

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

U.S. Congress.

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 9

APRIL 3, 1973 TO APRIL 11, 1973

(PAGES 10643 TO 12002)

our strong international economic position, and because we had a vested foreign policy interest in the recovery of Western Europe and Japan, we tolerated certain foreign trade practices which restricted our ability to export.

However, conditions are radically different today. Our political rationale for tolerating unfair trading practices on the part of Japan and Western Europe no longer exists. The improved capabilities of our trading partners have given us new competition at home and abroad.

While all nations of the world benefited from the post-World War III pace of economic growth and trade for the first time in 100 years, U.S. imports have grown faster than exports over a sustained time period. The difference in growth rates was small until the mid-1960's, and as a consequence we maintained trade surpluses averaging about \$5 billion annually between 1955 and 1965. Since then, although our export growth has been well maintained, our import growth has soared and therefore, our net trading position has rapidly deteriorated. We incurred our first deficit of the century in 1971, when our imports exceeded our exports by \$2 billion. In 1972 this deficit worsened, totaling \$6.4 billion. This adverse swing in trade during 1964-72, can be attributed to a few major product categories: motor vehicles and parts, steel products, textiles, clothing and footwear and consumer electronic goods. This surge of imports has not only hurt our balance of trade, but has affected American industry in specialized areas. Some industries are especially affected by trade, and sudden shifts in trade can have dramatic consequences on domestic U.S. enterprises and jobs in certain industrial or geographical areas.

To overcome these problems requires that we take action here at home and abroad through international agreements. At U.S. initiative, the world's major trading nations have decided to work toward multilateral trade negotiations to begin in late 1973. These negotiations will be difficult and take some time to complete; however, it is of great concern that we provide the President with the new authority he needs to fashion a vehicle for our international trade which is responsive to the needs of the 1970's, and to replace the expired authority of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

The administration's bill is responsive to the trade and other economic problems of today's world. It is conceived in the knowledge that we live in a world of rapid change and in which the amazing growth of world trade has brought more international interdependence than ever before. The bill is carefully gaged to dampen and eliminate the frictions and tensions that have arisen in our international economic relations.

Most important of all, the administration's bill responds to U.S. needs, as we in the Congress see them. It requests tariff authority sufficient to free trade and to attack the problem of tariff discrimination. A basis would be provided for negotiating away the vast complex of Government measures which are non-

tariff barriers. Agriculture, a sector of international trade greatly affected by nontariff barriers, will be foremost in our minds, fully aware that we enjoy therein a strong international competitive advantage. The bill recognizes that labor and industry need better legislative assurances, than are now provided, that serious injury or the threat thereof from imports will be dealt with more expeditiously. The President will be authorized to cope better with unfair trade practices and unfair competition confronting American firms and workers. We are being asked to provide a basis for the President to capitalize on his momentous moves with regard to the Communist countries through the extension of most-favored-nation treatment. Finally, the bill would fulfill this Government's promise to share, with our major trading partners, in a meaningful and mutually advantageous system of tariff preferences for developing countries.

In summary, I believe it is essential that the Congress give this legislation its direct and foremost attention and move quickly in the best interest of the Nation.

THE U.S. JAYCEES AND THEIR EFFORT TO ELIMINATE HUNGER AMONG CHILDREN IN OUR SCHOOLS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, several days ago I met with Mr. Robert M. Benedict and Mr. David Jones, two dedicated and capable individuals who are working with the U.S. Jaycees in an effort to eliminate hunger among children in our schools.

Headquartered in Minnesota, this project by the U.S. Jaycees is directed toward expanding Federal child-feeding assistance to the 18,000 schools throughout the United States which currently have no school lunch program.

As a recent staff report by the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs pointed out, "The single greatest obstacle to completing our task of feeding the hungry children of our Nation a free or reduced price school lunch is the lack of proper facilities in about 18,000 of our Nation's 100,000-plus schools."

I believe that the Federal Government must take all possible steps to assure that needy youngsters in these schools receive nutritious meals. I am hopeful that Congress will appropriate the full \$40 million authorized for nonfood assistance in fiscal 1974 so that "no program" schools can begin serving meals to hungry youngsters. I believe that we also should stipulate that the full amount appropriated for this program be spent in fiscal 1974.

I commend to my colleagues in the Senate a paper prepared by Bob Benedict outlining the urgency and importance of providing proper nutrition for our Nation's children.

I should also like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter which I sent to the U.S. Jaycees Center for Improved Child Nutrition in Bloomington, Minn., expressing my thoughts on the great value of their leadership in this field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following documents be printed in full in the RECORD.

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

EXPANDING THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM (By Robert M. Benedict, Chairman, Jaycee School Lunch Committee)

The following provides an explanation of the rationale for the U.S. Jaycees' advocacy of expanding the School Lunch Program.

The first can be labeled as a humanitarian concern. We were amazed, and indeed angered, to read the results of such nutritional studies as "Hunger USA," "Their Daily Bread," "Still Hungry in America," and the hearings of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. That American children should be suffering the diseases of malnutrition in a country that has:

A. Spent \$36 billion dollars in farm subsidies in less than a decade to rid itself of abundance;

B. Spent \$150 billion dollars in foreign aid since 1945 to assure the progress of future generations in other countries;

C. Spent \$160 billion dollars since 1954 in assuring the future of Vietnamese children.

That this nation cannot afford to invest fully in our own children's nutrition, seems to us incredible. I use the word invest because most of us in the Jaycees are businessmen. We are not willing to see the taxpayers' money spent on every program that comes along, unless it shows solid prospects for a good return. Yet after careful examination and consideration, we are clearly sold on expanding the School Lunch Program for a number of very practical and, we believe, frugal reasons:

1. This nation spends \$40 billion dollars each year on elementary and secondary education¹ to prepare our young people to take a productive and meaningful place in society. But at least three recent nationwide surveys have demonstrated the futility of this if the children come to school hungry. A hungry child is not concentrating on his studies, no matter how good they might be or how much we spend on them. He's thinking about that empty, gnawing craving in his stomach that is so relentless in its pain and devastating in its result.

"Teachers and principals have repeatedly told the board of the obstacle which hunger places in their way—in the form of listlessness, fights over food, inattentiveness, acute hunger pains, withdrawal, and a total sense of failure."—"Hunger USA," p. 31.

Introduction of the School Food Program to previously unserved areas brought startling results:

"Reports of students progress in schools with first time lunch programs were astounding. Drowsy, lethargic youngsters were transformed simply because they were able to eat at least one good meal a day. Many schools report a decrease in absenteeism."—Francis E. McClone, Chairman, CSFSA Nutrition Committee (Position Paper—"Apparent Hunger in California Schools").

Following up on Mr. McClone's statement concerning decreased absenteeism, Mr. B. P. Taylor, Superintendent of the San Diego, Texas Independent School District reports:

"We strongly believe that school lunch funding is an investment in hungry children. We think it has in fact kept them in school and our records will so verify. It has not only kept them in school for an extra year, it has kept them in school until graduation time. . . . Our dropout problem is almost nil in our school district and I think the food program has been a big contributing factor."

So the crux of the matter is this: If a child is too hungry to grasp his studies and/or he decides to drop out, few alternatives but wel-

¹Footnotes at end of article.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FOOTNOTES

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

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

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

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

⁵ "Hunger USA," pp. 19 and 20.

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

U.S. SENATE,
March 28, 1973.

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

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

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

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

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

With warm regards,
Sincerely,

WALTER F. MONDALE.

THE TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE

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

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

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

THE PIPELINE DISASTER

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

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

The circumstances of the pipeline disaster are loaded with irony.

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

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

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

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

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

MINNEAPOLIS TRIBUNE EDITORIAL SHOWS CONCERN OVER CAMBODIAN BOMBING

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

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

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

MR. NIXON AND THE WAR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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