

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

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

VOLUME 112—PART 14

AUGUST 3, 1966, TO AUGUST 15, 1966

(PAGES 17999 TO 19440)

match this mass movement wheat prices are climbing.

In a speech to the American Agriculture Editors' Association last month, HUMPHREY came closest to giving public expression to growing concern over dwindling grain reserves. Much of this reserve is committed to India in line with President Johnson's word that despite poor crop years and failing monsoon rains the Indian people will not suffer from famine.

HUMPHREY put the "minimum desirable level" for the wheat carryover at 600,000,000 bushels. This was down to 550,000,000 bushels on July 1, with the likelihood that due to weather and other factors it will be reduced considerably below that level a year from now.

Weather is the key. The Vice President said he got a call from South Dakota, where he was born and reared, reporting the beginning of a drought. Recalling the disastrous dust storms of his youth he warned that loss of feed grain production in the Dakotas alone would create a serious situation. According to the latest official crop report the outlook for spring wheat in the Dakotas and Minnesota is down 17 per cent.

Another warning little noted at the time came from Louis Bean, political and economic analyst. Speaking to the Federation of Grain Cooperatives he pointed to the weather cycle in the grain states. On the average of about every 20 years searing heat, such as is currently reported from the Midwest, brings low yields. Bean suggested that with the approach of the '70s a turn in the weather cycle is due.

Countering this gloom and doom on the agricultural outlook, the House has passed a Food for Freedom Bill calling for the most far-reaching attack on the problem of hunger. Closely paralleling a measure introduced by Sen. GEORGE MCGOVERN last year, it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to bring back into production acreage, in line with world needs, idled by the subsidy system. For this purpose the bill authorizes a whopping \$3.53 billion.

MCGOVERN, formerly head of the Food for Peace program, points out that to keep 60,000,000 acres of crop land idle the Government pays farmers \$1.6 billion a year. Bringing this acreage back into production and buying up the crops grown on it as a weapon against worldwide hunger would cost \$2.5 billion, MCGOVERN figures. Therefore, with an increase of less than a billion dollars the Government would have a reserve of incalculable value and farmers a source of expanded income.

The measure ties population control directly into the distribution of American food in developing nations. It authorizes the use of local currency paid for food out of the American reserve for control measures and requires proof that efforts are being made to check the population explosion. In the same way the bill requires countries getting American food to show they are taking steps to increase their own production. The Senate will likely approve a similar bill.

The demographers regard famine as a major threat in the early '70s to world order and stability. If that threat is to be met there must be action now.

#### SENATOR MONDALE'S CONSTRUCTIVE AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago the Senate adopted a highly constructive amendment to the foreign aid bill, an amendment proposed by my distinguished colleague and friend, Senator MONDALE. This amendment provides that, in developing countries with

severe food shortages, "high priority shall be given to efforts to increase agricultural production, particularly the establishment or expansion of adaptive research programs designed to increase acre-yields of the major food crops."

As a Senator long concerned with the world food crisis, I applaud my colleague for his highly constructive proposal.

It is particularly important in its recognition that farm improvement in hungry nations depends on the progress of their agricultural science, so that they can develop the techniques, fertilizers and pesticides, seeds, and farm implements best suited to their climate and soils.

As one who has worked closely with Senator MONDALE on the Senate Agriculture Committee, I know that this amendment is no isolated example of his intelligence and effectiveness in farm matters.

He was one of the first Senators to speak out forcefully for an expanded and improved food-for-peace program. He is a strong advocate of improved farm income and his work on the 4-year farm program last year brought about substantial improvements in that legislation. He is, in my view, one of the most effective champions of the farmer to come to the Senate in many years.

I am most gratified, therefore, that Senator MONDALE's farm research amendment has received highly favorable editorial comment in the national press. I ask unanimous consent that two editorials on Senator MONDALE's amendment—one in the Denver Post, the other from the St. Paul Dispatch—be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Aug. 1, 1966]  
SENATOR TAKES LONG VIEW OF FOOD CRISIS

The world food crisis is growing steadily and there are two time-honored concepts Americans ought to throw out the window—or at least sharply modify.

One is the old-fashioned idea that the United States, with its land wealth, can play Lady Bountiful to hungry people around the world, that we'll rush out dried milk and cereal grains in the best humanitarian tradition and feel good inside.

The time is rapidly approaching when we cannot physically do it. Despite what Jimmy Stewart says on television, simply donating food overseas may only mean a crisis of greater dimensions when the reckoning does come.

The other concept that needs radical adjusting is an unreconstructed rural belief that food shortages overseas mean profits in the Farm Belt. It isn't necessarily so.

The point that makes this discussion timely is an amendment to the foreign aid bill offered by U.S. Sen. WALTER F. MONDALE, D-Minn. As passed last week, the Senate version of the foreign aid package contains a firm specification by MONDALE that U.S. aid overseas put greater stress on self-help.

MONDALE's amendment is both idealistic and practical. He understands that the United States cannot, by itself, avert world famine—that the countries involved must help themselves or disaster is inevitable.

At the same time, MONDALE has in mind the welfare of his own Farm Belt constituents who would like to sell more products overseas. But he knows you can't sell food to a penniless man, no matter how hungry.

MONDALE SAYS:

"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."

The argument needs to be pounded home. Poverty abroad feeds more poverty. Neither donor nation nor recipient gain: the donor nation, in fact, loses its ability to help if there is no response overseas and the burden grows.

India is a good example. Under the stress of hunger, India has taken hundreds of millions of bushels of U.S. wheat in the last year. The U.S. farmer profited, we suppose, but the bill went not to the Indians but to the U.S. taxpayer.

An indication that the United States cannot allow itself to be overburdened came last week when the U.S. Department of Agriculture warned nations receiving U.S. wheat to expect 25 per cent less in the fiscal year which began July 1.

This is sound evidence that Senator MONDALE's amendment is timely. He is not the first lawmaker to suggest stepped-up crop and livestock output overseas. But the more pressure in this direction, the better.

It is a tough job adapting U.S. research to a foreign environment. Yet, as MONDALE points out, the vast resources of U.S. land grant colleges and other programs have revolutionized U.S. food production. It seems logical to put this capacity to work to a greater degree overseas.

There isn't much time left. The U.S. wheat carryover next spring may be as little as 200 million bushels. That would be the smallest in decades. Bread shortages are not likely at home but users of U.S. wheat abroad do have cause for worry—and reason to put out the biggest possible welcome mat to American technological aid in agriculture. The time for radical measures is at hand.

[From the St. Paul Dispatch, July 23, 1966]

#### L.B.J. FOREIGN AID SETBACK

A bipartisan rebellion in the Senate against President Johnson's foreign aid recommendations has severely cut back on financing prospects for economic development loans abroad. In addition the senators slapped down the President's proposal to authorize appropriations on a five year basis instead of one year.

These actions, in part at least, are of questionable merit and were motivated by resentment against various White House policies in other fields.

However, another action by the Senate on foreign aid Wednesday was highly constructive. This was approval of an amendment sponsored by Minnesota's Senator WALTER MONDALE. It puts greater emphasis on stimulating needy countries to increase their own food production. Foreign aid operations over the years have been seriously lax in this respect. India, for example, has been encouraged to rely on American wheat imports instead of raising its own crop yields.

MONDALE, supported by numerous farm authorities, has criticized failure of American aid officials to establish local research programs to push up per acre yields of food crops in the manner this has been accomplished in the United States. His amendment directs that high priority be given in the future to such work. It urges that adequate funds be used to permit American university farm specialists and researchers to help counterparts in needy nations develop programs specially suited to their own conditions. This should have beneficial long-range results.

In other respects, Senate action on foreign aid showed sharp disagreement with the Johnson Administration, and even hostility. The Administration had asked authorization for \$655 million for economic development

loans. The Senate Foreign Relations committee cut this down to \$620 million. Then, on the Senate floor, Republican Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN moved to slash this figure by another \$250 million, leaving a total of only \$370 million.

Democratic Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations committee and the ostensible floor manager for the foreign aid bill, joined DIRKSEN in voting for the cut. Also supporting DIRKSEN were 30 other Democrats and 27 Republicans. Thus more Democrats than Republicans voted against the Administration. The amendment carried, 59 to 34.

Senator Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD explained the bipartisan opposition as expressing "a general feeling of disenchantment" and frustrations. A number of the opposition Democrats also are against President Johnson's Vietnam policies. DIRKSEN said the cut was needed to reduce overall Administration spending which invites inflation. The Republicans pointed out the President's own recent advice to Congress to cut down on appropriations.

Another Dirksen amendment adopted by the Senate would prohibit AID loans unless they are approved by the World Bank. A further restriction, also Republican sponsored, calls for raising interest or service charges on such loans.

Altogether, President Johnson suffered a politically remarkable setback and rebuke. The final form of the foreign aid program, however, will not be determined until the Senate finishes consideration of more amendments and the bill goes to a House-Senate conference.

#### ALASKA SIBERIA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in 1956 the Congress enacted the Alaska Mental Health Act transferring the responsibility for the care and treatment of Alaska's mentally ill from the Interior Department to the Territory of Alaska. This law brought to an end what had long been described as an "archaic and inhumane" system for the care of Alaska's mentally ill.

The law provided authorization for an appropriation of \$6 million over a 10-year period on a diminishing scale as grants to the Territory to assist in meeting costs until the end of the period when Alaska would have the entire financial responsibility.

The law also authorized a \$6½ million appropriation for construction of hospital facilities.

A third major provision granted to the Territory the right to select 1 million acres of land with the revenues from such land to be applied first to the mental health program.

This modern program for Alaska's mentally ill was born in strife and engendered in the then 48 States one of the most vicious "hate" campaigns ever encountered by Members of Congress.

After passage in the House, the Senate was literally deluged with mounting protests that Congress was setting up a million-acre "Alaska Siberia."

The charges grew more reckless and unreasoning until Congress was accused of trying to establish in Alaska a barbed-wire enclosure of 1 million acres for political enemies.

Reason prevailed over the thousands of letters from all over the country, and the measure became law.

During the 10 years which have passed since the law was enacted, the old charges of an "Alaska Siberia" have cropped up from time to time throughout the country. Now the canard is repeated in the July issue of Common Sense.

I have written to the editor and ask unanimous consent that my letter be made part of the RECORD at this point.

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

AUGUST 1, 1966.

EDITOR, COMMON SENSE,  
Union, N.J.

DEAR SIR: I am surprised and shocked that Common Sense is still harping on the charge that a million acres of Alaska land is being held ready for internment of political "offenders". The word in quotation marks is yours.

You base this broadside on an article which appeared in the New York Times December 27, 1955 which stated that the United States "could intern 5000 spies and saboteurs almost immediately in the event of war, an invasion or an insurrection." No mention was made in that article about Alaska.

However, the following are words that Common Sense used in a caption which appeared below a partial reprint of the New York Times article:

"Just for whom are 'they' reserving these detention (concentration) camps?—Also the million acres set aside in Alaska 'for the construction of a mental hospital and other facilities . . . to provide an integrated health program.' Is perhaps the real purpose to establish concentration camps for Political Opponents, under the guise of care and treatment of mental cases."

This preposterous allegation was first made by a California newspaper when the Alaska Mental Health Act came before the Congress for consideration. It was repeated throughout the land by all too many people. A half hour devoted to research would be sufficient to demonstrate the absurdity of trying to couple the million acre land grant to a "plot" aimed at what you term political "offenders".

The Alaska Mental Health Act was passed before Alaska became a state. The million acre grant was made to help the Territory of Alaska finance a mental health program from the proceeds of the disposition of that land. Among other things, as a result of this act, Alaska now has a modern psychiatric institute and it is no longer necessary to send all Alaskans ill of mental diseases thousands of miles from their homes for treatment.

Common sense implies that the million acre tract is in one unit. It is not. It was never intended to be. The territorial government and subsequently the state government was entitled to choose land in large or small tracts. This it has done.

As of June 30, 1966 the state had applied for 976,720 acres out of the million acre grant. Tentative approval has been given to 308,262 acres and patent has been granted for 544,453 acres. I am advised by Mr. Phil R. Holdsworth, Commissioner of Natural Resources for the State of Alaska, that "the selections are located all over the state; i.e., within those areas eliminated from the national forest in southeastern Alaska as well as throughout the rest of the state. The size of tracts selected has varied from a few acres to several tens of thousands. There have been no restrictive acreage limitations on these selections.

"We have used our mental health selection authority as a means of not only providing maximum revenues to the state, but also protecting certain lands for continued use by the state and not subject to borough se-

lection. You, no doubt, realize that all mental health lands are subject to competitive leasing for oil and gas, and we utilized our selection entitlement in cases where previously withdrawn land which appear valuable for oil and gas development suddenly became available for state selection."

That statement by Mr. Holdsworth ought to dispel any notion that the million acres of land is being held in a single unit and will be used one day as a concentration camp. But I doubt it. I predict that this baseless, incomprehensible allegation will continue to be made year after year, just as common sense has now made it.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. BARTLETT.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, about 6 years ago the Alaska Psychiatric Institute was dedicated, and on September 26, 1962, I told the Senate of that event and reviewed the background of the Alaska Mental Health Act. Because it tells in detail the history of passage of that measure and because I hope it will lay to rest at long last the fabrications and charges surrounding the bill, I ask unanimous consent that my address to the Senate be made part of the RECORD.

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

#### NEW HOSPITAL OPENS IN ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Sunday, September 9, was a beautiful day in Anchorage, Alaska. The sky was clear. The sun was warm. The mountains stood out in bold relief. Nature was in an autumnal mood.

On the afternoon of that day the Alaska Psychiatric Institute was dedicated. This is the newest, most modern hospital in the world for the care of the mentally ill. It will begin to receive patients next month. Designed to care for 225 people at the outset, the institute is so planned that it may be expanded.

I traveled almost 9,000 miles in order to be at the dedication ceremony. I flew from Washington, D.C., to Anchorage and back over the weekend only so that I might be present for the dedicatory exercises. For everyone present it was a thrilling occasion. For some few of us it was even more meaningful. For three of us there on that day this was the culmination of an effort which began over a decade ago. For a fourth, this represented attainment of a goal which, for a time, seemed impossibly distant.

Winfred Overholser, M.D., the great psychiatrist who has been superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital here in Washington, D.C., for a quarter of a century, was present. Jack Haldeman, M.D., Assistant Surgeon General of the United States was there. I had the good fortune to be present. And Marjorie Shearon, Ph. D., who made such a significant contribution to the passage of the act which made possible the building of the institute, honored us by her presence. It was Dr. Overholser who, in 1949, headed a committee which subsequently reported the need for Alaska mental health legislation. This was a forerunner of the draft bill which became law.

In those days Dr. Haldeman headed up Public Health Service work in Alaska. Then and later he worked hard for passage of adequate mental health legislation.

The Alaska Psychiatric Institute was constructed because the Congress of the United States and the executive branch of the Government saw an imperative need for it and responded to that need generously and helpfully.

The then Territory of Alaska was and had been throughout its existence strangely situated in respect to the treatment of the mentally ill. For reasons not entirely clear,