

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 1

JANUARY 3, 1969, TO JANUARY 21, 1969

(PAGES 3 TO 1380)

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, shamefacedly, 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 of the United States 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—39 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 are lucky enough to graduate from high school, will have an eighth grade education.

More recently, of course, we have heard political appeals to other forgotten Americans—those of us 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 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 Biafrans starving 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 10 million of our own people, perhaps half of them children like yours and mine, suffer from hunger and malnutrition so severe that many are slowly starv-

ing 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 grass from a neighboring field. They acquired a chicken from a friend one day, but before the mother could cook it the children tore the feathers off and ate it raw. That happened in Virginia.

In the San Joaquin Valley 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 they would find 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 never been able to pay the \$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 go without lunch. Her youngest baby, a few weeks old, had never had milk.

In the village of Anatuvak Pass, Alaska, the population of 114 lives almost entirely on caribou meat, shot once each year and buried in the frozen ground 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 caribou meat.

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 the countless children 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 25 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 their findings to the 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—even to a group of physicians whose work involves daily confrontations with disease and suffering. In child after child we saw . . . in every county we visited, obvious evidence 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 chil-

dren drink contaminated water and live with germ-bearing mosquitoes and flies everywhere around. We saw homes with children who are lucky to eat one meal a day—and that one inadequate so far as vitamins, minerals, or protein is concerned. We saw children who don't get to drink milk, don't get to eat fruit, green vegetables, or meat. They live on starches—grits, bread, Kool-Aid. Their parents may be declared ineligible for commodities, ineligible for the food stamp program, even though they have literally nothing. We saw children fed communally—that is by neighbors who give scraps of food to children whose own parents have nothing to give them. Not only are these children receiving no food from the government, they are also getting no medical attention whatsoever. They are out of sight and ignored. They are living under 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 pain, sick; their lives are being shortened; they are, in fact, visibly and predictably losing their health, their energy, their spirits. They are suffering from hunger and disease, and directly or indirectly they are dying from them—which is exactly what "starvation" means.

Unbelievable as this seems in America today, these cases are not isolated or untypical of the conditions in our poorest families. And they exist because 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 us suffer from slow starvation. We 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 inquiry, composed of nutrition 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 suffered 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. Six million of our 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 without lunch at all while 16 million 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. And not just the visible effects—the bloated bellies and emaciated bodies—but the internal mental and physical effects. A child's brain grows to

90 percent of its full size between the ages of 1 and 4. If his brain is not supplied with enough protein, it will not grow. And it will not grow after he is 4 even if he gets enough protein. This kind of brain damage is irreversible and the child will be mentally retarded for life.

Then there are the physical effects of malnutrition. A poorly nourished child has little or no resistance to infections and diseases. He is infinitely more susceptible to parasites, viruses, and bacterial infections. And when he gets sick his illness is more severe and prolonged because he does not have the curing mechanisms in his body to fight off the infection.

Not the least of the effects of hunger are the educational, psychological, and social effects. A hungry child does not learn at school. He is listless. He fights with other children. He has hunger pangs. He withdraws. He cries. As one doctor has said, "He becomes tired, petulant, suspicious and finally apathetic."

If these problems exist—and we know they do—we have failed a substantial portion of our people. We have failed to make good on John F. Kennedy's first commitment as President, to assure every American an adequate diet, when he issued an Executive order on January 23, 1961, that expanded the commodities program and started today's food stamp program.

The commodity distribution program since its inception in the early forties has been our first line of defense against domestic hunger. It is designed to donate our agricultural surplus free to needy families. Today more than 20 separate commodities are given to 3½ million participants. Yet these commodities provide less than 50 percent of the calories, less than 60 percent of the iron needs and only 70 percent of the protein and calcium needed by those served.

In 1964 we passed the Food Stamp Act. It is designed to enable the poor to buy stamps at their local welfare office and redeem them at a premium at their local grocery store. But it has been a mixed blessing. It was supposed to replace the commodities program. But those who participate must pay, and their payments are supposed to equal their normal expenditures for food. Moreover, the food stamp and commodities programs cannot be operated in the same county. Many who were given free food under the commodities program and spent nothing for food before, cannot afford food stamps. As a result, fewer people are fed today through family food assistance programs than in January 1962. Thus a year after President Kennedy expanded the commodities program and began a pilot food stamp program, nearly 7½ million persons were fed through family food assistance. But in early 1967, when we began to rediscover hunger in America and the food stamp program was in full swing, less than 5 million Americans were participating in the two programs. Today, participation has increased to 6.1 million, but still fewer than were fed in 1962.

There are other problems with the food stamp program. The average American family spends 17 percent of its income on food. But a poor family of four with a

monthly income of \$39 must pay \$10 or about 25 percent of its income for food stamps. Added to this \$10 purchase price is a \$42 bonus. If their next door neighbors, also a family of four, make only a dollar more, or \$40 a month, it has to pay \$6 more for its food stamps, and it gets \$2 less in bonus. This is just one illustration of how the food stamp purchase schedules discriminate among various income levels of poor people.

To compound the problem, the total redemption value of food stamps—that is, the amount of food that the poor family can buy with the stamps—is only half what the Department of Agriculture itself says the family needs.

But the basic reason that our domestic food assistance programs have never begun to meet the needs of our poor people stems from their dual purpose. Neither is designed solely to feed people. The commodities program was designed and is still used primarily to support farm prices. Only a commodities in surplus, bought under farm price support programs can be distributed. While the food stamp program has the specific purpose of helping needy families achieve adequate diets, it was also designed by Congress "to strengthen our agricultural economy, as well as result in more orderly marketing and distribution of food." Both programs, therefore, are concerned with providing subsidies, direct and indirect, to the business of agriculture, as well as providing food assistance to the needy.

Among nutritionists, while there is no dispute about the existence of hunger, there is a running debate over its causes and cures. There are those who maintain the hunger problem is the result of bad sanitation, deplorable housing, lack of health care and lack of education. They say food alone is not the answer.

Others focus solely on nutrition, maintaining that hunger stems from the failure of our agriculture economy and the inadequacies of our food programs.

Both are right. We must get nutritious food into empty stomachs, and the best qualified people to accomplish that are people who grow and process food. But we cannot do that without at the same time providing hungry people with the education so they know what to buy and what to eat. By the same token, filling the stomach of a child whose insides are infested with worms is self-defeating. And getting rid of the worms at a local health clinic will not either unless he can go home to a clean house where parasites cannot survive.

What we need, I suggest, is to put together a coalition to end hunger in America. The Members of Congress with conflicting views need to listen dispassionately to all sides and separate the emotional from the practical issues. The private sector, including both farmers and food processors, must join with the do-gooders and bureaucrats to work out practical reforms designed to assure that no American need go to bed or to school with an empty stomach.

There has been some progress in the past year. Fifty-five million dollars more was appropriated for the food stamp program this year than last. This has enabled the Department of Agriculture

to institute food programs in each of our 1,000 poorest counties. An emergency fund of \$45 million was appropriated last fall which will be used to start a program providing special foods to pregnant women, infants, and old people and to hire 4,000 subprofessional nutrition aids to teach the poor what food to buy and how to prepare it.

But these are small steps compared with the need. We need new reforms in the food stamp, commodity distribution, and school lunch programs.

The food stamp program must be revised so that the purchase schedules and bonuses no longer discriminate among different income levels of poor people. The purchase requirements should be scaled so that the poorest poor who, after they have paid for their heat, light, rent, and clothing, have nothing left for food, get free stamps, and so that no family need spend more of its income than the average American spends on food. And the food stamp bonus should be increased to permit the purchase of an adequate diet by all participants.

The commodity distribution program need not be tied to the existence of surpluses. We know we can grow more than enough food for our people. We must devise a system that allows our full agricultural potential and expertise to be mobilized to assure that no one go hungry.

The school lunch program should guarantee that free meals, including breakfast, are available to any child unable to afford the regular price.

Finally, these programs should be expanded so that every county and city in the Nation that needs them can operate food assistance programs under uniform standards of eligibility that will allow all 29 million of our poor to participate.

These reforms in our present food programs are needed now. They are long overdue. But they are costly. They would require that present expenditures of about \$1 billion for the food stamp, commodities and school lunch programs be doubled. And I doubt that the next administration will propose or the Congress will provide the funds.

But even a billion dollars more for food assistance is not the ultimate answer. It doesn't solve the health, housing, sanitation, clothing and education problems of the poor. It does not give them jobs so they can be self-sufficient. And for those who cannot work or find a job, it does not put money in their pockets. The problems of poverty are complex. They require complex solutions. But the least we can do is keep 10 million Americans from slowly starving by giving them three good meals a day.

Mr. President, the bill I am introducing today would remedy some of the defects in the existing programs. While it preserves and continues the best features of the Food Stamp Act and other programs, it is a complete legislative overhaul of those laws. 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 red tape;

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.

The bill does not establish a monetary standard for the amount of food stamps, since this will necessarily vary from region to region, and according to circumstances. But it is difficult to see how it could go much below \$90 a month, the level USDA determines it a minimum needed to assure a nutritious diet.

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

The bill (S. 6) to repeal the Food Stamp Act of 1964 and enact in lieu thereof the Domestic Food Assistance Act of 1969, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 7—INTRODUCTION OF BILL—THE 1969 WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators RANDOLPH, BAKER, BOGGS, BURDICK, BYRD of West Virginia, CASE, COOPER, DODD, ERVIN, FONG, HART, INOUE, KENNEDY, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, METCALF, MONDALE, MONTROYA, MOSS, NELSON, RIBICOFF, SPONG, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YOUNG, I introduce the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969.

When the Congress adjourned last year, legislation substantially similar to this bill was a part of its unfinished business. Since the end of the 90th Congress, the Water Quality Improvement Act has been redrafted to clarify some misconceptions about its predecessor and to incorporate provisions passed in both the House and the Senate versions of the bill. Except for deletion of the financing provision of last year's bill, which will be submitted as separate legislation, this

year's legislation follows the essential pattern of last year's.

This legislation is designed to deal with three major sources of pollution which continue to damage our water resources: oil pollution, vessel pollution, and thermal pollution.

Frequent oil spills from vessels and from on- and off-shore petroleum facilities have ruined beaches and lowered the quality of our rivers and shore waters and have put in jeopardy animal and vegetable life. The spills from the *Torrey Canyon* and the *Ocean Eagle* have been spectacular examples of this danger, but the damage of continuous but unpublicized lesser accidents and intentional dumping is steadily increasing. It can no longer be tolerated.

Too often, the Government has been unable to react quickly enough to control the situation, or has not been informed of the incident. Frequently, the offenders have made no attempt to clean up the spill and have gone unpunished. This bill attempts to correct these deficiencies.

As pleasure boating becomes an increasingly popular recreation, more and more untreated sewage is dumped in our rivers, lakes, and oceans. Combined with increased wastes from commercial vessels, this pollution has created health hazards in waters previously known for their beauty and high quality.

Those who benefit from our water resources for trade or recreation must also accept the responsibility for preserving and enhancing its quality. The Water Quality Improvement Act provides for the establishment of standards of performance for vessel waste treatment systems to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage from these sources.

Finally, this bill recognizes the responsibility of Federal agencies to protect water quality wherever their activities, including assistance or authorization for activities by public or private bodies, affect public waterways. I would like to call particular attention to the problem of thermal pollution and the responsibilities of the Atomic Energy Commission in connection with the licensing of nuclear powerplants.

Thermal pollution can seriously and adversely affect the ecological balance of the receiving waters, and a sufficient body of evidence exists to require control. However, the AEC has not considered these factors in passing on the site selection and construction design of nuclear powerplants.

Under the terms of this bill, no Federal agency shall issue a license or permit for any activity which may affect water quality until it has determined from the appropriate State agency or the Secretary of the Interior that the proposed activity will be designed to insure compliance with applicable water quality standards.

In the past, these licenses and permits have been granted without any assurance that the standards will be met or even considered.

In the past 8 years, Congress has maintained that the effort to clean up our Nation's waters requires the most urgent commitment of organization, plan-

ning, engineering skill, and funds directed toward improvement of the quality of our environment. We have acknowledged the need for clean water in the broadest sense. But the demand for clean water is so great and is growing so fast that we cannot afford to overlook any opportunity to increase the available supply of water, or to prevent and control sources of pollution which threaten the existing supply.

The legislation which I now introduce will help insure that clean water will be available when it is needed.

I hope that Congress will move swiftly on this bill. There are few tasks as urgent or responsibilities as great.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

The bill (S. 7) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 7

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969".

SEC. 2. Sections 17 and 18 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, are hereby repealed. Section 19 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is redesignated as section 20. Sections 11 through 16 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, are redesignated as sections 14 through 19. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting after section 10 three new sections to read as follows:

"CONTROL OF SEWAGE FROM VESSELS

"SEC. 11. (a) For the purpose of this section, the term—

"(1) 'new vessel' includes every description of watercraft or other artificial contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on the navigable waters of the United States, the construction of which is completed after promulgation of standards and regulations under this section;

"(2) 'existing vessel' includes every description of watercraft or other artificial contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on the navigable waters of the United States, the construction of which has been completed before promulgation of standards and regulations under this section;

"(3) 'public vessel' means a vessel owned or bareboat chartered and operated by the United States, by a State or political subdivision thereof, or by a foreign nation or by a political subdivision thereof, except in any case in which such vessel is used primarily to carry freight or passengers or to engage in commercial fishing;

"(4) 'United States' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

"(5) 'marine sanitation device' means any equipment for installation on board a vessel which is designed to receive, retain, treat, or discharge sewage;

"(6) 'sewage' means human body wastes and the wastes from toilets and other