

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 11

JUNE 22, 1966, TO JULY 11, 1966

(PAGES 13843 TO 15188)

obligor. Location would also be facilitated through use of Federal law enforcement personnel. Under rule 18 of the Rules of Criminal Procedure as to venue, the defendant could be returned to the State where his family resides, and the court order requiring his support for his family could eventually be enforced.

Federal legislation in this area would overcome the difficulties of staff shortage and indifference to the plight of a deserted wife and children which may be encountered in the State where the deserting husband is residing. State and county welfare departments which currently cannot afford the expenditure necessary to locate absent fathers would be aided under this legislation in their efforts to bring families together and require support from the man of the family.

Although the problem of the deserting father is by far the most extensive, this law would also apply to mothers who desert their children, when responsible for their support. This was found to be the case of 4 percent of the families receiving aid to families of dependent children in the survey made in 1961.

I urge serious consideration of this proposal. The problem of deserting fathers is of national significance and requires Federal legislation to rectify it.

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

The bill (S. 3555) to amend title 18, United States Code, to make a misdemeanor the flight, in interstate or foreign commerce, by any person who is the parent of a minor child or who is a married man, if such person so flees with the intent of evading his legal responsibilities with respect to the support or maintenance of his minor child or of his wife, introduced by Mr. ERVIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM OF 1966— AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 620 AND 621

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments to H.R. 14929, the proposed Food for Freedom Act of 1966, and ask that they be appropriately referred.

The first of my amendments would call upon other advanced countries to play a greater role in the war on world hunger. The second would urge increased emphasis on adaptive agricultural research in hungry nations receiving food for freedom assistance.

In many ways, the Food for Freedom Act in its present form represents a landmark victory for those of us who have been supporting expanded U.S. participation in an all-out war on world hunger. In particular, the elimination of the principle of surplus disposal and the increased emphasis on self-help in agriculture in developing countries are vital changes which I hope that the Senate will uphold.

Yet in its present form, the bill is deficient in at least two respects. My amendments seek to deal with these problems.

In the hearings before the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee earlier this year, repeated concern was expressed about the need for other advanced nations, particularly those which export large amounts of farm commodities for cash, to play their proper role in meeting the world hunger explosion.

I was most gratified to learn that, at the time when Secretary Rusk testified on the resolution to supply emergency food to India, 23 nations had made contributions to averting famine in that country. I am informed that, since that time, 22 others have joined them.

We can likewise rejoice that the world food program, under the auspices of the United Nations and its Food and Agriculture Organization, has expanded to a target program level of \$275 million for 1966-68, and that pledges totaling \$209.3 million had already been made by 60 nations as of April 30 of this year.

But this program remains pitifully small when compared to our own efforts. Its present target level is less than 5 percent of the food aid which the United States will provide in the same 3 years. And there is real doubt that even this modest target can be attained.

I believe that the Congress should go on record in favor of increased efforts by other advanced nations in this area. My amendment would put the Congress on record to this effect.

It would support an expansion of the world food program to achieve this objective, and express the sense of the Congress that the United States should agree to match any contributions by other nations—in commodities, cash, or services—which are in excess of the present target of the program.

This would not mean additional cost to the United States, since it would mean channeling a slightly greater proportion of our food aid through the international program rather than increasing the total amount of such aid. But it would, I believe, be a strong demonstration of our support for such international efforts, and would encourage others who can well afford it to contribute more to them.

My second amendment would emphasize the role of adaptive agricultural research as an indispensable part of farm progress in developing countries.

Two weeks ago, I introduced a similar amendment to the economic assistance bill, calling for increased emphasis on supporting adaptive agricultural research in our aid to agriculture programs. I have been disturbed by the nearly unanimous testimony of experts such as Prof. Theodore Schultz of the University of Chicago, who said that "agricultural research has been postponed, put off, and grossly neglected" in our foreign aid program.

As one example of this neglect, we can look at the statistics for Latin America. In the period from 1960 to 1962, the U.S. Government and international and regional agencies together spent less than \$8 million on agricultural research in tropical Latin America. At the same time, we spend nearly \$2 billion—about 250 times as much—on adaptive agricultural research in the United States.

Such research is essential to adapt seeds, fertilizers, techniques, and farm equipment which have worked in other locations to the particular conditions in developing countries. We all recognize the invaluable contribution which such research has made to agricultural development in this country.

But I regret that the neglect of agricultural research seems to be continued in the Food for Freedom Act as presently drafted.

As passed by the House, H.R. 14929 lists eight self-help measures which recipient countries should undertake, and the United States should support, to improve agricultural production and distribution. Included are agricultural extension, production of fertilizers and farm machinery, providing adequate incentives to producers, and improving storage, marketing and distribution systems. All of these I favor. But I consider it a serious omission that adaptive agricultural research is not mentioned.

My amendment would remedy this by listing "establishing and expanding institutions for adaptive agricultural research" as one of the self-help measures the United States would encourage and support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments (Nos. 620 and 621) were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' PAY BILL AND MILITARY PAY BILL

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I reported to the Senate on May 26, 1966, H.R. 14122, the Federal employees' pay bill for 1966.

Since that date, no action has been taken, no move has been made, and virtually no word has been said about when the Senate would take up the bill. As we all know, the bill has an effective date of July 1, 1966. If the Senate does not take action to have the bill before the President before July 1, every agency in the Government will have to compute retroactive pay from the date of enactment back to July 1, 1966. If this is a way to reduce the costs of Government in the executive branch, it is a very odd way.

The House of Representatives Committee on Post Office and Civil Service unanimously reported the bill with an effective date of July 1, 1966. The House passed the bill by a vote of 393 to 1. The Senate committee unanimously reported the bill.

On the specific issue of the effective date, I supported the administration's recommendation that the pay raise be later than July 1. But other members of the committee did not share this viewpoint, and the effective date of July 1 was approved by a vote of 11 to 1.

I think it is crystal clear that the administration's recommendation that the bill be effective January 1 or October 1 has been given careful consideration by the Members of Congress, and will not be accepted.