

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

U.S. Congress.

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 9

APRIL 3, 1973 TO APRIL 11, 1973

(PAGES 10643 TO 12002)

fare will remain. We see the School Lunch Program as a bulwark against future welfare. If we are going to spend tens of billions to guarantee schools, textbooks and transportation for our children, why not guarantee them the nutritional ability to take advantage of it?

2. Malnutrition is costing this nation upwards of \$30 billion dollars annually² in terms of health care, loss of wages, and increased welfare. According to Dr. George Briggs, Professor of Nutrition at the University of California (Berkeley):

"The cost of malnutrition is six times the cost of feeding all of our nation's children in school food programs."⁴

This health care cost seemed fully feasible to us as we gleaned recent nutritional studies. "Hunger USA" told of school children in Mississippi and Alabama where 60 and 80 percent were anemic; of four and five-year-old children, weighing less than twenty pounds; and of Appalachian children who at the age of six years were nearly two inches shorter than the national norm.⁵

But perhaps the California study written by Mr. McClone states it best of all:

"Malnutrition in the young child is of particular concern because mental retardation often accompanies the resulting physical retardation."

"A child's potential for intellectual development can be irreversibly impaired by malnutrition. Early malnutrition produces a permanent irreversible effect on the growth and size of organs."⁶

We could continue to relate similar studies, such as those that list the number of ill-nourished American school children as one-third, but our point is this: We feel that it is far more humane and far less costly to spend money feeding our children during their formative years than to have to support them and their families on welfare, and lose what could have been a major contributor to society.

We further feel that it is far better to strengthen our children nutritionally during their formative years than to have to pay for them medically in later years.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Hearings before the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, October 13, 1971, p. 2475.

² Hearings before the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, October 13, 1971, p. 2467.

³ "Children's Needs" *School Foodservice Journal*, October 1971, p. 49.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

⁵ "Hunger USA," pp. 19 and 20.

⁶ "California States Its Position" *School Lunch Journal*, February 1971, p. 52.

U.S. SENATE,
March 28, 1973.

Mr. ROBERT BENEDICT,
National Director, U.S. Jaycees Center for
Improved Child Nutrition, Bloomington,
Minn.

DEAR BOB: It was with great interest that I learned of the U.S. Jaycees effort to expand school feeding programs to the 18,000 "no program" schools throughout the United States.

As you know, through my involvement with the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs and as Chairman of both the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity and the Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Subcommittee on Children and Youth, I am very much concerned about the well-being of our nation's children. Needless to say, a listless, malnourished child can hardly pay full attention to the lessons being taught in the classroom. His mind will be on the gnawing, craving hunger in his stomach. The poor health, missed educational opportunity, and

the sense of hopelessness and frustration produced by malnutrition can only lead to an alienated citizen who never reaches his full productive potential.

I have long been familiar with the Jaycees and am deeply impressed with their ability to design solutions for local problems, their organizational skills, and their methodical dedication to carrying their programs to conclusion. I feel the Jaycees can have a far-reaching impact in this most important area of concern facing our nation today.

With warm regards,
Sincerely,

WALTER F. MONDALE.

THE TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on March 28 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of editorials indicating the need for the trans-Alaska pipeline. At that time I erroneously indicated that the text of the editorial from the *Tulsa Oklahoma World* of February 12 was identical to that of the *Washington Evening Star* and *Daily News*. This was my error. I would like to set the record straight at this point and insert the correct editorial from the February 12 *Tulsa Daily World* entitled "The Pipeline Disaster."

I request unanimous consent for the insertion of the editorial in the RECORD.

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

THE PIPELINE DISASTER

By delaying and possibly killing the Alaska pipeline project, a Federal Appeals Court may have canceled out the last ray of hope for an early and sensible solution to this country's rapidly-deteriorating energy supply problems.

The ruling shuts off a vast new source of petroleum at a time when it is desperately needed. Alaskan oil and gas products would not be a positive solution to the energy crisis. But most experts believe that the supply could tide us over until science refines and improves nuclear power plants and develops other new sources.

The circumstances of the pipeline disaster are loaded with irony.

The successful lawsuit was the work of self-anointed, self-righteous "protectors of the environment." Yet they never came close to making a case on environmental grounds. After years of stalling, the ecology people only last August heard a Court declare that the INTERIOR DEPARTMENT had met all the environmental requirements for construction.

No, the Alaska project was not stopped for ecological reasons. It was the victim of a "Catch 22" legality—an old law limiting the width of right-of-way.

Further irony: In cutting off a source of clean, safe petroleum products, the ruling will almost surely force increased usage of low grade coal, high-sulphur-content oil and other high-pollution fuels. While presenting themselves as champions of Mother Nature, the pipeline opponents have set the stage for an unnecessary new dose of air pollution.

The decision also creates a new demand for foreign oil, all of which must come in by tanker with increased danger of troublesome spills. We can live with this, of course. But isn't it strange that it should be brought about by people who claim to be protecting the environment?

The Court decision is a complex one. Just what kind of legislation might be needed to overrule it is not immediately clear. But steps should be taken at once to change the old right-of-way law and to put the Alaska project back on the tracks.

MINNEAPOLIS TRIBUNE EDITORIAL SHOWS CONCERN OVER CAMBODIAN BOMBING

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial entitled, "Mr. Nixon and the War," which appeared on April 1, 1973, in the *Minneapolis Tribune*. The editors share a growing concern over the continuation of U.S. bombing in Cambodia, with no congressional authority.

I ask unanimous consent to have the *Minneapolis Tribune* article printed in the RECORD.

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

MR. NIXON AND THE WAR

In his speech to the nation on Thursday night, President Nixon appealed to all Americans to "put aside those honest differences about war which have divided us and dedicate ourselves to meet the great challenges of peace which can unite us." We agree with that statement.

And yet, it seems to us, the President himself continues to play upon the issues that have divided the country since America became deeply involved in the Indochina conflict eight years ago.

He gives no credit to the sincerity of those millions of Americans who differed, and still differ, with his goals in Vietnam. These he brushed aside as merely "a small vocal minority," notwithstanding the fact that among them were not only average citizens whose consciences had been stricken by America's intervention in another people's civil war, but some of the country's most distinguished scholars, diplomats, military leaders, businessmen and politicians. These were, and are, patriots, too.

Mr. Nixon Thursday night proclaimed that his goal of obtaining an agreement that provides "peace with honor" in Vietnam has been achieved. To the extent that all the American prisoners of war have been released and, for the time being at least, the Communists have been prevented from imposing their form of government on the people of South Vietnam, that is true.

But the fighting has not ended, the peace-keeping machinery has not taken hold, and we share the concern of Joseph Kraft, who, in a column elsewhere on this page, writes that "the road is being paved for another American entry to the Vietnam War." Mr. Nixon, Kraft says, is prepared to resume bombing in Vietnam to save the Saigon government. The United States, meanwhile, continues to bomb in Cambodia, where a corrupt and incompetent military regime hangs on only with American military support, as an article on the following page reports.

Three of the Senate's most distinguished Republicans, Javits, Mathias and Hatfield, have joined Democratic colleagues in challenging Mr. Nixon's authority for the use of American bombers in Cambodia. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee should hold full-scale hearings promptly on Indochina and the administration's intentions. Such an airing might go a long way toward reducing any possibility of reentry into the Vietnam War or a further descent into the Cambodian morass.

The Paris peace conference, as Robert Keatley of the *Wall Street Journal* wrote in February, was "supposed to help America get off the Indochina hook." The price for interfering in the affairs of the Vietnamese people—which, if the Vietnamese had been left alone, would have been settled years ago—has been awful. Let it not be added to.