

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 111—PART 5

MARCH 24, 1965, TO APRIL 6, 1965

(PAGES 5727 TO 7200)

Senator HUMPHREY sought an amendment in July 1953, to the mutual security bill broadening the power of the Administrator to use surplus foods in foreign aid programs.

He urged that the President be given legislative authority to donate commodities, to sell at world prices, to sell at concessional prices, to sell on long-term credits, to sell for soft currencies, and to trade for strategic materials.

Senator HUMPHREY considered this amendment a stopgap measure and began looking beyond it immediately to special legislation to make more effective use of the abundance farmers are capable of producing.

Speaking in December 1953, he said: "We need policies which will enable the farmer to see his food used wisely, rather than wasted, to see the output of his land, his toil make its utmost contribution to stamping out hunger and deprivation at home and abroad, and serving as the humanitarian arm of the Nation's foreign policy, in our efforts to create a better and more peaceful world."

Several bills were introduced in 1954 and an administration bill was adopted and became Public Law 480.

It was a 1-year program, considerably narrower in scope than the Humphrey bill and slanted more toward surplus disposal than to foreign economic development assistance.

But, it was a start and it was subsequently extended for 2 years.

In 1957, HUMPHREY sought a 2-year extension with a total of \$3 billion in authorizations.

"By sharing our blessing of food abundance with the people who seek to break away from tyranny, we can make American food the 'yeast of freedom' which can expand and strengthen the movement to freedom and independence. We take a calculated risk, but all we have to lose is the food itself," he said.

In early 1957, as our delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, HUMPHREY proposed a plan for international cooperation toward the establishment of a world food reserve.

"It would seem only logical if some of the world's surplus holdings were used to bolster stocks in areas where people live on the brink of disaster from one harvest to another," he told the U.N.

In August 1957, Senator HUMPHREY noted that "in time of war, we recognized the importance of food and fiber. We created a War Food Administrator to mobilize our food resources for victory. Today, in the time of a shaky and uncertain peace in the world, it is time to think about a similar role for a special Peace Food Administrator to guide more effective use of our food resources for another victory. It is even more important to use our food abundance as a constructive force for peace."

HUMPHREY envisioned that the Peace Food Administrator would coordinate the various functions relating to food distribution scattered among agencies in the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, the ICA, and the ODM.

"I would like to see America have a policy of setting aside a food reserve for humanity, as an arsenal of peace—to set aside, let us say, a billion bushels of wheat, and to announce to the world that never again will famine destroy peoples and nations. Why not? This country will never go bankrupt by sharing. One year's defense budget would pay for 10 years of this food-for-peace activity. Our task is to wage peace."

Speaking to our National Farmers Union convention in nearby Springfield, Ill., in March 1959, Senator HUMPHREY outlined the terms of the comprehensive, 5-year International Food for Peace Act, which he was to introduce 3 months later.

He told us at Springfield that the challenge of world conditions, "can best be met by

proving that we really care about people, at home or abroad, and care about progress—and most of all about peace with justice. We must seek constantly to express the American dedication to people, peace, and progress throughout the world—not only in words of peace, but in works of peace.

"A breakthrough in the conquest of hunger could be more significant in the cold war than the conquest of outer space. Thanks to you farm people, and others like you, the United States is today in a far better position than Russia to lead the world toward the conquest of hunger and want."

In 1961 President John F. Kennedy, as one of his first acts in office, established the office of the Food for Peace Director in the White House and instructed his appointee to exercise affirmative leadership in the program.

In 1961 Senator HUMPHREY's amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act declared it to be the policy of the U.S. Government to encourage and assist in the development of cooperatives.

HUMPHREY was a cosponsor of a resolution for a World Food Congress, and when it was held in Washington in 1963, he viewed it as a new advance—a beginning of a worldwide effort in the war against hunger. Fifty nations pledged \$100 million to the first phase of the world food program. HUMPHREY noted that from the Hot Springs conference in 1943, "it took 10 years for action to be initiated and it took nearly 20 years for this philosophy to become the consensus of world opinion."

Only a month ago, Vice President HUMPHREY said that food for peace and the Peace Corps, side by side are a powerful team in our foreign policy. But he insisted, food for peace must be strengthened.

"Food for peace is more than a farm program—it is a foreign policy program. It is one of the most imaginative things ever created. Through food for peace we are reaching 100 million persons, but we have only scratched the surface."

Again in a recent address, he declared: "In a real sense, what we need to understand is that agriculture is in the forefront of the struggle for a better world. It is not a laggard; it is not a burden; it is not what is holding America back. It is what's putting America ahead."

This is the measure of the man whom we honor today—a great friend of agriculture—one of the great statesmen of the world today—and a beloved coworker in the race for peace.

I am pleased on behalf of the membership of the National Farmers Union to confer our 1965 Award for Outstanding Service to Agriculture to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States.

Our congratulations, Mr. Vice President, God bless you in the days ahead.

THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am most honored to be listed as a cosponsor of S. 1564, the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I believe that it is absolutely necessary that this Congress act promptly and decisively to guarantee to all Americans the true enjoyment of their God-given, human, and constitutional rights. I am supported in this position by an overwhelming majority of the citizens of the State of Minnesota. As but one indication of their support for my position and the position of President Lyndon B. Johnson, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Minneapolis Spokesman of March 18, 1965, be reprinted at this point in the RECORD. Cecil E. Newman, editor of the Minneapolis Spokesman, wrote the editorial;

and I think he is to be commended for that and for his lifelong dedication to the cause of equal rights for all. I am proud to have this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Congress of the United States his dedication and the dedication of all our Minnesotans to these principles.

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

A PRESIDENT'S FINEST HOUR

Monday night the President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson of Texas, made perhaps the greatest speech a Chief Executive of this great Nation ever made, on the unresolved right of the Negro to full voting rights in this country—rights which are guaranteed by the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

No other President speaking to Congress and the American people has ever before so honestly, unequivocally, and courageously laid the issue so squarely and fully on the line—for all to see and heed.

Pulling no punches, Mr. Johnson placed the violation of the rights of the Negro to the ballot, the accepted practice in a number of States, right out where the whole world could see it. And in doing so, he arrayed himself and the power of his office definitely on the side of the Negroes who have been denied the right to vote by intimidation, murder, beatings, economic reprisals, and trick tests set up and designed by State legislatures and vote registrars for the sole purpose of keeping the Negro disfranchised.

There was no compromise in the southern accent and voice of a southern born President who, although admittedly proud of the region of his birth, recognizing its strengths and weaknesses, was prepared to disregard all except the rights which he said all Americans must enjoy equally, if this Nation was to live up to its great promise and national law.

In President Johnson's message there was not a word of comfort to the Wallaces, the Eastlands, the Ervins, the Ellenders, the Stenises, the Smathers of his own party or the Strom Thurmonds of the Republican Party. Most of this crowd sat on its collective hands as other Members of the Congress, the judiciary, the Cabinet, and the gallery arose spontaneously to its feet to applaud when President Johnson praised the Negro for his struggle to get the United States in line with the aims and promises of its Constitution.

In commenting on the long struggle for human rights in this Nation he told the people of the Nation that, "The real hero of this struggle is the American Negro." As true as this statement is, no President before Johnson had ever so frankly and forcibly reminded the country of the Negro's magnificent courage under extreme adversity, and those auditors who were touched by the magnificence, truth, and courage of his statement could not help but stand and applaud.

We doubt that in the years ahead Lyndon Baines Johnson will ever have a finer hour than he had Monday night. His "we shall overcome," was also a tribute to those brave Negroes and whites who have led and marched in behalf of freedom and justice, now. He accepted the genuine applause with a sober dignity that reminded one of the long hard road still ahead.

We felt rather proud of being an American Monday night despite our obvious continued concern against the injustice which is practiced against our Negro people, as President Johnson pointed out in all 50 of our States. Our pride was based on what we believe is the ability of this Nation and its people "when the chips are down" to make a final determination based on truth and justice. This has happened all through the

history of this Nation and the time has come for it to happen in the instance of the American Negro—for no force as President Johnson said, "can keep back the tide of freedom and justice."

He asked the Congress to pass as soon as possible a voting rights bill which would insure the right to vote of every American citizen who can write his name, in all elections; local, State, and National. If such legislation is passed, and it must be enacted, the final barriers to full citizenship will have been pushed aside to allow every qualified American man and woman of voting age to participate in the selection of public officials. This will greatly affect the peace, harmony, and unity of the country which has long been divided by the denial of constitutional rights, to part of the country's citizenry.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to President Johnson and the aroused public opinion which convinced him that he had to take a strong position and promised him the support which made his Monday night speech such a great document of true statesmanship.—**Cecil Newman**.

VOTER COMPLAINTS ABOUT MIS-LEADING PACKAGING

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of S. 985, the truth-in-packaging bill. I have received many letters supporting this proposed legislation. Typical of all that I have received is a series of correspondence relating to the deceptive use of "cents-off" allowances. I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and, in particular, I call attention to the letter from a leading food retailer in St. Paul, Minn., in which it is stated that many of the coffee companies come out with deal packs on coffee anywhere from 8 cents to 10 cents to 15 cents to 17 cents a can off. These do not reflect any difference in the cost. This is done by regulating the promotional allowance to the retailer, so that the cost of the 8-cent-off pack comes to the same price as the 17 cents one. This is a source of much concern to all ethical and honest retailers and businessmen; and I call it to the attention of the Congress of the United States.

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

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
March 4, 1965.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Thank you for your prompt reply to my letter of February 22.

I certainly have no objection to your reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the entire file I sent you, and can only hope it will focus the attention of others on the deceitful practices you are trying to combat.

Further, I enclose a reply I received from the Folger Coffee Co. In his third paragraph, Mr. Paulsen does not mention the regulating of promotional allowances which Mr. Sidney Applebaum calls attention to, and which naturally affects the dealer's price.

I realize the pressure on today's manufacturer to increase his business, but certainly there are other avenues than shady and misleading promotions such as we seem to have here.

My best wishes, Senator, for your success.
Sincerely,

MARY L. URBAN
Mrs. Mary L. Urban.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
February 22, 1965.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I heartily endorse your action in cosponsoring the truth-in-packaging bill, described in the February 11, 1965, issue of the Minnesota Union Advocate, copy herewith.

As you can see by the enclosed file, I have done some investigating myself. It appears that the manufacturer is using misleading merchandising to encourage the purchase of his coffee, and if one is not alert at the check-out counter, she may not realize she is not getting the cents off.

I've noticed many other such practices of late, and feel if manufacturers won't be honest and factual about package contents and labeling, then legislation is definitely needed.

Senator, I congratulate you on your forceful beginning in the Senate, and I consider us fortunate to have you represent our views in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARY L. URBAN.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Union Advocate,
Feb. 11, 1965]

TRUTH-IN-PACKAGING BILL: MONDALE PROPOSAL STRIKES BLOW AGAINST SALES DEFICIT

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE this week cosponsored a truth-in-packaging bill aimed at eliminating practices which confuse and deceive consumers.

The Minnesota Senator joined Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan, in supporting legislation which would direct the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission to promulgate regulations that will require packages accurately and clearly to give essential product information and fairly represent the contents.

Both MONDALE and HART have established national reputations for their efforts in behalf of consumer protection.

"Today's housewife," MONDALE noted, "is confronted with some 7,000 to 8,000 different items in the average supermarket and must choose between them on the basis of the packages they are in.

"Too often, these packages and the messages on them are either confusing or downright deceiving; thus there is a real need for laws which will require that packages contain sufficient meaningful information to allow the buyer to make a rational choice between competing products."

Among the devices the bill would prohibit would be phony "cents-off" deals. For example, a package which says "8 cents off," but doesn't say off what.

The bill also would prohibit deceptive illustrations on packages. For example, a picture of a pie full of ripe, red cherries when in fact there isn't a single cherry in the pie inside.

Also prohibited would be packages designed to deceive the consumer as to quantity. For example, the use of a 6-inch piece of cardboard in a package containing a 4-inch candy bar.

The bill also would authorize the standardization of weights and measures under certain conditions so that the housewife would not have to take a calculating machine shopping with her in order to determine whether the best buy is 17 ounces for 30 cents, 22 ounces for 35 cents, or 27 ounces for 40 cents.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
February 3, 1965.

BETTER BUSINESS BUREAU OF ST. PAUL, INC.,
Garrick Building,
St. Paul, Minn.

GENTLEMEN: Several weeks ago I called your office to report what I feel is an irregular procedure in the grocery department of

Target Stores, Inc., 1515 West County Road B. At that time I was told to file a letter of complaint if the incident was repeated.

That week I had purchased a 3-pound can of Folger's regular grind coffee, on which the manufacturer had printed, "15 cents off the regular price." However, the price stamped on the bottom of the can was \$2.29, which is the regular price without discount. The cashier would not allow the 15-cent discount, so I asked for the manager, who said, "We don't take it off."

Again last week I purchased a 3-pound can of Folger's with the same imprint, with approximately the same sequence of events, except that another cashier testily assured me that "Folger's is a more expensive coffee," and the manager stated that \$2.29 marked included the discount.

I bought the coffee, but sent my husband back to the coffee shelf, where other cans of Folger's without the "15-cent off" label were marked \$2.29. I could have pursued this further with the manager and undoubtedly obtained the 15-cent discount. However, I believe a shady practice such as this should be stopped, and the manufacturer made aware that this merchandising is being used for the benefit of the store, not of the buying public.

On both occasions mentioned, I purchased other items with cents off imprints, and in all these cases, the store-stamped amount was legitimately priced. In other words, I believe some coffee is being sold at an excessive profit while cheaper brands are used as leaders.

If you need further details, you may reach me at work during the day at 733-0149, or at home evenings, MI 5-4037.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. RAY URBAN.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
February 12, 1965.

MERCHANDISING MANAGER,
FOLGER COFFEE CO.,
San Francisco, Calif.

SIR: Recently I have been in disagreement with the manager of a local discount supermarket over his refusal to allow the discount of "15 cents off" banded on a 3-pound can of Folger's coffee, which has been selling regularly for \$2.29 at his store. The price is the same, with or without the band. After two attempts to obtain the 15 cents off, I wrote a letter to our local Better Business Bureau, complaining of his procedure.

Better Business sent a copy of the letter to the headquarters of the discount store, and a gentleman called me to explain why the discount is not allowed. He claimed they pay the same case price for the banded coffee as the other, and that a complicated distributor pricing schedule makes it difficult for them to know exactly what to charge for each new order of coffee they receive.

At another supermarket this week, I checked Folger coffee prices. Their 3-pound can price with "15 cents off" band (also not allowed) was \$2.39, or almost 80 cents per pound. However, the 2-pound can without the band was \$1.39, or only 70 cents per pound. It would appear that the "15 cents off" is a signal for increasing rather than decreasing the price, and that on a descending scale we could buy a quarter-pound for a few pennies.

I have also obtained coffee-pricing figures from an independent grocer in this area.

I realize that you do not directly set retail coffee prices, but indirectly you do, by creating confusion and indignation on the part of retailers and consumers with your misleading merchandising and vacillating wholesale prices.

I take issue with this kind of merchandising, which does not benefit the consumer, but is completely false. It is practices such