

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 9

MAY 19, 1966, TO JUNE 6, 1966

(PAGES 10981 TO 12444)

the New York Times of May 22, 1966, entitled "Reforms for the Consumer."

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times,
May 22, 1966]

REFORMS FOR THE CONSUMER

After four years of public discussion, committee hearings and extensive revision, a truth-in-packaging bill is now nearing a vote in the Senate. Its approval by the Senate Commerce Committee is a tribute to the perseverance of the bill's sponsor, Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan.

The bill would afford consumers some necessary and elementary protection when they shop for food, drugs, cosmetics and toilet articles. At the same time it meets many, though not all, of the objections of manufacturers who have expressed fear that strict Federal controls will inhibit competitive merchandising. In its mandatory sections the bill requires manufacturers to state on their labels the exact contents of the package and either a numerical count of its contents or its net weight in ounces. In this way the buyer will be able to compare the prices of different makes and sizes. Misleading verbiage is forbidden. The bill also grants discretionary authority to Federal authorities to develop additional regulations for specific kinds of products.

Although the bill could usefully have been more stringent in some respects, it is nevertheless a reasonable compromise. Its prospects for approval in the Senate appear to be good; but if action is to be completed in this Congress, it is imperative that the House Commerce Committee begin work promptly. And now that the truth-in-packaging bill has finally cleared its committee, this should be a signal to the Senate Banking Committee to take up a companion measure, the truth-in-lending measure introduced by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois. Consumers are as unwary—and as much in need of Federal protection—when they go shopping for credit as when they buy food in the supermarket.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, while I voted in favor of reporting S. 985, the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, to the full Senate, I reserved at that time the right to oppose the bill on the floor of the Senate.

I wish to point out that I want to protect the consumer in the fullest degree against any deceptions practiced by the manufacturers or distributors of packaged articles. There is no issue with me about the need of such protection. The issue is whether or not under existing Federal laws, the executive branch of the Government has already been vested with coercive powers adequate to protect the consumer and make the manufacturer or distributor answerable to criminal prosecution and injunctive relief favoring the consumer by ordering a complete cessation of practices that are deceptive.

At present, the Federal laws contain two acts which are intended to protect the consumer:

First. The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act:

Section 403 of this act states that food shall be deemed to be misbranded—first, if its labeling is false or misleading in any particular; second, if it is offered for sale under the name of another food; third, if it is an imitation of another food, unless its label bears, in type of uniform size and prominence, the word "imita-

tion" and, immediately thereafter, the name of the food imitated; and fourth, if its container is so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading.

This section of the act also requires:

First. That labels show an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count; and further second, that all information required by the act to appear on the label must be prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness 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.

While the foregoing major provisions apply only to foods under this act, similar provisions are contained in the act relating to drugs and cosmetics.

It should be further noted that general regulations were issued by the Food and Drug Administration, section 1.9 (1) through (6) amplifying existing law which takes into consideration smallness or style of type, insufficient background, contrast, obscuring designs, etc.

Second. The Federal Trade Commission Act:

Section 5 of this act declares unlawful "unfair methods of competition in commerce, or unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce."

Section 12 of this act arms the Federal Trade Commission with additional procedural weapons to combat practices of false advertising of foods, drugs, devices, and cosmetics, thus giving these broad provisions coverage over all unfair or deceptive packaging and labeling and advertising practices relating to all products in commerce.

It has been my opinion that under these two acts, the Federal Government is vested fully with the power to bring prosecution against manufacturers or distributors who in any manner practice deception in the packaging of their goods and also vests the Federal Government with the power to go into a court of equity and procure injunctive relief against any manufacturers or distributors who indulge in such practices.

In addition to the two foregoing acts of the Federal statutes, each State has laws which subject individual manufacturers or distributors engaged in fraudulent practices in the sale of their goods to criminal prosecution and many States have laws giving the State government the right to seek injunctive relief to procure a remedy against fraudulent practices.

During the Commerce Committee's consideration of this bill, I supported the proposal which requires manufacturers or distributors of packaged goods to print on the outside of such packages in clear, understandable, conspicuous lettering the weight, measure, or numerical count of the pieces contained in the package and if the content is not in pieces but in weight, then the weight contents should not be identified in pounds and ounces but in ounces alone to simplify the housewives task in making comparisons.

My interest in protecting the buyer is just as deep as the interest of anyone else, but I do not subscribe to the policy

of passing new laws on a given subject when existing laws are adequate to reach the desired objective.

Every time you pass a new law of this type, you create new bureaus with their plethora of public employees bringing about a scandalous, indefensible expansion of public workers duplicating the work that is already authorized under existing law.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I wish to speak in support of the resolution of the senior Senator from Minnesota to establish a Select Committee on Intelligence Operations, as that resolution was ordered reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Recent stories in the press indicate that there is a need for oversight over some aspects of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency with particular reference to the effects of this activity on our general foreign policy. Participation of members of the Foreign Relations Committee will permit and be particularly appropriate to such scrutiny.

It appears, for example, that CIA agents used Michigan State University as a "cover" for intelligence activities, in a technical assistance project undertaken in South Vietnam from 1955 to 1959.

What effect does such activity have on our technical assistance projects elsewhere in the world? Surely it gives opponents of U.S. activity in such countries a handle with which to beat our supporters. If so, is the gain from this particular activity worth such a cost? These questions of foreign policy can best be answered by a broadly based Select Committee.

It is reported in the series of New York Times articles of April 25-29 on the Central Intelligence Agency that the Agency has used money to influence the results of elections in foreign countries on occasions where it appeared that Communists were doing so. Certainly such activity cannot be carried on without becoming known. If the report is correct, how does this affect other foreign policies which we wish to pursue?

The junior Senator from New York recently spoke in this Chamber on the Alliance for Progress, and urged that the United States should take an active part in encouraging democratic forms and traditions in Latin America. I think nearly everyone agrees with him. How is such a desirable policy affected in its execution by the fact that we are in some places using bribery to influence the outcome of elections? Will they not do as we do, not as we say?

Answering such questions involves weighing the intelligence advantages in light of our long range foreign policy—an exercise most appropriately performed by a committee including members of the Armed Forces, Appropriations, and Foreign Relations Committees.

Another question which might well be taken up by the Select Committee is the degree to which our foreign intelligence activities may properly extend into this

country. It has recently come to light in the press that Mr. George A. Carver wrote an article on the Vietcong in the April issue of *Foreign Affairs* without disclosure of the fact that he is a full-time employee of the CIA. The *New York Times* also reports in its series of articles that the CIA has subsidized U.S. book publishers under circumstances that were not clear. What intelligence goals are furthered by such activities? To what extent do they conflict with historic values and freedoms of our citizens?

The same question may well arise from the position of the Agency, asserted in a slander suit in Baltimore, that its agent when acting under orders, can with absolute immunity slander a man in this country by labeling him as a Soviet agent.

Because these questions extend beyond the intelligence field into areas of foreign policy, I support the motion which would place them within the scope of a select Committee on Intelligence Operations.

VIETNAM: MOMENT OF TRUTH

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, with American battle casualties exceeding those of the South Vietnamese, and with the South Vietnamese fighting one another instead of the Vietcong, the time has come for us to consider what possible justification there is for us to continue fighting in Vietnam.

Incidentally, when I visited Vietnam and Thailand and other places in southeast Asia from last September 28 until October 19, my eyes were opened, and it did not take me very long to see for myself that we were involved in a miserable civil war in an area that is of no strategic or economic importance whatsoever to the defense of the United States.

Our President has two alternatives. One is to escalate the war by increasing our armed forces in southeast Asia, from the present number approximating 400,000 by 100,000 or 200,000 additional American GI's, bombing Hanoi and mining the harbor of Haiphong, and carrying the war more directly to North Vietnam.

The second is to suspend all bombing of areas of North Vietnam and withdraw to our strongholds, pending the negotiation of a cease-fire and an armistice. This should be followed by elections under the supervision of the International Control Commission or under the auspices of the United Nations, and eventually by the orderly withdrawal of our Armed Forces.

Mr. President, in his usual concise and clear manner, Walter Lippmann, one of the free world's great journalists and outstanding thinkers, has stated the problem extremely well in his column, entitled "Moment of Truth," which was published in the *Washington Post* on May 24, 1966. I commend this column to my colleagues and am hopeful that administration leaders responsible for Vietnam policy will give serious and careful consideration to the excellent analysis set forth by Walter Lippmann. I ask unanimous consent that his column be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

MOMENT OF TRUTH (By Walter Lippmann)

The hardest question facing us at the moment is whether or not the disintegration of the Saigon government and army can be stopped and reversed. The official position is, of course, that it can be.

But there is little evidence to support the official will to believe, and there is mounting evidence that General Ky or anyone like him is in an irreconcilable conflict with the war-weary people of Vietnam. There is no prospect now visible that the South Vietnamese people and the South Vietnamese army can be united and rallied for the prosecution of the war.

Unless this condition changes radically, we shall increasingly be fighting alone in a country which has an army that is breaking up and a government which has little authority.

We can already see on the horizon the possibility of an American army fighting on its own in a hostile environment. We must hope that the President and his strategic planners are prepared for such a development. For if the South Vietnamese government and army continue to disintegrate as is now the case, our troops may find themselves without serious organized military support, and forced to find their way in a seething unrest where friend and foe are indistinguishable.

If the Saigon forces disintegrate, it will no longer be possible to continue the war on the theory that the mission of our troops is to smash the hard core of the enemy while the Saigon troops occupy and pacify the countryside. What then? We shall be hearing from the Goldwater faction, whose first article of military faith is unlimited belief in airpower. They are arguing that the way to repair the breakdown in South Vietnam is to bomb Haiphong and Hanoi in the north. The Administration, as we are told by Secretary McNamara and Mr. Brown, the Secretary of the Air Force, knows the folly and the futility of that course of action.

Is there any real alternative to a holding strategy, sometimes called the enclave strategy, pending the negotiation of a truce and agreement for our phased withdrawal from the Asian mainland? If the Vietnamese war cannot be won by the Air Force, if it cannot be won by American troops fighting alone in South Vietnam, what other strategic option is there?

The only other option would be to make no new decisions, pursue the present course, and hope that things are not so bad as they seem, and that something better will turn up. The President is bound to be strongly tempted to take this line. The alternatives open to him are dangerous or inglorious, and repulsive to his cautious but proud temperament.

A great head of government would have seized the nettle some time ago, as long as 1964, and would have disengaged gradually our military forces. But that would have taken a high-mindedness and moral courage which are rare among the rulers of men. For rulers of men nearly always will do almost anything rather than admit that they have made a mistake.

Yet the moment of truth comes inexorably when a radical mistake has been made. The mistake in this case has been to order American troops to fight an impossible war in an impossible environment. The American troops, which may soon number 400 thousand men, are committed to an unattainable objective—a free pro-American South Vietnam. They are commanded to achieve this on a continent where they have no important allies, and where their enemies have inexhaustible numbers.

The situation, not anyone's pride or the Nation's prestige, must be our paramount concern.

GALLANT SHIP AWARD CEREMONY ON CAPITOL STEPS TO "JAPAN BEAR"

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, yesterday, on the steps of the Senate wing, an intrepid American merchant mariner, his officers and crew of the ship the *Japan Bear* were honored for a great act of courage and heroism performed a year ago last January when the Chinese Nationalist vessel radioed an SOS as it was breaking in two, and the *Japan Bear* came to its rescue.

The captain of the *Japan Bear* is Kenneth A. Shannon. I am proud to observe that he is a fellow Californian.

The ceremonies took place under legislation adopted in the 84th Congress and sponsored by one of the great leaders in the field of maritime legislation in Congress, our friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The Senator from Washington spoke yesterday at the ceremonies. It was an eloquent tribute at the time that the Gallant Ship Award was given to the ship the *Japan Bear*.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* the text of the comments made by the Senator from Washington.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR WARREN MAGNUSON AT GALLANT SHIP AWARD CEREMONY

It is a special pleasure for me to be here to present the Gallant Ship Award to the *Japan Bear*. I have long been deeply aware of the selfless courage exemplified by American seamen and concerned that it be properly recognized. It was for that reason that I sponsored Public Law 759, which was passed by the 84th Congress, and it is for that reason that I am here today.

We expect our American seamen to be courageous. Even their way of life is barred to the fainthearted, for they leave home and shore far behind them as they venture to the farthest reaches of the earth. No matter how new and modern their vessel, they must always beware of the power of the sea which, when enraged by storm, is a fearful adversary. Thus their very calling requires courage. How much greater is the demand when they face the elements in a rescue at sea. It is only just that we recognize how magnificently they respond.

I am proud of the men who man our ships—men like the crew of the *Japan Bear*, acting in the highest tradition of the sea. Their courage is unchallengeable and their willingness to come to the aid of others is known throughout the world. I am proud of the superb seamanship which enables them to successfully battle the elements, and I am proud of the safety of American ships—the safest in the world.

No words can better praise the men of the *Japan Bear* than the simple story of what they did. I would like to read the *Unit Citation* so that all may know and admire these men.

"During the early morning of January 13, 1965, the *Japan Bear* received an SOS from the Chinese Nationalist Ship *Grand*, immediately altered course and raced to intercept the distressed vessel. Late that afternoon in heavy seas rendezvous was made with the *Grand*. The vessel had broken in two; only