

UNITED STATES



*U.S. Congress*

OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 18

JULY 1, 1971, TO JULY 8, 1971  
(PAGES 23211 TO 24434)

surface forces in a single branch, as in the Navy, was more effective militarily than their separation.

Admiral Hart did not seek election in 1946. In October, 1947, he warned that Korea probably would become the 17th Soviet Republic. "A Sovietized Eastern Asia," he said, "is fully as menacing to us as would be a Sovietized Western Europe, and the probability that it may happen is decidedly greater."

He regretted in the light of later events that the United States had sought Russian entrance into the war against Japan, saying that "Japan's China army gave up, the Russian troops were not needed at all and the estimate was wrong."

Last November, he welcomed the election of his Sharon neighbor, James L. Buckley, as Conservative Senator from New York. "I always knew Jimmy had the stuff," he said.

In Sharon, he was active in such civic enterprises as the reforestation of Sharon Mountain, the Sharon Hospital, and in establishing the Sharon Historical Museum to which he gave his collection of firearms.

Admiral Hart is survived by his widow, the former Caroline Brownson, daughter of an admiral; a son, Roswell R. of Sharon; 3 daughters, Mrs. LaVerne Baldwin of Taconic, Conn., Mrs. Dana Bergh of Rochester, and Mrs. Francis B. Sayre Jr. of Washington; 13 grandchildren and a great-grandchild.

A funeral service will be held Wednesday at noon in the First Church of Christ, Congregational, in Sharon. Burial will be in Arlington National Cemetery following a service in the chapel at Fort Myer in Arlington, Va., on Thursday at 10 A.M.

#### PROTECTION OF ST. CROIX ESSENTIAL FOR CONTINUED RECREATIONAL EXCELLENCE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on June 18, the Minneapolis Star published an interesting editorial concerning the lower St. Croix River, which the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) and I have asked Congress to protect under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

As the Star points out, the St. Croix River is exceptionally valuable because its natural beauty and recreational potential are available to residents of the Twin Cities metropolitan area. If this river is not protected, the editorial adds, the St. Croix River Valley will no doubt become quickly overdeveloped and thus lose its attraction as a close retreat for Twin Citians.

Mr. President, because the editorial so succinctly summarizes the reasons why the St. Croix River should be afforded the protection of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

##### MYSTERY OF THE ST. CROIX

How Minnesota and Wisconsin could come this far without having the St. Croix River Valley they share overwhelmed by development is a mystery. But they can be thankful that, despite the pressure of the nearby urban area, the St. Croix remains essentially a beautiful, if somewhat overworked, recreational river.

Sens. Mondale, D-Minn., and Nelson, D-Wis., have introduced legislation to include the St. Croix from St. Croix Falls to the Mississippi River under the protective cover of the national scenic and wild rivers system. A federal-state study team suggests spending about \$7.5 million to preserve 8,250 acres

along the river, either through purchase or scenic easements.

While probably something less than one-fourth of the valley is still undeveloped, most of what is developed has a low profile. It's still possible to preserve much of the valley's basic recreational appeal, which, incidentally, was the recommendation of a Metropolitan Council staff report recently.

Without restrictions, on the other hand, it isn't hard to predict the overdevelopment of the valley and its loss as a place to retreat from the urban crush. While circumstance has provided a chance to save this valley from and for ourselves, the opportunity can't last forever. Congress should move quickly to approve the Mondale-Nelson proposal.

#### PROMISES WITHOUT PERFORMANCE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, I have been especially concerned about the need to realize the full potential of our young people. One of the prerequisites of their fullest development is a supportive environment free from fear, insecurity, and hunger. I am deeply concerned about the number of children—our greatest resource of the future—who are not only living in poverty but are struggling day to day without adequate food.

At present, our children comprise almost half of the 25.5 million citizens who live below the poverty line. In other words, about 13 million or 12.8 percent of all citizens under the age of 25 are probably suffering emotionally and physically from inadequate nutrition. It has been shown that severe hunger can impair an individual's mental abilities. Therefore, I believe that elimination of hunger should be one of the Nation's first priorities.

Earlier this year, the Department of Agriculture repeatedly urged the cities to expand their summer feeding programs. Consequently, requests from the cities were far greater than available funds. But suddenly, on June 17, the Department of Agriculture announced that it would be unable to fulfill its earlier promises to the cities to fund the expanded summer lunch program under section 13 of the National School Lunch Act. Now it appears that hungry children are going to become the victims of the administration's "promise without performance."

Mr. President, we all have read that on June 28 the Department of Agriculture announced proudly that it was prepared to spend \$18.1 million on the 1971 summer lunch program as compared with \$5.8 million spent in the summer of 1970. What the Department of Agriculture cleverly and purposely omitted was the fact that the \$18.1 million is about \$15 million less than the appropriation they led the cities to believe would be available. Not only did the Department of Agriculture deceive the cities about the appropriations, but they continued to encourage them to plan and initiate expanded programs right through the month of May. Then in June, they suddenly notified the cities that the promised funds would not be available. Such an abrupt and undeserved termination of funds places an additional problem in the laps of our already burdened cities.

I am astounded by the casual treatment which cities have received from the Department of Agriculture. Less than 2 weeks before funds were terminated, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Richard Lyng, testified before a Senate committee that the Department had sufficient funds to carry out all the provisions of the School Lunch Act. It begins to appear that these recent pronouncements and decisions by the administration have been somewhat whimsical.

My own State of Indiana is a prime example. As late as May the Regional Office of the Department of Agriculture urged the Indiana School Lunch Agency, through telephone calls and written correspondence, to contact churches, day-care centers and other organizations in order to plan the summer lunch program. Assurances were made that additional money would be available for the programs.

Buoyed by the written and verbal encouragement of the Regional Office, Indiana proceeded with its plans for the programs by buying food and making commitments to various organizations. In June only \$1,618.32 remained of the initial funding and Indiana was unable to pay for debts incurred during April and May. The school lunch agency requested by telephone an additional \$105,412 to cover debts and to start summer programs. A tentative letter was received saying the money would be coming, but to date no letter of credit has been received.

Shortly thereafter—around June 1—the Indiana office was informed that not as much money was available for summer programs as previously indicated and funding would not go beyond June 25. No new programs were to be implemented and some programs already in operation were to be terminated.

As we are well aware, Congress responded to the needs of the cities for additional funds by passing overwhelmingly H.R. 5257 by June 22. This bill extends summer feeding programs and authorizes \$32,000,000 for fiscal year 1972, an increase of \$12 million over funds for last year. It further authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to use during the next 2 years up to \$135,000,000 in money available under section 32. It was the clear intention of the Congress that the Secretary use that authority to provide full funding for the summer programs—and to use as much additional transferred money as necessary for the year-round programs. What we are faced with is an intentional frustration of the intent of Congress. Accordingly, I have sent a letter, with 40 other Senators to George Schultz, Director, Office of Management and Budget, urging his immediate reconsideration of the funds available for the summer lunch program. I sincerely hope that the repeated requests of Congress and the cities for more money will lead the administration to use the money available to feed our hungry children.

What will happen to the millions of children in New York and Newark, in San Antonio and Los Angeles, in Chicago and Indianapolis, and in many other cities throughout the Nation who will not be fed? It is hard for a person to con-