

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 114—PART 11

MAY 16, 1968, TO MAY 24, 1968

(PAGES 13565 TO 15010)

them with a dinner invitation so the visitors can get "down to the nitty-gritty."

Sen. Edward W. Brooke, R-Mass., Whitney M. Young Jr. of the Urban League and the Rev. Ralph D. Abernathy of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference are among those who have got the benefit of the black view.

"Sometimes it doesn't do too much good, from what some of the black VIPs have said when they got back home," one soul-session advocate said later.

Self-segregation does not attract all Negroes, and there are some who shun any appearance of Negroes getting together, no matter what the purpose.

There are Negro officers and civilians in Saigon hotels who prominently display record albums by Mantovani and Lawrence Welk and hide albums by such soul-sound purveyors as James Brown and Aretha Franklin.

HEALTHY FEELING

"A lot of the brothers feel they can't be themselves and integrated," said Lt. Col. Felix H. Goodwin, a Negro veteran of 27 years of Army service.

"This dates back to the time the Army was first integrated and we all felt we had to show whites we were not prejudiced," he added. "Most of us feel comfortable enough now to be both black and integrated, and we think this is healthy."

While integration is fairly recent in the military, Negro participation in American wars is as old as the country's history.

The Negro's ability and willingness have not been questioned in the war in Vietnam, and have in fact been consistently praised.

In a speech to fellow South Carolinians last year, Westmoreland said: "The performance of the Negro serviceman has been particularly inspirational to me. They have served with distinction. They have been courageous on the battlefield, proficient, and a possessor of technical skills."

Courage—and quite often bravado—is the young combat soldier's long suit.

"When America invented the grunt, she legalized thuggery," one front-line observer said. "When I'm out with grunts and the Viet Cong fires on us, I'm damn glad she invented them."

A young Negro Marine in war-ravaged Hue typified the grunt's bravado, his eagerness to fight, his disbelief that he can be hurt or killed.

The Marine sat on a naval landing craft on the Huong (Perfume) River, bound for the Citadel, once the seat of the Vietnamese imperial government, and now, during the Tet fighting, South Vietnam's major killing ground.

"Put me in your paper," the Marine told a correspondent.

"What can I say about you?" the newsman asked.

"You can say Lance Cpl. Raymond Howard, 18, better known as 'Trouble' from Bayonet, Ala., squad leader, 2nd Platoon, Delta Co., 1st Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, is going 'cross the river to kick him a few behinds."

THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I think it is unfortunate that the Senate Committee on Appropriations should react to recent tragic disclosures of the wide extent of starvation and malnutrition in the United States by cutting the appropriation for the school lunch program.

A recent CBS News documentary on "Hunger in the United States," the publication of a comprehensive report by the Citizen's Board of Inquiry, and a report by several women's organizations on the inadequacy of the school lunch program all call for increased effort by the Con-

gress in this area. At the very least, we have a right to expect that the bare-bones requests of the administration for funds ought to be granted.

It should be pointed out, too, that we are not talking here about mere budgetary amounts, nor statistical charts, but children who will be deprived of the free or reduced-price school lunches. The Department of Agriculture estimated that 20.2 million schoolchildren would participate in the program in fiscal year 1969. The cut imposed by the Committee on Appropriations represents a financial cut of approximately 5 percent and if this percentage carries over into the number of children involved, over 1 million children will be denied participation in the school lunch program. I think this is absolutely wrong. It goes in the wrong direction.

The problem with the school lunch program today is that it does not reach enough children. The recent report on the school lunch program, "Their Daily Bread," states:

1. Of 50 million public elementary and secondary school children, only about 18 million participate in the National School Lunch Program. Two out of three children do not participate.
2. Of 50 million school children, fewer than two million, just under four per cent, are able to get a free or reduced price school lunch.

I ask unanimous consent that the introduction—chapter 1—and the recommendations—chapter 14—of this report be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I sincerely hope that this action is not punitive in nature, designed to show the Poor People's Campaign that they dare not affront the Congress with their demands at the risk of losing ground in the fight to overcome poverty and hunger.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the amounts appropriated for this program also be printed in the RECORD. I call upon the Senate to restore the full amount of the administration request at the very least.

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

School lunch	Budget	House	Senate
1. Food assistance—			
(a) Cash payments to States.....	\$157,097	\$171,448	\$157,097
(b) Special cash assistance.....	10,000	5,000	7,500
(c) Commodity procurement.....	64,325	64,325	64,325
2. Pilot school breakfast program.....	6,500	3,500	4,500
3. Nonfood assistance.....	6,000	750	2,000
4. State administrative expenses.....	2,300		2,252
5. Operating expenses.....	2,545	2,127	2,252
Total.....	248,768	247,150	237,674
Appropriation.....	184,443	182,825	173,349
Sec. 32.....	64,325	64,325	64,325

INTRODUCTION

Poverty is not a uniquely American disease, but Americans have a uniquely optimistic way of dealing with it. In the twenty years from the end of World War II to the mid-sixties, we hid our disease in the attic of the national consciousness and almost convinced ourselves that it did not exist. We concealed it with phrases like "the affluent society" and "the highest living standard in the world," and we covered it with booming

production, consumption and employment statistics. We exported the goal of American prosperity to under-developed nations.

But poverty would not be concealed. One of the chief by-products of the civil rights movement was the revelation to middle-class America of the existence of an under-developed nation right here—millions of Americans, black and white, living in a shadow world of bare subsistence. This "Other America" is with us, but not in our midst. Unlike the one-third of a nation ill-fed, ill-clothed and ill-housed during the Depression, poor people are no longer visible to middle-class America. It is possible for a suburban family to live its entire life without ever meeting a poor person.

So that while we have finally been forced to acknowledge the existence of wide-spread poverty—and indeed have declared a national War on Poverty—there is an unreality bred by distance about our acknowledgment.

This unreality pervades not only our awareness of the problem, but our assessment of the methods created to deal with the problem. It is more reassuring and easier for us to believe uncritically that if a program is adopted to deal with employment or housing or welfare, then solutions to the problem are on the way, and we need trouble our minds and consciences no further.

This attitude applies with special force to the National School Lunch Program. Because it is one of the oldest social benefit programs in this country, and because it operates smoothly in a well-established mechanism for its administration, most Americans accept the present functioning of the program without complaint, believing that it adequately meets the need for which it was created. It is easy to understand why they believe this.

The National School Lunch Program last year celebrated its twenty-first birthday. During its life, it has won wide acceptance from educators and nutritionists. The members of both professions feel, with few exceptions, that there is a direct relationship between adequate nutrition and good scholastic performance, discipline in the classroom and constructive social attitudes. Hungry children are inattentive children, educators believe, and inattentive children cannot learn.

The Congress which originally created the National School Lunch Program in 1946 recognized the importance of a good lunch to the school child and passed legislation "to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children." To achieve this goal, the Program was "to supply lunches without cost or at a reduced cost to all children who are determined by local authorities to be unable to pay the full price thereof" without discrimination.

Because of this wide-spread recognition of the value of the National School Lunch Program, most of middle-class America believes that the school lunch is universally available. If you were to question, as we did, middle-class acquaintances or neighbors about their understanding of how the School Lunch Program operates, they would likely reply: "Oh, all the children get that," or, "That's to give needy children a good lunch," or, "All the kids get it, but the ones who can't afford it don't have to pay."

But in these comfortable assumptions—as in so many others—we are unrealistic. The facts show otherwise:

1. Of 50 million public elementary and secondary school children, only about 18 million participate in the National School Lunch Program. Two out of three children do not participate.
2. Of 50 million school children, fewer than two million, just under four per cent, are able to get a free or reduced price school lunch.
3. Whether or not a child is eligible for a free lunch is determined not by any universally accepted formula, but by local de-

cisions about administration and financing which may or may not have anything to do with the need of the individual child. And generally speaking, the greater the need of children from a poor neighborhood, the less the community is able to meet it.

These three facts, while perhaps not generally known, are well understood by school lunch administrators. What has not been comprehensively studied heretofore is why so few children participate in the National School Lunch Program or are denied the opportunity to participate, and why the School Lunch Program is failing to meet the needs of poor children.

This study was undertaken to find out why. It is peculiarly appropriate that these particular organizations have sponsored this particular study. All five sponsors are women's organizations and have a special affinity for the needs of children.

All five organizations have a religious orientation or connection, so their concern for social problems is neither that of a useful political tool or a passing fancy.

And most important, all five—sometimes working cooperatively, sometimes separately—have had practical experience on the local level dealing with the great social issues of our day: the problems of the aged, of children, of employment, education, housing, race relations.

The Appendix sets forth in detail how this study was organized and conducted, how the communities to be studied were selected, and who participated in conducting the studies.

All the material used in this study, except that which is specifically identified as coming from outside sources, was gathered by personal interviews using questionnaires specifically designed for this study. These interviews, more than 1,500 of them, form the basis for our conclusions about the National School Lunch Program.

The method of personal interviewing has been a great strength of the study, since it enabled the volunteer to talk directly with the school lunch administrator, principal, class room teacher and parent involved in school lunches in a local school, and to see the program in actual operation for herself. But it also leads to some contradictory statistics, since the volunteer did not attempt to evaluate the material herself, or to reconcile the figures given by one school official with conflicting figures given by another.

But in spite of some conflicting or confusing findings, the larger conclusions of the study are inescapable. We set them forth below, and discuss, document and analyze each in the chapters that follow:

1. The National School Lunch Program is inadequately financed on the Federal level, and the gap between the available Federal money and the needs of the Program grows bigger every year.

2. The formula for state and local financing which allows states and localities to contribute little or no financial support to the National School Lunch Program is both unjust and harmful to the operation of the program.

In many states, Federal money and Federal commodities pay for one-third of the child's lunch and the children themselves pay for two-thirds, which includes not only the food on their plates, but the salaries of state and local school administrators, cooks and food handlers, the storage and transportation of the food, and the cost of free and reduced price lunches for needy children who cannot afford to pay.

3. The lack of a uniform method of determining who shall be eligible for a free or reduced price lunch results in unequal and unfair decisions on the local level. A child eligible in one community for a free lunch might not be eligible in a neighboring town; eligible in one school, he might be disqualified in a neighboring school. Even in the same family, one child may be eligible and his

brother or sister may be declared ineligible. This lack of standards presents conscientious educators with choices they should not be forced to make. It fosters resentment and distrust on the part of needy parents.

4. Many older schools do not participate in the School Lunch Program because they were built without kitchens or cafeterias. Some do not participate because it would not "pay" to have a kitchen or cafeteria, i.e., the children's payments could not cover the cost of the program. Both types of schools are almost invariably located in slums. This means that the slum child, who needs good nutrition most, has the least chance of getting a school lunch.

Around these basic inadequacies, several cherished myths have arisen which tend to obscure the problems and to inhibit constructive solutions of them:

1. "No child who is hungry goes without lunch." We heard this over and over again from school lunch administrators. This is true in many schools where concerned principals and generous teachers work out emergency ways of paying for lunches, often out of their own pockets. But thousands and thousands of children watch their classmates eat while they sit in the cafeteria, not eligible for a free lunch and too poor to buy one.

2. "Teen-age eating habits account in large part for low participation in the school lunch program." Teenagers, according to a press release of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), "find it the 'in' thing to do to subsist on soft drinks and candy bars. They've got the weight problems to prove it." No comprehensive survey has been done to find out why participation is so low, but our study indicates that teen-age eating habits are a small part of the problem.

Certainly a vigorous educational campaign needs to be undertaken to teach teen-agers—and all children—the value of good nutrition. School boards, which permit the installation of soft drink and snack machines in public schools as a money-making device, could also benefit from such an educational campaign. And surely there is a relationship between participation and how attractively the food is prepared and served. But all of these factors, our study indicates, are less important to participation than how many children can afford the lunch.

3. "It is better for young children to eat lunch at home. This is one of the benefits of the neighborhood school idea." This is only true when the child who goes home to eat lunch gets a lunch to eat. But thousands of slum children come home for lunch to an empty house and a bare refrigerator.

4. "Children who are getting a free or reduced price lunch cannot be identified by the other children." This is a requirement seemingly implied by the legislation and touched on by the USDA regulations. Every State School Lunch Director we interviewed felt certain it was being followed. Some schools have indeed worked out careful systems to avoid humiliating free lunch children. But the majority of them have no such procedures, and quite a few, by using special tickets and tokens for needy children, have guaranteed their identification by classmates. We found many children, especially teenagers, who would rather go hungry than eat under these circumstances.

These are the broad conclusions reached in this study. There are, of course, many other elements in the National School Lunch Program, and they, too, will be discussed in the chapters which follow. Among them are Federal programs, in and out of the National School Lunch Program, which provide special assistance to feed needy children; the role of donated commodities in the National School Lunch Program; and a consideration of the professional qualifications of school lunch personnel.

In a program such as this, which is not fulfilling its potential, there is a tendency

to try to assign the blame to particular individuals or groups for its inadequacies. But succumbing to this easy temptation in this case would be unjust. Members of this Committee and the writer, who have dealt with school lunch officials at the Department of Agriculture, have been impressed with how hardworking and cooperative they are. Among State School Lunch Directors, there is a high percentage of dedicated public servants. Similarly, in the local communities we studied, we encountered cooperation and concern on every side—from School Lunch Directors to principals and classroom teachers.

Not every official we met was a paragon, of course. But whatever shortcomings there are in the School Lunch Program lie not in the individuals charged with responsibility for it, but in the system which limits, and sometimes even prohibits, their effective functioning.

How that system operates is the subject of this inquiry. The following thirteen chapters describe what our volunteers found. Chapter XIV is a series of recommendations for Federal, state and local action set forth in some detail and dealing with all aspects of the National School Lunch Program.

Our chief recommendation calls for a universal, free school lunch program as part of a long-range plan for better nutrition for all children. But until such a total program is developed, the following recommendations are designed to make the present system work:

1. Reduce the maximum price of the school lunch to 20c and provide free lunches for all children who cannot afford to pay.

2. Raise the federal contribution to keep pace with the growing needs of the National School Lunch Program.

3. Create a new matching formula for the states to insure that they bear some of the financial burden, relieving the children of paying for salaries, administration, food handling, and the cost of the free and reduced price lunch program.

4. Set uniform standards of eligibility for free and reduced price lunches to end the haphazard and inequitable present system.

In order to understand the study, some of our readers may wish to refresh their memory of how the National School Lunch Program operates, and what the various terms, which will be used throughout our report, mean. What follows is a brief summary of the legislation and Regulations governing the School Lunch Program. It is excerpted from the kit of materials prepared for our volunteers who conducted the state and local interviews.

Some facts about the national school lunch program

The National School Lunch Program currently operates under legislation passed in 1946 and amended in 1962 and entitled the National School Lunch Act. This legislation grew out of various Federal programs providing surplus commodities and cash in the late Depression days. Today, all states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands participate in the Program. Here are its most important features:

Purpose: "It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children, and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, by assisting the States, through grants-in-aid and other means, in providing an adequate supply of foods and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation and expansion of non-profit school lunch programs."

The Act provides this assistance by Federal contributions of both cash and agricultural commodities to each state.

Administration: On the Federal level, the program is administered by the United States Department of Agriculture through its Consumer and Marketing Service, School Lunch Division. In each state, it is administered by the state educational agency—State Board of Education, as it is usually called. Most states have set up a School Lunch Division for this purpose.

State allocation formula: The Act prescribes a formula for distribution of cash assistance to the states. The formula is based on (a) the number of school lunches served the previous year in each state; and (b) the assistance need rate of the state.

The assistance rate is based on a comparison between the average per capita income within the state and the average per capita income in the United States as a whole. When the state average per capita income falls below that of the United States, the extent to which it does determines, within certain limits, the correspondingly higher amounts of cash assistance to which that state is entitled.

In addition, assistance in the form of donated commodities is allocated to each state based on the number of lunches served in the state the previous year. (See Commodities Program below). If any state cannot use all the funds allocated to it, the unused portion may be distributed to the other states on the same basis described above.

Matching funds: The Federal cash contribution must be matched by funds from sources within each state on the basis of \$3 of state money for \$1 of Federal money. But those states whose per capita income is less than that of the United States have this ratio reduced.

However, since the state's matching funds include the money the children themselves pay for their lunches—which is about two-thirds of the cash amount of the Program—no state has ever had any difficulty meeting this requirement.

Other sources included in the state's matching funds are state and local government funds, except funds used for school construction, and private charitable donations.

The state is not required to match the value of commodities donated by the Federal Government.

Participation requirements: The Act requires that all schools wishing to participate in the National School Lunch Program must sign an agreement with the state educational agency that they will operate a non-profit school lunch program which:

(a) Meets minimum nutritional standards for a Type A lunch—a specified amount of protein-rich foods, vegetables and fruit, bread, butter or margarine, and milk;

(b) Complies with state and local health and sanitation standards;

(c) Supplies lunches free or at reduced price and without discrimination to all children who are determined by local school authorities to be unable to pay the full price.

Extra assistance: Agriculture Department Regulations authorize—but do not require—the state educational agency to allocate out of its general school lunch funds extra money to those schools which have a high proportion of children unable to pay for lunch. The Federal limit in non-needy schools is up to 9¢ a lunch. In needy schools, the state is empowered to reimburse up to 15¢ a lunch.

Special assistance: The reimbursement rate described above must come out of general school lunch funds. In addition, the Act authorizes in Section 11 (one of the features added in the 1962 amended Act) the appropriation by Congress of funds over and above the regular amount to provide special assistance to needy schools.

These Sec. 11 "Special Assistance" funds are distributed to the state on the basis of the number of free or reduced price lunches served in the state the previous year and on the assistance need rate of the state.

Nonfood assistance: The Act authorizes Federal appropriations to assist schools in purchasing equipment with which to set up lunch programs—stoves, refrigerators, etc. But Congress has not appropriated any non-food assistance funds under the School Lunch Act since 1946.

Nonprofit private schools: These schools may participate in the Federal program, but where a state is prohibited by state statute from making allocations to non-profit private schools, e.g., parochial schools, the Federal Government may withhold from that state the amount which the private schools would receive, and make the Federal contribution directly to the private schools. In such cases, the private schools must adhere to all the regulations for nutrition, free lunches, program review, matching funds, etc., even though they are not dealing with the state educational agency, but directly with the Federal Government.

Administrative review: The Act requires the state educational agency to review at least one-third of the schools participating every year to assist the local manager in improving her operation, to make sure they are meeting nutritional standards and are providing free or reduced price lunches to needy children, and to determine the adequacy and accuracy of their records.

Other school lunch legislation

Commodities program: Almost thirty years ago, the Federal Government began distributing surplus commodities to state welfare agencies, which in turn distributed them to charitable institutions and schools. The School Lunch Act continued this commodity distribution. But unlike the cash assistance part of the program, the state educational agency is not necessarily the agency in the state which distributes the commodities. Each state designates the agency within the state to distribute commodities. It may be the state educational agency, but it may also be the state Welfare Department, the state Agriculture Department, or some other agency, or a combination of agencies.

In any case, the decision about the amount of commodities allocated to the schools in the state is not made by the distributing agency, but by a formula prescribed by the Federal Government based on previous participation in the program.

Commodities available for school lunch programs are of three types:

(a) Sec. 32 surplus foods: Surplus foods are purchased by the Federal Government when supply exceeds commercial demand. The funds for purchasing these foods come from customs receipts on imported foods, and thus do not depend on yearly Congressional appropriations.

(b) Sec. 416 price support foods: These foods are purchased by the Department of Agriculture to carry out price support programs established by Congress for certain basic agricultural products. They are paid for with funds appropriated for price support purposes, and not funds appropriated for the National School Lunch Program.

(c) Sec. 6 special foods: In addition, the 1946 Act authorized the Federal purchase and donation to the states of special foods over and above the available surplus and price support commodities.

These special foods were authorized to insure the good nutritional balance of school lunches, which could not be guaranteed if the commodities were limited to the haphazard supply of only surplus and price support foods.

Special milk program: Previously under separate legislation, the Department of Agriculture provided Federal payments for each half-pint of milk served to children at reduced price in schools, pre-school groups and child-care institutions. In the schools, this does not include the half-pint which is served as part of the Type A school lunch. The special milk payments apply only to

second or third half-pints and to milk served separately from the school lunch.

Schools may participate in both the National School Lunch Program and the Special Milk Program, or they may participate in one and not the other. Many more schools are in the milk program than in the lunch program.

Under the special assistance section of the milk legislation, free milk is authorized for needy children attending schools classified as especially needy.

Administration for public and private (parochial) schools and child-care institutions is the same for the milk program as for the lunch program described previously.

As noted, the Special Milk Program operated under separate legislation. But since 1966, it has been incorporated into the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

Child Nutrition Act of 1966: Pilot breakfast programs in needy schools and schools to which children must travel long distances are being funded by the Federal Government under this Act. It uses the same apportionment formula as the National School Lunch Act, although an initial amount is apportioned equally among the states.

However, so far as donated commodities are concerned, the states are limited to using Sec. 32 and Sec. 416 foods in the breakfast programs, and may not use the more desirable Sec. 6 foods in it.

Like the National School Lunch Act, the Child Nutrition Act authorizes appropriations for non-food assistance (equipment) to assist needy schools. For the first year, 1966-67, Congress appropriated \$750,000 for non-food assistance under the Child Nutrition Act.

The pilot breakfast program is authorized for only two years. Since the Federal money for it did not become available until the last six months of the school year, less than \$1 million of the \$2 million appropriated for 1966-67 was used.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA): Under Title I of ESEA, local school districts may undertake a variety of projects to meet the needs of areas with concentrations of children from low-income families. Some schools are providing free school lunches funded by Title I. This program is under the jurisdiction of the Office of Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, not the Department of Agriculture. (When we mention ESEA in the text, we are referring to Title I.)

14. RECOMMENDATIONS

This report has stressed over and over again that the present operation of the National School Lunch Program is inadequate in meeting the needs it was designed to serve. First of all, the funds are inadequate. They are inadequate on the Federal, state and local levels. They are inadequate to keep the prices of the lunch at a point which would increase participation significantly; they are inadequate to serve needy children free and reduced priced lunches; they are inadequate to provide training to administrators and those responsible for food preparation.

School lunch administrators all over the country are beginning to express their sense of defeat about coping with this financial burden which grows larger every year. Articles in the *School Lunch Journal*, the field's professional journal, talk about "the deepening crisis of the school lunch program", "the inability to hold the line on prices", "the ever-decreasing federal contributions." The phrase "drop-out" is being applied to the National School Lunch Program with increased frequency.

Perhaps even more important, a feeling of dissatisfaction, of unrest about the School Lunch Program pervades those communities where children are excluded from the program. The parents of these children are not professionals—they are not interested in the average contribution per lunch of donated

commodities and the Federal cash reimbursement, or what percentage of funds are contributed by the state. What they are interested in is that the lunches are priced out of reach for those who could pay something; and the majority of those who cannot pay are denied the opportunity to receive a benefit which is theirs by law.

This community concern is a real and growing one. The National School Lunch Program has been a source of organized community protest in New Mexico, California, Ohio, Mississippi, Alabama, Texas and Pennsylvania. The list is likely to grow longer.

So the most important and the most detailed recommendations we make in this report are those which concern financing. But we have a larger concern.

From our talks with school administrators, local, state and Federal officials, legislators and parents, we have come to the conclusion that unless the School Lunch Program is accepted as a means of providing good nutrition for all our children in order to insure their present ability to absorb the education that is offered them, to help insure their present and future health, and to help insure their present and future functioning as responsible citizens, it will never be adequately financed and it will never be properly run.

This is hardly an original thought—on the surface it seems like a mere repetition of the language of the National School Act itself. But unfortunately, this attitude is not the prevalent one among many legislators, school lunch administrators, or community officials.

Too many legislators view the National School Lunch Program primarily as a convenient market for surplus commodities.

Too many school administrators regard the School Lunch Program as a welfare burden, not an educational responsibility.

Too many school principals regard the school lunch program as an administrative headache, not a means of raising the level of academic performance.

And woven into these attitudes are some darker threads of dislike and distrust. "They"—the poor—are "no good." "They" are trying to get something for nothing. "They" drink. If "they" won't provide for their own children, it is not our responsibility.

Too many legislators, school administrators, school principals and community officials regard the National School Lunch Program as one in which the books must balance. If the program cannot be made to pay off financially in a poor school, it ought to be eliminated, they feel. But by showing a financial profit, we may show a corresponding loss in the nourishment of our children, and mortgage their future well-being—a costly profit to our nation indeed.

If these attitudes persist, they will wreck the National School Lunch Program. For if the National School Lunch Program is viewed as a business which must pay for itself or is administered unfairly, then it cannot simultaneously be viewed as an opportunity to provide America's children—all her children—with a start toward a healthy and productive life. And if it is not viewed this way, the financing of it will continue to be grudging, insufficient and unsuccessful.

On the following pages are our formal recommendations based on the material in this study. They are addressed to the President, to Department of Agriculture, to Congress, to school lunch administrators and to professionals in the food service field. But in addition to these groups, voluntary agencies as well as official bodies have educational jobs to do:

1. We must educate parents about good nutrition. We must tell them about the school lunch program and inform them that their children have a right to be included in it.

2. We must convince educators, school board members and state legislators and the total community about the need to support the National School Lunch Program at the state and local level.

3. We must develop a national awareness that adequate nutrition is an essential part of education—without it, the most sophisticated advances in educational techniques are meaningless. "You can't teach a hungry child" must be first understood, and second translated into a sound nutrition program, starting first with the school lunch.

Recommendations

1. *The price of the school lunch should be reduced to place it within the reach of the majority of children.* We believe, along with many State School Lunch Directors, that a maximum price of 20¢ would make this possible. Reduction in price, a feasible short-run objective, could be achieved by the following combination of Federal, state and local action:

a. *Increased Federal Contribution:* Congress should set a standard below which the Federal cash reimbursement per lunch should not be allowed to drop. We recommend that the 9¢ reimbursement be restored as a preliminary step. The minimum Federal reimbursement should be so calculated that, combined with the states' contributions and the donated foods, it will keep the price at the 20¢ maximum.

b. *Increased Contributions from the States:* The formula should be changed to require the states to match the Federal contribution on a one-to-one basis. That is, if the Federal Government provides 9¢ per lunch, the states must also provide 9¢ per lunch. But the regulations of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) should specify that the states are not allowed to include in their matching funds the children's fees, funds from private charity, or the costs of program administration, construction or equipment. The money should come from state appropriations out of state revenues. The formula could be adjusted, as it is now, to permit states with a per capita income lower than the national average to contribute proportionately less.

c. *Increased Local Contributions:* The local school district should pay for local administration, labor and equipment for school food service as a regular item in its budget. The USDA Regulations should specify that children's fees may be used only to cover the cost of the food served to them.

d. *A Dependable Level of Commodities:* The cash value of donated commodities should be maintained at a steady and dependable level. The current standard should be 11¢ per meal, but subject to change should food costs rise. If the income from tariffs is not sufficient to maintain this level, or if the available supply of price support foods is not sufficient, Congress should appropriate special funds to ensure this level of support.

The value of the more highly nutritious Sec. 6 foods should constitute 50% of the cash value of all donated commodities. With more funds available from within the state, State Directors would have more flexibility and could make advantageous commodity purchases within their area.

2. *The Regulations should be changed to require that the local public school district should be the unit which contracts to participate in the National School Lunch Program, not the individual school.* (Parochial schools, where so required by state law, would continue to deal directly and individually with the Federal Government.)

As a condition of participation, the school district should be required to make the program available without discrimination to all schools, to submit a total plan showing how the service will be provided in each school, and to explain the exclusion of any school under its jurisdiction.

Lack of facilities, the enrollment of large numbers of poor children, or the fact that a school is a neighborhood school where children can go home for lunch should not be considered valid reasons for excluding schools from the program.

The contract should obligate a school district to feed all of its needy children. These children should be identified in advance, according to a uniform Federal standard, and the district should report to USDA its plan for including them in the National School Lunch Program.

3. *Higher reimbursement rates and increased Special Assistance (Sec. 11) funds should be made available to schools which serve a high proportion of needy children.* Increased Federal and state financial support to reduce the price to 20¢, plus the requirement that the program must be available district-wide, will put the school lunch within the reach of most children. But there will still be schools in poor neighborhoods which will need extra assistance.

a. School districts containing schools in poor neighborhoods and/or a high percentage of poor children should get a higher reimbursement rate out of general school lunch funds. This would enable them to reduce the price below 20¢ and across the board in poverty-impacted schools and to offer free or reduced-price meals to poor children wherever they are in the district.

b. Special Assistance (Sec. 11) funds should be sufficient to help the States feed all of their needy pupils, not just a token few. As a first step, Congress should appropriate the \$10 million originally authorized for Special Assistance. Subsequent appropriations (following this one) should be based not on the number of free meals served in the previous years, but on the estimated number of children who will need assistance in the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made.

Ultimately, the School Lunch Program should be adequately funded on the national and state levels so that Special Assistance would not be necessary. But until that time Special Assistance will have to be vastly increased to be effective.

4. *Children should be eligible for free or reduced price lunches according to a uniform standard of need.* All school children in families below the poverty level established by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), plus all school children in families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), should be automatically eligible. Children in large families with marginal incomes, even though they are not on welfare or below the poverty level, should be added.

5. *Identifying needy children by such practices as using special tokens or different color tickets, by calling out the names of those receiving free or reduced price meals, by collecting money in a conspicuously different way, by forcing them to go to the end of the cafeteria line or by requiring them to work should be specifically banned by USDA Regulations.* We do not object to giving all children the opportunity to earn money or credit for community service. But to make their eating dependent on cafeteria work is humiliating and psychologically unsound.

6. *All school food service should be put under one administration at all levels—national, state and local—to promote uniform funding, standards of eligibility, record-keeping and review and to effect greater efficiency and coordination.* The need for special programs to provide lunches and breakfasts to needy students will continue until the National School Lunch Program becomes truly inclusive. We look forward to the time when all special efforts, with their separate administrations, will not be necessary.

7. *USDA and the states should assume greater responsibility for improving the ad-*

ministration of the National School Lunch Program. Higher levels of administrative and business skill as well as competence in food service are required if the program is to be of greater benefit at a lower cost.

The major burden will be on the states who carry traditionally the responsibility for professional standards, training and certification. The states should accelerate their efforts in training, upgrading and certification and should hasten the time when only certified persons will be eligible for employment.

USDA should set guidelines for program standards, administrative reviews and record-keeping. Federal grants to strengthen the administration of the state and local school lunch divisions should be provided.

8. *The Congress, USDA, Boards of Education, state legislators, school lunch administrators should begin planning now for a universal free school lunch program as part of a coordinated plan for better nutrition for all children.*

We believe that school lunch should be served to all children as a matter of course. Each child should be given his school lunch in the same way that the majority of children now receive their books and school equipment. The school lunch should be a basic part of the free public school education to which every child has a right.

Part of the malaise of the present school lunch program is that it is isolated from the rest of the child's education. More important, its present operation bears little relation to the needs of today's children. What is needed is a total plan which will unify the present piecemeal system, modernize its administration and integrate it into the total educational process.

In order to achieve this goal, we recommend a two-stage program:

a. *Congress should provide incentive grants to school districts, municipalities or counties to develop model nutritional and food service programs for children and youth.* These models should include: a scientific analysis of nutritional needs; a total food service plan for maximum participation, free or at low cost, for children of all ages; experimentation with developments in food technology; increased efficiency and professional upgrading in already existing programs; community involvement in nutrition education; coordination with other community planning efforts for improving health and education.

b. *The President should appoint a National Commission with a mandate to design a federally sponsored free nutrition and food service program for children and youths.* The Commission should gather data about the nutritional status of America's children, evaluate all food service programs, and review the experiences of other countries with universal programs. Based on their study, the Commission should make recommendations about how a universal free school lunch program should be financed and administered. It should create the blueprint for a total nutrition program which would include not only the free school lunch but which would cover children's nutritional and health needs all day, every day.

The Commission should be broadly based and should include educators, nutritionists, economists, experts in food technology, school lunch administrators and parents.

"It is my firm conviction that to make lunch a fully educational project, it is necessary that it be offered free to all the children everyday . . . It is a growing conviction that a proper lunch is just as important as proper teaching, and that can be controlled only by having lunches offered to all children in the school . . . We are living in an age where the schools will assume more and more responsibility for the children and when such responsibilities are assumed, we in the school

lunch field cannot neglect our obligation to the hungry child and to all children.

GEORGE MUELLER,
Late Comptroller, Board of Education,
Kansas City, Mo., School Lunch
Journal, July-August 1966.

WEST VIRGINIA DELEGATES FOR HUMPHREY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a story from the May 23 edition of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette entitled "Of 36 Delegates, 24 on Humphrey Slate."

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

OF 36 DELEGATES, 24 ON HUMPHREY SLATE

Results from all but one county show supporters, of Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey for the presidential nomination will outnumber Sen. Robert F. Kennedy's supporters more than 3-to-1 in the West Virginia delegation to the Democratic National Convention.

Unofficial tabulation of May 14 primary results—with only Mingo unreported among the 55 counties—show the apparent election of a delegation made up of:

Twenty-four candidates who were on the slate supported by United Democrats for Humphrey; seven who favor Kennedy; one who favors President Johnson despite his rejection of candidacy; three who list themselves as uncommitted, and one whose name appeared on both the Humphrey and Kennedy slates.

The 36 elected delegates will include 16 delegates-at-large chosen in statewide voting and four delegates from each of the five congressional districts. In addition to the elected delegates, the delegation at Chicago in August will include the Democratic national committeeman and committeewoman.

The following unofficial results show the 18 leaders for the 16 delegate-at-large seats and the five leaders for the four seats in each congressional district H-Humphrey slate, K-Kennedy slate, J-Johnson, U-uncommitted: Delegates-at-large: 1. U.S. Sen. Jennings Randolph (U), 145,933; 2. Gov. Hulett C. Smith (H), 129,906; 3. Rep. Ken Hechler (H), 113,750; 4. Rep. Harley O. Staggers (U), 105,166; 5. State Sen. Paul J. Kaufman (U), 105,138; 6. Rep. John M. Slack (H), 104,003; 7. Troy S. Bailey (H) of Bridgeport, 93,210; 8. Alfred F. Chapman (both H. and K. slates) of Wheeling, 91,348; 9. C. A. Blankenship (H) of Pineville, 88,016.

10. Rudolph D. Jennings (J) of Bluefield, 87,233; 11. John D. Amos (H) of Charleston, 83,735; 12. Robert J. Burke (K) of Wheeling, 83,556; 13. Alan B. Mollohan (H) of Fairmont, 83,490; 14. Clarence E. Johnson (H) of Morgantown, 82,295; 15. William S. Bryant (H) of Summersville, 81,442; 16. Lawrence Barker (H) of Dunbar, 78,977; 17. W. E. Chilton III (K) of Charleston, 76,362, and 18. George Blizzard (U) of Oak Hill, 74,098.

1st District: 1. William D. Evans (H) of Fairmont, 24,200; 2. Walter Neeley (H) of Clarksburg, 24,179; 3. Richard W. Barnes (K) of Wellsburg, 21,172; 4. Jerome A. Burke (K) of Wheeling, 19,034, and 5. Charles L. Ihlenfeld (H) of Wheeling, 18,779.

2nd District: 1. State Sen. Betty H. Baker (H) of Moorefield, 14,885; 2. Robert Hedrick (K) of Elkins, 13,171; 3. John A. Canfield (H) of Keyser, 12,819; 4. Charles S. Armistead (H) of Morgantown, 12,454, and 5. Dr. Charles L. Leonard (K) of Elkins, 12,035.

3rd District: 1. Kelly L. Castleberry (K) of South Charleston, 14,144; 2. State Sen. Carl E. Gainer (H), of Richwood, 13,894; 3. David C. Callaghan (H) of Charleston, 11,381; 4. Virgil E. Matthews (K) of Charleston, 9,874, and 5. Lloyd C. Calvert (H) of Belle, 8,817.

4th District: 1. Paul Crabtree (H) of Point Pleasant, 13,472; 2. State Sen. Lyle A. Smith (H) of Huntington, 12,380; 3. the Rev. Harley E. Bailey (H) of Parkersburg, 10,515; 4. Charles M. Polan Jr. (H) of Huntington, 9,034, and 5. John M. McGuire (K) of Parkersburg, 8,995.

5th District (Mingo County unreported): 1. Andrew L. Clark (H) of Princeton, 14,486; 2. Roy A. Cunningham (H) of Beckley, 14,212; 3. State Sen. Tracy Hylton (H) of Mullens, 14,192; 4. Buzzy Bowling (K) of Beckley, 14,088, and 5. N. Joe Rahall (H) of Beckley, 12,656.

THE FOOD AND DRUG COMMISSIONER AND PROTECTION OF THE CONSUMER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, with the resignation early this week of Food and Drug Commissioner James L. Goddard, the administration faces the responsibility of appointing a successor who is, in the words of the New York Times editorial of May 23, an individual of "great energy, substantial professional status, and considerable courage." The Food and Drug Administration is one of the most important consumer agencies in the Federal Government—as a matter of fact, 25 cents of every consumer dollar is spent for products produced by FDA-regulated industries. Thus, it is incumbent upon the administration to designate an able, consumer-minded executive to this post which Commissioner Goddard has called "one of the hottest of the governmental hotspots."

A final point. It is not generally recognized that the Food and Drug Commissioner is not an "advise and consent" post, although other officials at the same echelon in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are—for example, the Commissioner of Education, and the Surgeon General. Senate confirmation of the nomination of the FDA Commissioner would afford the Senate an opportunity to review the qualifications of the appointee and determine the policies he will be pursuing as Commissioner. This is now done by the required Senate confirmation of the nominations of the Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Commissioner of Social Security, the Commissioner on Aging, and others who occupy parallel positions within the Department. It is for this reason that I introduced S. 958 on February 15, 1967. This bill would mandate such senatorial advice and consent. While it may have been appropriate for a Commissioner of Food and Drugs to have been appointed without a Senate review when the Food and Drug Act first went into effect in 1907 or when the FDA was created in its present form in 1930, the scope of the agency's responsibilities for the public's health have grown so appreciably since that time that the opportunity for Senate advice and consent should now be afforded. The task involved in selecting a successor to Dr. Goddard gives emphasis to this point.

RUCKUS AT COLUMBIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a timely and thoughtful