

Proposed Reduction of Appropriations
for the School Milk Program - Feb. 8

Dairy Support Prices - Feb. 18

Dairy Colloquy - Nelson - March 17

National Milk Sanitation - March 25

Butterfat - Sugar Products - June 9



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1966

No. 21

PROPOSED REDUCTION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, innumerable Federal programs show the commitment of the American people to the health and well-being of our children and young people, as the most important single resource we have. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Project Head Start, Crippled Children's Services, Maternal and Child Health Services, Child Welfare Services, National School Lunch Programs, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and a host of other programs all show the very real concern we have as a Nation for guaranteeing that every child have a fair and equal chance to develop all of his talents and capabilities to the fullest extent possible.

Under the national school lunch program, nourishing and well-balanced lunches were served to 16 million children in 1964, 17 million in 1965, and an estimated 18 million in 1966.

Under the special milk program, children in schools, child-care centers, summer camps, orphanages, and similar institutions were provided with almost 3 billion half-pints of milk in 1964 and 1965, and an estimated 3 billion plus in 1966.

The relationship between hunger and nutrition, and the academic performance of children in school is very clear. Children who have not had an adequate, well-balanced diet, do much less well than others who have.

Now we are faced with the proposal to chop and slash the past levels of the special milk program by nearly 80 percent, from \$103 to \$21 million. This proposal has caused a storm of protest both here in Washington and in my State of Minnesota, and I think rightly so.

The Minnesota Farmers Union policy statement for 1966 said:

We urge measures to insure good nutrition for everyone This may be encouraged in several ways; through a nationwide food stamp plan; expanded school lunch and school milk program The Federal aid for the special milk program should be sufficient so that milk at the "milk breaks" is supplied free to the students.

Mrs. Grace Larson, Bloomington, Minn., said:

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure you would not want to take this away from them.

Mr. V. E. Harris, Twin Ports Co-op Dairy Association, said:

This program is very essential to the farmers of our Nation and even more important to the schoolchildren.

Mrs. Thomas J. Jones, Faribault, Minn., said:

As a working mother of seven children, I depend on their getting that penny-a-carton milk twice a day at school.

As if it were not bad enough that 80 percent of these children will no longer have milk, and I think we must be practical in recognizing that the States will be hard pressed to provide the funds necessary to subsidize this milk—as if this were not bad enough, it will be a tremendous blow to our dairy farmers in Minnesota. The return per hour to dairy farmers is now shockingly low—much less than \$1 per hour. This low rate of return caused a sharp drop in Minnesota milk production in 1965, and I think we could expect a further sharp decline with this greatly reduced consumption.

I am heartened that Senators PROxmire and HOLLAND have indicated their opposition to this cut, and I intend to oppose it firmly.

I ask unanimous consent that the following letters from Minnesota residents be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SAINT PAUL PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Saint Paul, Minn., January 25, 1966.
The Honorable WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: It was with considerable concern that we read that President Johnson's budget proposed reducing the sum spent on the school milk program to \$37 million for 1967—and, further, that only needy children be allowed to buy milk at reduced cost.

It is our considered judgment that these proposals are false economies to the extreme.

In Saint Paul where we sell milk at 1 cent to students bringing a lunch from home, we are certain that an increase to 4 cents (our cost) would seriously reduce participation among the very students who are most in need of milk at noon from a nutritional standpoint.

In secondary schools, which is our major service in Saint Paul, it is difficult presently to meet the needs of all the underprivileged because such students will go to lengths to avoid being stigmatized as such. We feel certain that such is the case in most secondary schools and only slightly less true in elementary grades.

If the suggested reduction were applied to the school lunch program, it is likely that our lunch charge in Saint Paul would be increased from its present 25 to 30 cents. We feel that such an increase would adversely affect participation among the very students most benefited by the program.

We have worked hard—and have been greatly assisted by State and Federal aids—to increase participation in both the school milk program and the school lunch program. Saint Paul has more than doubled such participation in the past 5 years. We are working to continue this progress.

We urge that you give full consideration to this suggested reduction and work for its reconsideration if you can do so in good conscience.

Cordially,

S. W. DOUCETTE,
Director, Saint Paul School Cafeterias.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Congratulations to you as our Senator from Minnesota.

Are you a supporter of the school lunch program as your predecessor Vice President HUMPHREY is? I sincerely hope you are as I have a request to make of you.

I have worked in the school lunch program for 20 years and am aware of the benefits gained by our children by learning to eat a variety of different foods.

The President's proposed budget included large cuts in the special milk program and the school lunch program. These cuts, if allowed to pass, would mean an increase in price to the children and may well cause some to have to go without a school lunch. My request is that you lend your support to disallow the proposed cuts and keep our school lunch program a vital part of the Nation's economy helping our future citizens grow up strong and healthy.

A friend of yours, Mr. Leroy Johnson, with General Mills, mentioned last week that he too was going to tell you how important it is to support the school lunch program.

Thank you for your consideration to this request.

Sincerely yours,

MR. DAVID V. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 26, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We are greatly disturbed over President Johnson's proposal to slash the school milk budget. We feel as an average taxpayer some other budget could be considered—why do we always have to consider the needy, they receive plenty already and it is we who pay for it—or the Cuban exiles, who else but us, is paying their transportation costs and so forth, or that highway beautification bill; is that as beneficial as a glass of milk?

Please give due thought to this proposal. Gratefully

Mr. and Mrs. ROGER REICHEL.

FARIBAULT DAILY NEWS,
Faribault, Minn., January 28, 1966.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Can anything be done to prevent the discontinuance of the penny-a-carton milk plan in our public schools? How can our good Democratic President do this to us? Are there not many other places to cut that would not at the same time cut the health of our children?

As a working mother of seven children, I depend on their getting that penny-a-carton milk twice a day at school. Although our county commissioners declared our Rice County not in need of the poverty funds available, this was an unrealistic decision.

Actually, there is much poverty in Rice County and Faribault. Wages are low here and the cost of living high. Our real estate taxes are \$330.66 per year, * * * my wages \$60 per week for 6 days a week. Unions are almost unheard of here in Faribault except among the most skilled labor.

This letter is written in great haste as I felt I must in some way protest. I realize it is not worded most effectively. What I am trying to say is that this milk cut or increase, depending on how you look at it, is going to be hard on families like my own which do not want to go on welfare, but still need that little boost we have been getting with the school milk program. This is the first time I have vehemently disagreed with the administration, and I am sure that this is going to be a weapon in the hands of the Republicans during the next election. C'mon, now, let's reconsider this decision and urge President Johnson to retain this beneficial milk program just the way it has been.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. THOMAS J. JONES.

ARROWHEAD COOPERATIVE MILK
PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Duluth, Minn., January 21, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We, members of Arrowhead Cooperative Milk Producers Association, want you to do your utmost to restore any moneys that are being cut from the school milk program.

This program is one of the best and should be encouraged more, as it gives "nature's best food," milk, to the group that needs it most. It also, supplies it to some, who may not receive it otherwise.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

ROY E. PETERSON,
Manager, Operator, Arrowhead Cooperative Milk Producers Association.

MENTOR PUBLIC SCHOOL,
Mentor, Minn., January 31, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: After much exposure to all the "title programs, the poverty program and colossal waste that will take place there; to know that the Federal Government is trying to give away money for endless "dreamed up" jobs for youth at \$1.25 per hour—(we know, because we had to dream them up and furnish names of students); then to know vast amounts of foreign aid moneys are given away with no strings attached—and to read about the plans for school lunch in foreign countries at our expense, we superintendents have trouble with our temperatures when we read the enclosed news item.

We have had to deduct 5 percent on each of our monthly lunch reports on the Federal milk program—which seems silly. Recently I received a letter from the State department of education stating that beginning with the February report 10 percent must be deducted. Every time I do this I think how picaunish the Government can be about established and proven programs and how unbelievably loose they can be on such programs as foreign aid.

In light of some of the things mentioned above, isn't it rather ridiculous that the Federal Government should play the lunch program aids so closely? We should be getting more commodities—meat in particular. This year we have received considerably less.

I have always gone along with the Democratic Party but I am beginning to cool quite a bit. Let Congress and/or the executive branch cut the school lunch program and it will be the biggest political mistake they ever made. This is one place where the money is not wasted on administrative costs. One party might blame the other, but the Democrats are in and must assume the responsibility. It really makes one perturbed to think that a cut in lunch aids was even considered—say nothing about bringing it about.

You will be smart if you work to increase lunch program aids to schools—not to decrease them. Cutting aids would be the biggest joke of the century.

Sincerely yours,

E. P. NEUBAUER,
Superintendent.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters here in the United States well fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,

MURIEL ROSS.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a cook in one of our lunch-rooms, in Bloomington. I can see how much good our hot lunch does for our boys and girls. Please see what you can do, so our school lunch and milk money will not be cut.

Sincerely,

ETTA MUNCKE.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE, and Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk programs.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LEONA JONES.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,

January 27, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE and Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep

our youngsters well-fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. GRACE LARSON.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE and Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you because of the proposed cut in funds for school lunch and special milk programs. I am hoping you and others will give this much consideration before it is brought up before our lawmakers. If this cut is made, as proposed by President Johnson, it will mean the prices of lunch and milk will have to be raised. If the price of lunches are raised there will be less participating in our lunch program.

I am in hopes the proposed budget will be reconsidered by all persons who have the power to do so.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. FLORENCE RYMAN.

WAUBUN PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Waubun, Minn., February 2, 1966.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MONDALE: We are very much concerned with the proposed cut in the budget for the support of the school lunch program. Should a reduction take place in the amount of our reimbursement and also a reduction in commodities we receive, it would seriously impair our program.

At the present time we are operating our school lunch program at a loss because we charge our students only 20 cents. If it became necessary for us to raise the price, many of our families would be unable to afford lunches for their children.

The board of education and myself feel that the support of the lunch program is a very worthwhile program and we would certainly not like to see a reduction in the support of it. In fact, if anything, an increase would be most helpful. This is a program that benefits all children and certainly is a very practical and humane way of making the very best use of any surplus agricultural products.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER M. BJORNSON,
Superintendent.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,

January 29, 1966.

Mr. WALTER MONDALE,
Minnesota Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Twin City Chapter of the Minnesota School Food Service Association met on Monday, January 24, at Richfield.

This was the same day it was announced that the 1967 Federal budget recommended a cutback from \$89 to \$37 million for the school milk program. Also a reduction in the school lunch subsidy was announced.

The 500 members of this chapter from the school districts of St. Paul, Minneapolis, West St. Paul, Richfield, Bloomington, Robbinsdale, Edina-Morningside, Columbia Heights, and White Bear Lake urges you to work for the restoration of these funds so that the school milk program and the school lunch program can continue to meet the needs of our schoolchildren.

We trust that you and your colleagues will be able to execute economies in other areas rather than at the expense of the school food services.

Thank you sincerely,

MAYME MOORE,
Secretary, Twin City School Food Service Association.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,

January 31, 1966.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk program.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ALFRED NYBO.

STILLWATER, MINN.,

January 24, 1966.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding the milk fund and school lunch programs, either all students should benefit or none. Where can the line be drawn. Only the rich and poor will be able to survive the Great Society.

We surely do not want the inspection costs added to the prices we already pay for meats and poultry.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. VERNON HOPMAN.

TWIN PORTS CO-OP

DAIRY ASSOCIATION,

Superior, Wis., January 21, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senator from Minnesota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: At a joint meeting of the executive board of Twin Ports Cooperative Dairy Association and several members of the Arrowhead Cooperative Milk Producers Association, it was brought to the attention of the group the action taken on the school milk program as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 195 and 196 of the Senate CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as of January 14, 1966.

These two groups commend Senator PROXMIER on his stand and Senator HOLLAND for his support to Senator PROXMIER. We also urge that you throw your support to this very worthwhile program, as well as lend your support to the restoration of the \$3 million that was cut from this program. This program is very essential to the farmers of our Nation and even more important to the schoolchildren.

We will appreciate any support that you can lend to this worthwhile program. Thank you.

Yours very truly,

V. E. HARRIS, General Manager,
Twin Ports Co-op Dairy Association.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters well-fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. GRACE LARSON.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you because of the proposed cut in funds for school lunch and special milk programs. I am hoping you and others will give this much consideration before it is brought up before our lawmakers. If this cut is made, as proposed by President Johnson, it will mean the prices of lunch and milk will have to be raised. If the price of lunches are raised there will be less participating in our lunch program.

I am in hopes the proposed budget will be reconsidered by all persons who have the power to do so.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. FLORENCE RYMAN.

WAUBUN, MINN.,
February 2, 1966.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MONDALE: We are very much concerned with the proposed cut in the budget for the support of the school lunch program. Should a reduction take place in the amount of our reimbursement and also a reduction in commodities we receive, it would seriously impair our program.

At the present time we are operating our school lunch program at a loss because we charge our students only 20 cents. If it became necessary for us to raise the price, many of our families would be unable to afford lunches for their children.

The board of education and myself feel that the support of the lunch program is a very worthwhile program and we would certainly not like to see a reduction in the support of it. In fact, if anything, an increase would be most helpful. This is a program that benefits all children and certainly is a very practical and humane way of making the very best use of any surplus agricultural products.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER M. BJORNSON,
Superintendent.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 29, 1966.

Mr. WALTER MONDALE,
Minnesota Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Twin City Chapter of the Minnesota School Food Service Association met on Monday, January 24, at Richfield.

This was the same day it was announced that the 1967 Federal budget recommended a cutback from \$89 to \$37 million for the school milk program. Also a reduction in the school lunch subsidy was announced.

The 500 members of this chapter from the school districts of St. Paul, Minneapolis, West St. Paul, Richfield, Bloomington, Robbinsdale, Edina-Morningside, Columbia Heights, and White Bear Lake urges you to work for the restoration of these funds so that the school milk program and the school lunch program can continue to meet the needs of our schoolchildren.

We trust that you and your colleagues will be able to execute economies in other areas rather than at the expense of the school food services.

Thank you sincerely,

MAYME MOORE,
Secretary, Twin City School Food
Service Association.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
and
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk program.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ALFRED NTRIO.

STILLWATER, MINN.,
January 24, 1966.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding the milk fund and school lunch programs—either all students should benefit or none. Where can the line be drawn? Only the rich and poor will be able to survive the Great Society.

We surely do not want the inspection costs added to the prices we already pay for meats and poultry.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. VERNON HOPMAN.

ARROWHEAD COOPERATIVE MILK
PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Duluth, Minn., January 21, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We, members of Arrowhead Cooperative Milk Producers Association, want you to do your utmost to restore any moneys that are being cut from the school milk program.

This program is one of the best and should be encouraged more, as it gives "nature's best food" milk, to the group that needs it most. It also supplies it to some who may not receive it otherwise.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

ROY E. PETERSON,
Manager-Operator.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
January 26, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We are greatly disturbed over President Johnson's proposal

to slash the school milk budget. We feel, as an average taxpayer, some other budget could be considered. Why do we always have to consider the needy, they receive plenty already, and it is we who pay for it; or the Cuban exiles, who else but us, is paying their transportation costs, etc.; or that highway beautification bill, is that as beneficial as a glass of milk?

Please give due thought to this proposal.

Gratefully,

Mr. and Mrs. ROGER REICHEL.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Congratulations to you as our Senator from Minnesota.

Are you a supporter of the school lunch program as your predecessor, Vice President HUMPHREY is? I sincerely hope you are as I have a request to make of you.

I have worked in the school lunch program for 20 years and am aware of the benefits gained by our children by learning to eat a variety of different foods. The President's proposed budget included large cuts in the special milk program and the school lunch program. These cuts, if allowed to pass, would mean an increase in price to the children and may well cause some to have to go without a school lunch. My request is that you lend your support to disallow the proposed cuts and keep our school lunch program a vital part of the Nation's economy helping our future citizens grow up strong and healthy.

A friend of yours, Mr. Leroy Johnson, with General Mills, mentioned last week that he too was going to tell you how important it is to support the school lunch program.

Thank you for your consideration to this request.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. DAVID V. JOHNSON.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
January 25, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: It was with considerable concern that we read that President Johnson's budget proposed reducing the sum spent on the school milk program to 37 million for 1967—and, further, that only needy children be allowed to buy milk at reduced cost.

It is our considered judgment that these proposals are false economies to the extreme.

In St. Paul where we sell milk at 1 cent to students bringing a lunch from home, we are certain that an increase to 4 cents (our cost) would seriously reduce participation among the very students who are most in need of milk at noon from a nutritional standpoint.

In secondary schools, which is our major service in St. Paul, it is difficult presently to meet the needs of all the underprivileged because such students will go to lengths to avoid being stigmatized as such. We feel certain that such is the case in most secondary schools and only slightly less true in elementary grades.

If the suggested reduction were applied to the school lunch program, it is likely that our lunch charge in St. Paul would be increased from its present 25 cents to 30 cents. We feel that such an increase would adversely affect participation among the very students most benefited by the program.

We have worked hard—and have been greatly assisted by State and Federal aids—to increase participation in both the school milk program and the school lunch program. St. Paul has more than doubled such participation in the past 5 years. We are working to continue this progress.

We urge that you give full consideration to this suggested reduction and work for its reconsideration if you can do so in good conscience.

Cordially,

S. W. DOUGETTE,
Director, St. Paul School Cafeterias.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
February 3, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk programs.

Respectfully,

Mrs. GERALD EVANS.

WETTERBERN DAIRY,
St. Peter, Minn., February 2, 1966.

The Honorable Senator MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I read in the paper where the milk program for the schools would be cut millions of dollars and just the needy would be the recipients. I don't know who is to do the classifying, etc., but I hope you will support the milk program on a full scale as is ANCHER NELSEN.

I believe the milk that children get in the morning is the only breakfast that most of them get.

I trust that you will check into this matter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. WETTERBERN.

P.S.—I discussed this with Russell G. Schwandt, who was our speaker at Lions yesterday at my request, and he said to contact you.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters well fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. LILLIAN MADNIC.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
February 7, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I ask that you please reconsider the cut in appropriations for school lunch and special milk programs. I hope the cut will not be approved.

Sincerely,

Mrs. FRANK MILLEREN.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters well-fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. GRACE LARSON.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I am writing you because of the proposed cut in funds for school lunch and special milk programs. I am hoping you and others will give this much consideration before it is brought up before our lawmakers. If this cut is made, as proposed by President Johnson, it will mean the prices of lunch and milk will have to be raised. If the price of lunches are raised there will be less participating in our lunch program.

I am in hopes the proposed budget will be reconsidered by all persons who have the power to do so.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. FLORENCE RYMAN.

WAUBUN, MINN.,
February 2, 1966.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MR. DEAR MR. MONDALE: We are very much concerned with the proposed cut in the budget for the support of the school lunch program. Should a reduction take place in the amount of our reimbursement and also a reduction in commodities we receive, it would seriously impair our program.

At the present time we are operating our school lunch program at a loss because we charge our students only 20 cents. If it became necessary for us to raise the price, many of our families would be unable to afford lunches for their children.

The board of education and myself feel that the support of the lunch program is a very worthwhile program and we would certainly not like to see a reduction in the support of it. In fact, if anything, an increase would be most helpful. This is a program that benefits all children and certainly is a very practical and humane way of making the very best use of any surplus agricultural products.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER M. JOHANSON,
Superintendent.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 29, 1966.

MR. WALTER MONDALE,
Minnesota Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Twin City Chapter of the Minnesota School Food Service Association met on Monday, January 24, at Richfield.

This was the same day it was announced that the 1967 Federal budget recommended a cutback from \$89 to \$87 million for the school milk program. Also a reduction in the school lunch subsidy was announced.

The 500 members of this chapter from the school districts of St. Paul, Minneapolis, West St. Paul, Richfield, Bloomington, Robbinsdale, Edina-Morningside, Columbia Heights, and White Bear Lake urge you to work for the restoration of these funds so that the school milk program and the school lunch program can continue to meet the needs of our schoolchildren.

We trust that you and your colleagues will be able to execute economies in other areas rather than at the expense of the school food services.

Thank you sincerely,

MAYME MOORE,
Secretary, Twin City School Food
Service Association.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
and
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIRS: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk program.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ALFRED NYRO.

STILLWATER, MINN.,
January 24, 1966.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding the milk fund and school lunch programs—either all students should benefit or none. Where can the line be drawn? Only the rich and poor will be able to survive the Great Society.

We surely do not want the inspection costs added to the prices we already pay for meats and poultry.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. VERNON HOPMAN.

ARROWHEAD COOPERATIVE MILK
PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Duluth, Minn., January 21, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We, members of Arrowhead Cooperative Milk Producers Association, want you to do your utmost to restore any moneys that are being cut from the school milk program.

This program is one of the best and should be encouraged more, as it gives "nature's best food" milk, to the group that needs it most. It also supplies it to some who may not receive it otherwise.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

ROY E. PETERSON,
Manager-Operator.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
January 26, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We are greatly disturbed over President Johnson's proposal

to slash the school milk budget. We feel, as an average taxpayer, some other budget could be considered. Why do we always have to consider the needy, they receive plenty already, and it is we who pay for it; or the Cuban exiles, who else but us, is paying their transportation costs, etc.; or that highway beautification bill, is that as beneficial as a glass of milk?

Please give due thought to this proposal.

Gratefully,

Mr. and Mrs. ROGER REICHEL.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Congratulations to you as our Senator from Minnesota.

Are you a supporter of the school lunch program as your predecessor, Vice President HUMPHREY is? I sincerely hope you are as I have a request to make of you.

I have worked in the school lunch program for 20 years and am aware of the benefits gained by our children by learning to eat a variety of different foods. The President's proposed budget included large cuts in the special milk program and the school lunch program. These cuts, if allowed to pass, would mean an increase in price to the children and may well cause some to have to go without a school lunch. My request is that you lend your support to disallow the proposed cuts and keep our school lunch program a vital part of the Nation's economy helping our future citizens grow up strong and healthy.

A friend of yours, Mr. Leroy Johnson, with General Mills, mentioned last week that he too was going to tell you how important it is to support the school lunch program.

Thank you for your consideration to this request.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. DAVID V. JOHNSON.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
January 25, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: It was with considerable concern that we read that President Johnson's budget proposed reducing the sum spent on the school milk program to 37 million for 1967—and, further, that only needy children be allowed to buy milk at reduced cost.

It is our considered judgment that these proposals are false economies to the extreme.

In St. Paul where we sell milk at 1 cent to students bringing a lunch from home, we are certain that an increase to 4 cents (our cost) would seriously reduce participation among the very students who are most in need of milk at noon from a nutritional standpoint.

In secondary schools, which is our major service in St. Paul, it is difficult presently to meet the needs of all the underprivileged because such students will go to lengths to avoid being stigmatized as such. We feel certain that such is the case in most secondary schools and only slightly less true in elementary grades.

If the suggested reduction were applied to the school lunch program, it is likely that our lunch charge in St. Paul would be increased from its present 25 cents to 50 cents. We feel that such an increase would adversely affect participation among the very students most benefited by the program.

We have worked hard—and have been greatly assisted by State and Federal aid—to increase participation in both the school milk program and the school lunch program. St. Paul has more than doubled such participation in the past 5 years. We are working to continue this progress.

We urge that you give full consideration to this suggested reduction and work for its reconsideration if you can do so in good conscience.

Cordially,

S. W. DOUCETTE,
Director, St. Paul School Cafeterias.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
February 3, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk programs.

Respectfully,

Mrs. GERALD EVANS.

WETTERCHEN DAIRY,

St. Peter, Minn., February 2, 1966.

The Honorable SENATOR MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I read in the paper where the milk program for the schools would be cut millions of dollars and just the needy would be the recipients. I don't know who is to do the classifying, etc., but I hope you will support the milk program on a full scale as is ANCHER NELSEN.

I believe the milk that children get in the morning is the only breakfast that most of them get.

I trust that you will check into this matter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. WETTERCHEN.

P.S.—I discussed this with Russell G. Schwandt, who was our speaker at Lions yesterday at my request, and he said to contact you.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters well fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. LILLIAN MADNIC.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
February 7, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I ask that you please reconsider the cut in appropriations for school lunch and special milk programs. I hope the cut will not be approved.

Sincerely,

Mrs. FRANK MILLERIN.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1966

No. 31

THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, several days ago I protested the reduction in funds for the special milk program. Since then I have received a flood of telegrams, letters, and calls urging me to support both the school lunch and special milk programs. I intend to do so. The reduction in funds requested by the Budget Bureau ignores the facts that such a cut would harm the dairy industry, would harm the schoolchildren now receiving the benefits of these programs, and would make necessary a means test as a qualification for receiving milk or food under the programs. As Senator JOSEPH TYDINGS pointed out so well a few days ago, that if we thought a means test for receiving medical care benefits for the aged was demeaning and an insult, this would be even more true for children in school.

I cannot ask that all the letters I have received be put in the RECORD. But I do ask unanimous consent that a representative sampling be printed in the RECORD at this point reflecting the views of Minnesotans.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
St. Paul, Minn., February 7, 1966.
The Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: During the last number of weeks we have received two telegrams and a letter from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, copies of which are enclosed.

Because of the many benefits that are provided to our schoolchildren under these programs and because of their contribution to the education, welfare and health of the participants, I feel the lowering of payments to the schools will have a great detrimental effect on the school lunch and special milk programs in our State.

There is also a discriminatory feature in the cutback of funds as outlined in the second telegram that I feel worthy of mention. I would be concerned about the administrative arrangements for programs in Minnesota public schools in which special emphasis and direction were placed upon providing milk for needy children and children in schools without a food service program that would be above and beyond the efforts now being made by local school boards in taking care of these needs.

In view of the significant appropriation of money for recently developed and new programs, it is difficult for me to understand why programs such as school lunch and special milk which have proven to be so worthwhile in the schools of our State and the Nation and for which the needs are definitely known be curtailed in their appropriations.

Because of the substantially worthwhile contributions of these two programs and the increased participation in them by schoolchildren, I urge you to do everything possible to reinstate the funds to their present level and increase them accordingly each year to provide for the improvement and expansion of these excellent programs.

Sincerely,

DUANE J. MATTHEWS,
Commissioner of Education.

"CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 27, 1966.

"C. E. HOLT,
"School Lunch Section, Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn.:

"For your information the President's budget for 1967 requests total of \$183 million for school lunch with breakdown as follows:

"Cash payments, \$129,415,000; section 11 special assistance, \$6,500,000; section 6, \$45 million; administration, \$2,085,000.

"Request of \$21 million for special milk program to be redirected to provide milk for needy children and children in schools without a food service. We will give you further details as quickly as they are available.

"DENNIS M. DOYLE,
"Food Distribution, USDA, Chicago."

"CHICAGO, ILL.

"CARL HOLT,
"Director, School Lunch Section, State Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn.:

"In accordance with instructions from the Bureau of the Budget to hold expenditures under the special milk program to \$1 billion inclusive of administrative costs for this fiscal year you are hereby advised that the current deduction of 5 percent will be increased to 10 percent beginning with claims for the month of February. Schools and child care institutions should be notified as promptly as possible. As provided in section 215.7(e) of the special milk regulations no deductions will be made in reimbursements to needy schools.

"DENNIS M. DOYLE,
Director, Midwest Area, U.S. Department of Agriculture."

"U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE,
FOOD DISTRIBUTION,
"Chicago, Ill., December 28, 1965.

"Mr. C. E. HOLT,
"Director, School Lunch Section, State Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn.

"DEAR MR. HOLT: This will supplement my wire of December 23 on the special milk program fund situation for the remainder of the fiscal year.

"As you know, Congress appropriated \$103 million for the special milk program this year. Based on preliminary estimates of expenditures for the year, however, we would need at least \$102 million obligating authority in fiscal year 1966 if the present 5-percent reduction is continued through the full year. In order to hold expenditures to \$100 million as instructed by the Bureau of the Budget, it has become necessary to reduce obligations for the last half of the year by \$2 million.

"Because the school year generally begins in September, about 40 percent of program obligations occur from February 1 to the end of the fiscal year. This, in order to reduce obligations by \$2 million during the remaining 40 percent of the year, an additional 5-percent reduction in claims is necessary beginning with the claims for the month of February.

"No restoration of funds which may be saved by the percentage reduction method will be made after the end of the fiscal year.

"Although the wording of section 215.7(e) of the special milk program regulations, effective December 1, 1965, is not spelled out as thoroughly as it was in the former section 215.8(e) of the prior regulations, the intent is the same. No percentage reduction of reimbursement shall be applied to any part of claims submitted by needy schools approved for special assistance under the special milk program.

"We hope the overall impact of this section will not adversely affect program operations.

"Sincerely yours,
"DENNIS M. DOYLE,
"Director, Midwest Area."

MENTOR PUBLIC SCHOOL,
Mentor, Minn., January 31, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: After much exposure to all the title programs, the poverty program, and colossal waste that will take place there; to know that the Federal Government is trying to give away money for endless "dreamed up" jobs for youth at \$1.25 per hour (we know, because we had to dream them up and furnish names of students); then to know vast amounts of foreign aid moneys are given away with no

strings attached—and to read about the plans for school lunch in foreign countries at our expense, we superintendents have trouble with our temperatures when we read the enclosed news item.

We have had to deduct 5 percent on each of our monthly lunch reports on the Federal milk program—which seems silly. Recently I received a letter from the State department of education stating that beginning with the February report 10 percent must be deducted. Every time I do this I think how playunish the Government can be about established and proven programs and how unbelievably loose they can be on such programs as foreign aid.

In light of some of the things mentioned above, isn't it rather ridiculous that the Federal Government should play the lunch program aids so closely? We should be getting more commodities—meat in particular. This year we have received considerably less.

I have always gone along with the Democratic Party but I am beginning to cool quite a bit. Let Congress and/or the executive branch cut the school lunch program and it will be the biggest political mistake they ever made. This is one place where the money is not wasted on administrative costs. One party might blame the other, but the Democrats are in and must assume the responsibility. It really makes one perturbed to think that a cut in lunch aids was even considered—say nothing about bringing it about.

You will be smart if you work to increase lunch program aids to schools—not to decrease them. Cutting aids would be the biggest joke of the century.

Sincerely yours,
E. P. NEUBAUER,
Superintendent.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters here in the United States well fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,
MURIEL ROSS.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a cook in one of our lunch-rooms, in Bloomington. I can see how much good our hot lunch does for our boys and girls. Please see what you can do, so our school lunch and milk money will not be cut.

Sincerely,
ETTA MUNCHE.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
HON. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk programs.

Sincerely,
MRS. LEONA JONES.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
HON. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters well-fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. GRACE LARSON.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
February 4, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
HON. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you because of the proposed cut in funds for school lunch and special milk programs. I am hoping you and others will give this much consideration before it is brought up before our lawmakers. If this cut is made, as proposed by President Johnson, it will mean the prices of lunch and milk will have to be raised. If the price of lunches are raised there will be less participating in our lunch program.

I am in hopes the proposed budget will be reconsidered by all persons who have the power to do so.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. FLORENCE RYMAN.

WAUBUN, MINN.,
February 2, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MONDALE: We are very much concerned with the proposed cut in the budget for the support of the school lunch program. Should a reduction take place in the amount of our reimbursement and also a reduction in commodities we receive, it would seriously impair our program.

At the present time we are operating our school lunch program at a loss because we charge our students only 20 cents. If it became necessary for us to raise the price, many of our families would be unable to afford lunches for their children.

The board of education and myself feel that the support of the lunch program is a very worthwhile program and we would certainly not like to see a reduction in the support of it. In fact, if anything, an increase would be most helpful. This is a program that benefits all children and certainly is a very practical and humane way of making the very best use of any surplus agricultural products.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER M. BJORNSON,
Superintendent.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 29, 1966.

MR. WALTER MONDALE,
Minnesota Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Twin City Chapter of the Minnesota School Food Service Association met on Monday, January 24, at Richfield.

This was the same day it was announced that the 1967 Federal budget recommended a cutback from \$89 to \$37 million for the school milk program. Also a reduction in the school lunch subsidy was announced.

The 500 members of this chapter from the school districts of St. Paul, Minneapolis, West St. Paul, Richfield, Bloomington, Robbinsdale, Edina-Morningside, Columbia Heights, and White Bear Lake urges you to work for the restoration of these funds so that the school milk program and the school lunch program can continue to meet the needs of our schoolchildren.

We trust that you and your colleagues will be able to execute economies in other areas rather than at the expense of the school food services.

Thank you sincerely,

MAYME MOORE,
Secretary, Twin City School Food
Service Association.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
and
HON. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIRS: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk program.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ALFRED NYBO.

STILLWATER, MINN.,
January 24, 1966.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding the milk fund and school lunch programs—either all students should benefit or none. Where can the line be drawn? Only the rich and poor will be able to survive the Great Society.

We surely do not want the inspection costs added to the prices we already pay for meats and poultry.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. VERNON HOPHAN.

ARROWHEAD COOPERATIVE MILK
PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Duluth, Minn., January 21, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We, members of Arrowhead Cooperative Milk Producers Association, want you to do your utmost to restore any moneys that are being cut from the school milk program.

This program is one of the best and should be encouraged more, as it gives "nature's best food" milk, to the group that needs it most. It also supplies it to some who may not receive it otherwise.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

ROY E. PETERSON,
Manager-Operator.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
January 26, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We are greatly disturbed over President Johnson's proposal

to slash the school milk budget. We feel, as an average taxpayer, some other budget could be considered. Why do we always have to consider the needy, they receive plenty already, and it is we who pay for it; or the Cuban exiles, who else but us, is paying their transportation costs, etc.; or that highway beautification bill, is that as beneficial as a glass of milk?

Please give due thought to this proposal.

Gratefully,

Mr. and Mrs. ROGER REICHEL.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Congratulations to you as our Senator from Minnesota.

Are you a supporter of the school lunch program as your predecessor, Vice President HUMPHREY is? I sincerely hope you are as I have a request to make of you.

I have worked in the school lunch program for 20 years and am aware of the benefits gained by our children by learning to eat a variety of different foods. The President's proposed budget included large cuts in the special milk program and the school lunch program. These cuts, if allowed to pass, would mean an increase in price to the children and may well cause some to have to go without a school lunch. My request is that you lend your support to disallow the proposed cuts and keep our school lunch program a vital part of the Nation's economy helping our future citizens grow up strong and healthy.

A friend of yours, Mr. Leroy Johnson, with General Mills, mentioned last week that he too was going to tell you how important it is to support the school lunch program.

Thank you for your consideration to this request.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. DAVID V. JOHNSON.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
January 25, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: It was with considerable concern that we read that President Johnson's budget proposed reducing the sum spent on the school milk program to 37 million for 1967—and, further, that only needy children be allowed to buy milk at reduced cost.

It is our considered judgment that these proposals are false economies to the extreme.

In St. Paul where we sell milk at 1 cent to students bringing a lunch from home, we are certain that an increase to 4 cents (our cost) would seriously reduce participation among the very students who are most in need of milk at noon from a nutritional standpoint.

In secondary schools, which is our major service in St. Paul, it is difficult presently to meet the needs of all the underprivileged because such students will go to lengths to avoid being stigmatized as such. We feel certain that such is the case in most secondary schools and only slightly less true in elementary grades.

If the suggested reduction were applied to the school lunch program, it is likely that our lunch charge in St. Paul would be increased from its present 25 cents to 30 cents. We feel that such an increase would adversely affect participation among the very students most benefited by the program.

We have worked hard—and have been greatly assisted by State and Federal aids—to increase participation in both the school milk program and the school lunch program. St. Paul has more than doubled such participation in the past 5 years. We are working to continue this progress.

We urge that you give full consideration to this suggested reduction and work for its reconsideration if you can do so in good conscience.

Cordially,

S. W. DOUCETTE,
Director, St. Paul School Cafeterias.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
February 3, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
HON. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk programs.

Respectfully,

Mrs. GERALD EVANS.

WETTERGREN DAIRY,
St. Peter, Minn., February 2, 1966.

The Honorable Senator MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I read in the paper where the milk program for the schools would be cut millions of dollars and just the needy would be the recipients. I don't know who is to do the classifying, etc., but I hope you will support the milk program on a full scale as is ANCHER NELSEN.

I believe the milk that children get in the morning is the only breakfast that most of them get.

I trust that you will check into this matter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. WETTERGREN.

P.S.—I discussed this with Russell G. Schwandt, who was our speaker at Lions yesterday at my request, and he said to contact you.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
HON. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters well fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. LILLIAN MADNIG.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
February 7, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I ask that you please reconsider the cut in appropriations for school lunch and special milk programs. I hope the cut will not be approved.

Sincerely,

Mrs. FRANK MILLEREN.

percent they propose to take out of the school milk program.

I think that is a great disaster; and I hope we can get to the President, back behind his facade of speechwriters, and help him realize, No. 1, the inconsistency of this approach; No. 2, its devastating effect on the schoolchildren of America; and No. 3, its lack of overall wisdom.

My colleague has had an illustrious career as food-for-peace Director, and knows something about the programs abroad; but I believe he would agree that, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, no program we have set in motion has done more for American children than this milk program. So I hope, as my colleague has suggested, we can get through to the President and straighten out this situation, because, while surely there are places in this great big budget the White House has sent down where we should be economizing, I do not think it is wise to accept this attack of a 79-percent cut in the school lunch program.

One way to let the program move forward is to provide a continuous expansion of the supply of milk. That can be done, as my colleague has suggested, by action of the Secretary of Agriculture in providing a more adequate and equitable price support for milk products in America.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator for his very helpful contribution. I am certainly happy to respond to his suggestion about the rich dividends that we receive, not only in this country but in the countries we have tried to assist overseas, with such efforts as school lunch and school lunch programs. I have thought for a good many years that, taking into consideration the entire foreign aid program, the overseas aid of all kinds, there is no part of that whole program that has returned such great dividends as the programs that have been aimed at improving the health of schoolchildren and preschool children through the milk programs.

That has been true here in our own country. Some years ago, when I served as Director of the food-for-peace program under the late President Kennedy, I received a very thoughtful letter from the dean of the University of Georgia, who said that in his best judgment, there was no single Federal program that had done so much to improve the lives of the people of the South in the last 30 years as the school lunch and school milk programs. He said that many of the youngsters had suffered from an inadequate diet over the years, and he thought it had held down both the physical growth and the educational growth of millions of people in the South, and that the school milk and school lunch programs had done more to correct that situation than anything else.

I applaud the Senator's high priority on these programs, and I hope that we will be successful in restoring the funds to an adequate level. That is one thing the Congress can do something about. It is quite true that the Secretary has authority to set the price support levels on milk, but Congress has the authority

to restore the funds that are needed for our school milk and school lunch programs; and I hope we will be able to restore them to an adequate level.

In terms of our national defense, we can present a better picture to the world, and a stronger defense position, if our young people are healthy and strong.

It has always disturbed me that such a high percentage of our young people are rejected as unqualified for military service because of health deficiencies. One of the ways to correct that in terms of the future defense needs of the country is to make sure that we have an adequate supply of high protein foods, and that we do not exercise a penny-wise, pound-foolish program with reference to those items.

I thank the Senator for his excellent contribution to the discussion.

Mr. President, the number of milk cows in the dairy herds here in the United States has reached an alltime low as of January 1 of this year. The number of cattle reported stood at 16.6 million head on January 1, which is a decline of 5.6 percent from a year ago.

The total milk production for 1965 stood at 125 billion pounds, which is a drop of 1½ percentage points from the previous year. In January, national milk production was off 5.3 percent from the previous year.

This decline has been continuing for several months. The greatest decline in milk production is in the heart of the dairy country of the United States—in my part of the country—Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and the surrounding States. The decreases for January were 14 percent in Minnesota, one of the great dairy States.

Mr. President, I pause at this point to say that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], who is necessarily away from the Senate on official business, has asked me to insert in the RECORD a brief statement on the dairy situation. He feels strongly that steps are needed to arrest the decline in dairy production. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that his statement be included in the RECORD at this point, before I continue my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONDALE

There are many reasons why we must maintain and support a dairy industry—in fact, our entire agricultural industry—which is capable of meeting the needs of the American consumer, as well as our commitments abroad.

Population is rising. Youngsters will need milk as they grow up, to supply the needed nutrition.

The President has called for a war on hunger, pointing out that "hunger poisons the mind, saps the body, and destroys hope, and is the natural enemy of mankind."

He added that "we must have adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets, and to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs. Milk from U.S. farms is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad."

These are some of the reasons why we must take steps necessary to stop the decline in dairy production.

I think the time has come to raise the support price for milk so that farmers can be encouraged to maintain their herds.

Now is the time to act, before more dairy farmers get out of the dairy business. Unless we stop this decrease in milk production, we may wake up and find that we cannot supply the milk needs of the American consumer, much less meet our foreign commitments.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, production is down some 7 percent in Wisconsin and 15 percent in Iowa, as compared to January 1965. The drop in the State of South Dakota for this same period of time is 9 percent. The situation is such that when milk prices and returns from dairying are compared to such alternative farming enterprises as hogs, beef cattle, and soybeans, dairy farming comes out second best.

This point was made very well a few moments ago by my colleague [Mr. MONDRI]. Many farmers, therefore, are relieving themselves of the 7 days a week confinement necessary to dairy operations. We know that the upper Midwest is a reservoir for the dairy industry. It is this area that most fluid milk markets depend upon for their reserve supplies. It produces a great deal of our butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk. I hasten to add, however, that virtually every State in the Union is involved in the dairy industry in one way or another.

If we are to have an adequate supply of milk and dairy products in 1966 and 1967, it is imperative that the exodus of dairy farmers be stopped. This can only be done by giving dairy farmers assurance that they will be rewarded fairly for their efforts. We are not talking about some kind of unwarranted subsidy or financing, but merely the assurance of a fair return is for the hard labor which is involved in dairy farming.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield at that point?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that the Agricultural Act of 1949 specifies as a criteria for the price-support level—one of the important criteria—that the Secretary shall establish price supports at a level which will assure an adequate supply?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The whole thrust of what both Senators from South Dakota have stated in their extremely able speeches is that the supply will not be adequate unless the Secretary recognizes this criteria and gives weight to it, that we will have shortages which could result in a temporary bonanza for dairy farmers. There is no question that if the prices rise severely and sharply, it would be very temporary indeed. Some farmers might take a shortsighted view of this and be very happy.

The point is, it would be bad for the dairy industry as well as for the consumer. It would also be bad for the stability of prices generally. The upward surge in prices would be temporary, but our experience indicates that whereas an appropriate, steady increase in the price support level by the Secretary of

Agriculture could assure adequate supplies, the law of supply and demand would come into adjustment at an appropriate level—say 85 percent of parity, or some reasonable, moderate level—and thus the dairy farmers of the country could continue to maintain their herds. They could and would make their plans accordingly. They would be able to stay in the dairy industry. The result would be, in the long run, a healthier picture for the dairy farmers as well as a better picture for the consumers and for price stability generally.

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin. As I understand his point, the consumers have just as great an interest in stabilization of dairy prices and supplies of dairy commodities as does the producer. This is not a one-way street. We are not talking here about the problem of the dairy farmer alone. We are talking about insuring an adequate supply at fair prices for families all across the country. Thus, it is really a double problem, of concern to the consumer, as well as to the producer.

The Senator is correct, that in the long run a price support level adequate to assure necessary supplies of dairy commodities is in the interests of both the taxpayer and the consumer.

Mr. PROXMIER. Let me say to the Senator from South Dakota who, along with his colleague [Mr. MURPHY], represents the most agricultural State in the Union, or at least the one State in the Union in which agriculture represents the largest proportion of total income, and who are, therefore, deeply aware of the problems, that the No. 1 economic injustice in America is low farm income.

There is no question about that—in terms of the investment made, the amount of work they put in, their efficiency, and in terms of the risks taken. Farm income is much too low for all farmers. We can make a convincing case of economic injustice for virtually every farmer. But it is particularly severe for the dairy farmers. The Secretary of Agriculture has won appropriate respect for the honesty and accuracy of his statistics which show that in my State—the No. 1 dairy-producing State in the country—farmers receive an income, if you allow them only a 4-percent return on invested capital, of less than 50 cents an hour.

This is right now. That is not a few months ago when the farmer's income was even lower. He is receiving less than 50 cents an hour, when the minimum wage is \$1.25 an hour. As I say, our farmers are among the most skilled workers in America.

It seems to me that this adds another dimension to the very strong argument which the Senator from South Dakota is making, that the Secretary of Agriculture should give careful consideration to increasing price supports for dairy products from 75 percent of parity to a level which will assure an adequate supply, which will bring the dairy farmer a little closer to the kind of income he so richly deserves.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his keen observations. I, of course, agree with him wholeheartedly. I agree that agriculture is the one major sector which has not generally shared in the rising economic prosperity of the country as a whole. For almost 5 years now, this country has enjoyed an unbroken economic advance—taking the economy as a whole—but the farm families of the Nation have not shared fairly in that economic advance. They are grateful for what Congress has done, particularly in the passage of a general 4-year farm bill in 1965, which does provide some degree of stability. But the fact remains that even with the 1965 program and other steps which have been taken by the Department of Agriculture, and by Congress, the per capita income level of farm families is still far below the national average. Thus, we do have an imbalance in this country in rural America, and particularly, as the Senator has said, with reference to dairy producers.

Mr. PROXMIER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I wish to support the position taken by the Senator from South Dakota and join him in urging action to increase dairy price supports.

I used to be both in wheat farming and in the dairy business. Therefore, I believe I know a little bit about the operations involved in both.

Probably the most difficult type of farming operation is that of the dairy business which keeps you on the job all day long, 7 days a week.

When farmers start losing money in the dairy business, they quickly go into some other kind of farm operation.

We are in the situation now where if the price supports are not increased and milk marketing orders are tied to price supports, we may face severe shortages in the years to come. The consumer would be far better off to have a little increase in price now and be assured more adequate supplies, rather than face severe shortages in the future.

The time of that shortage may not be very far off. We hear a lot of talk about increased exports of wheat and other grains. We are now experiencing exports three times as high as they were only 4 or 5 years ago. If worldwide demand continues, many dairy producers will shift to grain production, as grains will be in great demand if we can continue to increase exports.

I join the Senator in requesting higher price supports. They should have been increased before. There has been no increase for many years. The dairy farmers are in the most difficult financial straits of all agricultural producers.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator for his observation. I think there is no question about the fact that the American farmer has contributed greatly to

the strength of the country as a whole, and has done it without an adequate compensation to himself. There is no country on the face of the earth today, and there has never been a country in the history of the world, which is provided with an adequate food supply for its people at such a small cost to the consumer.

As the Senator has said, in spite of the price support program, which some people see as a device to increase the cost of food, the fact is that food is a bargain. Food takes only 18 percent of the income of the American consumer. In some countries it takes as high as 50 percent of the family budget to buy food. So we are in an unusually favorable position as far as food consumers are concerned. What we are pleading for is an adequate and fair compensation for the farmers who provide us with the most wholesome supply of food in the world at the lowest real cost.

The kind of price support we are asking for can be supplied under present law simply by increasing the support level. This increase can be directed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Under the pricing criteria of the Agricultural Act of 1949, the support price to farmers must be increased to assure even a semblance of an adequate supply.

As I said earlier in our discussion, this matter is being taken up with the Secretary. I hope a number of us can sit down with the Secretary of Agriculture soon and make our case. I think we have a Secretary who has the interests of American agriculture at heart. I have faith that when the case is made to him, face-to-face discussion, he will do whatever is within his authority to deal with this problem in a fair manner.

If the present trends continue in the dairy industry, we are going to be faced with acute shortages of milk and dairy products for years to come. A cow can be slaughtered in an instant, but it takes a minimum of 2 years to replace a dairy cow, and then she can be replaced only if there is a mother around to give birth, which will not be the case if dairy herds are liquidated.

Severe shortages of milk and dairy products will immediately result in inflationary prices at the consumer level, and this is what we want to prevent. If the herds continue to be liquidated, a future shortage will result. That means uncontrolled price increases. An increase in the dairy supports will not cause an inflationary spiral. The best assurance against inflation is production, and the only assurance that milk will be produced is by giving the producer a fair price.

The present status of the industry concerns many people very deeply, not only because of farmers, but from the viewpoint of consumers and the viewpoint of many of our communities. In many of the Northern States the milk plant is the biggest industry in town. I can think of many towns in my own home State where the dairy plant is the backbone of that particular community. I am informed that many of the



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org