

UNITED STATES



U.S. Congress,

OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 2

JANUARY 28, 1966, TO FEBRUARY 9, 1966

(PAGES 1415 TO 2816)

summer rains later was used to good purpose in relieving the subsequent drought.

But much remains to be done. As the Congress studies the President's budget requests for 1967, it is important that we consider all benefits of our water control and utilization programs. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial, "Winter Water", by Jim Monroe, of radio station WCMO, Kansas City, Mo., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WINTER WATER

Plenty of water in the midst of a winter drought. Dry weather isn't so critical in winter as it can be in the growing season, yet a shortage of winter water causes its own troubles.

Our winter water lies ready for use in the huge reservoirs upstream on the Missouri River. It will not be used to relieve dryness of the land, but gates will be opened on a calculated basis to generate new record amounts of electric power and to maintain the Missouri at a good level to assure downstream users of plenty of intake capacity without the common winter ice jams.

In years past, ice floes were regular problems as they served to cut the flow of water like dams. Dynamite and bombs were used on occasion to break loose the big packs. City water intakes were bogged with mud in the low water. Now, the six upstream reservoirs are at record high levels to provide plenty of winter water downstream. By spring, they will be lowered sufficiently to take care of floodwaters and prevent damage along with maintaining a good navigation level.

The Missouri River is now tamed as far down as Omaha. Plans are developing slowly to control the river farther downstream in Kansas and Missouri. With public support, flood control and its fringe benefits could become one of the outstanding achievements of the century.

THE RESUMPTION OF BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at a time when the President of the United States was nearing a decision with respect to the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam, the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, sent a telegram to the President urging the resumption of the bombing of enemy supply lines and installations in North Vietnam. The telegram was sent on behalf of the 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans who are members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I should like to bring to the attention of my Senate colleagues this telegram from VFW Commander in Chief Borg, to the President in support of the President's position on the resumption of bombing.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD.

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

JANUARY 29, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans comprising the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

I respectfully urge you to order the resumption of bombing of North Vietnamese targets. The VFW believes that the Communist aggressors have had abundant opportunity to indicate a desire for peace through the cessation of their cruel aggression. The Red leadership has responded to your efforts by ridicule and continued terror. The VFW further believes that the winning of the war and the protection of U.S. fighting men requires the bombing of enemy supply lines and installations in North Vietnam. Continuation of the bombing pause will permit the Communists to send more bullets into South Vietnam to kill more U.S. troops and those of our allies. I take this occasion also to pledge you Mr. President the continued support of the VFW for your strong and determined policies to turn back Communist aggression in Vietnam. My recommendations in this telegram are based upon the resolution unanimously adopted by the delegates to our 1965 convention supporting whatever steps are necessary to win in South Vietnam.

Respectfully,

ANDY BORG,

Commander in Chief, Veterans of
Foreign Wars of the United States.

PROPOSED REDUCTION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, innumerable Federal programs show the commitment of the American people to the health and well-being of our children and young people, as the most important single resource we have. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Project Headstart, Crippled Children's Services, Maternal and Child Health Services, Child Welfare Services, National School Lunch Programs, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and a host of other programs all show the very real concern we have as a nation for guaranteeing that every child have a fair and equal chance to develop all of his talents and capabilities to the fullest extent possible.

Under the national school lunch program, nourishing and well-balanced lunches were served to 16 million children in 1964, 17 million in 1965, and an estimated 18 million in 1966.

Under the special milk program, children in schools, child-care centers, summer camps, orphanages, and similar institutions were provided with almost 3 billion half-pints of milk in 1964 and 1965, and an estimated 3 billion plus in 1966.

The relationship between hunger and nutrition, and the academic performance of children in school is very clear. Children who have not had an adequate, well-balanced diet, do much less well than others who have.

Now we are faced with the proposal to chop and slash the past levels of the special milk program by nearly 80 percent, from \$103 to \$21 million. This proposal has caused a storm of protest both here in Washington and in my State of Minnesota, and I think rightly so.

The Minnesota Farmers Union policy statement for 1966 said:

We urge measures to insure good nutrition for everyone * * *. This may be encouraged in several ways; through a nationwide food stamp plan; expanded school lunch and

school milk program * * *. The Federal aid for the special milk program should be sufficient so that milk at the "milk breaks" is supplied free to the students.

Mrs. Grace Larson, Bloomington, Minn., said:

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure you would not want to take this away from them.

Mr. V. E. Harris, Twin Ports Co-op Dairy Association, said:

This program is very essential to the farmers of our Nation and even more important to the schoolchildren.

Mrs. Thomas J. Jones, Faribault, Minn., said:

As a working mother of seven children, I depend on their getting that penny-a-carton milk twice a day at school.

As if it were not bad enough that 80 percent of these children will no longer have milk, and I think we must be practical in recognizing that the States will be hard pressed to provide the funds necessary to subsidize this milk—as if this were not bad enough, it will be a tremendous blow to our dairy farmers in Minnesota. The return per hour to dairy farmers is now shockingly low—much less than \$1 per hour. This low rate of return caused a sharp drop in Minnesota milk production in 1965, and I think we could expect a further sharp decline with this greatly reduced consumption.

I am heartened that Senators PROXMIRE and HOLLAND have indicated their opposition to this cut, and I intend to oppose it firmly.

I ask unanimous consent that the following letters from Minnesota residents be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE SAINT PAUL PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Saint Paul, Minn., January 25, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: It was with considerable concern that we read that President Johnson's budget proposed reducing the sum spent on the school milk program to \$37 million for 1967—and, further, that only needy children be allowed to buy milk at reduced cost.

It is our considered judgment that these proposals are false economies to the extreme.

In Saint Paul where we sell milk at 1 cent to students bringing a lunch from home, we are certain that an increase to 4 cents (our cost) would seriously reduce participation among the very students who are most in need of milk at noon from a nutritional standpoint.

In secondary schools, which is our major service in Saint Paul, it is difficult presently to meet the needs of all the underprivileged because such students will go to lengths to avoid being stigmatized as such. We feel certain that such is the case in most secondary schools and only slightly less true in elementary grades.

If the suggested reduction were applied to the school lunch program, it is likely that our lunch charge in Saint Paul would be increased from its present 25 to 30 cents. We feel that such an increase would adversely affect participation among the very students most benefited by the program.

We have worked hard—and have been greatly assisted by State and Federal aids—to increase participation in both the school milk program and the school lunch program. Saint Paul has more than doubled such participation in the past 5 years. We are working to continue this progress.

We urge that you give full consideration to this suggested reduction and work for its reconsideration if you can do so in good conscience.

Cordially,

S. W. DOUCETTE,
Director, Saint Paul School Cafeterias.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Congratulations to you as our Senator from Minnesota.

Are you a supporter of the school lunch program as your predecessor Vice President HUMPHREY is? I sincerely hope you are as I have a request to make of you.

I have worked in the school lunch program for 20 years and am aware of the benefits gained by our children by learning to eat a variety of different foods.

The President's proposed budget included large cuts in the special milk program and the school lunch program. These cuts, if allowed to pass, would mean an increase in price to the children and may well cause some to have to go without a school lunch. My request is that you lend your support to disallow the proposed cuts and keep our school lunch program a vital part of the Nation's economy helping our future citizens grow up strong and healthy.

A friend of yours, Mr. Leroy Johnson, with General Mills, mentioned last week that he too was going to tell you how important it is to support the school lunch program.

Thank you for your consideration to this request.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. DAVID V. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 26, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We are greatly disturbed over President Johnson's proposal to slash the school milk budget. We feel as an average taxpayer some other budget could be considered—why do we always have to consider the needy, they receive plenty already and it is we who pay for it—or the Cuban exiles, who else but us, is paying their transportation costs and so forth, or that highway beautification bill; is that as beneficial as a glass of milk?

Please give due thought to this proposal.

Gratefully,

Mr. and Mrs. ROGER REICHEL.

FARIBAULT DAILY NEWS,
Faribault, Minn., January 28, 1966.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Can anything be done to prevent the discontinuance of the penny-a-carton milk plan in our public schools? How can our good Democratic President do this to us? Are there not many other places to cut that would not at the same time cut the health of our children?

As a working mother of seven children, I depend on their getting that penny-a-carton milk twice a day at school. Although our county commissioners declared our Rice County not in need of the poverty funds available, this was an unrealistic decision. Actually, there is much poverty in Rice County and Faribault. Wages are low here and the cost of living high. Our real estate taxes are \$330.66 per year, * * * my wages \$60 per week for 6 days a week. Unions are al-

most unheard of here in Faribault except among the most skilled labor.

This letter is written in great haste as I felt I must in some way protest. I realize it is not worded most effectively. What I am trying to say is that this milk cut or increase, depending on how you look at it, is going to be hard on families like my own which do not want to go on welfare, but still need that little boost we have been getting with the school milk program. This is the first time I have vehemently disagreed with the administration, and I am sure that this is going to be a weapon in the hands of the Republicans during the next election. C'mon, now, let's reconsider this decision and urge President Johnson to retain this beneficial milk program just the way it has been.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. THOMAS J. JONES.

ARROWHEAD COOPERATIVE MILK
PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Duluth, Minn., January 21, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We, members of Arrowhead Cooperative Milk Producers Association, want you to do your utmost to restore any moneys that are being cut from the school milk program.

This program is one of the best and should be encouraged more, as it gives "nature's best food," milk, to the group that needs it most. It also, supplies it to some, who may not receive it otherwise.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

ROY E. PETERSON,
Manager, Operator, Arrowhead Cooperative Milk Producers Association.

MENTOR PUBLIC SCHOOL,
Mentor, Minn., January 31, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: After much exposure to all the "title programs, the poverty program and colossal waste that will take place there; to know that the Federal Government is trying to give away money for endless "dreamed up" jobs for youth at \$1.25 per hour—(we know, because we had to dream them up and furnish names of students); then to know vast amounts of foreign aid moneys are given away with no strings attached—and to read about the plans for school lunch in foreign countries at our expense, we superintendents have trouble with our temperatures when we read the enclosed news item.

We have had to deduct 5 percent on each of our monthly lunch reports on the Federal milk program—which seems silly. Recently I received a letter from the State department of education stating that beginning with the February report 10 percent must be deducted. Every time I do this I think how picayunish the Government can be about established and proven programs and how unbelievably loose they can be on such programs as foreign aid.

In light of some of the things mentioned above, isn't it rather ridiculous that the Federal Government should play the lunch program aids so closely? We should be getting more commodities—meat in particular. This year we have received considerably less.

I have always gone along with the Democratic Party but I am beginning to cool quite a bit. Let Congress and/or the executive branch cut the school lunch program and it will be the biggest political mistake they ever made. This is one place where the money is not wasted on administrative costs. One party might blame the other, but the Democrats are in and must assume the responsibility. It really makes one perturbed

to think that a cut in lunch aids was even considered—say nothing about bringing it about.

You will be smart if you work to increase lunch program aids to schools—not to decrease them. Cutting aids would be the biggest joke of the century.

Sincerely yours,

E. P. NEIBAUER,
Superintendent.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters here in the United States well fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,

MURIEL ROSS.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a cook in one of our lunchrooms in Bloomington. I can see how much good our hot lunch does for our boys and girls. Please see what you can do, so our school lunch and milk money will not be cut.

Sincerely,

ETTA MUNCKE.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE and Hon. EUGENE
McCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SRS: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk programs.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LEONA JONES.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE and Hon. EUGENE
McCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep

our youngsters well fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. GRACE LARSON.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE and HON. EUGENE McCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you because of the proposed cut in funds for school lunch and special milk programs. I am hoping you and others will give this much consideration before it is brought up before our lawmakers. If this cut is made, as proposed by President Johnson, it will mean the prices of lunch and milk will have to be raised. If the price of lunches are raised there will be less participating in our lunch program.

I am in hopes the proposed budget will be reconsidered by all persons who have the power to do so.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. FLORENCE RYMAN.

WAUBUN PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Waubun, Minn., February 2, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MONDALE: We are very much concerned with the proposed cut in the budget for the support of the school lunch program. Should a reduction take place in the amount of our reimbursement and also a reduction in commodities we receive, it would seriously impair our program.

At the present time we are operating our school lunch program at a loss because we charge our students only 20 cents. If it became necessary for us to raise the price, many of our families would be unable to afford lunches for their children.

The board of education and myself feel that the support of the lunch program is a very worthwhile program and we would certainly not like to see a reduction in the support of it. In fact, if anything, an increase would be most helpful. This is a program that benefits all children and certainly is a very practical and humane way of making the very best use of any surplus agricultural products.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER M. BJORNSON,
Superintendent.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 29, 1966.

Mr. WALTER MONDALE,
Minnesota Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Twin City Chapter of the Minnesota School Food Service Association met on Monday, January 24, at Richfield.

This was the same day it was announced that the 1967 Federal budget recommended a cutback from \$89 to \$37 million for the school milk program. Also a reduction in the school lunch subsidy was announced.

The 500 members of this chapter from the school districts of St. Paul, Minneapolis, West St. Paul, Richfield, Bloomington, Robbinsdale, Edina-Morningside, Columbia Heights, and White Bear Lake urges you to work for the restoration of these funds so that the school milk program and the school lunch program can continue to meet the needs of our schoolchildren.

We trust that you and your colleagues will be able to execute economies in other areas rather than at the expense of the school food services.

Thank you sincerely,

MAXME MOORE,
Secretary, Twin City School Food Service Association.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,

January 31, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
HON. EUGENE McCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk program.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ALFRED NYBO.

STILLWATER, MINN.,

January 24, 1966.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding the milk fund and school lunch programs, either all students should benefit or none. Where can the line be drawn. Only the rich and poor will be able to survive the Great Society.

We surely do not want the inspection costs added to the prices we already pay for meats and poultry.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. VERNON HOPHAN.

TWIN PORTS CO-OP

DAIRY ASSOCIATION,

Superior, Wis., January 21, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senator from Minnesota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: At a joint meeting of the executive board of Twin Ports Cooperative Dairy Association and several members of the Arrowhead Cooperative Milk Producers Association, it was brought to the attention of the group the action taken on the school milk program as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 223 and 224 of the Senate CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as of January 14, 1966.

These two groups commend Senator PROXMIERE on his stand and Senator HOLLAND for his support to Senator PROXMIERE. We also urge that you throw your support to this very worthwhile program, as well as lend your support to the restoration of the \$3 million that was cut from this program. This program is very essential to the farmers of our Nation and even more important to the schoolchildren.

We will appreciate any support that you can lend to this worthwhile program. Thank you.

Yours very truly,

V. E. HARRIS,
General Manager,
Twin Ports Co-op Dairy Association.

THE PROBLEMS AND NEEDS OF THE EGG AND POULTRY PRODUCERS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, egg producers and poultry farmers have faced an increasingly bleak future during recent years.

In my own State of Connecticut, the number of egg producers has declined by 50 percent or more since 1960.

During these years the price of eggs has dropped steadily, with the exception of 1965 when prices rose slightly.

But 1965 does not portend a better future for the independent poultry farmer.

Due to the unpromising future, many small independents went out of business, a development which caused an egg shortage sufficiently large to drive up the price of eggs after the 10-year period of decreased prices.

In order to help the poultry industry achieve a higher degree of stability, and in order to give the independent egg producers a better chance to prosper, Con-

gress should step in and establish a marketing order similar to those now in effect for other agricultural commodities.

Senator CASE, my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, has introduced such a proposal, S. 2832.

I was pleased to cosponsor this bill, on which hearings were held by the Senate Agriculture Committee, Thursday and Friday of last week, February 3 and 4.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the testimony in support of S. 2832 of two Connecticut organizations, the Connecticut Poultry Association and the Central Connecticut Cooperative Farmers Association.

Both are very much in favor of this bill and provide in their statements compelling evidence of the need for marketing orders for the egg producing industry.

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

STATEMENT TO THE SENATE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE, SUBMITTED BY MAX GIRSHICK, REPRESENTING THE MEMBERS OF THE CONNECTICUT POULTRY ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 4, 1966

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee; my name is Max Girshick. I am a member of the board of directors of the Connecticut Poultry Association, an organization that counts among its members the vast majority of the egg producers and poultry farmers in the State of Connecticut. I have been authorized to present the following statement representing the views of the Connecticut Poultry Association.

From year to year the economics of egg production become more chaotic and the independent farmer finds himself in a tighter squeeze. And each year, or each time a census is taken, we find that the number has shrunk. Not the number of hens but the number of families who find their freedom to exist under a chosen way of life, being denied them by circumstances beyond their control, either collectively or individually.

In a census taken, county by county, by the Connecticut Extension Service in 1960 there were 981 egg producers. Three years later, in 1963, despite the fact that Connecticut is a deficit egg producing area, a similar census was taken by the same agency and it disclosed that 46 percent of these egg producers were out of business; only 527 were left.

The price of eggs the last 10 or 12 years has declined steadily. During the 5-year period, 1952-1956, the price of eggs averaged about 42 cents per dozen. The next 5 years the average price of eggs was about 36 cents per dozen, and the year 1964 saw the decline continue with an average price of 33.4 cents per dozen.

The temporary reversal of this trend during the past year only emphasizes the dilemma of the family unit. So many family sized units were discouraged by the earning experience of the preceding year that they curtailed their operation. Temporarily there were shortages, and therefore higher prices. This cannot, however, be considered as a reversal of trend.

Already there is again a threat of overproduction. Chick placements during the month of December and the early part of January are averaging 13.5 percent above a year ago. What this portends is best explained in the following quote from the January 1966 Poultry Marketing Bulletin published by the Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Connecticut.