we use our food program to stimulate progress in foreign agriculture. We must give more technical assistance to farmers in poor countries. It is easy to provide these countries with factories, featuring the latest and most modern equipment, but it is much harder to adapt our American agricultural technology to very different soils and climates. It is still more difficult to persuade illiterate peasants to use advanced methods.

Thus, we are tempted to make a quick impression with factories, but a one-sided stress on industry can be the worst thing for these countries. So that we must follow the harder path, the only right path, of putting top priority on growth in farm production.

First of all, we should make more of our food assistance conditional on greater attention to agricultural progress by the governments of developing countries. Among other things, they should be expected to increase imports of fertilizer, to expand their agricultural extension services, and to adopt needed land reforms.

We should also consider requiring that more of the local currencies generated by Public Law 480 sales be used for agricultural development projects. In particular, we should help finance research in agricultural techniques particularly applicable to tropical climates and soils.

In addition, we must do all we can to export our agricultural know-how, by increasing the use of our experts in the International Agricultural Development Service of the Agriculture Department and the Agency for International Development, and by searching for new ways to lend effective aid. We should expand the agricultural assistance activities of the Peace Corps. We might explore ways to use returned Peace Corps volunteers, with their experience and their knowledge of foreign languages

and cultures, in this expanded program to support agricultural growth.

Finally, I believe that we should consider undertaking crash programs of rural development, in particular, countries threatened by revolution or subversion because of unrest in the areas away from the large cities. Such programs would combine the imaginative use of food for peace with intensive efforts to bring rapid increases in agricultural production. It is not too much to say that if we had carried out such a program in the Dominican Republic, the recent tragedy there might never have come to pass. For as Senator McGovern told this body last month:

One in five children born in the Dominican Republic dies of malnutrition.

To bring about the changes that will be required, to administer a revised program based on changed conditions and new needs, our food-for-peace program will require strong policymaking at the top. So the final question we must face is the organization of this program here in Washington.

Up to now, the agencies responsible for this program have run it with real efficiency and impressive cooperation. Yet the present situation is clearly one of divided responsibility and fragmented authority. The Department of Agriculture, the Agency for International Development, the State Department, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Defense, the Commerce Department—all of these, and others, have important administrative duties in the food-for-peace program.

But, below the level of the President, there is no one clearly in charge of making policy for the whole operation. We have a Food for Peace Office, headed by an able Director, but this office has no real power to direct our overall efforts, or to help plan our agricultural production so that we can continue and expand our food-for-peace program.

I believe that this vital responsibility should be exercised by a body at the Cabinet level. It is my hope that, when he proposes changes in the program, the President will consider the establishment of a Food for Freedom Policy Council, on which would sit the Director of a strengthened Food for Peace Office, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and other high officials who now have partial responsibility for the program.

Such a Food for Freedom Policy Council would be responsible for planning America's overall policy concerning the world food problem, including food for peace and technical assistance to agriculture. It would set targets for U.S. agricultural production to enable us to do more in filling world needs, and it would recommend to the President and the Congress the policy changes necessary to achieve these targets.

To increase international cooperation in facing the world food problem, this Council would consult frequently with officials of the Food and Agriculture Organization and the world food program.

Mr. President, there is room for us to differ on specific institutional arrange-

ments, and the suggestion I have put forward would have to be worked out in far greater detail. But I feel there is little room for argument about the need to have greater policy direction and planning, if our program is to be bold enough to meet the challenges which await us.

Mr. President, every American should look with pride on the achievements of our food-for-peace program. As my distinguished predecessor, HUBERT HUMPHREY, said less than a year ago:

No nation has ever done more to wipe out hunger in the vast areas of the world than the United States.

But the accomplishments of the past will not solve the problems of the future. For, as the Vice President also said, in his next breath:

We have merely scratched the surface.

Two years ago, speaking to the World Food Congress, John F. Kennedy warned that "World peace and freedom cannot be maintained in a world half fed and half hungry." These words are no less true today.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is a speech which needed to be made. I know of no one who is better qualified, for many reasons, to make it, than is the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota. In the first place, he comes from a great agricultural State. It is a diversified agricultural State. It has played a big part in this food-for-peace program.

In the second place, as he has said in his speech, the man who inspired the program and championed it on the floor of the Senate for many years was his great predecessor, the then Senator HUMPHREY, now the Vice President of the United States.

I well recall, when I first came to the Senate, Senator HUMPHREY talking to me in this Chamber about this program, what could be accomplished with the program, and how it could enable us to use our magnificent resources of farm production to solve what is the most pressing and difficult and cruelest problem in the world, the problem of starvation.

The Senator has pointed out what I temporarily neglected to note, and what most Americans do not realize, that we have a hunger explosion. We have not only a population explosion, but also a hunger explosion. Although agricultural production in developing countries has increased rapidly, the fact is, as the Senator has pointed out, population has increased even more rapidly. Therefore, we are not gaining ground to hunger but losing ground.

He points out—and this should impress all of us, because we are a fat, overfed people, because we are an overfed and overstuffed people, many of us are dying of heart attacks—that throughout the world one-half of the people are hungry, pitifully hungry. Using Public Law 480 food in this way is the most logical thing we can do.

I refer particularly to the Senator's remarks at page 4 of his manuscript, where he is quoted as saying:

Our food-for-peace program is still based on the negative principle of surplus disposal—that we should give only our leftovers which we cannot use ourselves.

I ask the Senator from Minnesota if it is not true that if we were to change that concept, and put it on a positive basis, it would have a profound effect on the technology of the American farmer, good as it is. Is it not correct to say that there is psychological and economic pressure on the American farmer to limit his production and not to take advantage, to the extent that he would like to, or could, of the great new techniques that have been developed because it is plain to him that he produces more food than we can use, and the more he produces the more his price drops. The whole psychology is to produce less and to work less, to put more into the Soil Bank and not to produce.

Mr. MONDALE. I am grateful to the Senator from Wisconsin for his observation with respect to the food-for-peace program. His opinion is extremely valuable, because the senior Senator from Wisconsin was always going forward arm in arm with the Vice President, then Senator HUMPHREY, with the inspired objective of trying to use American agricultural production to help the starving and underprivileged throughout the world.

It is characteristic of his modesty that he has failed to point that out.

Getting back to the question the Senator has asked, there is no question in my mind that the present outlook of American agriculture is one of channel vision; it is limited to the boundaries of this country.

Our agricultural economics—and the Senator is aware of this fact, because he serves with distinction as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—has been one of trying to balance supply and demand with respect to domestic needs. For years we have failed to look at the needs of our own underprivileged within our own land.

I was glad that the Senator from Wisconsin and such able leaders as the late President Kennedy, and now President Johnson, have greatly expanded distribution of American food through such programs as the Food Stamp Program, in an attempt to make more agricultural products available to people in our own midst.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; this is something that I had forgotten about temporarily. We are not doing the kind of job that we should do. In the school milk program, for example, a cutback had to be made in the amount of milk made available to our own school children, because the appropriation was so small. We were practicing a fake, wasteful economy. There is a law on the books which provides support for milk at 75 percent of parity. We are storing vast amounts of dairy products, only to let them rot. At the same time we are cutting back on the amount of milk available to children in our schools.

This year the proposal of the Bureau of the Budget, and what the House passed, were at least \$10 million lower than they should have been.

If we were to give full vent to the school milk program, we would make the amount about \$113 million. The Bureau of the Budget and the House agreed on a \$100 million program.

Even here in America we have not recognized the possibilities of making food available, as the Senator says, to people within our own boundaries, let alone the unlimited opportunity for service to the world in achieving peace by opening up this opportunity to people throughout the world.

Mr. MONDALE. That is particularly true in the high protein field. In my speech I commented on some of the newest technology. I pointed out that, in one case, we were opening up ways by which, at a cost of only 16 cents per year, we could introduce into some of our food reserves of low protein content special additive that would make the food adequate from a high protein content standpoint. The same thing could be said for farm production. If we could have the type of program about which I am speaking, we could encourage substantially increased production of agricultural products of high protein content, and therefore we could meet a special need for the underprivileged and starving people at home and abroad.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed. That field has great possibilities. I see in the Chamber, the Senator from South Dakota, who as head of the food-for-peace program did such a magnificent job. I shall yield to him in a moment. I should like to ask one more question.

First, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his stress on improving food production. Many of us think of the program as a surplus disposal program and do not recognize that unless it is widely administered, it could be very destructive. It is possible that people become reliant on regular large food gifts from this country with the result that they do not improve their own agricultural technology. Until they do so, as the Senator has pointed out, they will really make no progress. That is the first step up from poverty. Until agricultural techniques are improved so that manpower can be freed to do other things, the people will be limited by their food supply.

The Senator's stress on that point is most appropriate and often forgotten in this kind of approach.

I should like to ask one technical question. I have heard it said that we shall have difficulty in expanding our food-for-peace program because countries do not have the port capacity, the transportation, and the storage facilities to receive any more food than they are now receiving. India is cited as an example. It is said that India seems to be having trouble in handling what it is getting today. Is there some sort of absolute limitation on how much food poor countries can receive?

Mr. MONDALE. I am glad the Senator from Wisconsin has raised that question. It is a question that I have often asked. My speech did not get into

it as deeply as I would have liked. It is true that limited port and transportation facilities, as well as storage, have been real problems. But I think it is wrong to conclude that they are insurmountable, or that they impose an absolute ceiling on the amount of food we send to hungry peoples no matter how great the need.

First of all, if these governments are faced with the choice of either improving their ports and adding to their internal transportation, or letting thousands—even millions—of their people die, they are going to have to build better facilities. This is the only sane political course for them to take, not to mention the basic morality involved.

But also, we have clear evidence that countries can increase this capacity if they make strong efforts. Take India, the largest Public Law 480 recipient by far. A year ago, her ports were unloading no more than 600,000 tons of grain a month at the most. At the request of the Indian Government, our Aid agency sent to India a team of American experts representing both government and private enterprises. They arrived last September and spent a month studying port management and cargo-handling practices. They concluded that India could adopt certain changes, and increase her port capacity to 780,000 tons of grain.

Now this year, after our longshoremen's strike ended in March, India had to unload an unusually large number of ships in April and May. By adopting the new techniques she was able to receive more than 950,000 tons in May, an improvement of over 50 percent in less than a year. And this is 950,000 tons cleared from the docks, meaning it was loaded onto railroad cars and on its way toward the people who needed it. This exceeded the best hopes of the American technical assistance team, and while a part of the improvement may have been due to diverting some facilities from other cargoes, I think this shows clearly what a country can do if it has to act.

For the long run, India is planning a new port at Haldia on the east coast, near Calcutta, which can relieve congestion and permit the unloading of larger ships. This is likely to be ready within 5 years.

Pakistan also has made substantial improvements. Through a combination of her own efforts and aid from the United States and the World Bank, she has almost doubled the capacity of the port of Karachi in the last 10 years, and for East Pakistan the record is even more impressive.

I am not denying that the problem raised by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is a real one, but I am convinced that it can be solved, especially if it is a choice between increasing capacity and letting millions starve.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I am pleased to yield to the outstanding expert on Food For Peace in this country, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator for his overly generous words.

The Senator from Minnesota has delivered the finest statement I have heard

on challenge of world hunger and what our response to that challenge ought to be.

The Senator has described in moving terms the world food gap. I regard it as the most important single problem in the world today. I use those words advisedly. If we cannot figure out some way to deal with the problem that faces half of all the people on this globe today—and that is the problem of adequate food, either too little food or the wrong kind of food—we are in for very serious times.

Human hunger, human misery and disease, all of which are interconnected, are at the bottom of a good many of the tensions, instability, and explosive situations that exist all over the world.

The Senator from Minnesota is addressing himself to an absolutely crucial problem. It is crucial from a moral standpoint. It is crucial from a political standpoint. It is crucial from an economic standpoint.

The Senator has also described in effective terms the rough outline of what ought to be our response to that problem, which is to harness the bountiful productive capacity in this country—capacity that we have been trying to idle at great expense to our taxpayers—and put that bounty to work in the cause of health and peace all over the world.

I fully appreciate, as does the Senator from Minnesota, that until we find a more effective way of using this food overseas, we must have some kind of control program at home to keep the surpluses from destroying our agricultural economy.

The time has come, however, particularly if we look at the dwindling food reserves in this country, to do what the Senator from Minnesota recommends today, and that is to take an imaginative and careful look at the possibility of using our ability to produce to take care of the needs of hungry people overseas.

Today I was talking with one of the world's leading nutritionists, Dr. Zabrel. He told me that there are now 3 million children who will die before the end of this year because of malnutrition or outright hunger; and that rate has continued annually for some time.

It may be that the cause of death is not listed as hunger. It may be that a child will be said to have died from chickenpox, influenza, or any one of the diseases that take the lives of children all over the world, but the reason children die from those diseases—diseases youngsters in this country would throw off—is that they are so undernourished and poorly fed that they have no resistance.

If today the American people were told that 3 million children were about to die because of some dramatic catastrophe, perhaps an earthquake or famine or flood, they would respond quickly.

We would do everything we could. We would have our globemasters flying food to them. We would make our military forces available to help distribute it. We would bring ships out of the mothball fleet and do whatever we could to make that food available.

But we do not see the silent death occurring all over the world. Millions of men, women, and children drag out their lives undernourished and underfed, dying premature deaths, not being able to make a contribution to society because of the lack of energy that stems from bad diet. It is to that question that we must address ourselves as a nation that has been blessed and can produce food beyond our own needs.

I commend the Senator from Minnesota for helping to open up this subject on the floor of the Senate. This is really the kind of war we ought to fight. We can win a war against hunger. It is the kind of war the United States is better equipped to fight than any country in world history.

The challenge is greater to meet than in the past.

I welcome the opportunity to join the Senator from Minnesota in the magnificent effort he has made in the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. MONDALE. I am highly grateful to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his comments. He is universally regarded as the Nation's leader in this great fight. He was the first Food for Peace Director, receiving one of the first appointments made by the late President Kennedy, and thus he was responsible for shaping much of today's program. Incidentally, he incorporated many new and creative ideas in the use of food to help children, to help build roads and schools by using food for wages, and to expand and encourage the participation of private charitable and religious organizations in food distribution. Our Nation will forever be indebted to him for his contributions, and also for the literature that he has written. This literature has helped more than that from the pen of any other man to develop this Nation's understanding of the great problem which we confront in facing what can only be described as a hunger explosion.

The point that the Senator from South Dakota has made about seeing for the first time this silent hunger, as he so aptly described it, is the very core of the problem. If we have a neighbor down the street who is starving, everyone responds. If people in American society are starving, and we see it, we respond without question. It is what a decent person does without question. If there is a disaster overseas—an earthquake, a tornado—time and time again our Nation has responded without question to make available any resources we have to help those people in their hour of need. What is different with this silent hunger; this hunger that takes the lives of at least 10,000 people a day? It is silent; it is unseen; it is unknown. And it is not only death that we must prevent; we must relieve bodies and minds from malnutrition, not merely in the thousands, but in the millions.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The Senator knows that one of the unfortunate, permanent aspects of malnutrition is that when a youngster lives out the period of life after weaning until he is perhaps 5 or 6 years old, with a bad diet, a diet lacking in protein, minerals, and vitamins, there

is nothing that can be done in later life to correct the permanent damage that has been done to the physical and emotional life of the child. That youngster will be warped for the rest of his life. The most critical period is from the age of 1, after the child has been weaned, until he is 6 or 7 years old.

One of the reasons why it is critical is that the child at that age is not old enough to fight for his share of the food that is available. There is a mistaken notion in many underdeveloped countries that the father ought to have the major share of the food because he is working in the field and is doing the physical labor. The mother will carefully set aside the largest portion of food for the father.

Actually, it is the little child that suffers the greatest damage; it is the child, more than adults, that requires the most food and requires a balanced diet. So what we are talking about here is perhaps most acutely the problem of children.

The Senator from Minnesota is quite correct in saying that if the American people had their way about solving this problem, they would perhaps be ahead of Congress. The American people are generous, moral people. What they need is more aggressive leadership from Congress and more aggressive leadership from our policymakers downtown. They will quickly respond to the kind of program that will harness our abundance in the cause of peace and freedom.

I feel certain that the Senator's distinguished predecessor, who is now the Vice President of the United States, and who in many respects is the father of the food-for-peace program, a man who stood on the floor of the Senate 10, 12, and 15 years ago, talking about the possibility of greater use of our food abundance overseas, would be proud to hear the junior Senator from Minnesota, his successor, speak out as he has done today.

Mr. MONDALE. I deeply appreciate the Senator's kind comment. I cannot imagine a program in which more interests of Americans converge than this. It is not merely our moral responsibility, which, in my opinion, ought to be enough. But we stand as the richest Nation in the world, the major surplus-food-producing nation in the world, with incredible unused agricultural productive power and surpluses being held at Government expense, while thousands of people starve and millions have stunted physical and mental growth because of malnutrition. I do not believe we can live in that kind of world and respond in that way without being hated, just as our neighbor would hate us if we did not help him when he was starving.

Second, at a time when we are in a titanic struggle with the forces of communism and other forces of dictatorship for the minds of men, surely we must know that it is hunger, illiteracy, disease, and poverty together which are our main enemies. It is the desperate acts of frustrated people who reach out for fanatical leaders that are our major problems. The use of American food in

an enlightened, creative manner, and in the fullest sense, can help to destroy the very basis of our major enemy.

Third, if we would use our best agricultural productive power to help to meet the needs of the people of the world for food, we would give to our agricultural economy the lift it desperately needs.

Any Senator who represents a farm population cannot help being struck by the fact that farm people are fine, hard-working Americans, investing their lives in their chosen profession, while receiving less than almost any other group for all they have contributed to the rest of American society. That is not fair.

In addition, by using the surpluses to help nations to get on their feet, to build strong, viable economies and, hopefully, democracies, we have already demonstrated that we can create new markets for industry and for farm products, as we have already done in Japan, Taiwan, Italy, Spain, and elsewhere.

Thus, by helping them, in the long run, we will create markets that will strengthen our economy.

Finally, I do not believe any nation, any strong Christian society such as ours, can forever ignore its moral responsibilities and remain fat in a starving world. We cannot fail to respond to the growing voice of humanity crying out for enough food to survive and get started.

For all these reasons, I believe the time has come for our Nation to open its eyes and to take the steps necessary to be the kind of compassionate, humane Nation that I believe we can and must be.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

#### PEARSON IS MISTAKEN ON VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, what I am about to do is not a pleasant task. It is probably not a wise task for anyone engaged in politics.

Two of the outstanding columnists and the most widely read and respected columnists in the country are Walter Lippmann and Drew Pearson.

Drew Pearson supplies something that is very badly needed. He is a muckraker. He does an excellent job. He exposes scandals and situations involving weakness, inefficiency, incompetency, and dishonesty in our Government. He is a columnist who is widely read in my State.

I regard him as a man of great integrity and ability, as a man of compassion, and a fine human being.

Like everyone else, Drew Pearson can be mistaken. It seems to me that in his column of Tuesday, July 27, he was very much in error in what he had to say. What he had to say can have a most unfortunate effect, I believe, on the attitude of our people toward the war in Vietnam.

I believe that he must be answered.

Pearson made a series of statements about the situation in Saigon. I was deeply concerned about those statements.