

U.S. Congress
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 27

NOVEMBER 26, 1969, TO DECEMBER 4, 1969

(PAGES 35895 TO 37182)

Senator state the time for the trans-
action of routine morning business?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Not to
extend beyond 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there
objection? Without objection, it is so
ordered.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON
FOOD, NUTRITION, AND HEALTH—
REMARKS OF SENATOR MONDALE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on this,
the fourth day of December, we see the
conclusion of the 3-day White House
Conference on Food, Nutrition, and
Health. Three thousand participants
from all over the Nation were invited to
take part in panel discussions and con-
sultations about hunger, malnutrition,
and the needs of the poor.

Experts familiar with every phase of
nutritional needs and nutritional prob-
lems contributed to these sessions. Con-
ference panels covered the most minute
aspects of everything from evaluation of
nutritional needs to food-delivery sys-
tems and nutrition education.

But there is no doubt that the most
fundamental cry at that conference was
made by the poor—those who are forced
to go through life suffering food depriva-
tion because they have no money to buy
a full meal. They expressed, with full
emotion, what it means to go day after
day with that dull, gnawing pain that
signals an empty stomach. They came
here to Washington, along with all the
others, to let us know that whatever is
said about proteins, vitamins, hemo-
globin, and iron levels and all the other
jargon professionals use when they dis-
cuss nutrition—whatever may be said
about all those things, there were people
at that conference who know what must
be done. They came here to make one
and only one recommendation—feed the
hungry now.

When Robert Kennedy returned from
the Mississippi Delta in 1967 he said:
"Just get some food down there."

That is what we need. Let us feed
hungry Americans and let us feed them
right away.

The Senator from Minnesota (Mr.
MONDALE) spoke at that White House
conference this afternoon, and he elo-
quently reviewed our Nation's sorrowful
response to the needs of hungry people.
He eloquently chronicled the way we
have promised and flattered hungry
Americans. But, we have continually
failed to feed them.

Senator MONDALE properly cites the
powerlessness of the poor as the real
cause of hunger and deprivation. He
clearly sees that because the poor have
not been able to bring to bear the pres-
sures and influences of their demands
they have been doomed to continue to
suffer.

I join with the Senator from Minne-
sota in his call for a declaration of a
national emergency to set the needs of
hungry Americans on top of all other
national priorities.

Therefore, I am pleased to ask unani-
mous consent to have printed in the Rec-
ord Senator MONDALE's remarks before

the conference this afternoon, in which
he called for immediate action to elimi-
nate hunger in America.

There being no objection, the remarks
were ordered to be printed in the Rec-
ord, as follows:

TEXT OF SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE'S RE-
MARKS TO THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE
ON FOOD, NUTRITION, AND HEALTH, DECEM-
BER 4, 1969

Senator McGovern sends his best wishes.
Since those doctors found hunger in Mis-
sissippi 2½ years ago, we have flattered
America's hungry with a mammoth amount
of publicity; surveys; reports; TV docu-
mentaries; Presidential messages; testimony;
touring committees; and now, even a White
House Conference.

We have flattered them with everything—
except food.

Along with many of you, I have been
privileged to be part of the liberal road
show. It's quite a sight. Shriveled infants
on the Navajo; blank-eyed, unlearning chil-
dren in Nome; unbelievable proportions of
anemia in a migrant community in Texas;
a Florida migrant county with no food pro-
gram at all, but with a death rate for non-
white infants over six times the national
average. Hunger everywhere—including a
ghetto less than a mile from this hotel,
where we saw children's lives being ruined
by lack of food.

We set up a Nutrition Committee under the
chairmanship of one of the truly remark-
able leaders of our time, George McGovern.
At latest count, our committee has heard
over 6000 pages of testimony; 300 witnesses
and traveled thousands of miles.

We weren't the first to look at hunger and
deprivation—many of the poor remember
visits by Eleanor Roosevelt, John Steinbeck,
and others. Like them, we were shocked by
what we saw; like them, we promised re-
form.

The case is now beyond dispute.

The problem is *not* that we lack facts
about hunger and malnutrition—the prob-
lem is that we have lacked the will to elimi-
nate it.

Our policies have not left us unscarred.
For just as a war in Vietnam brutalizes us
as well as the Vietnamese, so our willing-
ness to permit hunger and deprivation in
our land takes its toll on us as well. We
might be able to live with our platitudes—
but thank God, our children cannot. We
may be losing them because we first lost
our commitment to our professed ideals.

Many of your recommendations involve
further nutrition studies and surveys, and,
in exquisite detail, set forth a plan for an
army of trained nutritionists to move among
the poor and educate them. Undoubtedly,
some of it is needed.

But I believe it would be far more val-
uable—we might even end hunger—if the
education process were turned around and
directed at ourselves, our society, to find out
why in the name of heaven we have lost
our capacity to respond quickly and ade-
quately to starving Americans.

We would find, I believe, that the real
cause of hunger and deprivation is the pow-
erlessness of the poor, a powerlessness result-
ing from our desire to hold the poor in a
guardian-ward relationship.

At times, our paternalism is benevolent.
Often, it is abusive. But always it carries
the self-seeking tone of wanting to do minor
good works while preserving the power and
the institutions of the dominant society.
And in the end, those who are made depend-
ent upon *our* continued interest and *our*
voluntary sacrifices remain miserable and
hungry.

Call the roll: Indians; Eskimos; migrants
and farm workers; ghetto dwellers; the rural

poor; millions of children who never have
a chance; the elderly who are left alone or
Americans confined to institutions of "care."
These impoverished Americans, as Michael
Harrington observed, "see life as a fate, an
endless cycle from which there is no deliv-
erance."

It is the powerlessness of the poor which
results in the hunger we are discussing to-
day—not ignorance or lack of will. I have
never yet met a hungry person who liked it
that way. But unlike us, they cannot do any-
thing about it.

Until the poor have power—*political* power,
legal power, and most of all *purchasing*
power, they will stay poor and they will stay
hungry.

I am convinced, in short, that poverty
and hunger will not be eliminated until we
tap the vast wisdom, understanding, loyalty,
and pride of the poor. What an awful, un-
utterable waste not to realize that above
all it is the poor themselves who know most
about the details and the solution to their
predicament!

But we must enjoy our paternalism. Why
else do we fight so hard to preserve it? Why
do we constantly attack those institutions
attempting to afford the poor some control
over their lives? Why the current effort to
cripple foundations—an attack aimed pri-
marily at foundations which are financing
efforts to increase political participation by
the poor and programs to make bureaucracies
responsive to the needs of the poor? Why
do we support efforts to destroy those same
foundations which first exposed hunger in
America and made this conference possible?

Why did the Senate adopt the Murphy
Amendment—to turn over control of OEO's
Legal Services Program to Governor Reagan
and his colleagues? How many lawsuits
against the government to feed the hungry
will be brought by lawyers hired and di-
rected by the Governor?

Perhaps this Conference should have
tackled the real cause of hunger—powerless-
ness. You have squarely met the need for
purchasing power in your income mainte-
nance recommendations. But there are other
types of power which could have been con-
sidered.

For example, why not endorse Cesar Cha-
vez's attempts to organize the table grape
growers—a first essential step in granting the
same bargaining power to migrants and farm
workers which nearly all other workers enjoy?

Why discuss the hunger of the Eskimo
without mentioning the Alaska Native Claims
Settlement Act—which would give the Alas-
kan native more hope, more pride, and more
income from a fair share of oil properties
than anything we could do here?

Why not recognize that if the Southern
Black were permitted to participate fully
and effectively in state and local govern-
ment—in part, by extension of the Voting
Rights Act—he could do more to help him-
self than we can.

Why is there no mention of one of the
greatest sources of powerlessness in this
country today—our government's policy per-
mitting the thousands and thousands of des-
perate, impoverished, unskilled Mexicans
daily crossing the borders of Texas and Cali-
fornia, depressing working conditions, taking
jobs, breaking strikes and refueling the
cruellest and most destructive institution in
America today—the migrant stream?

My point is perhaps most clearly evident
in the case of the American Indian. For 130
years they have been the special responsi-
bility—special wards—of the Federal gov-
ernment. We permit the average Indian fam-
ily barely to exist on \$1,500 a year—but if
the annual budget of the BIA and related
federal programs would be divided among
the Indian people, the average Indian's fam-
ily's income would rise to \$6,500.

Instead, our first Americans are now indisputably the last. Of all Americans, they have been most dependent upon us for the longest. Our paternal policies have resulted in their breaking all records—of ill health, joblessness, school failure, alcoholism, suicide, and, yes, hunger. Yet the recommendations here did not call for Indian control of their schools or any basic remedies which would empower the Indian to do something to save himself.

But despite these omissions, your panel recommendations and the reports of your task forces do propose a clear program for an end to hunger in America.

Most important, the Conference has recognized the greatest single need of the hungry—money for an adequate diet.

Many of you have made the first priority of this program a national system of income maintenance—a recommendation which I strongly support. By offering economic power to the beneficiaries, income maintenance offers an answer to both the immediate problem of hunger and the more fundamental problem of powerlessness.

Cash income means far more than adequate nutrition. It conveys dignity and self-respect, which have no value and yet all value.

But let's not delude ourselves. \$1,600 a year, with or without food stamps, does not constitute adequate income maintenance for a family of four. And we would compound our self-deception if we accept government statistics which assume that a family of four with an income of \$3,600 is not poor.

We need a program that provides real—not token—income maintenance and that offers incentives—not threats—for meaningful employment. A combination of good jobs and income help without demeaning and unnecessary investigations would go far toward ending both poverty and paternalism.

Studies show that "the poor make better use of their investment dollar than the well-to-do," that they will spend the money they receive more wisely to meet their needs than we can. This income and employment program must be a central and crucial objective in our pursuit of a just America.

Because of distorted priorities—with which most of us do not agree—we cannot accomplish this goal overnight.

But children cannot go hungry while we seek to reverse our priorities. As you have pointed out, there are important measures which can and must be adopted immediately.

1st. I join with those who have urged the President to declare at once a National Emergency, and to harness all resources to eradicate hunger—just as he would deal with other kinds of national disasters. The President had a perfect opportunity to make such a declaration at this conference, I regret that he did not. If the President and the nation can move so fast and effectively to aid victims of hurricanes, surely we can respond similarly to the victims of hunger.

2nd. It is time to stop making vague commitments to end hunger. If "the time has come to end hunger," that time is now. Let that national commitment contain a national deadline—just as a deadline was set by President Kennedy and met one year early for landing a man on the moon!

3rd. The key threshold objective of those totally committed to ending hunger must be the passage and full funding of the McGovern-Javits Food Stamp program adopted by the Senate.

It is carefully designed to assure adequate food assistance to the estimated 5 million poorest of the poor, 1.3 million of whom have no cash income at all. It is among those desperate Americans that hunger often becomes starvation.

The Administration alternative would serve far fewer of these most desperately poor if it worked—and it won't work. It won't because it assumes that State and local governments will all participate and will all find and feed the hungry. There is no basis for that sunny expectation. Today, several years after local governments could have implemented food stamp programs, 5 states and over 300 counties do not have them at all, and most counties have only token programs, in fact, the average food stamp county reaches only 10% of the poor.

The Administration program, unlike the Senate measure, lacks a national responsibility to end hunger. That is the gimmick—the "rhetoric" of the Administration position. Unless some national officer is finally responsible for finding and feeding the hungry, they won't be found or fed.

The Senate bill, which now languishes in the House Agriculture Committee, was not a Democratic measure—it enjoyed wide bipartisan support. I therefore plead with the President, whose representatives lobbied against its passage in the Senate; and whose Secretary of Agriculture now lobbies against it in the House, to stand up and clearly support this essential measure to end family hunger among this nation's most desperately poor.

If after everything—including this conference—we cannot enlist the President's clear support for the Senate bill and assure its passage, then we can do nothing meaningful to eliminate hunger.

The President spoke about working within our system. But that system responds to leadership; we need his now.

4th. We must immediately pass your recommended Children's Emergency Food Service Program to bring nutritious lunches and breakfasts to the 5 million low income children not now receiving them. An adequate diet should come first, before textbooks. Textbooks are useless to hungry children.

The President has set a target of feeding every needy school child by next June. But his Administration is fighting that goal. His current budget assures that almost 5 million needy school children will remain unfed. And they have opposed a House-passed measure to increase that budget.

Nor has this Administration pursued a creative and meaningful program for early childhood pre-school nutrition, beginning with mothers during pregnancy. Our failure to do so now destroys millions of our young before they even enter school.

5th. We clearly need Congressional reform. Obviously, all blame does not rest with the Executive.

The first step must be the extension for at least one more year of the Senate's Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. The Senate-adopted food stamp bill would not have been possible without the bipartisan push by this Committee. This Committee can help monitor passage of your recommendations.

In addition, legislative jurisdiction for all nutrition programs should rest in those Committees primarily concerned with human problems—the Labor and Public Welfare Committee in the Senate and the Education and Labor Committee in the House.

Now, where do we go from here? What happens to these recommendations? Do we simply await the Conference's final report and place it, perhaps, alongside the report of the Kerner Commission?

Or do we join in a call for an immediate end to hunger and malnutrition as the central and overriding goal of this Conference?

Your recommendations must be implemented. But that job requires pressure—*unrelenting public pressure*.

Our responsibility—your responsibility—

does not end with this conference—it only begins. You represent most of America. With your constituencies and your concern, you are ideally suited to move both Congress and the President.

We know the stakes.

As Nick Kotz observed, we once resisted the conclusion of widespread hunger in our land. We said, "We don't know." But the most disturbing answer was, "We don't know because we have not looked; we have not looked because we feared what we would see; and we were afraid because seeing would indict us."

We knew that seeing it raised not only questions of hunger but questions about our society.

It is now too late to say "We don't know." We have looked. We have seen, and we stand indicted.

The only question that remains is what we mean by the Politics of Hunger.

Will the hungry continue to eat promises or will they eat food?

LACK OF UNIFORM DESEGREGATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in recent days, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) has been doing some excellent work in connection with the lack of uniformity in insisting upon desegregation in public schools. Within the last few days, he has shown how wide is the practice of having dual school systems and an apparent disregard of desegregation of the public schools in the manner in which HEW has insisted upon for southern schools.

Certainly, there can be no justification for a different treatment in different sections of the country.

This point was discussed very clearly in an editorial published in the Mobile Press Register of November 16, 1969.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Press Register, Nov. 16, 1969]

WHY PUT PRESSURE ON SOUTH ALONE?

"Government sources" not otherwise identified have been quoted by the Associated Press in Washington, D.C., to the effect that the Nixon administration "will apply new pressure on some 130 holdout southern school districts in a first positive response to the Supreme Court's desegregate at once mandate."

These same "sources" are quoted to the effect that the Nixon administration "will not demand faster action from the 109 Southern districts that already have signed up to desegregate next fall."

Politicians who specialize in ridiculing and harassing the South can be counted on to rejoice over the reported prospect of "new pressure" being put on "holdout" school districts in this region of the nation.

Assorted leftist radicals in general may be expected to join in the rejoicing, for they, too, are overflowing with prejudice against the South.

But if new so-called desegregation pressure is to be applied, why single out "holdout" school districts in the South when racial segregation is practiced so widely and conspicuously outside the South.

In the words of Sen. John Stennis of Mississippi, "If it is the law, it ought to apply