

June 17, 1969

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 6539

The thrust of my amendment is to make sure that specific programs in the areas of prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation of alcoholics in the poverty sector be initiated and continued. The purpose also is to direct the use of existing program and facilities of OEO in helping impoverished families afflicted by the existence of this disease among its family members.

I submit to you, Mr. President, there is no investment we make that will pay richer dividends in human values and economic resources than the modest investment called for in this amendment to help America's poor families cope with this pernicious disease and its disastrous effect.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1969—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT 44

Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. PELL, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. MONTOLA, Mr. CASE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HART, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. GORE, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. METCALF, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. SPONG, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. INOUE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert B. Krupansky, of Ohio, to be U.S. Attorney for the northern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years, vice Merle M. McCurdy, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, June 24, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency will begin hearings on 1969 housing and urban development legislation on July 15, 1969.

Hearings will be held upon all bills pending before the subcommittee at the time the hearings commence.

All persons wishing to testify should contact Miss Doris I. Thomas, room 5226, New Senate Office Building; telephone 225-6348.

Mr. President, at a later date, and prior to the hearings, I shall submit for the Record a list of the bills to be considered during the hearings.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON MILITARY POLICIES AND PROGRAMS IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will hold a series of hearings beginning June 23 on U.S. Military Policies and Programs in Latin America.

The first witnesses, to be heard June 23 at 10 a.m. in room 4221, New Senate Office Building will be:

Ralph Dungan, former Ambassador to Chile, 1964-67.

Prof. George C. Lodge of the Harvard Business School, former Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs, 1958-62.

David Bronheim, former Deputy U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, 1965-67.

On July 8, the subcommittee will hear from G. Warren Nutter, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, and Charles A. Meyer, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

The purpose of the hearings is to explore the full range and scope of U.S. military activities in Latin America, their political impact in Latin America, and their implications for U.S. foreign policy. The activities in question include not only the military assistance and sales program but also U.S. military missions and service attachés, mobile training teams, other training programs both in the Canal Zone and the United States, military bases and other facilities, ship loans, joint United States-Latin American military exercises, orientation tours of the United States for Latin American military officers, military decorations received by U.S. officers and bestowed on Latin American officers, and, finally, the role of the United States in inter-American military activities, such as regional conferences and meetings, the Inter-American Defense Board, and the Inter-American Defense College.

The breadth of these activities raises a number of questions—

What are the coordination and control procedures of the executive branch?

What is the role of Congress in authorizing and approving?

What is the impact on the image of the United States in Latin America?

What is the relationship, if any, to the increasing number of increasingly authoritarian military governments in Latin America?

What basic U.S. national interest is served by these activities, and what is their cost-benefit ratio?

"FOOD FOR WORK" RAISES NEW HOPE FOR WORLD'S HUNGRY, U.S. FARMERS

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, during recent months the Nation has given

welcome and well-justified attention to the problem of overcoming hunger and malnutrition in the United States. Concurrently, there has arisen a new idea that holds out great promise for helping to overcome hunger throughout the world. This is the food-for-work plan, which was incorporated in the legislation enacted in the past session to extend the life of the Food for Peace Act for 2 more years.

The new food-for-work plan has a most exceptional potentiality. It might enable the United States to export increased quantities of our farm products for famine relief and economic development purposes overseas, while actually reducing our net budget expenditures and improving our balance of payments over what they otherwise would be.

And by increasing total world demand for and consumption of food, it would likewise strengthen farm prices both in the United States and in other countries.

Surely these are possibilities that deserve the most constructive and conscientious attention from our AID and Department of Agriculture officials.

At present, I understand that the Department of Agriculture is exploring how to devise operating procedures and to negotiate agreements with importing countries to put the food-for-work provision into effect. A food-for-work association is being organized by our farm organizations and other interested groups, under the leadership of the National Association of Wheat Growers, to encourage and assist in this effort. As I noted several times last year when the Food for Peace Act extension bill was before the Committee on Agriculture and later as it was being acted upon in the Senate, I consider this a most promising advance and I earnestly hope the administration will put it into effect as expeditiously as possible.

Recently the Farmers Union Herald published an article pointing to the tremendous potentials in India for the new food-for-work plan. The Herald is one of the outstanding farmers' cooperative publications in the northern Midwest, and indeed in the entire country. The article was one of a four-part series written by Robert Handschin, director of research for the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, who with eight other American newsmen recently returned from a 3-week tour of India's agricultural areas.

Mr. Handschin's article quickly comes to grips with the central problem in the developing countries—the need to create jobs and purchasing power for the huge numbers of people who are being added to the labor force both by the swift growth of population and by the displacement of farm laborers out of agriculture by mechanization and advanced technology. He perceives that the food-for-work amendment might resolve this problem, and in the process lead to the day when, as Handschin writes:

There will no longer be hungry, jobless people while our acres stand idle and farm surpluses depress prices here and in many other countries.

Mr. President, the series of articles by Mr. Handschin was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, 1969. I now ask unanimous consent that the an-

June 17, 1969

S 6540

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

nouncement by the National Association of Wheat Growers of its campaign to promote expanded exports of U.S. farm commodities through implementation of the food-for-work amendment and other means, and a memorandum by its president, Mr. E. L. Hatcher, describing the Food for Work Association being formed for that purpose, be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHEATGROWERS SEEK TO BOOSTER BUYING POWER FOR U.S. FOOD IN HUNGER AREAS OF WORLD

The National Association of Wheat Growers has launched a drive to reverse "the present gloomy outlook for farm exports."

E. L. Hatcher, wheat farmer from Lamar, Colo., and president of the national association, announced he is writing to leaders of other farm organizations, farm supply businesses, and processors and exporters of farm commodities this week to ask for their cooperation and support.

"We aim to hitch American food-power to the needs of hungry people by promoting direct action to raise their earning power and their buying power," Hatcher explains.

A memorandum accompanying Hatcher's letter analyzes the slump in farm exports and outlines plans for "a concerted and constructive effort to turn the current trend around."

Hatcher said the "decline in the Food for Peace program that has set in during the past few years" is "a factor of very serious proportions."

"This is an outgrowth of the present United States Government policy of promoting the expansion of agriculture in importing countries to make them 'self-sufficient in food production,'" Hatcher stated.

Hatcher asserted that the "self-sufficiency" policy "must be modified so as to give to American agriculture the larger role in the world economy that its comparative efficiency warrants." He added:

"The principal means by which we propose to advance this goal is to promote trade and food aid policies on the part of the United States which will lead to massive expansion of demand for and consumption of food in the world.

"Our specific object is to promote increased purchasing power among the low-income people in the developing countries who will spend a large share of any increase in their incomes for food. If human need can be transformed into effective demand, all the food that all the world's farmers can produce could be sold—and at remunerative prices."

Hatcher announced that the Wheat Growers Association has retained Robert G. Lewis, a consulting economist in Washington, to plan and direct the campaign.

Lewis was a Vice President of the Commodity Credit Corporation and Administrator in the U.S. Department of Agriculture until 1967, and has been a consultant to the Agency for International Development on food and development policies. He authored a study last year which made the first major criticism of the policy adopted in 1966 of urging self-sufficiency in food production upon developing nations. Lewis originated the "Food for Work amendment" to the Food for Peace law which was enacted by Congress last year with the support of the Wheat Growers and other farm groups.

Hatcher's memorandum termed the Food for Work amendment "particularly effective because it provides for positive measures to expand demand for food in the importing countries." Encouraging implementation of

this amendment will be one of the major goals of the campaign, Hatcher said.

The amendment provides that when U.S. farm commodities are sold under the Food for Peace law to developing countries, the local currencies received in payment by the U.S. Government may in turn be sold at a discount for dollars. Buyers of the currencies must spend them to pay wages in works of public improvement.

According to Lewis' study the U.S. Government would need to realize only a small percentage-return on the market value of commodities sold in this manner in order to reduce its net costs below the alternative of paying farmers to reduce U.S. farm output by an equivalent amount.

BUILDING SALES OPPORTUNITIES FOR U.S. AGRICULTURE IN THE HUNGRY COUNTRIES

(Memorandum from E. L. Hatcher, president, National Association of Wheat Growers)

APRIL 1969.

American farmers and agribusiness industries face a drastic cut-back in their export markets.

We all know of the drop in U.S. agricultural exports that has occurred this year. To some extent this reflects temporary conditions of world supply and demand.

But there is also a long-range factor of very serious proportions. This is the decline in the Food for Peace program that has set in during the past few years. For example, P.L. 480 wheat exports alone may decline this year by more than 100 million bushels below last year. This is an outgrowth of the present United States Government policy of promoting the expansion of agriculture in importing countries to make them "self-sufficient in food production".

Recent official U.S. Government forecasts signify that a major share of the usual "Food for Peace" outlet for American farm products may disappear within the next few years. In March 1968, the Administrator of AID summed up for the first time some of the specific implications for American farm exports of the "self-sufficiency" policy, declaring:

"... Pakistan has an excellent chance of achieving self-sufficiency in food grains in another year. India . . . hopes to achieve self-sufficiency in food grains in another three or four years. She has the capability to do so. Turkey . . . total production this year may be nearly one-third higher than in 1965. The Philippines are clearly about to achieve self-sufficiency in rice . . ."

AID's magazine *War on Hunger* reported later that "The Government of India is predicting that the country will be self-sufficient in food grains by the early 1970's." Undersecretary of State Katzenbach said self-sufficiency might be achieved in India "as early as 1971."

Some countries that formerly imported grain under Food for Peace programs are now becoming exporters of grain as a result of the self-sufficiency campaign. For example, the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported in *Foreign Agriculture* on February 3, 1969:

"For the past two years Iran has switched sides at the world wheat trading counter—becoming a seller rather than a buyer. Exports during 1967 totaled 100 thousand metric tons; during 1968, about 250 thousand."

Other former-importers of grain also are entering the world export market, many as a result of U.S. encouragement and aid. Meanwhile, the surplus of grain-producing capability in the U.S. and other advanced countries already exceeds the total volume of food grains moving in world trade, and is growing.

The recent and apparently continuing decline in P.L. 480 exports is not being replaced by commercial exports. Total U.S. farm ex-

ports have ceased to expand in the past few years, and efforts toward self-sufficiency threaten further inroads upon U.S. farmers' foreign markets in many of the prosperous countries as well as in the poor countries.

This adds up to a most serious outlook. In the case of wheat, for example, exports have been taking far more than the domestic market. In recent years wheat exports have ranged from 144 percent to 168 percent of domestic food use. Exports under Food for Peace programs alone have amounted to more than the total demand for domestic food use in some years.

Exports represent a major market also for many other crops. Moreover, any loss of markets for wheat will result in immediate difficulties for most other crops and for livestock products, if acreage that is now devoted to wheat should become available for production of feed grains.

This outlook is serious also for the suppliers of farm production materials, for the businesses that sell farm commodities and manufacture and export food products, and all other industries that serve agriculture and the food business.

The worst thing about this is that it does not mean the end of—nor even any significant decline in—human hunger in the world. Our own experience in the United States shows that "self-sufficiency"—or even huge surpluses—do not necessarily insure that food will get to those who need it.

The National Association of Wheat Growers is asking you to join in a concerted and constructive effort to turn the current trend of U.S. farm exports around, and onto a steady, sustained, and speedy upward course.

We believe that the present policy of promoting "self-sufficiency in food production" in the developing countries must be modified so as to give to American agriculture the larger role in the world economy that its comparative efficiency warrants.

The principal means by which we propose to advance this goal is to promote trade and food aid policies on the part of the United States which will lead to massive expansion of demand for and consumption of food in the world. Our specific object is to promote increased purchasing power among the low-income people in the developing countries who will spend a large share of any increase in their incomes for food. If human need can be transformed into effective demand, all the food that all the world's farmers can produce could be sold—and at remunerative prices.

We believe the new "Food for Work" amendment to P.L. 480 that was enacted by Congress last year can be particularly effective, because it provides for positive measures to expand demand for food in the importing countries to be linked directly to the importation of added food supplies. Public works projects carried out under this amendment can result in immediate large-scale increases in total consumption of food, while liberalized policies concerning imports of labor-intensive goods into the United States will make it possible for these newly-developed markets for American farm products to be transformed onto a permanent commercial basis.

The National Association of Wheat Growers has retained Robert G. Lewis to plan and direct a campaign of at least one year's duration to advance these purposes. Mr. Lewis is an economic consultant who has extensive experience in government agricultural programs and trade policy. He originated the Food for Work amendment last year, and with the support of our organization, persuaded Congress to enact it. His Food for Work proposal was developed in the course of a study of the Food for Peace program which Mr. Lewis conducted under the sponsorship of several of the Nation's leading farm and commodity or-