and real estate promoters are racing to carve up Big Thicket at the dizzying rate of 60 acres a day. But growing numbers of Texans have been keeping a close eye on the state's last public land, its dwindling natural areas, its mere 166 miles of trails—are becoming seriously concerned about the future of the state's largest forest.

Bertram Gross, a conservationist and statesman, Senator Ralph Yarbrough, introduced in 1967 a bill to establish a Big Thicket National Park of 75,000 acres. S. 4. The National Park Service has made no final recommendations, its preliminary study of 1965 envisioned a nine-unit national monument of 33,000 acres built on a "string of pearls" concept.

(1) The Big Thicket Profile Unit, 15,500 acres, a southward extension of the part of the original Thicket and contains a representative selection of almost every kind of land and vegetation to be found in the area.

(2) The Beach Creek Unit, 6,100 acres, with its virgin beach forest.

(3) The Neches Bottom Unit, 3,040 acres.

(4) The Tamis Bayou Unit, 1,100 acres.

(5) The Trinity River.

(6) The Little Cypress Creek Unit, 860 acres.

(7) The Hickory Creek Savannah, 220 acres, which contains an unusually lush growth of insect-eating plants.

(8) The Lobolilly Unit, 550 acres, which contains one of the last stands of virgin pine in the state of Texas.

(9) Clear Fork Bog, 50 acres.

The Lone Cypress couple of the Sierra Club takes part in the proposed "string of pearls" plan, and believes it is too small and too fragmented to preserve Big Thicket's special values. Accordingly, the chapter recommends the following changes and additions:

The Big Thicket Profile Unit should be extended southward and eastward down both sides of Pine Island Bayou to its confluence with the Neches River. No "motorized nature road" should cut this strip, as has been suggested. The extension would protect Pine Island Bayou and its tributaries. The proposed Pine Island Bayou Water Management Program, a drainage project that would undoubtedly upset the Neches ecosystem.

The Neches Bottom Unit should be expanded to include most of the wildlands and forest along the Neches between highway U.S, 190 and the confluence of Pine Island Bayou. The almost extinct ivory-billed woodpecker has been seen here, and the Neches is a fine river for canoeing.

A Village Creek Unit should be added, protecting both sides of Village Creek between the Big Thicket Profile Unit and the Neches Bottom Unit.

A Village Creek branch south and east of Saratoga, bounded by highways 770, 326, and 105, should be added. Here the larger wildlife species, such as black bear, puma, and red wolves, can thrive.

Major units should be connected by corridors at least a half mile wide, with a hiking trail along each corridor but not within the public roads.

Such additions would form a greenbelt of about 100,000 acres through which wildlife and people could move along a continuous circuit of more than 100 miles.
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The usefulness of social indicators to help in the task.

The forthcoming social report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that expresses the priorities of the political party of the future' and that establishing a more appropriate gait would take better descriptive information, the development of predictive tools, and careful analysis of both our problems and our resources. The program-planning-budgeting system; possible benefits for both the Government and the social sciences of the nation agreed with John Gardner, director of the Urban Coalition and former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for example, is certainly a step toward the coordination of our efforts at a high level of the Government, and we are much better off for having it than we would be without it.

But it is limited to the executive branch and it is limited to the efforts of the Federal Government to improve and urge that the people of America and those who cannot cries out for a bridge, but we still do not know how long a bridge we need, or what it must be built of, or how to anchor it on either side of the abyss. Perhaps we will need more than one kind of bridge.

We have made some beginning attempts to build a bridge, but we do not really know whether people are moving across. It may be that we will find some who must be taught to walk before they can cross.

We will never find out unless we devote our best resources to a broad, systematic effort on a continuing basis, until we define what it means to have crossed that river, or, until we have measured the capacities and weaknesses of those who must cross, until we really know whether the bridges that have worked so long and so well for most of us need only minor repairs, must be completely rebuilt, or can serve side by side with new ones built to carry their special loads.

Something like the structure proposed in the Full Opportunity Act is absolutely essential to such an effort. Perhaps the Council of Social Advisers is the best example of the effects of the Full Opportunity Act would provide the institutional and procedural framework to first, coordinate attempts to measure the Nation's social health; second, foster the development of more informative social indicators; third, focus public attention on developing social problems; and, fourth, provide policymakers with the information and analysis needed to make rational allocations of resources.

It has become clear in the past 2 years, as it was not clear before, that some such effort is vital to the national welfare. Furthermore, the attention that has been given to the question of social indicators during this period of time has essentially eliminated any doubts about the importance of preserving individual privacy; and some alternative organizational possibilities.

Our efforts at a high level of the Government, and we are much better off for having it than we would be without it.

But it is limited to the executive branch and it is limited to the efforts of the Federal Government and to urban affairs. Its members will represent individual agencies and be responsible to the President, to the Congress, and to the White House staff, and they will be contributing a great deal to our national social effort.

But it will not be enough. The time has come for this Nation to devote the same intense effort to analysis of its social trends, and recommendations of techniques to deal with them, as it now devotes to economic description, analysis, prediction, and recommendation.

The gulf between those who participate in the promise of America and those who cannot cries out for a bridge, but we still do not know how long a bridge we need, or what it must be built of, or how to anchor it on either side of the abyss. Perhaps we will need more than one kind of bridge.

We have made some beginning attempts to build a bridge, but we do not really know whether people are moving across. It may be that we will find some who must be taught to walk before they can cross.

We will never find out unless we devote our best resources to a broad, systematic effort on a continuing basis, until we define what it means to have crossed that river, or, until we have measured the capacities and weaknesses of those who must cross, until we really know whether the bridges that have worked so long and so well for most of us need only minor repairs, must be completely rebuilt, or can serve side by side with new ones built to carry their special loads.

Something like the structure proposed in the Full Opportunity Act is absolutely essential to such an effort. Perhaps the Council of Social Advisers is the best example of the effects of the Full Opportunity Act would provide the institutional and procedural framework to first, coordinate attempts to measure the Nation's social health; second, foster the development of more informative social indicators; third, focus public attention on developing social problems; and, fourth, provide policymakers with the information and analysis needed to make rational allocations of resources.

It has become clear in the past 2 years, as it was not clear before, that some such effort is vital to the national welfare. Furthermore, the attention that has been given to the question of social indicators during this period of time has essentially eliminated any doubts about the importance of preserving individual privacy; and some alternative organizational possibilities.

From the hearings and from examination of the social health of the Nation, it is apparent that:

First, it must provide an arms-length perspective on the Nation's social conditions and needs, free from the vested interests and channel vision of individual agencies and pressure groups.

Second, it must attract nationally recognized members of the social science community who can bring both their expert knowledge and their prestige to the task of developing social information and advising the President, the Congress, and the Nation.

Third, it must create a highly visible public forum, capable of attracting the attention of the Nation and situated with direct access to the President.

Fourth, its analyses and recommendations must be subject to the review of the appropriate legislative branches, the academic world, and the private sector.

Fifth, it must devote itself to using the most sophisticated techniques of social research available to develop effective social indicators to identify areas of social need and illustrate our progress—or lack of it—in periods of time.

All of our efforts so far have failed to meet one or more of these criteria. They are limited to single units or to a single branch or level of government, or they are limited to describing and analyzing what happened in the past. We need now to take the initial steps of broad, systematic efforts, or they are structured so that they fail to achieve—and possibly they even avoid—public attention.

The establishment of the Council of Social Advisers in the executive branch is the best example of the effects of the Full Opportunity Act would provide the institutional and procedural framework to first, coordinate attempts to measure the Nation's social health; second, foster the development of more informative social indicators; third, focus public attention on developing social problems; and, fourth, provide policymakers with the information and analysis needed to make rational allocations of resources.

It has become clear in the past 2 years, as it was not clear before, that some such effort is vital to the national welfare. Furthermore, the attention that has been given to the question of social indicators during this period of time has essentially eliminated any doubts about
It has helped make possible sustained economic progress, and has helped to eliminate some of the effects of periodic recession or depression in the Nation.

It has helped to demonstrate that our national economy can be manipulated to some extent, and it has built up a demand for Government intervention in the economy.

It has provided a forum where economists, Presidents, Members of Congress, academicians, and leaders of business and labor have been able to express their views.

And there is something which the Council of Economic Advisers has not done. It has not diminished the authority of the Congress or the executive branch or the businessman or the individual citizen to make decisions for himself. Instead, it has changed the level of discussion involved in the decision-making of everyone.

The recent debate over the imposition of an income tax surtax is a good example of this. It became quite clear in that debate that the decision-making had not left the hands of the Congress. The debate was over whether this means should be employed in cooling off an overheated economy. There was disagreement over whether the proposal was too severe or not severe enough, or even whether it was relevant. The traditional interplay between Congress and the President went on as usual.

In short, the Council of Economic Advisers has helped to change the Nation's attitude toward the economy. It has been able to do all this because it could attract prestige and sophisticated experts to the social debate. Their views attracted the attention of the President, the Congress, the news media, and the people. And I believe we are all better off for installing this structure at the highest, most visible level of our Government.

I believe that we can hope for similar results in social analysis, reporting, and discussion from the establishment of a structure like the Council of Social Advisers proposed in this act. And I believe we have every indication that it is none too soon to start.
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cect for the salaries of the members and officers and employees of the Council) such sums as may be necessary. For the salaries of the employees of the Council and the salaries of the employees of the Council, there is authorized to be appropriated not exceeding $900,000 in the aggregate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE SOCIAL REPORT

Ssc. 5 (a) There is established a Joint Committee on the Social Report, to be composed of eight Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and eight Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each case, the majority party shall be represented by five Members and the minority party shall be represented by three Members.

(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee:

(1) to make a continuing study of all matters relating to the social report; and

(2) to advise the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the social report, not later than June 1 of each year to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the social report, the report to be timely printed, and, to such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from its members, each of whom shall represent a majority party.

(d) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to request the services, expertise, and information of any department or agency of the Government, or the services of any expert.

(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year the sum of $425,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this section to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairmen or vice chairman.

The article presented by Mr. Mondale, is as follows:

The ART OF FORECASTING SOCIAL CHANGE (By Daniel Bell)

At periodic intervals, the Central Intelligence Agency prepares for the National Security Council a "national estimate" of the Soviet Union. This is an assessment of intentions and capabilities, a characterization of national will, the health of the economy, the military strength, the loyalty or disaffection of the people, and the like. Such national estimates are also made for a five-year period in order to forecast longer-range changes in Soviet society. Presumably, the Russian counterpart of the C.I.A. makes a similar forecast about the United States. Each side needs these forecasts to participate lead times for production, such that education would become public and universal, that inequality be reduced and most necessary resources in the society.

At one point, Condorcet wrote: the society would become paramount. Now every society, to some extent, is based on knowledge, but the singular characteristic of the post-industrial society is the technical-professional. Its growth rate, projected from 1960 to 1975, is double that of the labor force as a whole. By 1975, there will be 14 million such persons in the United States, making it the second largest of eight occupational classes, with the semiskilled group being, numerically, the largest, though the skilled are shrinking relative to other classes.

But the most significant element of change is that in the "skeleton structure" of the society. The dominant institution has been organized around property, and most social institutions and legal arrangements cluster about the perpetuation of property. But the post-industrial society is primarily a knowledge society, in which skill and education become paramount. Now every society, to some extent, is based on knowledge, but the singular characteristic of the post-industrial society is the technical-professional. Its growth rate, projected from 1960 to 1975, is double that of the labor force as a whole. By 1975, there will be 14 million such persons in the United States, making it the second largest of eight occupational classes, with the semiskilled group being, numerically, the largest, though the skilled are shrinking relative to other classes.
What distinguishes the act of forecasting from that of the past is a significant difference in methodology and in intention. But what is most distinctive about the middle of the 20th century is the awareness of the vulnerability, of deliberate intervention by government, to control change for specified ends. All of this puts us on the threshold of a persistent and persistent human quest: to choose our future. What is central, therefore, to "futurist studies" is not simply the effort to "predict," as if it were a standard point in time, but to sketch "alternative futures."

THE ELEMENT OF CHOICE

All social change today involves social policy and social choice. A large part of America since World War II, and the Depression before it, has been reshaped by the desire of individuals to own their own homes, a desire made possible largely by the tax and credit policies of the government. Yet such choices were made without any awareness of the additional social costs of such changes: the needs for such new services as schools, water, police, roads.

It would have been possible, for example, not to accept such a choice, uncritically, but to show, for example, that a single-detached home could be built as single-unit detached homes, or as cluster developments, or as high-rise in the suburbs with large open spaces. Each of these alternatives exist. It may well be that, in the end, Americans would have chosen the pattern they did, but then it would have been done more consciously in the light of informed judgment.

The art of forecasting, then, is primarily an awareness of consequence, and only by knowing consequences can one make full rational and moral choices.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am glad to rise in support of the legislation introduced by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. The Full Opportunity Act, which I also cosponsored when it was first introduced 5 years ago, is an important piece of legislation which deserves early and favorable action by the Senate this session.

The act declares full opportunity for all Americans as a national policy and declares that every citizen has the right to live in decency and dignity.

New mechanisms would be established, somewhat similar to the Council of Economic Advisers and the Joint Economic Committee. A Council of Social Advisers, making social policy recommendations to the President, would annually prepare a social report for the President who would transmit it to the Congress. A newly created Joint Committee on the Social Report would scrutinize the Nation's social priorities, goals, and trends as outlined and discussed in the report.

The act would encourage the development of a set of social indicators, or "yardsticks," designed to measure the progress of the Nation's programs, and of a system of social accounting to determine the cost-benefit ratios of these programs with an emphasis on the human side of the ledger.

Altogether the mechanism and the approach to social policy that the Full Opportunity Act would declare more social progress and public statements which would be more sound judgments on setting priorities and goals could be made.

In addition a more viable and visible national debate would educate and involve the public to a much greater extent. The public would be better sensitized to present and impending social problems and would be more responsive to the urgent needs of our times.

Finally the Full Opportunity Act would tend to enhance the status and prestige of social science. The Full Employment Act did for economists. The proposed act would place at the right hand of the President a select group of social scientists upon whom he would look for advice on social affairs, both short term and long range.

The National Foundation for the Social Sciences, a bill I authored in the 89th Congress, and plan to reintroduce shortly, now would be the right hand of the President. The National Foundation for the Social Sciences, a bill I authored in the 89th Congress and plan to reintroduce shortly.

The act would encourage the development of a set of social indicators and a coordinated system of social accounts.

THE CASE FOR THE FULL OPPORTUNITY ACT

Several compelling arguments in favor of the proposed Act evolved during the seminar and the hearings. I will not go into each one in detail but will discuss the utility of a system of social accounting and the framework of social indicators and a coordinated system of social accounts.

The Senate has already spent considerable time and effort on this bill. The Subcommittee on Government Research, of which I am chairman, held an unprecedented seminar followed through with an extensive set of hearings during the 90th Congress. The overall result of the subcommittee's activities was to make a strong case for the passage of the Full Opportunity Act.

Why an informally structured seminar before a regular set of hearings? The scope of the proposed act was so broad that it was felt that a seminar format would be the best method by which the thinking of the Subcommittee and all those concerned might be sharpened and refined prior to actual hearings on the legislation.

The seminar was an innovative approach to dealing with legislation pending before the full Senate. The 18 experts assembled participated in a rather historical event in the national legislative process.

The distinguished panel was composed of many nationally known figures in public service. It included Dr. Gerard Colm, former member of the Council of Economic Advisers and an architect of the Full Employment Act of 1946, whose unfortunate death occurred just weeks ago. Among the other participants, to name a few, were the late Dr. Francis Keppell, former Commissioner of Education and now chairman, board of directors, General Learning Corp.; and Dr. Joseph Kraft, syndicated columnist.

The volume of prepared statements on the bill, produced a lively and stimulating exchange of ideas and points of view and, as a result, the nature and scope of the bill were more carefully delineated.

The subsequent hearings, held in July 1967, were conducted at a time when an incredible wave of civil disorders was sweeping the Nation, leaving many cities scarred by acts of violence and testimony given during the hearings policy formulations that would predict or prevent social disruptions, and how ill prepared we were to deal effectively with the resulting lawlessness and disorder. The creation of the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders was the result of these hearings. These hearings highlighted the intensity of national concern and made arguments in favor of the Full Opportunity Act even more compelling.

Twenty-eight distinguished witnesses from the public and private sectors testified during the hearings and addressed their remarks to a set of questions concerning the following six areas:

First. The possibility of establishing a national social account by which a set of social indicators and designing a set of social indicators.

Second. Methods to prevent an invasion of privacy while securing necessary social data.

Third. The role of State and local governments in formulating and implementing national social policies.

Fourth. Whether data collection should be a State, regional, or national responsibility.

Fifth. The suitability of a Council of Social Advisers to achieve the objectives of the bill.

Sixth. What can and should be done to excite, involve and commit the American people to social goals?

The fruitful hearings helped to identify many issues including the deficiencies and fragmentation of present social accounting efforts. Several witnesses suggested modifications to increase the utilization of the bill. In the bill, as it was passed by the Joint Committee and the House and was highlighted by expressions of deep concern for devising better ways to predict and prevent civil disorders, to discover and correct social inequities and to gauge improvements in the quality of life.

The Full Opportunity Act would declare as a national policy the promotion and encouragement of such conditions as will give every American the opportunity to live in decency and dignity. The creation of a Council of Social Advisers, composed of the Joint Committee on the Social Report, would give more visibility and urgency to all efforts designed to achieve this objective.

These new mechanisms will serve as forums which would stimulate debate, comment and criticism on how well our Nation is doing in improving the quality...
of American life. The debate will sharpen and rationalize decision-making on social policy and result in greater accountability by government and test of our responsiveness. These attempts may be, the resulting accounting techniques and social yardsticks will not be so precise as to freeze our priorities, goals, and overall national strategy for social betterment. The intent is to try to chart the various capabilities to chart our way toward reaching the goal of equal social and economic opportunity.

Social accounting can offer a better idea of where we are at any given time. There are a few examples of how we are using manpower, funds, and facilities to expand the opportunities available to the deprived and disadvantaged.

A set of social indicators would constitute a set of tools to arrange social data in certain patterns so as to discern trends, both favorable and unfavorable, and take action as appropriate. In this sense the Council of Social Advisers would function very much like the Council of Economic Advisers.

The Full Opportunity Act will stimulate new and better social data gatherings. Many shocking instances that illustrate the primitive state of data collection are illustrative. For example, as Dr. Harvey Perloff, dean of Architecture and Urban Planning, University of California, stated at the seminar:

It is striking that it wasn't until EEO asked the Census Bureau to collect data on neighborhoods—communities, such as Watts and Harlem—that we really came to know how difficult the situation was in these various neighborhoods in terms of income and employment.

Also, the shocking fact was recently discovered that about 6 million Negroes were not counted during the 1960 census. Six million people, in effect, were considered nonexistent. Can alienation from our society be any more complete? These typical situations are deplorable and demand immediate attention.

With more and better data and indicators to trace social trends problems will be forced to the surface more quickly. Dr. S. M. Miller, program advisor in social development, Ford Foundation, made the observation that—

"I think one of the interesting things about poverty is that it took so long to discover it. There were discussions about the issue before the sixties but the issue didn't emerge; economics wasn't really centrally concerned about it until the sixties. He might have added that it took the shocking revelations of Michael Harrington's "The Other America" to sensitize the nation to realities that had prevailed unnoticed for so long. This is such an exciting period in the future. We should be able to deal with problems as they arise and act to prevent rather than react to repair.

The Council of Social Advisers with its congressional mandate would enhance the power to upgrade and coordinate present social accounting efforts. It would be in a position to advise the President on social issues including the social impact of economic decisions. In this manner it would serve as a complementary agency, countering force to the Council of Economic Advisers.

More attention to social consequences of policymaking and priority setting would result. For example, while a tax increase or a Federal budgetary cutback may have the same economic impact, the social impact of each would be dramatically different. I believe matters such as this are not now receiving the fullest possible attention in the inner circles of Government.

The invasion of privacy issue came up repeatedly before the subcommittee. Undoubtedly there can be conflict between the need to gather more social data and the rights of an individual to privacy. This is an area where progress is information acquisition has to be accompanied by caution and circumspection.

Data collection on a large scale is not just in the offing but is underway and, therefore, invasion of privacy is already an issue. The President recently established the Council of Social Advisers would be a good agency for the collection of such data. Its position of power would tend to expose any manipulation that might be underwritten. Bureaucratic secrecy and the tension between the Federal establishment and self-fulfilling statistics would be minimized.

The Joint Committee on the Social Report, performing the traditional legislative oversight function, would serve as another check on the methods employed to acquire data and the purposes for which they are used.

Regardless of these built-In safeguards the area remains very sensitive and all precautions should be taken to guarantee that the nature of the social data required for the work of the proposed Council be of a generalized nature; individual as opposed to societywide behavior is of no utility in developing information indicative of social trends. There is also the need to insin that methods of acquiring data are ethically and legally sound.

The role of Federal, State, and local governments—as well as the private sector—in relation to the collection and use of social data was another salient topic of discussion before the subcommittee. This legislation would encourage the acquisition, exchange, and use of social information by all governmental jurisdictions and interested private organizations.

The function of the Council to foster more relevant, timely, and accurate information was squarely addressed by those who testified. Dr. Robert P. Abelard, professor of Economics, Yale University, saw the Council of Social Advisers serving "as a lightning rod to focus national attention on problems of common concern to disparate locales. A series of review and new studies of ghetto conditions would be a matter of national urgency."

Dr. Howard E. Freeman, professor of social research, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, observed that—

"We have a very bizarre form of government from the standpoint of gathering statistics. We have a city, country, state, regional and Federal establishment, all of which make information available. They all measure in a variety in their validity, reliability, and precision. It seems to me it is an important mandate of the Full Opportunity Act to generate and exert influence and pressure to permit a more integrated type of approach in terms of the various available data.

In both cases the Council is portrayed as playing a decisive role in stimulating and coordinating the acquisition of data, the handling and interpretation of it. It is a function of orchestration without domination.

Many changes in the bill have been proposed and some already adopted. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that case for passage already has been made before the Subcommittee on Government Research. What is left are possibly a few structural changes which can be made during further committee consideration. The full committee considerations will be covered by the congressional report.

Staffing is also a crucial factor upon which the success of the Full Opportunity Act largely depends. The legislation would encourage the acquiring of the case for passage already has been given to it. I would heartily recommend that in the full report on the bill the intent of Congress in this matter be clearly and forcefully elaborated. In this way the full committee consideration will be covered by the congressional report.

Also, I believe some guidelines on an agenda for the social report should be given in order to provide the proposed Council with a better starting point for preparing the report.

Finally, I want to say that this is a propitious time for the passage of the Full Opportunity Act. Because the setting of social goals and priorities is both difficult and complex, it is even more incumbent upon us to undertake such efforts on a more systematic basis. Mr. Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League, urged the need for this legislation when he asserted that—

"Just as we once floundered in the area of economic policy for lack of hard factual information, so today we are floundering in the area of adequate social policy due to lack of hard factual information."

He continued by citing an event in mid-1967 that vividly demonstrated the desperate need for reliable social indications, namely the sudden official discovery that there was human starvation in our country, a matter that will be the subject of considerable attention this session.

What they pointed out that—

Irrefutable testimony to the suffering in Mississippi was introduced into the record
of hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment and Poverty by doctors at work in Mississippi; and we were treated to the incredible sight of a parade of public officials who, shamed facedly, had to admit their ignorance of the situation. Nobody, it turned out, knew the extent or degree or geographical distribution of hunger and malnutrition in America.

The Secretary of Agriculture, who runs the food programs, did not know. The Surgeon General, who above us said he did not know. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity did not know. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare did not know.

Mr. President, America the wealthiest and most powerful Nation in the world cannot permit this type of situation to continue. We must get down to the root causes of our social problems. An active Council of Social Advisers will not only tend to prevent sudden shocking discoveries, such as those associated with widespread hunger and malnutrition, but will offer a better assessment of the social health of the Nation and will give us a fighting chance to provide full opportunity to all Americans.

S 6—INTRODUCTION OF BILL—THE DOMESTIC FOOD ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce again in the 91st Congress the Domestic Food Assistance Act of 1969, a bill to revise and completely overhaul the food stamp and commodity distribution programs in the United States. I ask that it be received and appropriately referred.

In the early 1960's, thanks to Michael Harrington and others, we began to hear about the forgotten Americans—30 million men, women, and children who live in poverty; who live in dilapidated housing; who have no jobs, or if they do make less than enough to live on; and whose children go to poor schools where, if they get there, they are not given a chance to compete. From high school, will have an eighth grade education.

More recently, of course, we have heard political appeals to other forgotten Americans—those who work and pay taxes and take our homes and the education of our children for granted—appeals designed to convey the impression that the poor are paid too much attention.

Perhaps there is some truth to this, but I am not one who thinks we have done too much for the poor. There are still 29 million impoverished Americans, and at the rate we have progressed in the last 10 years it will take another 20 years to wipe out poverty.

But this bill deals with about 10 million of our 29 million poor—10 million who suffer not just from joblessness and bad housing and poor education, but who lack the first necessity of life, food. It is these poorest of the poor with whom I believe we must be concerned. We read of famine in India and Biafra starved by the millions because their leaders and neighbors are playing politics with their right to eat. But we have only recently become aware of the fact that an estimated 20 million Americans—perhaps half of them children like yours and mine, suffer from hunger and malnutrition so severe that many are slowly starveing and most are physically and mentally impaired for life.

You will not find these people dying in the streets as in Calcutta, but you will find them on the plantations in Mississippi and Alabama, on the Indian reservations of South Dakota and Arizona and in the ghettos of Chicago and New York. Let me illustrate. Last year, a witness before a Senate subcommittee related how her five small children had gone without meat or vegetables for 3 months, so hungry at times they ate food from their neighbors' fields. They had to fish but could not afford food for lunch. In other years they could have fished but the stream had dried up.

In Cleveland, Miss., a middle-aged mother had signed up for food stamps but had no income. She paid $12 to buy $76 worth of food stamps because she had no income. She and her six children had eaten rice and biscuits left over from surplus commodities which had been distributed the month before. They would have gone hungry without food stamps for their children.

In the streets of California, 50 yards off a seldom-traveled road, a migrant family of seven, the youngest child not yet two, were living in a pickup truck abandoned by a small stream. They had no breakfast and did not know where to obtain food for lunch. In other years they could have fished but the stream had dried up.

In the village of Anatuvak Pass, Alaska, the population of 114 lives almost entirely on caribou meat, shot once each year, and which was distributed to the 14 children during the 3 days on which thousands of caribou pass through that area. Because she lacked the nutrients to sustain proper bone development, a 5-year-old girl lost all her teeth and can no longer eat cari­boos.

These are but four hungry American families which the Senate Poverty Subcommittee of which I am a member saw or had reported to it in 1967. And there are thousands more who go to school without breakfast and cannot afford to bring or buy their lunch. I saw some of them in a school in St. Paul, Minn., just a few weeks ago. While their classmates lined up in the school cafeteria, those who could not afford to pay 5 cents for lunch ate cookies they had brought with them or went without lunch.

These conditions were observed by a team of physicians who went to the Mississippi delta a year and a half ago. They reported to the 90th Congress and the public. I think it worth reading their words:

We saw children whose nutritional and medical conditions we can only describe as shocking. Their whose work involves daily confrontations with disease and suffering. In child child we saw... In every county we visited, we saw children of severe malnutrition, with injury to the body's tissues—its muscles, bones, and skin as well as an associated psychological state of fatigue, listlessness, and exhaustion.

We saw children afflicted with chronic diarrhea, chronic sores, chronic leg and arm (untreated) injuries and deformities. We saw homes without running water, without electricity, without screens, in which child­ren drink contaminated water and live with germs breeding everywhere around. We saw homes where children are lucky to eat one meal a day—and that one inadequate so far as vitamins and minerals are concerned. We saw children who do not eat milk, do not get to eat fruit, green vegetables, or meats. We saw a little girl who drank Kool-Aid. Their parents may be declared ineligible for commodities, ineligible for the food stamp program, even though they have no income and are not working. We saw children food com­munally—that is by neighbors who give scraps of food to children whose own parents have no money to buy it for them. We saw these children, some of whom are receiving no food from the government, are also getting no medical attention whatsoever. They are out of sight and out of mind; they are in such primitive conditions that we found it hard to believe we were examining American children of the twentieth century.

In sum, we saw children who are hungry and who are sick—children for whom hunger is a daily fact of life and sickness, in many forms an inevitability. We do not want to quibble over words, but "malnu­trition" is not quite what we found; the boys and girls we saw were hungry—weak, in their faces, their bones, their skin; they are, in fact, visibly and predictably losing their health, their energy, their spirits. They are suffering from hunger and disease, and dying from them—which is exactly what "starvation" means.

Unbelievable as this seems in America today, these cases are not isolated or unusual of the conditions in our poorest families. Such families are the least observed, because comfortable middle-class America finds it easy to ignore their existence and because some of our unforgettable politicians find it politically expedient to deny their existence.

What are the dimensions of the problem? I have referred to 10 million Americans who are hungry and malnourished. But we really do not know how many of them there are. We have ignored the problems for so long that no one in or out of Government took the trouble to find out. But we are making headway at least in defining the problem. Last spring a private citizens board of nutritionists, economists, and other experts held hearings throughout the country and examined all available data. They concluded in a report entitled "Hunger, U.S.A.,” that between a third and a half of the poor in America suffer from hunger and malnutrition, that is, between 10 and 14 million people. Yet, present family food assistance programs reach less than 6 million poor persons, and no family receives a nutritionally adequate diet from these programs. Eighteen million schoolchildren come from poor families. Eighteen million schoolchildren receive lunches under the Federal school lunch program, yet only 2 million of these are poor children. In other words, 4 million poor children go to school hungry and malnourished, who can afford to buy their own lunch are subsidized.

But statistics do not tell the whole story. The real tragedy is evident when we list some of the effects of malnu­trition. Malnutrition does not just affect the physical aspects— the bloated bellies and emaciated bodies—but the internal mental and physical effects. A child's brain grows to