

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 10

JUNE 7, 1966, TO JUNE 21, 1966

(PAGES 12445 TO 13842)

gage purchase authorization, would extend FNMA operations for another year, thus affording sufficient time for any further congressional review which may be necessary.

FNMA has proven its value indeed in providing home mortgage funds in periods of tight market conditions.

Although other suggestions to increase the borrowing authority of FNMA have been made, I feel this bill represents the soundest approach.

Congress has increased previously FNMA's borrowing authority, and no adverse reaction resulted in the ability of FNMA to borrow funds in the private market. The method I am proposing has worked well before, and I believe much preferred to any of the alternative proposals.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the bill lie on the table for 7 days for cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bill (S. 3482) to enlarge the home mortgage authority which the Federal National Mortgage Association may exercise in its secondary market operations by increasing the amount of preferred stock which such Association may issue for delivery to the Secretary of the Treasury, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3482

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 303(d) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "\$115,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$225,000,000".*

*SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 303(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$115,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$225,000,000".*

#### AMENDMENT OF ACT OF JUNE 3, 1966, RELATING TO GREAT SALT LAKE RELICTED LANDS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of June 3, 1966, relating to the Great Salt Lake relicted lands.

Enactment of this measure will, hopefully, finally resolve the problem of the relicted lands around the Great Salt Lake. Last Friday the President signed into law S. 265, the bill Congress passed relating to these lands. However, upon approving that legislation, the President specifically requested the prompt enactment of an amendment which would protect the interest of the Federal Government in the unlikely event the State of Utah subsequently decided not to purchase these relicted lands after executing leases on them on its own terms, thus leaving the United States heir to encumbrances on its own lands, the terms of

which had not been approved by any responsible official of the Federal Government.

Therefore, enactment of this legislation would provide for renegotiation of such leases in the event title to these lands reverted to the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the proposed legislation together with a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting and explaining the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3484) to amend the act of June 3, 1966 (Public Law 89-441, 80 Stat. 192), relating to the Great Salt Lake relicted lands, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3484

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of the Act of June 3, 1966 (Public Law 89-441, 80 Stat. 192), is amended by deleting " , shall be deemed permits, licenses, and leases of the United States and shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the terms and provisions thereof" and by substituting "shall not be binding on the United States unless within 90 days they are renegotiated to include such modified terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior deems appropriate."*

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To amend the Act of June 3, 1966 (P.L. 89-441, 80 Stat. 192), relating to the Great Salt Lake relicted lands."

We recommend that it be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The June 3 statute provided for the sale to the State of Utah of the federally owned relicted lands around the Great Salt Lake. During the interim between the conveyance to the State and the payment of the purchase price, the State is allowed to lease the lands, and if the title should revert to the United States because of a failure to pay the purchase price the United States would take the title subject to the State leases.

When the President approved the enrolled bill he asked for the prompt enactment of an amendment providing that if title to the land should revert to the United States the State executed leases would not be binding on the United States unless they are approved by the United States.

The enactment of the enclosed bill will carry out the President's request by providing for a renegotiation of such leases at the time the title reverts to include such modified terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior deems appropriate.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that the enactment of the bill would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,  
Secretary of the Interior.

#### STRENGTHENING ADAPTIVE RESEARCH IN OUR FOREIGN ASSISTANCE TO AGRICULTURE

AMENDMENT NO. 587

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of myself, and Senators BURDICK, MCGOVERN, and PELL an amendment to S. 2859, the bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Since I came to the Senate last year, no problem has concerned me more than the threat of human hunger in the poor countries of the world. In my first major speech to the Senate last July, I expressed my fear that the developing countries were losing the race between population growth and food supply, and becoming increasingly unable to feed their growing numbers of people. I urged that our food-for-peace program, magnificent though it has been, be reshaped in several fundamental ways.

In the 11 months since I delivered that speech, we have read, in our newspapers, reports from India which have borne out the worst of our fears. Through a combination of a disastrous drought and accumulated shortfalls in production, India faces the need to at least double the food assistance she receives from the United States and the other food surplus countries, if millions of her people are not to starve. And even then, the average Indian will have to cut back on his already meager diet.

Both Houses of the Congress recognized the dire situation when they voted unanimously to support President Johnson's proposal to ship at least 3½ million extra tons of food grains to India this year.

But if the problem has grown, Mr. President, so also has our awareness of it.

Led by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), Senators and Congressmen, farm organizations, church groups representing all of our major faiths, and literally hundreds of other concerned individuals and organizations have stirred public opinion. Their efforts have brought about a nationwide recognition of the magnitude of the problem we are confronting.

And on February 10 of this year, President Johnson proposed to the Congress that "the United States lead the world in a war against hunger." He added, "there can be only victors in this war."

The President proposed that the Congress enact a landmark Food for Freedom Act, which would base our food assistance programs not on the negative principle of surplus disposal, but upon recognizing the extent of world needs and producing enough to play our part in meeting these needs.

This act further proposes that we increase our emphasis on self-help in developing countries, realizing that American efforts alone cannot hope to avert worldwide famine, but that the main effort to win out over hunger must be made by the developing countries themselves.

Hearings have been held on this bill in both Houses of Congress, and the

House Agriculture Committee has just reported out the Food for Freedom Act, which recognizes both important departures in our food assistance policies.

A particularly encouraging step forward is the realization that we must help poor countries increase their food production. When I spoke to the Senate last year, I said:

Strange though it may seem, it is only through improving their own agriculture that these countries can, in the long run, grow into major dollar importers of American farm products.

There has been a fear that by helping others increase farm output, we would be reducing the demand for our own products. But today there is widespread recognition that as peoples' incomes increase, their demand for food products, particularly higher quality food products, also increases.

A recent study indicates that for every 10 percent the less developed countries have increased their income level, they have expanded their dollar purchases of our farm products by about 16 percent.

As Secretary Freeman said in his testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee in March:

Agricultural development in the poor and hungry nations offers to us the best opportunity for expanding exports of the products of our farms and factories.

I was impressed, in the Senate Agricultural Committee hearings, with the virtual unanimity of opinion among Senators on the need to do all we can to encourage self-help in agriculture in developing countries.

Now that we have unprecedented agreement on the need to help develop agriculture overseas, we must turn to the specific programs needed to accomplish this end. I offer my amendment to bring about one such improvement in our foreign aid program.

My amendment would express the conviction of the Congress that:

In any developing countries or areas where food production is not increasing enough to meet the demands of an expanding population, or diets are seriously deficient, a high priority shall be given to efforts to increase agricultural production, particularly the establishment or expansion of adaptive agricultural research programs designed to increase acre-yields of the major food crops.

It would further provide that:

Such research programs, to the greatest extent possible, should be based on cooperative undertakings between universities and research institutions in the developing countries and United States universities and research institutions.

President Johnson has exercised impressive leadership in urging increased emphasis on agricultural assistance in our foreign aid program. In his foreign aid message to Congress on February 1, he proposed that "the Agency for International Development increase its efforts in the field of agriculture by more than one-third, to a total of nearly \$500 million."

But our past programs have erred not only in giving insufficient attention to agriculture as a whole; they have also seriously neglected the emphasis on prac-

tical, adaptive agricultural research which was essential to our achievements here in the United States.

In testimony before the House Agriculture Committee, the distinguished economist, Prof. Theodore W. Schultz of the University of Chicago said:

Although we have developed an outstandingly productive agriculture in the United States, we have not done well as builders of agriculture abroad. We have long been hampered by what I would call the *extension bias*, and as a consequence, agricultural research has been postponed, put off, and grossly neglected. When research has been undertaken, altogether too little attention has been given to the development of viable agricultural research centers. . .

Consider the record of government. After two decades, starting with the Point Four Programs, when about a third of the aid funds for Latin America were allocated to agricultural development, and large amounts since then, there is not a single first-class agricultural research center in Latin America to show for it. Why? Latin American governments have not vetoed such research. The reasons are predominantly of our own making; namely, (1) crash programs, (2) the agricultural extension bias, and (3) selling agriculture short in economic development, especially after the Point Four period.

Another expert, Dr. F. F. Hill, consultant on international programs for the Ford Foundation, said in testimony before the House Agriculture Committee:

What is needed at this time is a special and vigorous effort, perhaps limited at first to basic food crops in food crisis countries, to speed the development in these countries of greatly improved production technology tested for local suitability in all important food producing areas in which it is recommended for use. Progress in developing improved production technology in less developed countries is being made, but it is not being made fast enough.

We have been far too inclined to believe we could help agriculture overseas with limited funds, short-term crash programs, and by simply transferring techniques proved effective here in the United States. We now know that this type of approach will not work.

We must recognize past mistakes in this field, and make substantially increased investments in overseas agricultural research as part of a comprehensive, long-term effort to help developing countries solve their food problems. As one possibility, Dr. Hill proposes the organization of highly competent and adequately financed food-crop research teams.

An example of what adaptive research can accomplish is provided by an article reprinted May 7 in the Washington Post, which I would ask be included in the Record at the close of my remarks. In the village of Bandri, in the Deccan highlands of India, the staple grain is a sorghum called jawar. A young Indian in his thirties introduced a new hybrid strain of jawar, developed through research, and the result was beyond belief to the villagers—a yield 10 times as great as the old strains had produced.

Unfortunately, this grain can only be used in a limited part of India. But while improvements of this magnitude are exceptional, we know from our American experience the importance of sus-

tained efforts in agricultural research to bring about substantial increases in yields.

Just as particular seeds and farm methods cannot be transferred from one area of the United States to another, so too they cannot simply be transferred from the United States to other parts of the world and be expected to work. What is needed is practical, adaptive research, to take seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, and mechanical equipment from elsewhere and adapt them to different conditions.

In the United States, we recognize that adaptive research is one of the essential elements in agricultural progress, along with active extension work and first-rate agricultural education. We know how indispensable our land-grant colleges have been in carrying out all three of these roles.

If we look south, toward Mexico, we see that adaptive research there, supported to a considerable degree by our Rockefeller Foundation, has made possible a 3.3-percent annual increase in wheat yields over the past 25 years, as large as any in the world.

Yet in our foreign assistance programs in general, we have not given anywhere near the emphasis on agricultural research overseas which is needed.

Mr. President, for the past several years AID has been spending \$1 to \$1½ million contracting for university assistance in the field of agriculture in Pakistan. This is only a fraction of 1 percent of the total economic assistance furnished Pakistan during this time. Of this university assistance probably not more than 5 to 10 percent has gone to expanding adaptive research directed to increasing the acre-yields of the major food crops.

By far the most of the university assistance is for institution building and the improvement of the sciences and educational programs relating to agriculture. This assistance has been valuable and has strengthened the institutions' ability to carry on significant research and educational activities. It should be continued at least for a few more years. Yet, in view of the country's serious food shortages, too few resources are being devoted to adaptive research designed to increase the yield of Pakistan's major food crops.

In India, where food shortages are so severe at the present time, in the 10 years ending in 1963, AID financed university assistance programs averaging a little over \$1 million a year. Since that time the university assistance program carried on by seven U.S. universities contracting with AID has averaged over \$2 million a year. Approximately an equal value of rupees earned by sales of food under Public Law 480 have been utilized each year to strengthen Indian universities and research institutions.

This is excellent, but it is again only a fraction of 1 percent of the total economic assistance given India in recent years. And, I am told that virtually none of these university assistance activities have been devoted directly to expanding adaptive research programs to increase acre yields of India's major food crops.

Only now are we making a serious effort to help India expand her food production research activities. I commend AID for this much-needed shift in program emphasis. But, India is a tremendous country with more than 20 times as many farmers as the United States and great variations in her agricultural regions, and I believe an even higher proportion of our economic assistance to India should be in the form of expanding adaptive food production research programs.

It is disturbing that Chancellor John T. Caldwell, chairman of the International Foods Committee of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last month that:

We have long sought to include a research component in university foreign assistance contracts, with only limited success.

There are important signs that we are beginning to give more adequate recognition to this need. In a recent speech to the National Academy of Sciences, David Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, said that he feels that the need to build a strong base for applied research and continuing technical progress in the agricultural field is the most important long-range problem faced by developing countries in their efforts to expand food production. It is a problem, he added, which "we do not think we are handling satisfactorily at the present time," although he cited impressive evidence of increased concern over this problem in our aid programs.

But despite the real progress that has been made in recognizing the importance of research overseas, we have not made, to my knowledge, a hard commitment to the kind of comprehensive, thoroughgoing approach in this area that is vital to success in the war against world hunger. My amendment is designed to express the will of Congress that such a program be carried out.

My amendment would call upon our universities—particularly our land-grant colleges—to play a major role in improving agriculture overseas, as they have done so well here.

Already our universities have played major parts in our AID program, in a wide variety of areas, including agriculture. But they need assistance to strengthen their capacity to develop the resources—particularly capable professional personnel—needed to carry out technical agricultural research assistance programs with maximum effectiveness. They have been hampered by the tendency of the AID agency to follow the restrictive contract approach in funding university foreign assistance activities, rather than providing grants which could allow greater flexibility. They have been limited by short-term financial commitments imposed by our annual foreign aid authorizations, making it difficult for universities to plan operations in particular countries on a long-term basis and therefore secure top-quality staffs.

To overcome these shortcomings, Senator McGovern introduced last year

an excellent bill, S. 1212, aimed at applying our experience in agricultural development through our universities here at home to the problems overseas.

The President proposed this year the International Education Act, to strengthen the competence of universities in international affairs in general. The administration also included a provision in S. 2859 to allow technical cooperation and development grants to be made available to research and educational institutions in the United States to strengthen their capacity to carry on foreign assistance programs in cooperation with AID.

This authority, if granted by the Congress and forcefully implemented by the executive branch, would make possible the type of program that Senator McGovern has been advocating. But it makes no specific provision for expanding agricultural research in the countries being helped. My proposal would remedy this omission.

Here at home, I have joined with many of my colleagues in fighting against the Budget Bureau's proposal to reduce funds for agricultural research. I recognize the need for continuing this program at its full strength, for it has been the foundation of our agricultural progress in the past, and must continue to be so in the future.

But I have been disturbed to learn that the number of American agricultural specialist working overseas is only about 1 percent of the number we have at home. And only a small percentage of those overseas, perhaps 10 percent, are engaged in research activities.

My proposal would provide a means for substantially increasing the number of seasoned, experienced American agricultural specialists working in agricultural research overseas, and help to train specialists in foreign countries as well, by indicating the will of Congress that such research be substantially expanded.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that this session of the Congress, through its amendments to the foreign aid bill and passage of a strong Food for Freedom Act, can provide the foundation for a massive American effort to help poor countries solve their most fundamental development problem—that of improving food output. In such an effort, it is my hope that our Department of Agriculture and our Agency for International Development will call upon our land-grant universities; our farmers, researchers, and extension workers; and our major farm organizations and cooperatives to make major contributions to this vital phase of the war on hunger. Such an effort, I am convinced, would go a long way toward building a world, so easy to talk about, yet so hard to achieve, where no man need go to bed hungry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Des Moines Register of April 21, 1961, entitled "Improving Our Foreign Aid," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article and editorial will be printed in the RECORD. The

amendment (No. 587) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The article and editorial presented by Mr. MONDALE are as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 7, 1966]

FOR INDIAN HUNGER A SEED OF HOPE

(By Godfrey Hodgson)

BANDRI, DECCAN.—India has about five years to solve her long-term food problem, said Indira Gandhi, announcing her decision to go to the State of Orissa, as a sequel to allegations that starving people there are selling children. According to the planners and the experts in Delhi, that means that the production of food grains, which was under 75 million tons last year—admittedly a year of monsoon failure—has got to be bumped up to 125 million tons by 1971.

In Delhi, that sounds almost hopelessly optimistic. Here, in a remote and hungry corner of the South Indian back of beyond, there is a glimmer of rational hope.

The village of Bandri is in the stony Deccan highlands. It is a scruffy place, even by the standards of a parched and backward region. The 2600 villagers must live off what they can grow on 2000 acres; and of that, only 200 acres are irrigated land. This is a brilliant green against the dun landscape; tiny splashes of green round each of the 17 wells, and two bigger patches below the village's two tanks. The tank nearest the village irrigates 23 tiny plots. Each of them either belongs to the cultivator or is rented by him from a village shopkeeper or money-lender.

The plots average one acre and they give a clue to how India's 500 million can be fed. For this year, for the first time, they have been sown with new hybrid seed, fertilized properly, and protected with insecticides. Next month, when the crop is harvested, each acre will yield anything from 15 to 20 quintals of grain, where before it has yielded two or three quintals.

The government is pinning its hopes of solving the long-term food deficit on these new hybrid strains of seed, which can take heavy doses of fertilizer. The plan is to sow 32 million acres with them by 1971. There are new strains of wheat from Mexico which yield two to three tons to the acre, against 700-1000 pounds with traditional seed, and new strains of rice from Formosa, whose yields are as good.

But what has happened here has little to do with anything that has happened in Delhi. It has everything to do with the common sense and initiative of one young man in his 30s. His name is M. Y. Ghorpade, and until 1947 his father was the reigning Maharajah of the tiny State of Sandur in these hills. Ghorpade read economics at Cambridge with Professor Guillebaud and he represents Bandri and several dozen other villages in the Mysore state legislature.

Last year he decided to experiment by planting a few acres of his own—he is not a big landowner—with a new hybrid strain of *jawar*, the sorghum which is the staple grain in this part of India. To the villagers who came and stared at his crop growing, the result was almost miraculous. The new seed yielded 26 quintals to the acre, exactly 10 times the yield of traditional strains.

Ghorpade saw that there would be little difficulty in persuading his neighbors to use the new seed, but he insisted that they must follow his instructions to the letter—to sow when told, to put down fertilizer and to spray.

The *jawar* was planted in February and the experiment had its share of troubles, but now the farmers beam with pleasure as they look at the *jawar* standing thick and tall, with heavy ears of seed.

The villagers can afford to pay. On a one-acre holding last year, a man might raise three quintals and sell it for 50 rupees a

quintal. This year, because of the shortage, *javac* is fetching 80 rupees; and Mr. Somappa, for example, who has the acre nearest to the village and wears a green bath towel as a turban, is going to get at least 20 quintals to the acre. That is an economic revolution.

Next year, the villagers mean to plant all their irrigated land with hybrids, probably rice. The village council is discussing it eagerly. After that, if Ghorpade can work out insurance cover against monsoon failure, they talk of borrowing enough to plant hybrids on the whole 2000 acres, rain-fed as well as irrigated land. Once they do that, Bandri will move out of the bullock-cart economy.

But the effect of what has happened in Bandri is not only economic. "This has completely changed the economy of this village," Ghorpade told me. "This used to be the most hopeless, useless, quarrelsome village in the *taluk* (county)."

The villagers grinned sheepishly; in South India quite a few villagers speak English. "Look at them now. Now they have hope."

[From the Des Moines Register, Apr. 21, 1966]

#### IMPROVING OUR FOREIGN AID

The United States is in the throes of revising its foreign aid program. After several years of almost automatic renewal of the same kind of program, in roughly the same amount, Congress is taking a hard look. So is the Administration. President Johnson proposed substantial changes this year.

When the Marshall Plan for recovery of Europe ended in 1953-54, U.S. economic aid dropped sharply—from around \$3.5 billion to \$1.5 billion per year. In 1958-59 the rate of spending was stepped up to about \$2 billion a year, where it has held since. Instead of priming the pump of industrialized areas devastated by war, the U.S. turned to long-range development of the revolutionary, unstable countries of Asia, Africa and South America.

The results have been uneven—and downright disappointing in some areas. Consequently, both Administration and Congress have been searching for more effective ways and means. For some time now, the Administration has been trying to funnel aid to countries which prove they can make better use of it—and to slow it down or withdraw it from places where ineffective or uncooperative governments misuse the grants and loans. Also, the program has been making more loans and giving fewer grants.

J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT (Dem., Ark.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, feels that unilateral aid ties the U.S. into dangerous political situations such as the war in Vietnam. He advocates switching aid toward the United Nations and other multi-nation organizations.

This has been advocated by many experts in development—not only on the ground. FULBRIGHT argues but also on the ground that recipient countries prefer the international mechanisms. No country likes to feel it is a ward of the rich and mighty United States. The World Bank and its subsidiary institutions often have been more effective in accomplishing development goals than the U.S. acting alone.

Another much-debated issue concerns the uncertainty of annual extensions of foreign aid. The Administration has proposed a five-year commitment. Actually, Congress has come through each year with a continuation of the program, without a sudden cutoff. But planners in both the U.S. Administration and other countries have been unable to make positive development plans for several years ahead—as they could in the highly successful four-year Marshall Plan.

Perhaps more important than any of these proposed changes is the Administration proposal for greater emphasis on agricultural development. Experience and new knowledge have shown that progress

has lagged where agriculture has been neglected. Countries eager to jump into the Twentieth Century of industrialization have unwisely concentrated on factories, dams, buildings and other glossy projects, while failing to improve production of food.

In recent years U.S. economic assistance funds for agriculture and agribusiness development have amounted to about 15 per cent of the total programmed by the Agency for International Development. In the new proposal, funds for agribusiness are about one-half larger than in 1965-66. This will still be only 18 per cent of the total.

This is a step but not far enough.

The Administration and Congress should greatly increase the emphasis on agricultural development. This will require that embassy and foreign and mission staffs be "beefed up" with more able and well trained men in food and agriculture.

In recent years food shipped in the Food for Peace program has been four to five times the value of the technical and economic assistance in agricultural development. This is out of proportion. Free food may cause some governments to neglect their own agricultural development. However, food aid often can be effectively used to further development. It will take more capable staffs in handling the food aid and in administering farm development projects to accomplish this.

The resources of the United States Department of Agriculture and of the Land Grant agricultural colleges still are not being mobilized sufficiently for the job that must be done. One of the greatest needs is for adaptive research, in cooperation with local governments, to develop crop varieties and improve livestock.

Research teams from the U.S. should be given the assignment of developing varieties and production practices which will raise yields by 50 percent or more. This can be done, and we have waited too long to make a major effort in farm research adapted to local conditions.

Congress this year ought to chart a new course in foreign aid, with these improvements:

1. Long-range commitments and long-range planning.
2. Greater effort to work through international organizations.
3. Greater emphasis on helping those who help themselves.
4. Primary attention to agriculture and related business development.
5. Recruiting the American agricultural scientists and technicians necessary for this program.

#### AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 588

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments (No. 588) intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3215) to amend the National Housing Act to provide mortgage insurance, and authorize direct loans by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, to help finance the cost of constructing and equipping facilities for the group practice of medicine or dentistry, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

#### FAIR PACKAGING AND LABELING ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 589

Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to

the bill (S. 985), to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 590

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, section 4(a)(2) of S. 985, the so-called truth-in-packaging bill, is presented to this body as a new step in regulating the packaging practices of our country's manufacturers of consumer commodities. This section purports to set a new standard for the listing of contents on packages offered for sale. It proposes that the appropriate Government agency or department shall issue regulations which will require that—

The net quantity of contents (in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count) shall be separately and accurately stated in a uniform location upon the principal display panel of that label.

Section 403 of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act presently provides:

A food shall be deemed to be misbranded—

(c) if in package form unless it bears a label containing . . . (2) an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight measure, or numerical form . . .

(f) if any word, statement, or other information required by or under authority of this chapter to appear on the label or labeling is not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs or devices, in the labeling) and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use.

Pursuant to this same law the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has promulgated specific regulations which the proponents of S. 985 tell is a necessary part of this pending bill. Section 1.8 of the FDC regulations, part I, reads as follows:

(e)(1) The statement of the quantity of the contents shall reveal the quantity of food in the package, exclusive of wrappers and other material packed with such food.

(2) The statement shall be expressed in the terms of weight, measure, numerical count, or a combination of numerical count and weight or measure, which are generally used by consumers to express quantity of such food and which give accurate information as to the quantity thereof. But if no general consumer usage in expressing accurate information as to the quantity of such food exists, the statement shall be in terms of liquid measure if the food is liquid, or in terms of weight if the food is solid, semisolid, viscous, or a mixture of solid and liquid; except that such statement may be in terms of dry measure if the food is a fresh fruit, fresh vegetable, or other dry commodity.

(f)(1) A statement of weight shall be in terms of the avoirdupois pound and ounce. A statement of liquid measure shall be in terms of the United States gallon of 231 cubic inches and quart, pint, and fluid ounce subdivisions thereof, and, except in case of frozen food which is so consumed, shall express the volume at 68° Fahrenheit (20° centigrade). A statement of dry measure shall be in terms of the United States standard barrel and its subdivisions of third, half, and three-quarters barrel. However, in the case of an export shipment, the statement