

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)

or a private nonprofit or cooperative buyer, could then obtain up to \$10,000 per unit loans for rehabilitation of property in any deteriorated or deteriorating area. I have received support of this proposal from cities such as Pittsburgh, Atlanta, Boston, and New York City, among others. I am hopeful this provision will be also included in the Housing Act of 1968.

S. 3506—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO ESTABLISH A JOINT COMMISSION ON THE GOLD RESERVES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, during the recent floor debate on the bill to remove the gold cover from our currency, I was prepared to introduce an amendment creating a Commission on the Gold Reserve.

Senator SPARKMAN, our very able chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and manager of the gold bill on the floor, requested that various amendments be withheld in order that the gold bill could be acted upon with all possible haste.

I know that many of my colleagues are concerned, as I am, with regard to this Nation's balance-of-payments deficit. I am also greatly concerned over the recent report by the Department of Commerce which indicates that the United States experienced in the month of March its first merchandise trade deficit in 5 years. This country's exports fell 11.5 percent from February and imports rose 0.4 percent, resulting in a trade deficit of \$157.7 million.

The problem, of course, is caused by pressures at home, and, more specifically, the problem is one of cost. The cost of goods produced, cost of money, cost of services—all are on the rise and at an alarming rate. Inflation has forced a strong cost factor which is negative to achievement of equilibrium in our balance of payments, and I fear that the March trade deficit is only a beginning of what may be expected in the months ahead.

Furthermore, I have been disturbed by many reports which have left the impression that the special drawing rights approach is the answer to this Nation's balance-of-currency transfers. It must not be forgotten that as long as the United States has an ounce of gold in its reserves, this gold will be jeopardized by our international trade position regardless of the success or failure of the special drawing rights system. It must also be remembered that the SDR's are tied to gold, expressed in terms of gold, and will only be issued to the various members of the International Monetary Fund in relation to the amount of gold they have previously deposited with the IMF.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I am introducing a bill to establish a joint commission to examine the gold policies of the United States, including, but not limited to, a study of the means for maintaining adequate reserves in gold to meet present and foreseeable needs, the role which gold plays in achieving liquidity in world trade, and the alternatives to the present reliance on gold in the settlement of international balances.

The Commission should, from time to time, give the President and the Congress its advice and recommendations with respect to matters falling within the purview of its study.

The Commission established by the bill I am offering would consist of the Secretary of the Treasury as chairman; the Secretary of Commerce; the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; six Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate; six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker; and eight public members to be appointed by the President.

This Commission would be charged to study our gold policies generally and to give the President and the Congress its advice and recommendations with respect to matters falling within the purview of its study.

In fact, Mr. President, the creation of the Commission under this bill would follow the same pattern and purpose as the Joint Commission which was provided by S. 2080, passed by the Congress in 1965, which provided for a study of the problems then existing in our silver currency. The House Members of that Commission were appointed July 26, 1965, and the Senate Members on July 30, 1965. The President activated the Commission on May 1, 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3506) to establish a Joint Commission on the Gold Reserves, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3507—INTRODUCTION OF BILL ENTITLED "DOMESTIC FOOD ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1968"

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I today introduce, for appropriate reference, the Domestic Food Assistance Act of 1968. This measure would enable us to launch a new attack on malnutrition, hunger, and starvation in this country, meeting one of the needs the Poor People's Campaign today dramatizes.

Mr. President, what welfare mothers, rural farmers, Senate subcommittee hearings, and the report by the Citizens' Board of Inquiry all have told us can no longer be ignored: Hunger stalks this country. Malnutrition shames this Nation.

Mr. President, many are the paradoxes in this country. But to me none is more appalling, or less forgivable, than the paradox of hungry poor in this land of plenty.

This Nation of voluntary dieters has thousands condemned to forced fasting every day;

This Nation of food fads has thousands sick for lack of protein and vitamins they cannot afford;

This Nation that spends billions to keep food off the market has perhaps 10 million people whom the choice is beans and biscuits, or no food at all.

And part of the paradox is that we do not even know the true dimensions of the problem. For this Nation that knows

much about the nutritional status of the underdeveloped countries has never done a complete study of itself.

Nevertheless, the information now available is more than sufficient to show us the nature, if not the scope of the hunger problem in this country.

Like poverty itself, hunger is a pervasive phenomenon. The look of hunger can be seen; the cry of hunger can be heard in every State in the United States. In the rural South, in the Appalachian North, on Indian reservations, in migrant camps, in urban ghettos live men, women, and children for whom each day represents a new horror, and to whom the malnutrition, disease, and death associated with Asia and Africa are a daily threat in America.

The baby is suffering from chronic malnutrition compounded by acute dehydration—

Said Dr. Christian M. Hansen, Jr., U.S.P.H.S. doctor servicing at the OEO-funded Tufts Delta Health Center in Mound Bayou, Miss., of a baby he examined. What is more, this month-old child was but one of hundreds of Negro children found already by the health center grotesque in shape, permanently stunted, and damaged in growth, due to lack of adequate food. This child was receiving only one-fifth the milk he should have had. And according to the pastor of the Catholic church of the area:

There is widespread malnutrition, especially among the children.

The findings at the Tufts center in the last few months simply confirm and reinforce the findings reported by the board of physicians that visited Mississippi and reported to the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty last summer. The findings are always the same:

Infant mortality rates much higher for Negro children than for white. For Negroes in the northern half of Bolivar County, the rate is three times that of whites. The cause: acute, persistent malnutrition.

Severe anemias. Thirty cases of iron deficiency anemia had already been found by March, just the beginning of the numbers of children suffering from a condition that leads to chronic fatigue and possibly brain damage.

Widespread malnutrition, especially among the children, with attendant long-term and immediate damage to the brain, to muscles, bones, skin, and to general growth and development.

Prevalence of bacteria and parasitic disease: 1,800 of 6,000 Headstart children in one survey were carrying worms in their intestinal tracts.

And this is but a sampling of the population, and a small number of the problems.

The Citizens' Board of Inquiry Into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States heard the litany of "Hunger, U.S.A.," the litany of physical, social, and psychological damage caused millions in the United States by lack of food, or inadequate nutrition. They heard of anemic children in Massachusetts, in South Carolina, in Kentucky, in Alabama; of anemic and protein and vita-

min-deficient pregnant women in Texas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Alabama, and Tennessee; of retarded growth—low heights and weights—in urban and rural areas; of the most severe protein deficiency diseases on Indian reservations in Arizona and South Carolina, and among migrant children in Florida; of parasitic diseases associated with malnutrition in South Carolina, Florida, Mississippi, Alabama, and on Indian reservations; of nutritional problems among the aged in New York State; of pervasive and persistent malnutrition among migratory farm-workers, Indians, and the urban poor of Boston, Baltimore, Cleveland, and New York City.

The study of the committee exhausted the scant literature of the field. It confirmed the fears and updated the information of those who read the results of the closest approximation to a national study of nutritional status listed by the National Library of Medicine, "The Co-operative Nutritional Status Studies," conducted in the early 1950's by USDA and PHS in four regions of the United States. Even in the period from 1947 to 1952, the western region sample of 69 children, 1,134 adolescents, 41 adults, and 664 older adults showed significant percentages having less than two-thirds the recommended National Research Council dietary standards. Even averaging rich and poor, one-third and more of the teenaged boys and girls were low in calcium, thiamine, and ascorbic acid. And when one group of the poor, Spanish-American boys of New Mexico, were studied, the list expanded to include deficiency in calories and vitamin A as well. Again, even averaging in rich and poor, as the study did, 9 to 17 percent of adults, and 14 to 25 percent of children, consumed less than two-thirds the calories recommended, and after age 50 the percentage of men, more than 20 percent underweight, shot up appreciably.

And these findings were corroborated by the studies in other regions. In the northeast region, a study of 854 males and 950 females in New York, Maine, Rhode Island, West Virginia, New Jersey, and Massachusetts found diets low in vitamin C, calcium, vitamin A, and riboflavin. In the north central region, 1,188 schoolchildren were studied. One-half to two-thirds were eating poor breakfasts, and many got insufficient milk, meat, and eggs. Again, these were overall averages which probably masked much greater problems in the poor segments of the populations of States studied.

We must wait for more current data for the studies to be released this summer by the Public Health Service, and the USDA.

Hunger means different things to different people. To the desperate mother, it is children who "go to bed hungry and get up hungry and do not ever know nothing else in between."

To the horrified physician, it is "evidence of vitamin and mineral deficiencies; unattended bone diseases, secondary to poor food intake, prevalence of bacteria and parasitic disease; and chronic anemias."

To the concerned psychiatrist, it is the urban and rural problem of "the sick, chronically malnourished child," who

"literally grows up to be tired, fearful, anxious, and suspicious," and who takes this with him as he moves from rural into urban poverty.

To every citizen, it is the national disgrace of people living out the "no win" cycle of poverty, hunger, illness, and dependency; the cycle of people sick because they are hungry, skipping medicine to buy food; the specter of millions of Americans too sick and hungry to get the education and the jobs they need to trade dependency for dignity.

Mr. President, as the report by the citizens board of inquiry points out:

Hunger kills: Malnutrition causes lowering of resistance to infection and consequently is a prime cause of infant mortality;

Hunger maims: There is increasing evidence that lack of protein in the diet of youngsters can cause severe and irreversible brain damage; . . . and that it can cause disabilities resulting from inadequate growth;

Hunger sickens: . . . Diseases such as blindness, rickets, scurvy, and pellagra . . . result from deficiencies of a particular nutrient;

Hunger affects us all: The cost of . . . chronic hunger and undernutrition takes many forms; educational, psychological, and social . . . hunger contributes directly to the schisms which threaten our society today.

Mr. President, hunger is a national disgrace. But it is also a curable condition. For among all the complex causes of poverty, hunger is among the easiest to correct.

Just as the citizens' commission helped us see the hunger problem, so too they help us perceive its solution.

The hunger problem is not new to this Nation. For years Federal food and welfare programs have worked to provide needed sustenance to thousands of needy Americans. But while our past record must be acknowledged, present problems must also be addressed. While the food stamp and commodity distribution programs have helped many, they have failed to do the total job.

In 1967, food programs reached only about 18 percent of the poor. As the citizens' inquiry points out:

We cannot assume that any of the remaining poor . . . are getting enough food.

The reasons are many;

Food stamps cost too much.

Food distributed through the commodity distribution program is insufficient, and too small a variety of foods is available;

There are not enough consumer services associated with the programs; women who need to know most about food purchase and preparation often know the least; and

There is inadequate communication between those who are recipients of food and those who administer the programs, and the system lacks either consultation or appeals mechanisms.

Mr. President, the bill I introduce today would remedy these defects. It would remove this blight from our countryside. While this legislation preserves and continues the best feature of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, it is intended to be, and is, a complete legislative overhaul of the Food Stamp Act and other domestic feeding legislation. Its purpose is to assure that no person in this land of riches and

plenty need starve or suffer malnutrition because of insufficient income.

Its main provisions are—

Free food stamps to those under the poverty level or whose income prevents them from attaining a fully adequate and nutritious diet;

Establishment of a task force on hunger, composed of commercial enterprises in the food and grocery business to bring the power and imagination of the private sector to bear on the hunger problem, following the pattern of the urban coalition;

Provision for new food stamp programs and direct food distribution programs to exist side by side;

Provision for nonprofit and charitable agencies, any capable agency of Federal, State, or local government, in addition to commercial enterprises, to run programs to feed eligible households;

Requirement that nutrition counseling and home economic services be provided food recipients;

Eligibility upon applicant affidavit, with no onerous redtape;

Changes in emphasis of standards from normal food expenditures to enough food for an adequate and nutritious diet;

Requirement and authorization for distribution by Federal Government of all commodities, whether or not in surplus, to supplement the food stamp program;

Involvement and self-help by the poor, through formation of cooperatives of low-income consumers, local advisory committees, and a National Food Assistance Commission.

While this bill no doubt will be referred to the Senate Agriculture Committee, I intend to work closely with other members of the Senate to insure that this bill or some closely parallel version receives active consideration in hearings beginning May 23 in the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Senator McGovern and I are sponsors with many other colleagues of a resolution to establish a select committee to explore thoroughly our reaction to this most grave problem. Whatever course of action is taken by the Senate and whatever bills are considered, I intend to urge the strongest and most comprehensive approach possible. It is much too serious and much too urgent a problem to be treated otherwise.

This bill does not establish a monetary standard for the amount of food stamps, since this will necessarily vary according to circumstances, but relies on the standards of a "fully adequate and nutritious diet." While this is true, however, it is difficult to see how it could go below \$90 a month for a family of four or the equivalent, which the USDA determines is a minimum needed to assure a nutritious diet.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary entitled "Hunger, U.S.A.," be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3507) to repeal the Food Stamp Act of 1964 and enact in lieu thereof the Domestic Food Assistance Act of 1968, introduced by Mr. MONDALE

(for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The summary, presented by Mr. MONDALE, is as follows:

HUNGER, U.S.A.—A SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

In issuing this report, we find ourselves somewhat startled by our own findings, for we too had been lulled into the comforting belief that at least the extremes of privation had been eliminated in the process of becoming the world's wealthiest nation. Even the most concerned, aware, and informed of us were not prepared to take issue with the presumption stated by Michael Harrington on the opening page of his classic, *The Other America*: "to be sure, the other America is not impoverished in the same sense as those poor nations where millions cling to hunger as a defense against starvation. This country has escaped such extremes." But starting from this premise, we found ourselves compelled to conclude that America has not escaped such extremes. For it became increasingly difficult, and eventually impossible, to reconcile our preconceptions with statements we heard everywhere we went:

That substantial numbers of new-born, who survive the hazards of birth and live through the first month, die between the second month and their second birthday from causes which can be traced directly and primarily to malnutrition.

That protein deprivation between the ages of six months and a year and one-half causes permanent and irreversible brain damage to some young infants.

That nutritional anemia, stemming primarily from protein deficiency and iron deficiency, was commonly found in percentages ranging from 30 to 70 percent among children from poverty backgrounds.

That teachers report children who come to school without breakfast, who are too hungry to learn, and in such pain that they must be taken home or sent to the school nurse.

That mother after mother in region after region reported that the cupboard was bare, sometimes at the beginning and throughout the month, sometimes only the last week of the month.

That doctors personally testified to seeing case after case of premature death, infant deaths, and vulnerability to secondary infection, all of which were attributable to or indicative of malnutrition.

That in some communities people band together to share the little food they have, living from hand to mouth.

That aged living alone, subsist on liquid foods that provide inadequate sustenance.

We also found ourselves surrounded by myths which were all too easy to believe because they are so comforting. We number among these:

Myth: The really poor and needy have access to adequate surplus commodities and food stamps if they are in danger of starving.

Fact: Only 5.4 million of the more than 29 million poor participate in these two government food programs, and the majority of those participating are not the poorest of the poor.

Myth: Progress is being made as a result of massive federal efforts in which multimillion dollar food programs take care of more people now than ever before.

Fact: Participation in government food programs has dropped 1.4 million in the last six years. Malnutrition among the poor has risen sharply over the past decade.

Myth: Hunger and starvation must be restricted to terrible places of need, such as Mississippi, which will not institute programs to take adequate care of its people.

Fact: Mississippi makes more extensive use of the two federal food programs than any state in the United States.

In addition to the hearings, the site visits, the personal interviews, the anecdotal stories, we learned from government officials, statistics, studies, and reports, that where, by accident or otherwise, someone looked for malnutrition, he found it—to an extent and degree of severity previously unsuspected.

To the best of our knowledge, we have collected the studies and information compiled by all who have gone before us and have supplemented it with the best evidence that our own direct efforts could uncover. At best, we can make an educated guess as to the order of magnitude of the problem. But the chief contribution we can make does not rest with engaging in a numbers game.

It lies elsewhere—with the reversal of presumption. Prior to our efforts, the presumption was against hunger, against malnutrition; now the presumption has shifted. The burden of proof has shifted. It rests with those who would deny the following words of one of our members, "there is sufficient evidence to indict" on the following charges:

1. Hunger and malnutrition exist in this country, affecting millions of our fellow Americans and increasing in severity and extent from year to year.

2. Hunger and malnutrition take their toll in this country in the form of infant deaths, organic brain damage, retarded growth and learning rates, increased vulnerability to disease, withdrawal, apathy, alienation, frustration and violence.

3. There is a shocking absence of knowledge in this country about the extent and severity of malnutrition—a lack of information and action which stands in marked contrast to our recorded knowledge in other countries.

4. Federal efforts aimed at securing adequate nutrition for the needy have failed to reach a significant portion of the poor and to help those it did reach in any substantial and satisfactory degree.

5. The failure of federal efforts to feed the poor cannot be divorced from our nation's agricultural policy, the congressional committees that dictate that policy and the Department of Agriculture that implements it; for hunger and malnutrition in a country of abundance must be seen as consequences of a political and economic system that spends billions to remove food from the market, to limit productions, to retire land from production, to guarantee and sustain profits for the producer.

Perhaps more surprising and shocking is the extent to which it now rests within our power substantially to alleviate hunger and malnutrition. While new programs are needed, and new legislation is desired and urged, there are now reserves of power, of money, of discretionary authority and of technical know-how which could make substantial inroads on the worst of the conditions we have uncovered—and this could be commenced not next year or next month—but today.

CHAPTER I. THE MISSISSIPPI STORY: A CASE HISTORY IN BUREAUCRATIC NON-RESPONSE

This chapter sets forth the events which triggered national awareness of the existence of hunger and malnutrition in Mississippi, the Congressional and administrative concern generated by these disclosures. It documents the ineffectiveness of the so-called massive federal efforts substantially to alleviate the problem to date.

CHAPTER II. DOCUMENTING THE EXTENT OF HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION IN THE UNITED STATES

Scope of the problem

The Board found concrete evidence of chronic hunger and malnutrition in every part of the United States, as a result either of field trips or hearings or upon a review of all available studies evaluating the nutritional status of the poor.

These conditions are not confined to Mississippi. In America, the number of victims

of chronic hunger and malnutrition appears to reach well into the millions—and the situation is worsening.

Those conditions, directly documented or corroborated by the Board include:

A high incidence of anemia among poor infants and children—urban and rural—white and non-white. Among the young, anemia can have serious and lasting medical and emotional effects.

Evidence of retarded growth (abnormally low in heights and weights) attributable to malnutrition in both urban and rural poverty areas.

Conditions of severe protein deficiency, which in early childhood, may cause permanent brain damage.

A prevalence of nutritional deficiencies and anemia among pregnant women in poverty.

A high incidence of parasitic diseases associated with malnutrition on field visits to South Carolina, Florida, Mississippi, Alabama and Indian reservations.

Order of magnitude and probable pattern of distribution

The Board recognizes that no definitive estimate can now be made regarding the number of people suffering from hunger and malnutrition in the United States. Nonetheless, the Board presents evidence which supports its tentative estimate:

"It is possible to assert, with a high degree of probability that we face a problem which, conservatively estimated, affects 10 million Americans and in all likelihood a substantially higher number."

Moreover, it is possible to identify those areas where the incidence of hunger and malnutrition is likely to be extremely high. Where income is low, where postneonatal (one month to one year) mortality rates are high, and where participation in welfare and food assistance programs is low or nonexistent, the Board suggests that hunger and malnutrition are prevalent. On this basis, the Board has identified 256 hunger counties requiring immediate and emergency attention.

CHAPTER III. THE DIFFICULTY OF DOCUMENTING HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION IN THE UNITED STATES

The Board of Inquiry was startled by the absence of knowledge, research, experimentation, affirmative action—and even concern about the existence of hunger and malnutrition in the United States. In seeking to learn why so little information was available, the Board turned to those sectors of society which seemed to possess the responsibility for documenting the nutritional status of the American people: the health professions, public health authorities, private charitable organizations, and the private food sector. The Board concludes that each of these sectors have failed to fulfill its responsibility, has allowed hunger to go, not merely unchecked, but also unidentified. As a result, the Board recognizes that—

"If this report is marred by any single element, it is the anomaly of asserting that a phenomenon exists, and that it is widespread, without being able to ascertain its exact magnitude or severity because no one ever believed it existed."

The health professions

The board presents evidence that—
The extent of recorded medical knowledge about dietary intake and malnutrition among the poor in the United States consists of about 30 studies, which—with a few exceptions—have been limited in scope and limited in methodology to the most easily determined manifestations of malnutrition.

Medical schools do not train students to recognize malnutrition.

Most hospitals do not keep systematic records or perform tests necessary to ascertain the presence of malnutrition.

The lack of data is used as the basis for

inability to move quickly toward solutions, and some professionals have turned lack of data into confirmation that malnutrition does not constitute a serious or pervasive problem.

Public officials

Among public officials, where the responsibility is clearcut, the Board found a shocking lack of information or action:

The Public Health Service has no knowledge of the extent of malnutrition in the United States, although it concedes that a serious problem exists.

The Department of Agriculture has conducted extensive studies to learn how much money is spent on food, and which foods are most popular among Americans at large. At the same time, its knowledge of nutrient deficiencies of the poor is scant, superficial, and unsatisfactory.

Other federal agencies have not added, significantly, to the collective knowledge of the federal government about hunger and malnutrition.

Dieticians and nutrition experts, public and private, on the state as well as the federal level, have not become familiar with the dietary and nutritional needs of the poor.

Private charitable organizations

In a survey of over 100 charitable organizations across the nation, the Board of Inquiry learned that in contrast to the extensive overseas feeding programs of organizations such as CARE, the immediate and severe problems of hunger in the United States have been addressed by the private sector in only a limited fashion.

The private food sector

The Board of Inquiry asked 75 food manufacturing companies: (a) what steps were being taken to determine the number of people now being excluded from the domestic food market because of low income and (b) what remedial efforts they were engaged in. Of 35 companies responding, the Board learned that there has been little activity in the private sector in determining the food needs of the poor.

This inactivity on the domestic front contrasts markedly with the situation abroad. A major contribution of the private sector in helping needy populations in poor and developing countries has been the development of new and fortified foods, which by themselves, provide many of the nutrients for a nutritionally adequate diet.

When certain barriers to acceptance of these foods are recognized, when taste, appearance, ease of preparation, adequate delivery systems are considered, and finally when an appeal is made to the nutritional advantages of a food rather than its special utility to the poor, the likelihood of acceptance is significantly increased. With these qualifications, the Board of Inquiry makes recognition of the valuable role that fortified foods can play in alleviating hunger and malnutrition in the United States.

CHAPTER IV. ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL FOOD AND WELFARE PROGRAMS

The Board has examined in depth the three chief programs designed to alleviate hunger and malnutrition: The Commodity Distribution Program; the Food Stamp Program; the Welfare Program. And it has taken a brief look at consumer education efforts and the school lunch program, a consumer education program as ancillary programs to combat hunger and malnutrition.

We are forced to conclude that these programs do not do the job.

These programs clearly have failed—but responsibility for this failure cannot be laid merely to lack of money or staff. Much of the responsibility for the failure of these programs rests with the mode of administration adopted, the discretionary decisions made, and the failure to use the full statutory power available to fulfill the purpose of these programs.

Commodity distribution program

Under this program, the Department distributes surplus commodities to needy families. These foods are called basic commodities and are provided in the form of cornmeal, corn grits, flour, non-fat dry milk, peanut butter, rice and rolled wheat. These are the foods that the commodity recipient can count on receiving each month—albeit with some variations in amount and variety.

The government, however, has available special additional money to buy and distribute free any other kind of food—orange juice, turkeys, beef, vegetables. It has the power to distribute such foods to the hungry.

This "Section 32" money (Section 32, P.L. 320, 74th Congress) designed to keep the farmer's prices high and to provide food for those in need, is not part of the President's budget. The Congress does not have to appropriate it. It comes directly and automatically to the Secretary. Last year, it added up to \$700 million. Of that \$700 million, some \$500 million was either returned to the Treasury or carried forward into the 1968 fiscal year. Less than \$150 million was used in connection with commodity or food distribution programs.

The Board of Inquiry found that 300 of the poorest counties in the United States have no food assistance of any kind. Local officials in many of these poor counties have refused to apply for federal food assistance, because of unwillingness to extend help to Negroes, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the poor in counties without food assistance.

The Department of Agriculture has the power to start food assistance programs where need is evident. Yet, until April 1968, the Department consistently declined to exercise its power to institute commodity distribution programs where local officials had refused to apply.

In counties where commodities are distributed, they seldom reach even a majority of the poor population. Some people are declared ineligible because their income is too high, although substantially below the poverty line. Some people are discouraged from participating because the distribution depots where they must go to obtain commodities are too far away, and the commodities received are difficult to transport.

The commodity distribution program does not supply enough food for the month. Food runs out, people go days without food. Moreover, the variety of foods distributed is not adequate to meet minimum nutritional requirements, despite the recognized fact that most of the three million participants must look to the commodity distribution program for their total food supply.

As the Board points out, the USDA does not meet its own standards for minimum nutrition:

"Each month the USDA distributes to a family of four commodities with a total retail value of slightly over \$20. The USDA has determined, however, that a family of four should spend over \$90 per month—on a variety of foods—in order to obtain a nutritious diet.

"Each month the USDA distributes less than 100 pounds of food to a family of four, a total of 23.38 pounds of food per person. The USDA recommends however, that to obtain an adequate diet, a family of four should have 308 pounds of a variety of nutritious foods. This figure excludes milk and eggs.

"The USDA recommends 50 pounds of meat, poultry or fish per month for a family of four. It distributes less than eight pounds to a family of four on commodities.

"The USDA suggests 176 pounds of fruits and vegetables. The family on commodities receives less than five pounds a month."

The Board of Inquiry concludes that the commodity distribution program is a failure. While they do not feel that changes will make the program successful in the long run, they

make proposals for administrative reform which, within the framework of existing legislative authority, would benefit the hungry and malnourished substantially. (See page 56).

Food stamp program

The food stamp program, in theory, was to correct the deficiencies of the commodity program. It was to let the poor choose their own foods. The bonus coupons they bought with their normal food dollars would multiply their food purchasing power at local stores. Eligible families would buy the food stamps at rates set by the Secretary of Agriculture. The law requires that such prices be set at a rate equivalent to the "normal expenditure" for food. The Secretary decided to set stamp prices by determining average expenditures for families of different size and income.

Averaging the food expenditures of the poverty population proved administratively expedient to the USDA, but became a nightmare for the hungry. Families who had literally no income were averaged in with lowest income families and expected to pay rates based on averages with money that did not exist. In areas where the commodity distribution program was being scrapped in favor of food stamps, the no-income family found itself whipsawed between a program that had distributed food free and a new program that assumed that the family had paid for its food. When the switchover occurred, participation dropped radically. For once, America became aware of its hungry.

This awareness led to piecemeal efforts at improvement. These efforts in turn uncovered other inadequacies in the planning and administration of the food stamp program. The lowering of the minimum food stamp charges pointed up the inequity of the prices at "higher" income levels. Every time the income of a family of four rises by 10 dollars, six of those dollars must go toward food stamps. The schedule of charges set up by the USDA suffers from certain internal inconsistencies and operates to discourage participation.

Consider the following:

Assumption: That all families with a given number of members and a given income normally spend the same amount of money on food. This is the assumption underlying the use of surveys to determine what are "normal expenditures."

Fact: The USDA concedes that a primary problem in poor families is that there is no plan for spending money, hence, there is no "normal" amount of money spent each month on food. Bills, fixed expenses, and poor consumer practices devour income the day it dribbles in, so that there can be no amount specifically allocated for food expenditures. No steady dollar-and-cents pattern to the expenditures of poor people has yet been established.

Assumption: A family in poverty normally pays a constant amount of money for food from month to month. This justifies the requirement that participants spend a fixed sum on stamps each month or be ineligible for further assistance.

Fact: Food expenditures may double—or be cut in half—from month to month depending upon emergencies, pressing bills—and on income which may vary from month to month or season to season.

Assumption: That as a family's income increases, the percent of income spent on food increases. Food stamp prices are set so that, at the lowest levels a sharp rise in stamp prices accompanies a modest rise in income. This assumption appears to be coupled with the further assumption that the lowest income families spend for food first and pay their bills last.

Fact: At low levels of family income, food expenditures give way to fixed expenses. Items like rent, utilities, and overdue bills come first. What is left is what is spent for food. And this pattern does not change as income

increases (until one is substantially above the poverty line).

The requirement that the poor lay out the cash for stamps all in one lump sum—and that they purchase the minimum amount or none at all—has worked considerable hardship. And once a person chooses to participate, he must continue to do so at the same level every month or he will be disqualified and required to apply all over again for eligibility.

A further inadequacy of the program is its unwillingness to provide even its participants with an adequate diet. By the Department of Agriculture's own standards, the money value of stamps falls consistently and deliberately below the amount necessary to secure a minimally adequate diet. Nutritional studies indicate that those participating in food stamps in fact are only slightly better off nutritionally than non-participants.

The county option system which has thwarted use of the commodity distribution program in many counties has been at least as great an obstacle to instituting the food stamp plan. The Secretary of Agriculture denies that he has the power to distribute food stamps in counties which refuse to apply. Yet section 14(a) of the Food Stamp Act expressly gives him that power.

After presenting this and other evidence, the Board of Inquiry concludes that the food stamp program has failed to fulfill its promise, and proposes a number of steps for administrative reform. (See pages 66-67.)

School lunch program

Despite its potential for directly alleviating hunger and malnutrition among the children of the poor, the school lunch program has to date proved unsuccessful. At most, one-third of poverty stricken children attending public schools participate. Although Congress expressly provided in the National School Lunch Act that poor children shall be served without cost or at a reduced cost, a majority of poor children are forced to pay the full price for school lunch or go without. The school lunch program in fact, operates for the benefit of the middle class.

Consumer education programs

Education in the advantages of budget, planning, bargain shopping and food selection has been held out as a solution of the malnutrition problem.

If education is the answer, the Board finds that little of it exists. In addition, limited evidence would appear to indicate that the poor use their food dollar well and that they need greater purchasing power, more than education on how to use that purchasing power.

Much of the need for education, budgeting knowledge, sophistication and skills stems from policies and procedures which make programs complex and directly decrease their utility to the poor. The call for education sometimes masks a shifting of responsibility for the defects of a program from the administrators, who have made the program complex, to the poor, who cannot cope with that complexity and red tape.

The role of public assistance programs in feeding the poor

The ability to eat adequately in the final analysis depends upon money. The poor do not have enough money to buy the food they need, despite the myth of massive federal handouts. Three out of every four Americans who live below the poverty level receive no help from federal public assistance programs whatsoever.

Some of those who do not receive federal assistance receive "general assistance" from the state and local government. But "general assistance" is minuscule in scale—amounting to less than six percent of federal expenditures under public assistance programs.

Most states administering federal welfare monies do not pay the minimal amount

necessary for subsistence as estimated either by their own standards or by the federal government's standards. Actual payments consistently fall below the level to which families are entitled by law.

Consequently, the Board of Inquiry finds those who do participate in federal public assistance programs do not get enough money to secure a nutritionally adequate diet. In fact, welfare recipients who receive the highest level of payment in the nation have been found to suffer from inadequate diet.

Thus to live on welfare is to be virtually certain of inadequate nutrition. But three-fourths of the poor do not even get welfare. There are four distinct causes for this lack of participation.

1. The categories of federal assistance are a limitation on eligibility.
2. The state exercises its power to restrict participation in federal public assistance programs. The states can simply decline to participate in federal programs, or they can restrict the number of participants by imposing additional eligibility requirements.
3. The mode of administration on the state and local level restricts participation.
4. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare consistently declines to re-examine state plans for conformity to federal law, court decisions and affirmative constitutional requirements.

CHAPTER V. AGRICULTURAL POLICY

Responsibility for the design, enactment and administration of food assistance programs—both domestic and international—has traditionally been vested in those groups and individuals in government concerned with protection of the producers of food. Such a policy converts programs to feed the poor into disposal systems to relieve market gluts and protect profits.

The central focus of agricultural policy has shifted over the years from the small producer, the family farmer, to the large producer, the commercial and corporate farmer.

In 1967 alone, for example, nine large landowners received a total of over \$14 million from one or a combination of farm programs designed, as the Department of Agriculture puts it, "to encourage, promote and strengthen the family farm".

Judged by the allocation of payments to farmers in 1967, this purpose has not been achieved. Some 42.7 percent of farmers—the classically small family farmers—with gross income of less than \$2,500 received 4.5 percent of total farm payments from the government while the top 10 percent of farmers—the large, diversified, and in many cases corporate landowners—each with more than \$20,000 gross income received 54.5 percent of total farm payments.

The large scale producer, as a result, is well protected.

At the same time the interests that dominate agricultural policy have not supported efforts to feed the hungry. The Board of Inquiry concludes:

1. The composition of the agricultural committees of Congress—which pass upon major food assistance legislation—dictates that inevitably the needs of the poor and hungry will be subordinated to the interests of large agricultural producers.

2. The relationship between these agricultural committees and the Department of Agriculture—which administers all major food assistance legislation—dictates that inevitably the Department's priorities will place the interests of agricultural producers first, the needs of the poor and hungry second.

CHAPTER VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board of Inquiry has made recommendations which call for both immediate action to alleviate the present emergency conditions and for long range programs to eradicate hunger and malnutrition in the United States.

Immediate relief

We call upon the President to—
Declare that a national emergency exists; Institute emergency food programs within these 256 hunger counties, at migrant farm camps, and, after consultation with tribal councils, on selected Indian reservations; all this to be done as the first earnest effort of a national resolve to dispel hunger;

Use all available statutory authority and funds including that under Section 32, P.L. 320 74th Congress customs receipts; under emergency food and medical appropriations (receipts) for the Office of Economic Opportunity, and under the 1967 Social Security Amendments providing for federal participation to needy families with children in order to assure completely adequate food programs in these counties;

Ask Congress for immediate enactment of such other powers and appropriations as he needs;

Use also in these places the authority and funds provided under the federal food programs, to the extent that doing so will not take funds away from other areas;

Report to the people by September 1968 the numbers of needy people reached in these counties, the numbers yet unreached (if there be any) and the nutritional adequacy of the diets provided for all these programs;

Report, at the same time, plans for longer range programs.

Long-range recommendations

The basic federal food program should be the free Food Stamp Program.

Eligibility for food stamps should be keyed to income, dependents, and medical expenses. The formula should bear some negative relationship to the same factors as the federal income tax.

At levels set by law, persons should become eligible for varying quantities of stamps without further investigation.

An eligible person should receive more or fewer stamps depending on need. Since the criterion is need, there would be no reason that the recipient pay anything for the stamps to which he or she is entitled.

We believe that school lunches should be available to every child enrolled in public, private, or parochial schools up to and including the 12th grade, as well as in kindergarten, Headstart or other pre-school centers, nursery schools, and day care centers. The lunches would have to conform to federal nutritional standards.

If it be required that families who can afford to pay for lunches do so, then we suggest consideration of a system of non-transferable lunch stamps which would be the only currency acceptable for federally supplied lunches, which would go to food stamp recipients along with their other stamps and which could be purchased by other parents at the issuing office.

School lunches could appropriately be used for prudent experiments with the palatability and nutritional effectiveness of so-called fortified foods.

Either the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Office of Economic Opportunity should be directed and funded to employ and train a large number of food stamp recipients (perhaps at a ratio of one trainee to every 50 recipients) as nutrition and health care extension workers among the poor.

Until such time as the President is able to report to the country that no households (or only an insignificant number) have diets that fall below the Department of Agriculture's criterion of "good" and that federal assistance is no longer a factor in keeping them at that level, custom receipts under Section 32 should be made available as required to supplement other appropriations for the food needs of the poor.

Medical, graduate, and nursing schools should give much more attention to the diagnosis and treatment of malnutrition,

and to an understanding of its causes and effects.

Finally, we do hope and urge that private organizations concerned with human welfare will address themselves to this most elemental of all of humanity's problems and that each will find within its purposes and resources its own distinctive contribution; and that all these organizations will, as part of their contribution, continuously monitor and evaluate governmental programs. To this end, and as a first step, we shall ourselves distribute our principal findings and our recommendations to groups representative of the nation's poor.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on February 7, 1968, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 140 to authorize the President to issue annually proclamations designating the Sunday of each year which occurs immediately preceding February 22 as Freedom Sunday and the calendar week of each year during which February 22 occurs as Freedom Week.

Since the introduction of this joint resolution, a number of my colleagues have expressed an interest in cosponsoring this joint resolution. I therefore ask that when this joint resolution is reprinted that the following Senators be added as cosponsors of this bill: Senator STROM THURMOND, Senator FRANK MOSS, Senator HIRAM FONG, Senator ALAN BIBLE, Senator JACK MILLER, Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Senator JOHN TOWER, Senator CARL T. CURTIS, Senator SAM ERVIN, Senator VANCE HARTKE, Senator QUENTIN BURDICK, Senator ROMAN HRUSKA, Senator GALE MCGEE, Senator JOSEPH TYDINGS, Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, and Senator EDWARD V. LONG of Missouri.

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

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 16, 1968, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3033) to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 795

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a new generation of Americans are taking their first steps in higher education. Many of them are the sons and daughters of some 8 million veterans who received similar educations under the World War II GI bill. This law made possible the single largest program of mass adult education ever undertaken at such bargain rates. The \$14.5 billion investment on the part of the Federal Government has already been recouped and it is generally estimated that during the life of those veterans who benefited from this law, the return will be better than 3 to 1 with an estimated return of some 45 billion income tax dollars alone. This has certainly been one of the soundest economic investments we have made.

One, I dare say, that can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the most skeptical critics.

Mr. President, the world we live in no longer views a high school education as terminal. It demands continuing education. It pressures our Nation's youth to seek at least 2 years of college in order to survive. It is time we quit congratulating ourselves on the successes of the GI bill. It is time to apply the lessons we say we have learned from that experience to some 6 million students many of whom are presently struggling to finance their continuing education. It is time to give this same opportunity to the millions of others who are less fortunate and cannot absorb the costs of higher education. Next year alone, more than 2.5 million youngsters will finish high school, and only about 50 percent of them will go on to college.

Mr. President, I am tired of the rhetoric about removing the economic barriers that preclude some 60 percent of our college age youth from going to college. I have lost interest in the academic debate of the value of continuing education to the individual and to society. Education is not a private privilege, it is a public responsibility. Today I propose we quit talking about the desirability of providing at least 2 years of tuition-free education on the post high school level and do something about it.

I submit at this time, for appropriate referral, an amendment to S. 3098, the proposed Higher Education Amendments of 1968, which would create a new title, title XIII to provide tuition grants for students of limited income families.

My amendment would grant to each student in substantially full-time attendance for the first two years in an accredited junior college or college, or accredited trade, vocational or technical school a maximum grant of \$500 per academic year for tuition and other academic fees if the gross income of the student and family during the preceding tax year is not more than \$8,000. The income factor will be adjusted upward to accommodate an increase in dependents.

I recognize that this is far from adequate. But it is a beginning. I am dedicated to education, and feel that the principle of free continuing education is a must for our society. Over a hundred years ago, when the battle for free public schools was being fought, Horace Greeley, in an editorial in the New York Weekly Tribune stated the argument on which I base my proposal today:

The education of children is a duty of parents when they are able, but it is a duty of the community whether all the parents are able or not. Not for his own sake merely, but for the sake of the whole, should every child be educated. A single ignorant person is a source of evil and peril to the community. That person, properly educated, might have invented something, evolved an idea for want of which the development of the race may be arrested for a whole half of a century.

We are meeting the challenge on the elementary and secondary level. We have matured as a people because of these efforts. I have therefore included a provision in my amendment which would authorize a complete and thorough study of existing proposals and programs all aimed at assisting college

students to absorb all or part of their tuition, and other college expenses. When the conclusions of this study are available, we will then be able to build on the concept I have just outlined.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment appear at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will be appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 795) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 795

On page —, line —, insert the following:
At the end of page 118, add the following new title:

"TITLE XIII—TUITION GRANTS FOR STUDENTS OF LIMITED INCOME FAMILIES

"Sec. 1301. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), upon application, shall grant to each student in substantially full time attendance for the first two years in an accredited junior college or college, or accredited trade, vocational, or technical school, the full amount of tuition and other academic fees or \$500 per academic year, whichever is less, if the gross income of the family of the student, or the student if he or she is self-supporting, during the preceding tax year is not more than \$8,000, provided that the Secretary shall adjust the basic \$8,000 income limitation to correspond with an increase in the number of dependents in a family. When a student is receiving a tuition grant from other government or private sources which is less than \$500 per academic year, the Secretary is authorized to make a tuition grant in the amount of the difference, but in no case shall the combined grants exceed \$500 per academic year.

"Sec. 1302. The Secretary may refuse grants for attendance at any institution which raises its tuition or fees in order to benefit from this title.

"Sec. 1303. (a) The Secretary shall, within a calendar year of the enactment of this provision, submit to the Congress a plan, or alternative plans, for providing a minimum of two years of educational opportunity at the post-secondary level. The Secretary shall have the authority to contract for a study to develop such a plan or plans. Such plans shall include, but not be limited to:

"(1) a minimum of two years of educational opportunity at the post-secondary level made available through outright grants to students or to institutions on behalf of every enrolled student;

"(2) various systems of loans to students or to institutions on behalf of enrolled students;

"(3) the use of the income tax such as through credits or deductions, and work-study or cooperative education systems;

"(4) existing programs of public and private financial assistance, including the Veterans Readjustment Benefit Act of 1966, and programs formerly in effect, including the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

"(b) The study shall include, but not be limited to, such factors as:

"(1) the actual or projected cost effectiveness of alternative plans;

"(2) the immediate and the long-run economic impact of alternative plans;

"(3) financial and social implications to individual students participating under alternative plans;

"(4) institutional implications for post-secondary education or training facilities under alternative plans;

"(5) the relative contributions of Federal,