

just finished flexing its military might by conducting live missile-firing exercises in the Strait of Taiwan, in a clear effort to bully and cower a valued and longstanding ally of the United States. This is the same country—China—that issued thinly veiled threats this spring suggesting that nuclear weapons would be used against the United States if the United States intervened on behalf of Taiwan. Assistant Secretary of State Winston Lord acknowledged that Chinese officials had declared that the United States, “wouldn’t dare defend Taiwan because they [China] would rain nuclear bombs on Los Angeles” if we did.

Now, if this is not nuclear blackmail, it will do while the Clinton administration folds its hands until the first nuclear missile hits the west coast. China’s ability to hold the United States hostage to such threats is made possible by the fact that a band of latter-day Luddites here in Washington have consistently refused even to consider building the very strategic missile defenses necessary to protect the American people from such an attack.

Mr. President, it is time for the defenders of the ABM Treaty to give up their pious devotion to an antiquated arms control theology and come to grips with the realities of the post-cold-war world. Dr. Henry Kissinger, the architect of the ABM Treaty, put it best when he recently wrote, “The end of the cold war has made . . . a strategy of mutually assured destruction largely irrelevant. Barely plausible when there was only one strategic opponent, the theory makes no sense in a multipolar world of proliferating nuclear powers.”

He went on to say that MAD, mutually assured destruction, would not work against blackmail with nuclear weapons. Yet, that is exactly what we are faced with when China blatantly threatens Los Angeles, U.S.A.

Second, I cannot fathom the administration’s sensibilities when it drew a distinction between threats to the United States and threats to the continental United States. The last time I checked, nearly 2 million U.S. citizens live in Alaska and Hawaii. These people and their families are no less deserving of protection than anyone living in Arkansas or North Carolina or Washington, DC, or anywhere else. It is simply incredible that those who oppose ballistic missile defense are doing so based on their view of the threat to only 48 out of the 50 States of the Union. This is all the more galling since it is an indisputable fact that North Korea is developing a series of missiles capable of striking both Alaska and Hawaii.

Third, I call Senators’ attention to a key caveat in the much publicized 1996 threat assessment that has been largely overlooked. That assessment declared that “foreign assistance is a wild card that can sometimes permit a country to solve difficult developmental problems relatively quickly. Such

external assistance can hinder our ability to predict how soon a system will become operational.”

Good Lord, Mr. President, this one statement alone unravels the whole ball of yarn. Foreign assistance is the norm in the development of ballistic missile systems, not the exception. The Soviet Union collaborated on ballistic missiles with 14 countries around the globe, all of whom can now field some type of Soviet-made missile.

Russia recently was caught shipping entire missile sections to Iraq. Both Libya and Egypt have transferred missiles to other countries. China has sold intermediate-range missiles to Saudi Arabia and missile technology to Iran, Syria, and North Korea. In turn, Iran is working with North Korea and Syria on various missiles, and North Korea is supplying both missiles and missile production facilities to anybody who is prepared to pay for them with cash.

Recently, Mr. President, I was astounded to discover that Russia and Ukraine may be concluding a secret deal with China to transfer ICBM components. A report by the Defense Intelligence Agency concluded that Communist China is seeking to enhance its strategic arsenal with components from Russia’s most lethal type of intercontinental ballistic missile—the SS-18.

Dubbed “Satan” by Western intelligence services, the SS-18 is the world’s most destructive weapon to date. It has the ability to drop 10 megaton-rated warheads within 600 feet of their targets. Acquisition of just the booster stage of this missile would give China the ability to launch nuclear warheads against any and every city in the United States of America—a strategic reach of up to 6,820 miles that China, thank the Lord, does not yet possess.

Mr. President, I am deeply troubled that Secretary of Defense Perry has held open the door to the possibility that SS-18 boosters could be used commercially by the Chinese to boost satellites into orbit. He stated during an interview with reporters from the Washington Times that “I guess our answer would be only if it’s very tightly controlled, so you can have great confidence this technology is not being diverted to some other application. That would be the only exception I would make.”

Well, speaking just as one Senator, I must say, in no uncertain terms, that I believe any such exception would be made at the peril of the national security of the American people. The Defense Intelligence Agency has specifically noted that “China’s interest in using SS-18 boosters in its civilian program seems odd because the SS-18’s engine characteristics may be incompatible with many sensitive satellite payloads.” I might add that the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am chairman, recommended Senate ratification of the START II Treaty subject to the understanding that the treaty

would rectify a longstanding inequity of previous arms control agreements by completely eliminating this monster missile forever. Secretary Perry’s comment appears to open the door for Satan’s coming under the red flag of Communist China.

For the record I should mention that the START II Treaty specifically prohibits Russia from transferring SS-18’s to any recipient whatsoever or whomsoever, and does so from the date of START II’s signature. The Foreign Relations Committee even attached a condition stating that “space-launch vehicles composed of items that are limited by the START Treaty or the START II Treaty shall be subject to the obligations undertaken in the respective treaty.” Case closed. In my judgment, there should not be any question about whether the transfer of SS-18 technology to China is acceptable. I contend that it absolutely is not.

The truth of the matter is that no amount of policy reformulation by the administration can change the fact that the United States is vulnerable to nuclear-tipped missiles fielded by China, or anyone else. Rectifying this dangerous deficiency requires leadership and action. It is an all the more pressing issue because the current course charted by the administration fails to recognize the inherent danger in China’s pursuit of an advanced nuclear arsenal.

Mr. President, any further delay in the development by the United States of a flexible, cost-effective national missile defense is unconscionable. I am honored to be a cosponsor of the Defend America Act and urge Senators to support this legislation to ensure that the American people in all 50 States are protected from attack by ballistic missiles.

#### THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to celebrate a birthday. June 4, 1996, marks the 50th anniversary of the signing of the National School Lunch Act by President Harry Truman. While turning 50 is not a happy occasion for most of us, the celebration of this birthday is one that should make all of us happy.

The link between proper nutrition and a child’s ability to grow and to learn is undisputed. The School Lunch Program was founded in part, because President Truman saw the alarmingly large number of World War II draftees who failed their physicals due to nutrition-related problems. President Truman declared it a “measure of national security to safeguard the health and well being of the nation’s children.” President Truman was right.

Numerous scientific studies have documented the nutritional benefits of the program—children who eat school meals perform better on achievement

tests and are late and absent from school less often than children who did not participate in the programs. Any parent or teacher will tell you that a child who has not eaten cannot think and cannot learn.

In speaking at the 1969 White House Conference on Food Nutrition and Health, President Nixon said that "a child ill-fed is dulled in curiosity, lower in stamina and distracted from learning."

Over the last year or so the school nutrition programs have been the subject of a lot of debate, with many extreme Republicans in the House supporting a repeal of the School Lunch Act. This is a program that has always enjoyed strong bipartisan support in the Senate.

Agriculture Chairman LUGAR and Senators DOLE and COCHRAN have always supported the program, and have really helped make it what it is today. Back in 1981 Senators DOLE, COCHRAN, and HELMS wrote, then-White House chief of staff, Jim Baker and urged the Reagan administration not to make cuts to the program.

In 1995, the Vermont School Lunch Program served over 7,663,000 lunches to students in 335 schools in Vermont. For many of these children school meals are their main source of nutrition. School lunches provide one-third to one-half of the recommended daily allowances for key nutrients.

The school nutrition programs have done a fabulous job for the last 50 years of providing American children healthy school meals that prepare them to learn today and to compete tomorrow. This program is an example of what is working and what is good about Government.

Today's school nutrition programs are healthier than ever. As part of the Better Nutrition and Health for Children Act of 1994 that I was able to pass as chairman of the Agriculture Committee, all schools must meet the dietary guidelines for Americans by the 1996-97 school year.

Many schools are ahead of the deadline and are already meeting these guidelines that lower the sodium and fat content of the school meals. For those schools that need help, USDA is working with them.

We in Congress are also working with the schools and asking them what they need. Just last week the President signed H.R. 2066 giving schools maximum flexibility in how they meet the new dietary guidelines. So I think that we have reached a very good medium of Federal support and guidelines while giving the individual schools the flexibility to do what works best for them.

Last year marked a major milestone in the history of the National School Lunch Program—for the first time in 50 years we made historic changes in the nutrition standards for school meals. Under the leadership of Under Secretary Haas we have the School Meals Initiative for Healthy Children.

Then, realizing that change cannot be mandated, Under Secretary Haas

undertook one of the most sweeping, innovative programs in the history of the program—Team Nutrition.

Team Nutrition's mission is to improve the health and education of children by creating innovative public and private partnerships that promote food choices for a healthy diet through the media, schools, families, and communities across the country.

For 50 years, the National School Lunch Program has prepared children for a healthier future.

Today, as we move into the 21st century, we are celebrating and bringing together all those who care about the health of our Nation's children. That's what Team Nutrition is all about—local community coalitions joining together to promote nutrition education for children and families. Already Team Nutrition has over 12,000 schools signed up. Team Nutrition is reaching millions of children in thousands of communities and inspiring educators, families, and community leaders to work together to improve the health of our Nation's children.

I am also pleased that one of my former communication directors, Alicia Bambara, is working with the Under Secretary on this effort and doing a wonderful job. She also worked to found a shelter for homeless, pregnant women in the District of Columbia.

I would like to congratulate the School Lunch Program and give a special thanks to a few special people who have helped bring so many healthy meals to Vermont school children: Jo Busha, the head of the Vermont Child Nutrition Program, Marlene Senecal, Connie Bellavance, and Sue Steinhurst at the Vermont School Food Service Association and Rob Dostis with the Campaign to End Childhood Hunger. I also would like to thank all of the wonderful school food service professionals who work so very hard at this important task.

I ask unanimous consent that an article which gives an excellent history of the program's first 50 years be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### DECADES OF DEDICATION—THE EARLY YEARS

(By Patricia L. Fitzgerald)

Despite all the changes of the past 50 years—technology, economics, demographics, legislation—the history of school foodservice is truly remarkable for how much has stayed the same. The mission hasn't changed since the earliest programs in the 19th century: Provide meals to children at school to ensure their health and promote their ability to learn. And while many faces have changed, the school foodservice profession has always been composed of individuals who have a true and dedicated commitment to this mission.

Many of the obstacles that confronted the profession's pioneers still exist—in different forms—today. These include managing tight budgets, surviving political maneuverings, meeting nutritional requirements in the face of children's tastes and preferences and fighting resistance to consider school meals

an integral and intrinsic part of the education system.

But where did all of this—the need, the dedication, the challenge—begin? How did two groups of foodservice directors find themselves merging together in 1946 to create a profession dedicated to advancing standards and managing a new federal program?

#### ROOTS

According to historical records, the first known program to combine lunch and education began in 1790, in Munich, Germany. Court Rumford, Benjamin Thompson, established the Poor People's Institute, which included a program of teaching and feeding hungry, vagrant children. Half of the day, the children worked making clothes for the army and the other half they received an education. Food was primarily a soup made from potatoes, barley and peas.

Throughout the 19th century, all over Europe, charitable organizations began to take on the burden of feeding and educating children in poverty, but as the century wore on, local governments began to pick up more and more of the financial burden. By 1877, the Paris government started school "cantes," providing meals at public expense for children in need. In England, the Education (Provision of Meals) Act passed in 1905, after lobbying from 365 private and charitable organizations. And in Holland in 1900, a royal decree ordered municipalities to supply food and clothing to needy school children.

These efforts in Europe were paralleled by ones in the United States. In 1853, the Children's Aid Society in New York served meals to students attending vocational school, but it wasn't until 1919 that the Board of Education assumed full responsibility for all lunch programs in Manhattan and the Bronx. The movement was similar in other U.S. cities. In Philadelphia, for example, the Starr Center Association began serving penny lunches in one school in 1894; in 1909, responsibility for operating and supporting the lunch program was transferred to the city's school board.

In smaller cities, "charitable organizations" often meant the mothers of the children at school. In 1904, the Women's School Alliance of Wisconsin began furnishing lunches to children in Milwaukee. The meals were prepared in the homes of women who lived near the schools and were willing to cook and serve. And in rural areas, the responsibility was often assumed by the teachers themselves, preparing soups and other hot dishes from meats and vegetables brought by the children.

#### THE GREAT DEPRESSION

The stock market crash of 1929 brought a whole new urgency and visibility to the issue of hunger in America. As unemployment skyrocketed, the country's middle class suddenly became the "new poor," and the country looked to the government for help.

Unfortunately, President Herbert Hoover's administration had no answers, and the Depression wore on without relief. Instead of slowing the expansion of local school lunch programs, the bleak economics drove home their value. In many communities, a school meal program was initiated and provided by a legion of volunteers.

Aid came in the form of new president Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal, and the establishment of a number of "alpha-bet organizations," government programs designed to provide opportunities for employment. In 1933-34, burgeoning school lunch programs in 39 states found valuable assistance from the Civil Works Administration and the Federal Relief Administration. And in 1935, the Work Projects Administration

(WPA) was created; needy women all over the United States found work under WPA programs to prepare and serve school lunches. And with much of the labor burden off of school districts, lunch prices could be kept low, which increased participation.

Donated commodities were another key to early school lunch success. While unemployment in the cities was rampant, America's farmers were having bumper crops. But without a market to buy, surpluses grew, prices fell and farmers began to go out of business. In 1935, the government began to remove price-depressing surplus foods from the market, and school lunch programs were one excellent outlet for the goods.

Throughout the 1930s, many states and cities began to adopt legislation—often including appropriations—that mandated schools to serve lunch to students. By 1937, 15 states had passed laws specifically authorizing local school boards to operate lunchrooms, serving meals at cost or less.

The numbers tell the story. By 1941, WPA school lunch programs were in all states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, serving an average of nearly 2 million lunches daily and employing more than 64,000 people.

#### A SENSE OF PERMANENCE

When America went to war, it sent its boys overseas and its women to work in the defense industry. By 1944, the WPA's payroll was gone, but the demand for continuation of lunch programs was not. In 1944, Congress earmarked funds to maintain the programs for the year and repeated this action in 1945. Behind the scenes, a campaign to establish a permanent, reliable federal subsidy for school lunch was in the works.

In 1946, Congress recognized the need to establish a national, permanent, federally funded school lunch program. Section 2 of the final law succinctly explains the legislators' rationale: "It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, by assisting the States, through grants-in-aid and other means, in providing an adequate supply of foods and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation and expansion of nonprofit school lunch programs."

After considerable lobbying by the burgeoning school foodservice profession and with the support of some heavy hitters in the Senate, Congress passed the National School Lunch Act of 1946, which was signed into law by President Harry Truman on June 4. In addition to defining appropriations—including those for administrative expenses—the new law set minimum nutritional requirements for three types of acceptable lunches.

#### A NEW PROFESSION

Although school foodservice began with unskilled volunteers, it was quick to grow into a bona fide profession during the 1930s. Cafeteria management and foodservice direction were new careers. And the early pioneers (see sidebar, page 50) developed high standards for sanitation, nutrition and home economics. The Thirties saw the formation of two national organizations created to further this brand-new profession: the Conference of Food Service Directors and the National School Cafeteria Association.

After passage of the National School Lunch Act, these two groups agreed to a merger conference to join forces and create a new organization. On October 10-12, 1946, in Chicago, the School Food Service Association was born (the word "American" wouldn't be added to the name of the organization until 1951). There were 300 school foodservice professionals in attendance, rep-

resenting programs in 34 states, as well as the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Constance C. Hart, a school foodservice director from Rochester, N.Y., and a founder of the Conference of Food Service Directors, was elected ASFSA's first president.

Through the end of the 1940's, the Association concentrated on getting on its feet, administering the new federal school lunch program and providing professional development opportunities for its growing membership. In 1947, member rolls were 709. Oklahoma became ASFSA's first state affiliate. The first annual convention was held in Dallas in November. Attendance at the convention was 478, and there were 39 exhibitors, including many still-familiar names, such as American Dietetic Association, The Cleveland Range Company, Florida Citrus Commission, The Hobart Manufacturing Company and the National Livestock and Meat Board. In 1948, membership remained steady. Betsy Curtis was president and the convention was held in Detroit.

Dr. Mary deGarmo Bryan took the helm in 1948-49, and ASFSA's first constitution was adopted. That year also saw the development of the Association's first membership publication: *School Meals*. Membership grew to 920. Thelma Flanagan's term as 1949-50 president saw many actions that gave shape to the infant association. We'll examine these in the next installment of "Decades of Dedication."

#### O PIONEERS!

The school foodservice profession owes a debt to all of the leaders that guided it through the turbulent waters of change and growth over the past 50 years. In this issue we pay special tribute to just a few of those who fought for the establishment of a federal school lunch program and helped shape a brand-new profession. Their influence is still felt today.

Dr. Mary deGarmo Bryan. A professional educator, she was largely responsible for the professional standards of the program, teaching many of the first generation of school foodservice professionals. Her 1936 text, *The School Cafeteria*, was one of the bases for the school lunch program. A professor at Columbia University Teachers College for over 20 years, deGarmo was president of ASFSA in 1948-49.

Marion Cronan. Through her regular column, "The School Lunch," in *Practical Home Economics* magazine, Cronan was instrumental in bringing the professional concerns of lunch programs to the attention of a foodservice audience. She served as ASFSA president for 1967-68.

Thelma Flanagan. Considered by many to be Florida's "first lady of the profession," Flanagan also made an indelible impact on the national association. As ASFSA's 1949-50 president, Flanagan was responsible for giving the fledgling association some shape, creating specialized departments and instituting long-range planning. Today, the Thelma Flanagan Gold Award recognizes states that excel in meeting ASFSA's Plan of Action.

Constance Hart. Director of Lunchrooms for the Rochester, N.Y., public school system in 1942, Hart was an early proponent for nutrition education in the schools. A founder of the Conference of Food Service Directors in 1935, Hart became ASFSA's first president, elected at the merger meeting between the Conference and the National School Cafeteria Association. She served in 1946-47.

Senator Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.) As chair of the Senate Agriculture Committee's Appropriations Subcommittee, his support of the National School Lunch Act was invaluable for getting the bill through Congress.

John Stalker. In 1935, Stalker headed Massachusetts' commodity distribution program

and became the state's director of school foodservice programs. Stalker set nutrition and management standards that were national models. He designed ASFSA's first emblem and served as a valuable legislative leader at both the state and national levels.

Frank Washam. Director of Chicago's school lunch program, Washam was a leader in the National School Cafeteria Association and a leader in the movement to obtain permanent federal support for school lunches.

#### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I think so often of that November evening long ago—it was in 1972—when the TV commentators network reported that the people of North Carolina had elected me to the Senate. It was 9:17 p.m. and I recall how stunned I was.

It had never really occurred to me that I would be the first Republican in history to be elected by the people of North Carolina to the U.S. Senate. Needless to say, it was a memorable moment in my life and I, that evening, made a commitment to myself that I would never fail to see a young person, or a group of young people, who wanted to see me.

Keeping that commitment for almost 24 years, it has proved enormously meaningful to me. I have been inspired on countless occasions by the estimated 60,000 young people with whom I have visited during the more than 23 years I have been in the Senate.

A large percentage of them are understandably concerned, and greatly so, about the total Federal debt which back in February of this year crossed the \$5 trillion mark for the first time in history. It is Congress that has created this monstrous debt which coming generations will have to pay.

Mr. President, the young people who visit with me almost always are inclined to discuss the fact that under the U.S. Constitution, no President can spend a dime of Federal money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by both the House and Senate of the United States.

That is why, on February 22, 1992, I began making these daily reports to the Senate. I decided that it was important that a daily record be made of the precise size of the Federal debt which, at the close of business yesterday—Monday, June 3, 1996—stood at \$5,136,903,015,098.32. On a per capita basis, the existing Federal debt amounts to \$19,384.92 for every man, woman, and child in America on a per capita basis.

The increase in the national debt in the 24 hours since my report yesterday—which identified the total Federal debt as of close of business on Friday, May 31, 1996—shows an increase of more than \$8 billion—\$8,394,510,205.52, to be exact. That increase alone is enough to match the total amount needed to pay the college tuition for each of the 1,244,737 students for 4 years.