

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 1

JANUARY 3, 1969, TO JANUARY 21, 1969

(PAGES 3 TO 1380)

visible effects—the bloated bellies and emaciated bodies—but the internal mental and physical effects. A hungry child may survive yet his promise and hope be destroyed. A child's brain grows to 90% of its full size between the ages of one and four. If his brain is not supplied with enough protein, it won't grow. And it won't grow after he is four even if he does get enough protein. This kind of brain damage is irreversible and the child will be mentally retarded for life.

A poorly nourished child has little or no resistance to infections and diseases. He is infinitely more susceptible to parasites, viruses and bacterial infections.

Not the least of the effects of hunger are the educational, psychological and social effects. A hungry child doesn't learn at school. He is listless. He fights with other children. He has hunger pangs. He withdraws. He cries. As one doctor said, "He becomes tired, petulant, suspicious and finally apathetic."

If these problems exist—and we know they do—we have failed a substantial portion of our people. We have failed to make good on John F. Kennedy's first commitment as President, to assure every American an adequate diet.

Since its inception in the early 40s, the commodity distribution program has been our first line of defense against domestic hunger, yet today it serves only 3½ million participants. The commodities in it provide less than an adequate amount of the calories, iron, protein and calcium needed by those served.

In 1964 we passed the Food Stamp Act. It was designed to enable the poor to buy stamps at their local welfare office and redeem them at a premium at their local grocery store. But it has been a mixed blessing. It was supposed to replace the commodities program. But those who participate must pay, and their payments are supposed to equal their "normal" expenditures for food. Moreover, the food stamp and commodities programs cannot be operated in the same county. Many who were given free food under the commodities program and spent nothing for food before, cannot afford food stamps. As a result, fewer people are fed today through family food assistance programs than in January 1962. That year nearly 7½ million persons were fed through family food assistance. Today, only 6.1 million participate.

There are other problems with the food stamp program. The average American family spends 17% of its income on food. But a poor family of four with a monthly income of \$39 must pay \$10—or about 25% of its income—for food stamps.

To compound the problem, the amount of food that the poor family can buy with stamps is only half what the Department of Agriculture itself says the family needs.

What are we going to do about this disgrace of hunger and malnutrition in our land?

What we need is coalition to end hunger in America. Farmers and food processors must join to work out practical reforms so that no American need go to bed or to school with an empty stomach.

A possible vehicle for mobilizing this coalition was formed in the Senate with the establishment of a new committee last August to recommend coordinated programs that will assure every American has access to nutritious food and other basic human needs. The Committee is chaired by our Senator George McGovern of South Dakota, and I am pleased to be a member of it.

We need reforms in the food stamp, commodity distribution and school lunch programs, and we need them now.

The food stamp program must be reformed. The purchase requirements should be scaled so that the poorest of the poor get free stamps, and so that no family needs spend more of its income than the average

American spends on food. The food stamp bonus should be increased to permit the purchase of an adequate diet by all participants.

Next, the commodity distribution program shall not be tied to the existence of surpluses. We know we can grow more than enough food for our people. We must devise a system that allows our full agricultural potential and expertise to be mobilized so that none goes hungry.

The school lunch program should guarantee that free meals, including breakfast, are available to any child unable to afford the regular price.

Finally, these programs should be expanded so that every county and city in the Nation that needs them can get them. Food assistance programs should be operated under uniform standards of eligibility that will allow all 29 million of our poor people to participate.

It was before this audience that the idea of Food for Peace was born. You supported and fought for it. Tonight I hope you will make the same decision to eliminate human hunger in our own land. I hope we agree here and now that it is immoral for a nation as rich as ours—as capable of producing food as we are—to permit infants and children to be permanently warped and stunted in body, mind and in spirit because we lack the will to deal justly with their needs. I use the word justice for it is not charity to feed a starving child, but simple justice and decency.

Like most issues of human improvement, failure to act reflects not only a failure of the heart but of the mind. Sound bodies and sound minds are not only desirable, but essential to a sound and decent nation.

What can be said of us in our time if we permit a single child to be destroyed by starvation? How can a Nation which boasts of its compassion spend 80 million on defense: 24 billion to go to the moon, and then refuse to purchase the estimated \$700 million in farm value of additional food to permit all Americans an adequate diet? Can a people that spend nearly \$200 million on dieting fads refuse to respond to the millions in our midst who are starving?

Isn't it far too late to argue against an adequate diet for our people? From the beginning of organized society hunger has been rejected as inhumane and unacceptable. It was the ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle who reminded those in his time:

"Health of mind and body is so fundamental to the good life that if we believe that men have any personal rights at all as human beings, then they have an absolute moral right to such a measure of good health as society and society alone is able to give them."

Perhaps Woodrow Wilson put it even better when he said: "No man can worship God or love his neighbor on an empty stomach." Thank you and good night.

#### GOVERNOR HICKEL AND CONSERVATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Interior-designate, Gov. Walter Hickel, caused genuine concern among conservationists by statements on resource development and antipollution measures at his maiden press conference. At the time I said, in part:

I am appalled by statements attributed to the Secretary of Interior-designate Walter J. Hickel, who is quoted as saying "It is wrong to set aside land and natural resources strictly in the name of conservation."

Without this "locking up" of resources in the past, the Nation would now have no National Park system and no National Wilderness Preservation system. With future decisions on which Interior-administered lands

will enter the wilderness system in Secretary Hickel's hands, it is evident that we can expect little enlargement of this system beyond its present inadequate area.

Now two great newspapers have also commented on the Secretary-designate's statement. The New York Times said:

If Governor Hickel has any reverence for the land or awareness of the unnatural imbalance that threatens to overwhelm mankind, he gave no hint of such sentiments in his remarks.

The Kansas City Star, after pointing out that the Interior Department "controls tens of millions of acres of priceless land—the canyons, forests, rivers, and mountains that make up the remaining outdoor heritage of America," asked:

The big question is what Hickel plans to do with this national treasure.

Many of us who are interested in conservation are asking the same question. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times]

#### CONSERVATION FRONT: CLOUDY

President-elect Nixon's choice for Secretary of the Interior, Gov. Walter J. Hickel of Alaska, has confirmed the worst fears of those who regard the restoration and conservation of a ravished continent and purification of its polluted air and waters as priority business for this generation of Americans.

In his first press conference the other day, Governor Hickel indicated that he has little if any comprehension of the basic meaning and purposes of conservation. As chief steward of the nation's resources his inclination seems to be to put private profit ahead of the public interest. We profoundly hope we are wrong in this interpretation; but his words leave little room for doubt.

"I think we have had a policy of conservation for conservation's sake," the Secretary-designate said. "Just to withdraw a large area for conservation purposes and lock it up for no reason [italics added] doesn't have any merit, in my opinion."

Compare this with the enlightened view of the current Interior Secretary, Stewart L. Udall, who has written: "The status we give our wilderness and near-wilderness areas will . . . measure the degree of our reverence for the land. . . . A wilderness system will offer man what many consider the supreme human experience. It will also provide watershed protection a near-perfect wildlife habitat, and an unmatched science laboratory where we can measure the world in its natural balance against the world in its man-made imbalance."

If Governor Hickel has any reverence for the land or awareness of the unnatural imbalance that threatens to overwhelm mankind, he gave no hint of such sentiments in his remarks. On the contrary, he belittled Secretary Udall's efforts to set national standards for clean waters, saying: "If you set water standards so high, you might hinder industrial development." These words will be music to the ears of irresponsible industrialists who have been battling to keep pollution control in the hands of state governments amenable to their narrow interests.

President Kennedy once warned: "Each generation must deal anew with the 'raid-ers,' with the scramble to use public resources for private profit, and with the tendency to prefer short-run profits to long-run necessities. The nation's battle to preserve the common estate is far from won." Considering the overwhelming economic, industrial and population pressures, it will be a

sad—perhaps fatal—day for conservation in this country if anyone who even looked like a champion of the "raiders" were to be named to the crucial post of Secretary of the Interior.

[From the Kansas City Star]

#### FUTURE OF CONSERVATION IS NOW UNCERTAIN

As secretary of the interior in the Nixon administration, Gov. Walter Hickel of Alaska will become the nation's No. 1 landlord. Under his supervision will be the National Park service, the bureau of sports fisheries and wildlife and the bureau of land management. Together these three federal agencies control tens of millions of acres of priceless land—the canyons, forests, rivers and mountains that make up the remaining outdoor heritage of America.

The big question is what Hickel plans to do with this national treasure. As governor of Alaska he has had strong feelings that government lands should be released for private development, particularly logging, mining and settlement. Perhaps a national land use policy for the 50th state is long overdue. However, the new secretary will face a far different problem in dealing with the public lands that remain in the older parts of the United States.

While Alaska is one of the last great wilderness areas on earth, the challenge in other parts of America is an altogether different one. The problem is to preserve as much of the remaining outdoors as possible to meet the future recreation needs of a nation of 300 or even 400 million people. Time is running out—and so is the land.

We believe the conservation policies that have taken shape in the 20th century form one of the most distinguished traditions of this nation. They were given their original direction by a Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt. The men who served under Warren G. Harding had other ideas about how the national domain could best be used.

Franklin D. Roosevelt presided over the second great wave in conservation. During the 1960s, both John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson added fresh luster to this American dream. Each administration must forge its own land-use policy and the approach has varied radically over the years.

Even during the most ambitious periods of expansion, when new parks and rivers and seashores have been preserved for the enjoyment of the American people, there has been a continuing battle between public and private interests. It required a national effort to save a few of the dwindling redwoods from the saw. The mining interests were successful in trimming Canyonlands National park to about a third of the original concept. Glen Canyon has been drowned forever and the Grand Canyon was almost dammed in two places by those who preferred desert irrigation to incomparable natural scenery.

Even under the most vigorous and dedicated secretaries of the interior, such as Harold Ickes and Stewart Udall, the conservationists have suffered many defeats at the hands of those who want to exploit the land. It is far too early to predict what policies Walter Hickel will pursue. Snap judgments would be unfair. But it is not too early to hope that Hickel and the new administration will continue the same programs put forward during the Kennedy-Johnson years. If so, America may still get the public playgrounds it needs—before the land runs out.

#### AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) to proceed to consider the resolution (S. Res. 11) to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I will continue to oppose any change in rule XXII. While I have great respect for those of my colleagues who argue that rule XXII obstructs and thwarts the will of the majority, I would respectfully suggest that the very men who would amend the rule overlook the extraordinary constitutional function of this body.

The Senate is the great balance wheel of our federal system, the great equalizer, the single national institution that distinguishes our confederation from most unitary forms of government. For in our Chamber the voice of an Alaskan citizen has the same great weight as the voice of a citizen from New York.

There is talk today of majority rule. I would call to the attention of my colleagues that, by simple calculation, it would be possible to construct a majority of 52 Senators that would effectively represent less than 17 percent of the people of this Nation. While I readily grant that it is hard to imagine an issue that would promote such a coalition, it is a simple statistical fact that the 52 men representing our 26 least populous States—or 33.3 million out of a 1967 population of 198 million Americans—could end debate on a matter of great importance to the remaining 83 percent of the Nation's population.

Mr. President, in the House of Representatives any majority, by reason of judicial and legislative reapportionment to approximate the values of one man, one vote, comes very close to representing a statistical majority of the people themselves.

Such is not the case nor was it intended to be the case in the Senate, for the Senate is the perfect example of one man, one vote, in the sense that the vote of each elector of each State amounts to precisely the same and is given the same weight as the vote of every other citizen within that State.

The vote and representation of a Senator thus elected is equal to the Senator who may be elected from a much more populous State. This is the concept of equality. The concept of majority rule is not promoted by the modification of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate but rather it is jeopardized, for in my view rule XXII, which requires more than a simple majority of the Senators—not the people, but the Senators—to cut off debate is the balance wheel of the Senate which in effect would prevent the unlikely but theoretically very possible coalition of 52 Senators, a majority, which would represent less than 35 million Americans.

The newspapers and the critics of rule XXII complain from time to time that a willful minority of Senators have obstructed the majority voice of the people. I respectfully submit that a minority of

the Senators very easily and often do represent a preponderant and overwhelming majority of the people; and once again, unlike the House of Representatives—where I am happy to say we are approximating now the concept of one man, one vote—a majority of the Representatives do generally equate to a majority of the people, but in the Senate it does not. It is not supposed to. It was never so intended. It was not thus designed by the founders of the Republic.

I believe rule XXII of the Senate provides an additional safeguard against the imposition of the will of a distinct minority on the expressed wishes and desires of the majority.

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

Mr. BAKER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator, of course, is familiar with the debates in the Constitutional Convention by the framers of the Constitution. Is it not strictly true that there was a necessary compromise to bring a constitution into being to be submitted to the Thirteen Original States that brought forth the concept of two Senators for each State, large or small, with equal vote, and to serve in a distinct sense as representatives of the sovereign States from which they came?

Mr. BAKER. The Senator is clearly correct, and it is the central thread woven through the fabric by the Founding Fathers in the creation of the Constitution.

I might point out further that rule XXII, it seems to me, grew up not as a result of our initial constitutional considerations but by subsequent precedent and usage. It grew up as a safeguard not of the least populated States but a safeguard of the majority of the people, for were it not for rule XXII or its equivalent or some variant thereof, as I pointed out or attempted to point out previously, it would be entirely possible for 33.3 million people out of the population of 200 million people in this country to be represented by a majority of 52 Senators in this Chamber.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. Is it not true likewise that in order to safeguard always the principle that if a sovereign State should have two Senators as voices to speak for that State, the Founding Fathers included in the Constitution a provision that no State should be deprived of its two Senators, or either of them, without its own consent?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, clearly and obviously that was one of the conditions by the several States in the nature of a compromise that produced the Constitution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not made clear by Mr. Madison in his later comments on what occurred—and I believe that is the most authoritative source—that without that compromise there would have been no Constitution to be submitted to the Thirteen States.

Mr. BAKER. That is obviously so. I hope I am not misunderstood by my colleagues in rising to the defense of rule XXII or its equivalent because I believe no one here will challenge that in the course of my brief tenure in the Senate