By Mr. BURTON of California:
H.R. 11071. A bill for the relief of Cheng Pong Sing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:
H.R. 11072. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Woman's Party, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CONTE:
H.R. 11073. A bill for the relief of Brother Albin Larwa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:
H.R. 11074. A bill for the relief of Alexis E. Lachman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:
H.R. 11075. A bill for the relief of Gdala Wierzbicki and Rosa Wierzbicki; to the Committee on the Judicary.

By Mr. MACKIE:
H.R. 11076. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irma Veres and her son, Tibor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:
H.R. 11077. A bill for the relief of Miss Benigna S. Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:
H.R. 11078. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Di Maggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

270. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Jeanne Struck of Novalo, Calif., and others, relative to seating the congressional delegation from the State of Mississippi, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1965

(Legislative day of Monday, September 13, 1965)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers and our God, whose mercy is like the wideness of the sea, amid all life's changing scenes, make us ever conscious of Thy overshadowing presence. In spite of the hellish gravitation of evil, we thank Thee for the unquenchable impulse toward the high and holy Thou hast planted within us.

Open our eyes, we pray, to see and touch the hem of Thy garment not just on the outer rim of the universe where whirling orbs seem always to chorus, "forever singing as they shine, the hand that made us is divine," but also in the human love which hallows our individual lives and sanctifies our homes and shines in the kindly light which guides our steps.

Gird us, with all our shortcomings to be exemplars of a love which at its best bears witness to Thee and which alone is the balm to burn barriers away and to cure the hurt of the world.

We ask it in the name of that One through whose life there flows Thy love for all mankind. Amen.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1965

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Following the recess, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 9811.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs, and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield me 3 minutes on the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 13, 1965, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 14th semiannual report of the Office of Minerals Exploration, Geological Survey, from the Secretary of the Interior as prescribed by section 5 of the act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its territories, and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 14, 1965.*

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY ASTRONAUTS COOPER AND CONRAD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, I wish to inform the Senate that Astronauts Lt. Col. L. Gordon Cooper and Comdr. Charles Conrad, Jr., and members of their families will visit the Senate at about 4 o'clock this afternoon. It is anticipated that at that time there will be a recess of some duration.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance, the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Special Ad Hoc Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the remainder of my time, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar to the International Atomic Energy Agency only.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged to the time on the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the joint leadership, I request that as many Senators as possible remain in the Chamber, to the end that perhaps the pending bill may be disposed of today. Much will depend upon the attendance of Senators, so I hope that the Senators will take notice accordingly.

Mr. BREWSTER obtained the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield 2 minutes?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator.

AMERICAN FARMER THE BIG LOSER IN PRESENT PROSPERITY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Sylvia Porter is a remarkably clearheaded economic commentator. She has been concerned with economic problems of our cities, of our consumers, and generally of all our people. Rarely if ever has she commented on farm economics.

Recently she analyzed the current prosperity, and in her clearheaded objective manner she found that the biggest winners were the wage earners, that American corporations had also won a huge increase in profits, and that those who own bonds and mortgages had won a sharp hike in interest. Proprietors and small businessmen had lagged behind but had still enjoyed some increase in profits. Professional people had enjoyed a steady and sharp increase.

But the big loser is the American farmer.

Let me quote Miss Porter:

A big loser was, as you might suspect the American farmer. Total farm income was actually down 8 percent in 1964 to $12 billion. The farmer's share of the national income pie today is a scant 2.3 percent, less than one-third what it was in 1948. The total share of the national income that we receive in the form of interest is larger than the farmer's share and the decline in the farmer's position has not yet ended.

Mr. President, as we consider this farm bill and hear some say, as a Senator said on this floor just last Friday, that farmers are riding around in air-conditioned Cadillacs, let us remember the farmer is at the very bottom of the barrel. His income, as Miss Porter says, is one-third as high a proportion of total national income as it was in 1948—just think of that.

He works longer hours than almost anyone else in the economy, makes a big investment, takes a whale of a risk, and receives a pitifully inadequate income. In my State our dairy farmers earn far less than 50 cents for each hour they work, according to the Department of Agriculture, and they are the most efficient dairy producers in the world.

I ask unanimous consent that the Porter article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WAGE EARNERS BIGGEST WINNERS

(By Sylvia Porter)

Which of you got how much of the spectacular $33.3 billion rise in our national income last year? To what extent are you—the individual wage earner, big businessmen, investor—spurting ahead? To what extent are you—the farmer, small businessman—lagging behind?

The biggest chunk of 1964's rise—$22.3 billion—went to U.S. workers in wages and salaries, a new compilation by the Commerce Department discloses. In terms of dollars, you, the wage earner, have been the biggest winner and you're now getting a record 64.8 percent of the national income pie.

The next biggest chunk—$6.4 billion—went to U.S. corporations in the form of profits. In terms of percentages, corporation profits rose the most last year—a full 11 percent. The overall share of the national income pie going to corporations has been declining, though, and is now at 12.5 percent.

FARMER BIG LOSER

The third biggest chunk—$1.6 billion—went in the form of interest to tens of millions of Americans who have savings accounts and who hold Government and corporation bonds. Due to the dramatic rise in the level of interest rates in the past 15 years and the upsurge in the volume of our savings, interest is accounting for an ever-rising total of our national income. The share of the income pie going to interest last year was 3 percent against 0.8 percent in 1948.

Lagging behind on the U.S. income ladder were proprietors—small businessmen and professionals. Their combined slice of the increase in our national income was only $1.3 billion and this was despite the fact that the income of professionals alone has been rising steadily and sharply.

A big loser was, as you might suspect, the American farmer. Total farm income was actually down 8 percent in 1964 to $12 billion. The farmer's share of the national income pie today is a scant 2.3 percent, less than one-third what it was in 1948. The total share of the national income that we receive in the form of interest is larger than the farmer's share and the decline in the farmer's position has not yet ended.

RENT SHARE HOLDS STEADY

The share going to rent—which includes the rental value of owned homes—is holding steady these days. After skyrocketing in the early postwar era it has stabilized at around 3.5 percent of the national income.

A most significant development in recent years is the soaring importance of fringe benefits in the national income picture. As recently as 1948, fringe benefits accounted for only 2.6 percent of the national income. Last year, the share of our income going out in the form of fringe benefits was up to 6.2 percent. With contributions to private and public pensions and welfare funds in a relentlessly steep uptrend, there is no doubt that fringe benefits will continue to account for a rising share.

The following table gives you a long-range perspective on how our income pie has been changing. The year 1929 reflects the division of a generation ago and 1948 was selected as the first normal postwar year:

[In percent]

	1929	1948	1964
Wages and salaries	58.1	60.4	64.8
Fringe benefits	.8	2.6	6.2
Small business and professionals	10.3	10.1	7.6
Farmers	7.1	7.8	2.3
Landlords (rent)	6.3	3.6	3.5
Corporation profits	12.1	14.7	12.5
Net interest	5.4	.8	3.0

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Yesterday I advised the Senate that I would call up amendment No. 441, and it was laid before the Senate. I should like to speak for the next 15 minutes in support of that amendment. I advise the Senate that at the conclusion of my remarks, I shall ask for the yeas and nays on this proposal.

I rise to offer an amendment that would effectively prevent any producer from receiving more than $10,000 annually from our overburdened American taxpayers. My amendment would prohibit the Department of Agriculture from making excessive price support payments and crop loans to any agricultural producer.

I offer this amendment because I firmly believe our agricultural support programs are out of hand. As they are now operated, they are not helping the small family farmer, they are not helping the consumer, and they are not helping the taxpayer. The plain fact is that our present agricultural commodity stabilization program is, in effect, benefiting large farmers at the taxpayer's expense, while the small family farmer is being tossed the remaining crumbs.

I call to the attention of Senators the fact that on the recent wheat referendum in my State of Maryland, the wheat producers, by a margin of 2 or 3 to 1, voted against the 4 wheat program. Our wheat producers are all small farmers.

Let us, for a moment, consider the shocking increased costs of our ineffective price support programs.

The annual cost of stabilization programs has increased 900 percent since 1955. It has been my privilege to serve in Congress since 1958. I have heard program after program brought into these halls by dedicated and sincere Members who assert that their programs would cut the cost of the main program. It has not happened. In 1955, the program I am speaking about cost $260 million. It has now hit an all-time record of $2.6 billion.

I ask: Where will this outrageous burden to the taxpayer end, if we do not place some limits on it now?

My amendment seeks to put the brakes on extravagant Federal spending programs.

While I fully recognize the difficulty of totally eliminating our gigantic price support and crop loan programs overnight, I believe that it is imperative that these ineffective and wasteful programs be reduced to reasonable proportions without delay. The time to start is now.

I am reminded of the brilliant words of a great American now gone:

To start a thousand-mile journey you must take the first step.

This is what I propose.

It is difficult for me to comprehend why the Department or Agriculture keeps coming back to Congress year after year to renew an agricultural program which is a holdover from the depression years of the 1930's.

The problems which existed then and those which exist today are entirely different. It is sheer folly for the "doctors" to continue to give the same medicine. What we need today is an agricultural program suited to the needs of the growing and dynamic economy of modern America.

Our farm subsidy programs only postpone the day on which we shall have to confront our Nation's agricultural problems fairly and squarely.

In the meantime, why should so many farmers have to suffer as the result of unimaginative farm programs?

Why should the taxpayers continue to be saddled with this multibillion-dollar burden? Why should the consumers be forced to pay, in part, artificially high prices?

I have been to the Department of Agriculture to find out who is being paid how much. I was shocked at the lack of available information on the subject. I was unable to find the names of the producers collecting over $10,000 in annual benefits from Uncle Sam.

I obtained this information from the Government accounting agencies. With some difficulty, I then obtained some statistics regarding the number and size of price support loans made by the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, before I discuss these figures, let me remind the Senate that the figures will be only a portion of the billions of dollars we are spending on agriculture today.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table designated "A," obtained from the General Accounting Office on the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

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

TABLE A.—*Price-support loans made on 1964 crops, dollar size distribution (grains excluding corn)*

	Number of loans	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned
BARLEY		*Bushels*	
Under $500	1,753	1,870,951	$1,439,733.14
$500 to $999.99	1,809	1,722,501	1,315,397.56
$1,000 to $1,499.99	1,077	1,722,504	1,321,565.21
$1,500 to $1,999.99	622	1,399,332	1,073,195.05
$2,000 to $2,499.99	382	1,113,196	852,654.74
$2,500 to $2,999.99	258	923,642	708,459.53
$3,000 to $3,999.99	266	1,177,558	919,102.06
$4,000 to $4,999.99	115	658,187	513,300.08
$5,000 to $9,999.99	196	1,639,312	1,283,249.80
$10,000 to $24,999.99	37	631,799	504,065.99
$25,000 to $49,999.99	6	200,589	183,048.81
$50,000 and over	7	1,857,742	1,753,175.76
Total	6,528	14,917,313	11,866,947.73
BEANS, DRY EDIBLE		*Hundredweight*	
Under $500	154	32,625	239,563.71
$500 to $999.99	238	25,231	182,214.04
$1,000 to $1,499.99	235	42,436	291,428.22
$1,500 to $1,999.99	253	63,034	444,134.50
$2,000 to $2,499.99	196	64,273	440,734.54
$2,500 to $2,999.99	177	68,667	479,618.79
$3,000 to $3,999.99	275	137,991	951,737.11
$4,000 to $4,999.99	224	143,394	998,003.83
$5,000 to $9,999.99	345	340,184	2,382,485.25
$10,000 to $24,999.99	93	176,773	1,227,497.88
$25,000 to $49,999.99	3	12,792	92,021.30
$50,000 and over	2	22,317	166,861.96
Total	2,195	1,129,717	7,896,301.13
FLAXSEED		*Bushels*	
Under $500	5,694	1,430,075	4,056,407.04
$500 to $999.99	3,735	965,296	2,733,876.13
$1,000 to $1,499.99	2,229	965,220	2,734,163.25
$1,500 to $1,999.99	1,236	750,483	2,122,804.74
$2,000 to $2,499.99	692	542,696	1,534,519.20
$2,500 to $2,999.99	443	424,343	1,200,501.81
$3,000 to $3,999.99	402	487,976	1,379,216.72
$4,000 to $4,999.99	185	289,838	817,418.47
$5,000 to $9,999.99	160	367,387	1,034,482.74
$10,000 to $24,999.99	19	82,894	236,461.38
$25,000 and over			
Total	14,795	6,306,208	17,849,851.48
GRAIN SORGHUM		*Hundredweight*	
Under $500	3,293	2,199,066	4,038,494.02
$500 to $999.99	3,039	1,248,501	2,268,006.59
$1,000 to $1,499.99	2,488	1,689,707	3,089,853.80
$1,500 to $1,999.99	1,849	1,754,307	3,226,763.71
$2,000 to $2,499.99	1,415	1,713,266	3,174,184.36
$2,500 to $2,999.99	1,181	1,742,300	3,233,306.87
$3,000 to $3,999.99	1,664	3,069,211	5,749,609.06
$4,000 to $4,999.99	1,247	2,968,690	5,572,478.44
$5,000 to $9,999.99	2,749	10,167,469	19,148,923.81
$10,000 to $24,999.99	1,734	13,622,103	25,784,429.87
$25,000 to $49,999.99	283	4,727,058	9,104,973.70
$50,000 and over	42	1,413,765	2,772,576.06
Total	20,984	46,315,383	87,163,600.29

	Number of loans	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned
OATS		*Bushels*	
Under $500	5,664	7,380,289	$4,253,461.54
$500 to $999.99	4,303	5,400,224	3,081,002.07
$1,000 to $1,499.99	2,426	5,190,111	2,952,750.94
$1,500 to $1,999.99	1,375	4,133,175	2,362,620.09
$2,000 to $2,499.99	772	2,980,303	1,708,850.55
$2,500 to $2,999.99	478	2,263,348	1,294,383.09
$3,000 to $3,999.99	546	3,247,262	1,874,101.28
$4,000 to $4,999.99	257	1,968,840	1,140,473.29
$5,000 to $9,999.99	389	4,297,809	2,555,578.38
$10,000 to $24,999.99	100	2,278,122	1,383,156.42
$25,000 to $49,999.99	10	539,163	358,480.80
$50,000 and over	1	953,125	691,015.62
Total	16,321	40,631,771	23,655,874.07
RICE		*Hundredweight*	
Under $500	5	5,977	30,287.29
$500 to $999.99	3	531	2,290.50
$1,000 to $1,499.99	7	1,858	8,465.34
$1,500 to $1,999.99	11	4,336	19,683.89
$2,000 to $2,499.99	10	4,932	22,472.11
$2,500 to $2,999.99	11	6,565	30,495.04
$3,000 to $3,999.99	20	15,428	71,068.56
$4,000 to $4,999.99	30	28,437	136,456.43
$5,000 to $9,999.99	139	217,518	1,056,364.02
$10,000 to $24,999.99	361	1,223,811	6,022,484.28
$25,000 to $49,999.99	241	1,687,572	8,364,854.76
$50,000 and over	108	4,432,061	22,531,968.91
Total	946	7,629,026	38,296,891.13
RYE		*Bushels*	
Under $500	1,563	1,054,417	1,045,094.39
$500 to $999.99	1,130	848,110	833,813.67
$1,000 to $1,499.99	541	674,066	660,004.58
$1,500 to $1,999.99	308	553,035	538,682.67
$2,000 to $2,499.99	197	439,710	436,535.82
$2,500 to $2,999.99	118	319,597	320,888.79
$3,000 to $3,999.99	109	380,404	379,627.11
$4,000 to $4,999.99	61	263,295	265,070.99
$5,000 to $9,999.99	77	491,530	510,120.28
$10,000 to 24,999.99	18	232,644	250,041.77
$25,000 and over			
Total	4,122	5,256,808	5,239,880.07
SOYBEANS			
Under $500	1,186	671,214	1,471,601.05
$500 to $999.99	2,247	804,254	1,762,109.09
$1,000 to $1,499.99	2,732	1,553,394	3,416,661.52
$1,500 to $1,999.99	2,638	2,105,845	4,637,588.47
$2,000 to $2,499.99	2,212	2,245,972	4,960,998.58
$2,500 to $2,999.99	1,412	1,752,075	3,865,472.11
$3,000 to $3,999.99	1,865	2,924,786	6,468,528.99
$4,000 to $4,999.99	1,123	2,256,903	4,997,315.91
$5,000 to $9,999.99	1,470	4,375,542	9,725,026.70
$10,000 to $24,999.99	322	2,064,429	4,620,918.96
$25,000 to $49,999.99	26	374,063	841,217.59
$50,000 and over	27	7,446,089	17,125,956.63
Total	17,260	28,574,566	63,893,395.60

TABLE A.—*Price-support loans made on 1964 crops, dollar size distribution (grains excluding corn)*—Continued

	Number of loans	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned
WHEAT			
Under $500	14,540	11,359,765	$14,868,780.81
$500 to $999.99	13,968	7,963,859	10,429,679.12
$1,000 to $1,499.99	13,276	12,490,904	16,441,073.13
$1,500 to $1,999.99	9,371	12,403,414	16,266,693.24
$2,000 to $2,499.99	7,241	12,480,390	16,256,678.92
$2,500 to $2,999.99	5,837	12,218,530	15,950,054.46
$3,000 to $3,999.99	7,404	19,716,057	25,576,145.63
$4,000 to $4,999.99	4,676	16,219,478	20,892,305.28
WHEAT—continued			
$5,000 to $9,999.99	8,598	45,854,142	$58,375,083.76
$10,000 to $24,999.99	3,076	35,068,758	43,953,736.19
$25,00 to $49,999.99	350	9,233,159	11,565,608.81
$50,000 and over	45	2,571,697	3,253,788.88
Total	88,382	197,580,153	253,829,628.23

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the table shows that seven barley producers received over $50,000 each. Those seven producers received in price support loans more than the 1,753 small farmers, who received less than $500 each. Only 50 out of a total of more than 6,500 barley producers received price support loans exceeding $10,000.

With respect to grain sorghum, $25.7 million was loaned in amounts ranging from $10,000 to $25,000 each. This represents the largest sum loaned to any category of grain sorghum producers.

It came as a considerable shock to me to learn that one-ninth of the loans made to rice producers—this is the total number of loans—accounted for nearly two-thirds of the total of $38 million loaned in 1964.

Soybeans are another crop which requires close scrutiny. In 1964, 375 price support loans were made to the tune of $10,000 or more. These large loans amounted to an additional $22.5 million. One lone producer, the Arkansas Grain Corp.—a business company, and not a small farmer—was loaned for soybeans, last year, $16,300,000 under the price support program.

I have a second table which lists who got how much, from what, from Uncle Sam, and from the taxpayer.

Briefly, I should like to introduce the table as follows:

The attached lists include not only those producers who received individual loans of $25,000 or more on one commodity, but it is possible that other producers received $25,000 or more from CCC loans by obtaining several loans on the same or different commodities, each for less than $25,000 a year.

It is also possible that the producers named on the attached lists obtained additional amounts on the loans for less than $25,000. The CCC carries out its loan operations on a decentralized basis at many locations throughout the country, and maintains all records on a commodity basis. Therefore, preparation of lists showing the total amounts received from CCC loans by producers who obtain more than one loan would not be administratively feasible.

I take exception to that statement from the Department of Agriculture, but I hold in my hand table B, the lists on the various programs showing the loans, all in excess of $25,000 on many different commodities, and I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*

(NOTE.—The lists below include only those producers who received individual loans of $25,000 or more on one commodity. It is possible that other producers received $25,000 or more from CCC loans by obtaining several loans on the same or different commodities, each for less than $25,000. It is also possible that the producers named on the attached lists obtained additional amounts on other loans, each for less than $25,000. CCC carries out its loan operations on a decentralized basis at many locations throughout the country and maintains all records on a commodity basis; therefore, preparation of lists showing the total amount received from CCC loans by a producer who obtained more than one loan would not be administratively feasible.)

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
BARLEY			
Arizona:	*Bushels*		
Youngker Farms Co., Buckeye	218,205	$200,748.60	$200,748.60
Gila River Ranches, Inc., Gila Bend	71,530	65,807.60	65,807.60
Enterprise Ranch, Inc., and Arizona Land & Cattle Co., Buckeye	30,057	27,652.44	27,652.44
California:			
Westlake Farms, Stratford	971,333	937,336.20	937,336.20
Five Points Ranch, Inc., Five Points	296,374	284,519.04	284,519.04
E. L. Wallace, Woodland	58,258	56,801.62	56,801.62
J. H. Austin, Fresno	26,257	25,731.86	25,731.86
Idaho:			
Robert W. Hubbard, Soda Springs	59,750	50,280.41	50,280.41
W. S. Shufeldt & Sons, Soda Springs	56,741	47,946.31	47,946.31
Gaylen Christensen, Tremonton, Utah	36,180	30,753.00	9,238.39
Minnesota: Keith Driscoll and Raymond Driscoll, East Grand Forks	31,590	25,272.00	16,128.00
Oregon: Tulana Farms, Klamath Falls	182,292	157,682.29	157,682.29
Washington: S. T. S. Farms, Inc., Prescott	19,764	25,693.20	25,693.20
BEANS, DRY EDIBLE	(*Hundredweight*)		
California: Gnesa Bros., Patterson	6,324	52,671.94	52,671.94
Idaho: William Hepworth and Jack Duncan, Rupert	5,300	38,531.00	7,270.00
Michigan:			
Michigan Cooperative Bean Marketing Association, Lansing	15,993	114,190.02	34,272.00
Mable Graham, Breckenridge	3,985	28,451.11	
Frank Kulhanek, St. Charles	3,507	25,039.19	
GRAIN SORGHUM			
Arizona:			
Jack Robison & Sons, Willcox	49,903	98,308.91	
Kinard & Greer, Willcox	33,702	78,820.18	
Floyd H. Robbs, Willcox	25,561	62,075.56	1,634.41
Gilmore & Riggs, Willcox	12,436	30,468.43	1,057.07
Kansas			
Glen C. Gaskill, Moscow	16,718	29,256.01	
J. David Sullivan, Ulysses	15,886	26,052.87	2 6,052.87
J. R. Kapp, Moscow	14,473	25,327.22	

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
GRAIN SORGHUM—continued	*Hundredweight*		
Nebraska			
F. Lucile Hammond and Tad D. Hammond, Nebraska City	31,683	$58,296.72	
Guy J. Barr, York	22,176	39,473.28	
A. L. Rosener & Sons, Daykin	20,868	37,979.76	
Dale Lovegrove, Geneva	20,966	37,948.46	
Wayne Lyon, Merna	22,261	37,621.09	
Kreutz Bros., Inc., Giltner	18,850	33,176.00	
Frank Higgins, Schuyler	18,954	32,411.56	
Sheridan Bros., Sutton	17,735	31,745.65	
Robert D. Lovegrove, Fairmont	17,136	31,022.16	$6.00
Forrest Binder, Table Rock	16,330	30,047.20	
Lamonte Sahling, Kenesaw	17,136	29,816.64	29,816.64
John E. Halloran, Hastings	16,378	29,152.84	
John Kroger, Jr., Rosalie	15,271	27,335.09	
Shurigar Bros., Inc., and Shurigar Farms, Inc., Kenesaw	14,816	26,372.48	
Marion Johnson, Loomis	16,127	26,341.36	26,341.36
Fred Schwindt, Jr., Clay Center	14,144	25,317.76	
New Mexico:			
Delbert Holloway, Clovis	25,892	49,052.07	
Jewel Castor, Clovis	22,152	42,753.17	
Texas:			
Tyline N. Perry, Kress	67,422	135,814.15	
Charles Heck, Jr., Nazareth	53,730	107,104.75	
J. Meredith Tatton, Refugio	46,111	96,832.90	
Lloyd M. Bentsen, Mission	41,625	90,040.91	
J. C. Mills, Abernathy	37,568	82,929.81	
Taft McGee, Hereford	44,853	78,044.31	
Carl Easterwood, Dimmitt	43,663	75,973.44	75,973.44
T. A. and K. G. McKamey, Taft	35,456	75,813.17	
Warner Reid, Tulia	41,375	72,669.11	
Miller Farms Co., Tulia	38,858	67,612.55	
John A. Raymond Smith, Hereford	30,770	65,034.05	
Martin & Marion, Hereford	33,120	63,965.65	
G. L. Willis, Dimmitt	31,378	63,294.95	
Simmonds & Perry, Robstown	29,493	62,230.86	
W. J. Giles, Dimmitt	29,956	60,991.90	
Don Williams, Farwell	34,853	60,644.92	
Stiles Farm Foundation, Thrall	26,602	60,531.34	

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
GRAIN SORGHUM—continued	*Hundredweight*		
Texas—Continued			
Miller Farms, Fort Worth	29,589	$60,480.56	
Corliss H. Currie, Happy	28,262	58,552.82	
S. A. McCathern, Hereford	33,504	58,297.13	$28,910.10
Nelson D. Durst, Eleanor Chance Couch, and Patience Chance Thomason, trustees under the wills of George G. Chance, deceased, and Georgia Chance, deceased, Bryan	28,839	58,254.78	
O. A. and C. E. Webb, and Charles Saigling, Abernathy	33,451	58,205.43	
J. L. Massey, Robstown	27,556	58,142.67	
Gerald McCathern, Hereford	32,340	58,094.90	
Autry & Baldridge, partnership, Dimmitt	28,690	55,945.89	
Ware Farms Co., Dimmitt	30,435	55,375.37	
John H. Goodwin, Sunray	31,740	55,227.25	
J. C. Mills, Abernathy	25,056	54,883.26	
Elmo Stevens, O'Brien	31,394	54,625.71	
John Trimmier, Jr., Hale Center	31,249	54,373.97	
J. D. Kirkpatrick, Bovina	30,580	54,232.34	
L. G. Mahagan, Kress	28,920	52,620.89	
David Nelson, Hart	30,075	52,330.50	
Mrs. Anna Blake Head, Ind. executrix, estate of Rand Morgan, deceased, Clarkwood	23,731	51,733.19	
Hosea Foster, Canyon	26,128	51,730.76	
Aubrey Harper, Robstown	24,380	51,440.93	
George E. Bennett, Hart	24,396	50,662.54	
Tom Miller, Dimmitt	25,767	50,335.03	
Floyd Webb and Smith Webb Burruss, Mathis	22,254	49,848.82	
Frank Wise, Dimmitt	22,717	49,522.86	
Jack Miller, Dimmitt	25,739	49,402.44	
Amko Farming, Inc., Corpus Christi	22,458	48,958.75	
C. B. Brittain, Sinton	23,027	48,586.33	
Aubrey Harper, Jr., Robstown Mrs. Ollie Knight Jackson, Corpus Christie	22,808	48,125.24	
Monroe Bros., Sunray	27,633	48,081.54	
Tommy Stanton, Dimmitt	22,296	48,013.36	
L. T. Wood, South Plains	26,121	47,721.82	
R. J. Cluck, Dimmitt	24,308	47,457.23	
Raymond Blodgett, White Deer	23,449	47,133.19	
F. J. Mears, Jr., Dimmitt	22,302	47,012.02	
Roy Montague, Silverton	26,646	46,364.03	
Harvey Brock, Hereford	25,239	45,934.17	
Marble Bros. and Paul Kropp, South Plains	23,109	45,647.74	
Brorman Bros., Hereford	21,115	45,400.78	
Wade E. Clark, Kress	23,454	45,265.63	
W. W. Walton, Corpus Christi	20,430	44,458.29	
L. D. Griffin, Silverton	23,966	44,216.53	
Allan Webb, Dimmitt	22,532	43,487.14	
C. H. Mayo, Taft	20,461	43,173.35	
J. M. Dellinger, Jr., Alice	20,373	42,927.01	
Bennett Bros., Pearsall	19,756	42,865.52	
B. L. Moore, Dimmitt	20,067	42,668.28	
W. H. Gentry, Hereford	24,135	41,995.25	
Una C. Dowd, Chapman Ranch	19,244	41,951.98	
J. H. Burkett, Sunray	23,998	41,756.45	
Travis Dyer, Bovina	22,151	41,564.82	
Glenn Merritt, Hart	19,172	41,356.11	
Don Dimball, Wildorado	21,227	40,967.41	
Fred Dunn, Dimmitt	20,259	40,914.17	
John Cole, Waka	23,420	40,750.80	
Dan Heard, Dimmitt	18,718	40,640.21	
Palo Alto Farms, Bishop	18,956	40,636.93	
Tide Products, Inc., Edinburg	18,511	39,880.29	
Merrill Dryden, Sunray	18,818	39,767.89	
Dulaney Bros., Dimmitt	20,109	39,763.79	
J. H. Kirby & Sons, Hale Center	20,383	39,338.82	
H. N. Keisling, Sunray	22,393	38,964.64	
Roy M. Lamb, Amarillo	21,443	38,919.27	
Harlan L. Barber, Hereford	19,745	38,503.04	
Ralph W. Shelton, Friona	22,118	38,485.32	
Epperson & Downing, Inc., Hereford	19,726	38,465.67	
Lloyd Glenn, Tulia	21,585	38,007.55	
Ocker Bros., Corpus Christi	17,388	37,905.84	
John Renner, Friona	21,705	37,766.70	
Joseph F. Green Heirs, Taft	17,882	37,730.98	
Lester Cole, Friona	21,660	37,689.10	
Berta Cunningham Estate, Chapman Ranch	17,268	37,644.58	
Meyer Bros., Wildorado	19,463	37,563.58	
James Fangman, Hereford	17,695	37,474.07	
V. H. Kellison, Lockney	18,523	37,230.44	
Ivan Block, Hereford	18,648	37,109.52	
J. C. Mills, Abernathy	16,976	37,007.03	
Calvin Petty, Dimmitt	16,958	36,968.43	
Donald J. Meyer, Hereford	21,199	36,886.73	
Bill Bourlon, Farwell	19,178	36,576.34	
Houston Lust, Dimmitt	16,744	36,501.93	
Roy Strasburger, Temple	16,119	36,490.57	
Clinton Glenn, Canyon	20,882	36,454.49	
Jackson & Hoepfner & Driscoll Foundation, Corpus Christi	16,764	36,416.36	
Wilbur Wilson, Plainview	17,383	36,330.47	
Tom Priestly, Corpus Christi Charles and Mabel Elliff, Agua Dulce	17,085	36,049.63	
Higgins & London, Hereford	20,712	36,039.23	
Jack R. C. Vincent, Amarillo	19,000	35,881.24	
Adkins & Son, Amarillo	18,660	35,828.04	
Jim Sam Howze, Robstown	17,024	35,792.99	

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
GRAIN SORGHUM—continued	*Hundredweight*		
Texas—Continued			
H. L. Wilson, Refugio	17,171	$35,724.07	$30,360.68
E. D. Chitwood, Jr., Muleshoe	17,968	35,641.10	13,958.77
Marble Bros., South Plains	17,985	35,583.99	
Gordon Taylor, Sunray	16,906	35,512.08	
Lyons Bros., Hereford	18,348	35,499.83	
Charles Norfleet, Hale Center	18,231	35,186.60	
T. L. Abernathy, Jr., Tulia	16,808	35,004.56	
Don Motheral, Kress	20,117	35,004.45	
Clayton Bros., Springlake	20,115	35,000.10	
John Range, Farwell	17,991	34,903.31	
T. C. Garner, White Deer	17,000	34,849.99	
Bob Anthony, Dimmitt	15,818	34,483.46	
R. D. and Billy McClellan, Sunray	19,791	34,436.69	34,436.69
Robert E. Hooper, Plainview	17,739	34,414.82	
Oscar Mayfield & Sons, Taft	16,291	34,373.50	
Harvey and W. A. Spurlock, Sunray	19,717	34,308.34	
Chester Clark, Hereford	19,627	34,151.75	
Jack Smith, Lazbuddie	16,924	34,101.83	
H. H. Parker, Hart	17,984	34,050.00	
D. C. Dilley, Borger	19,517	33,960.42	
Calvan Robertson, Plainview	18,051	33,950.63	
Akin & Tunnel, Plainview	19,489	33,910.16	
Morgan Sturgess, Tulia Mildred Lowman, Bishop G. A. Parr, Alice	19,459 16,019	33,858.20 33,799.20	
Wallace Corse, Sunray	19,299	33,580.66	
W. G. Sanderson, Dimmitt	15,388	33,544.93	
Billy John Thorn, Friona	19,250	33,495.00	
Bill Brown, Lazbuddie	19,250	33,495.00	
Gordon H. Branham, Plainview	19,211	33,426.33	
Dalton Caffey, Friona	19,000	33,060.00	
C. B. Womble and R. R. Strain, Hereford	18,977	33,020.71	9,952.80
Rayphard Smithson, Dimmitt	15,135	32,993.64	
L. D. Ballard and Howard Hurt, Plainview	17,814	32,870.62	
Buford Carter, Vega	15,000	32,549.69	
Garner Bros., Bovina	18,661	32,469.44	
J. T. Holcomb and W. E. Uselton, Springlake	14,870	32,417.48	
James Cannon, Lockney	18,563	32,300.31	
S. A. Fangman, Hereford	18,535	32,250.81	
Jack Middleton, Tulia	16,868	32,196.97	
Jack Robertson, Plainview	18,471	32,140.33	
R. R. Rule, Friona	16,649	32,046.54	
Roy Browder, Sunray	18,404	32,022.41	
L. M. Britten, Groom	15,239	32,020.67	
O. D. Jackson, Vega	14,738	31,891.73	
C. Ralph Blodgett, Spearman	15,247	31,866.02	
W. M. Sherley, Lazbuddie	18,295	31,833.30	
A. L. Hartzog, Farwell	18,124	31,536.11	
Wallace Cannon, Plainview	14,652	31,500.94	
Leroy Robison, Sunray	18,006	31,330.44	
W. E. Burnett and Neal Burnett, Plainview	17,980	31,285.72	
Dennis L. Allison, Happy	14,281	31,275.39	
Andrew Price, Kress	17,010	31,060.60	
H. C. Davis, Hart	15,339	30,991.80	
Taylor and Fortenberry, Lockney	17,787	30,950.06	
H. W. Sisemore and J. W. Treadwell, Hale Center	15,366	30,885.27	
Jimmy Cluck, Hart	17,649	30,709.78	
Silvas Bros. and Alex Boyd, Port Lavaca	14,011	30,603.10	
Robert Huseman, Nazareth	14,988	30,557.88	
Edwin Adams, Plainview	15,796	30,443.46	
J. E. McCathern, Jr., Hereford	16,795	30,406.07	
Joe P. Hart, Hart	15,702	30,305.62	
Jim Bob Curry, Hale Center	16,363	30,224.64	12,768.00
Herbert Friemel & Sons, Hereford	13,955	30,003.26	
Luther Browder, Sunray	17,240	29,997.72	
Jack George, Hart	17,226	29,973.46	
O. V. Wilson, Kress	17,208	29,941.75	
B. R. Bennett, Hart	14,158	29,872.87	
J. M. Kendrick, Nazareth	15,383	29,843.20	
Dryden Farms, Robstown	14,526	29,788.90	
Wright Bros., Robstown	14,114	29,781.18	5,727.18
Don Sudderth, Bovina	17,057	29,678.48	
M. N. Smith, Tulia	15,287	29,657.56	
Richard Lupton, Nazareth	15,543	29,615.04	
Gilbert Wenner, Friona	16,943	29,480.48	
Alton Morris, Muleshoe	13,992	29,459.24	
Victor Harman, Happy	16,930	29,457.67	29,457.67
W. C. McDaniel, Sinton	13,932	29,396.67	
Brooks & Brooks, Hart	15,125	29,342.49	
R. W. Barton, Kress	16,862	29,340.23	
Melvin Jennings and O. Sheppard Thomas, Tulia	14,787	29,339.38	
Phillip Haberer, Earth	13,910	29,329.12	
L. A. Lance & Sons, Bovina	16,705	29,066.70	
T. G. and R. L. Jackson, Austwell	13,814	29,008.99	
Fred Bruegel, Jr., Dimmitt	16,669	29,003.37	
J. S. Hays, Tulia	14,128	28,902.65	
R. W. Shelton, Friona	16,596	28,877.57	
Walter E. Stone, Robstown	13,622	28,741.66	
Ray Groce, Petersburg	13,179	28,729.36	
Robert W. Kinkaid, Plainview	14,844	28,648.15	
Lee Renner, Friona	16,413	28,557.92	
Max Rarick, Bushland	14,799	28,413.90	
Dick Geries, Farwell	15,693	28,389.30	
Mike Allen, Friona	14,059	28,328.06	
Daniel P. Moore, Portland	13,417	28,309.12	
Horne Bros., Plainview	16,255	28,283.79	

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
GRAIN SORGHUM—continued	*Hundredweight*		
Texas—Continued			
S. R. Hutto, Hart	13,078	$28,232.44	
G. O. King, Plainview	13,960	28,129.90	
Walter Mattiza, Robstown	13,525	28,128.78	
J. F. Whitsett, Tulia	14,249	28,096.19	
P. P. Stubblefield, Kress	14,408	28,095.43	
Dehnisch Bros., Mathis	13,304	28,072.33	
Earl Hillman, Kress	15,346	28,036.13	
A. T. Frye and Steve Barousett, Dawn	16,072	27,964.55	
Walterschied Bros., Hereford	16,070	27,962.03	
Ernest Sluder, Bushland	14,525	27,887.54	
M. A. Snyder, Jr., Farwell	14,429	27,848.75	
Milburn Haydon, Hart	16,000	27,840.00	
Alban Farms, Hereford	15,984	27,812.51	
C. C. Ellis, Hereford	15,984	27,811.81	
Iris Touchstone, Dimmitt	13,938	27,693.47	
Odell Jennings, Tulia	14,137	27,666.64	
A. E. Lewellen, Plainview	15,895	27,657.53	
Vernon Garrison, Silverton	14,199	27,609.18	
R. K. Brooks, Tulia	15,836	27,554.22	
Paul Kropp and Mae Bryant, Lockney	14,169	27,538.25	
J. W. Setliff, Robstown	13,037	27,508.54	
J. M. Wright, Dimmitt	15,806	27,502.44	$19,517.58
J. F. Clark, Nazareth	14,156	27,406.48	
Melvin Barton, Hereford	14,362	27,363.50	
C. R. Kay, Plainview	14,103	27,336.35	
Howard Sharp, Tulia	12,682	27,266.75	
Deta Blodgett, Spearman	13,011	27,193.20	
C. N. Cooke, Corpus Christi	12,473	27,190.61	
W. H. Long, Friona	15,625	27,186.92	
J. M. Young, Dimmitt	12,877	27,183.76	
Jack W. White, Summerfield	14,120	27,110.39	
Bob Kay, Dimmitt	12,428	27,093.92	
James D. Doan, Tulia	13,016	27,085.58	
Walter Taack, Lockney	14,318	27,014.02	
Harold Ray Caraway, Tulia	13,472	26,977.40	
J. W. Taylor Estate, Lockney	15,466	26,909.97	
A. L. Hollingsworth, Hereford	15,464	26,906.66	
O. W. Machen, Banguete	12,740	26,882.25	
Ray Copeland & Son, Olton	13,903	26,832.42	
Dennis Kotara, Panhandle	13,237	26,831.87	
Mrs. Mary A. Sanders, Corpus Christi Mrs. Gertrude Luby, Corpus Christi	12,307	26,829.39	
John A. Williams, Canyon	13,538	26,827.07	
Charles H. Friemel, Canyon	14,914	26,790.93	
George Heard, Hereford	12,286	26,783.49	
A. J. Givens, Plainview	13,507	26,743.07	
Carl Pate, Kress	15,361	26,728.49	
T. G. McKinney, Dimmitt	12,235	26,671.23	
E. M. Gossett, Jr., Dumas	15,859	26,600.84	26,600.84
Everett Wiseman, Vega	15,991	26,545.06	26,545.06
Roman Friemel, Hereford	12,219	26,515.23	
W. D. Howard, Jr., Farwell	15,210	26,465.40	
Lorenza Lee, Hart	13,785	26,426.46	
Fred Mercer, Silverton	15,180	26,413.90	
Virgil Marsh, Hereford	15,172	26,399.72	
Jimmy McLaughlin and Pete McLaughlin, Plainview	12,102	26,382.35	
Robert E. and Eugene O. Heath, Hale Center	13,107	26,345.46	
Doyle Davis, Hart	13,612	26,310.97	
Alice B. Simmonds estate and L. S. T. Farms, Robstown	12,442	26,251.96	
Mercer T. Ivey, Taft	12,437	26,241.03	
J. E. Howard, Plainview	15,077	26,233.63	
Harvey Milner, Tulia	15,075	26,229.74	18,381.14
John C. Carter, Plainview	13,485	26,161.28	
H. D. Moore and Vinita McClain, Wildorado	15,027	26,147.61	
Forrest Vise, Happy	12,788	26,086.21	
Lewis Sharp, Tulia	14,550	26,064.18	
Roma Boggs, Kress	13,553	26,022.35	
Felix Mote, Tulia	12,984	26,007.05	
Kenneth Heard, Littlefield	11,922	25,990.18	
Donal Akin, Floydada	12,638	25,974.64	
A. C. Glenn, Kress	13,441	25,940.95	
Young Bros. and R. E. Young, Floydada	13,290	25,914.73	
Melvin May, Hereford	14,859	25,854.97	25,854.97
George Heck, Tulia	13,175	25,847.07	
Bob Hammonds, Farwell	14,847	25,833.43	
Clyde Bradford, Happy	12,177	25,808.63	
Nelson Burton, Sunray	14,820	25,786.88	
Claude Higley, Stinnett	12,211	25,764.64	
Edgar Rathkamp, Tivoli	12,268	25,762.80	
C. F. Harris, Plainview	13,378	25,724.87	
Sam Rundell, Farwell	13,595	25,722.76	
Floyd Tomlinson, Canyon	14,769	25,697.36	
Ralph Britten, Groom	12,596	25,646.36	7,113.27
Jerry Young, Plainview	12,921	25,615.68	
Jack Jackson, Abernathy	12,148	25,534.18	
Everett Heller, Kress	11,634	25,496.45	
Roy Roberts, Olton	12,869	25,477.59	
Leo Szydloski, Happy	11,628	25,466.20	
Paul Schniederjan, Bushland	13,217	25,376.56	
A. T. Kleman, Dimmitt	12,538	25,367.27	
Mrs. Jessie Herring, Johnson Estate, Vernon	14,554	25,324.48	
John A. Abbott, Harlingen	12,919	25,321.44	25,321.44
Ted Richardson, Hereford	14,552	25,319.78	
Homer Bartram & O. C. Harris, Lockney	11,313	25,228.88	
E. L. Howard, Friona	13,100	25,209.65	
Bobby McCormick & Paul Cooper, Lockney	13,103	25,158.33	
Wayne Foster, Farwell	12,479	25,144.56	
GRAIN SORGHUM—continued	*Hundredweight*		
Texas—Continued			
Carl Bruegel, Dimmitt	14,477	$25,138.48	
Melvin Brock, Lockney	12,807	25,102.29	
F. L. Eicke, Hereford	11,532	25,025.30	
Paul Toliver, Plainview	11,963	25,001.84	
OATS	*Bushels*		
Georgia: C. T. Kersey, Sr., Elko	45,900	34,884.00	$34,884.00
Idaho: Robert Myers, Bonners Ferry	62,100	39,744.00	
Mississippi: Loyce Makamson, Sidon	69,636	47,842.76	27,655.38
North Dakota: Ballantyne Bros., West Hope	57,150	29,718.00	
Oregon:			
Tulana Farms, Klamath Falls	953,125	691,015.62	555,078.13
Murel A. Long, Merrill	61,875	43,312.50	393.75
South Carolina:			
Kirkland & Best, Ulmers	51,030	37,432.80	18,262.80
W. R. Mayes, Mayesville	44,959	34,168.84	34,168.84
J. C. Oswald, Allendale	39,478	29,791.95	29,791.95
South Dakota:			
Elkhorn, Martin	57,600	33,408.00	
J. E. Cheek Estate, Pierre	49,435	28,177.95	28,177.95
RICE			
Arkansas:			
Arkansas Rice Growers Cooperative Association, Stuttgart	1,975,974	10,192,868.95	10,192,868.95
Producers Rice Mill, Inc., Stuttgart	729,000	3,717,900.00	3,717,900.00
McAlister Seed Service Co., Walnut Ridge	29,676	146,163.14	146,163.14
Alice Sidney Farms, Lake Village	26,142	135,440.55	135,440.55
W. B. Bynum, Dermott	26,928	129,505.56	129,505.56
Lee Wilson & Co., Wilson	23,007	110,560.13	110,560.13
Charles J. Peacock, Jr., McCrory	16,793	89,832.61	83,810.99
James E. McDaniel, Jonesboro W. C. Bradley, Walnut Ridge	17,817	86,621.09	86,621.09
Kehi Plantation, Marion	16,042	81,631.71	
F. K. Bradshaw & Son, Hamburg	14,700	77,929.98	77,929.98
W. A. Baker, George Birmingham, and Aubrey E. Birmingham, Grady	12,422	68,227.86	
W. H. Hanna, Montrose	12,895	67,377.46	67,377.46
Charles H. Smith and Charles Bullock, Boydell	12,958	66,557.45	66,557.45
James E. McDaniel, Jonesboro	11,432	61,564.45	60,759.45
Tucker Blankenship, Corning	12,592	60,854.50	60,854.50
R. D. Williams, Jr., Diaz	12,633	57,879.95	57,879.95
David N. and James D. Ford, Sherrill	10,570	57,872.64	57,872.64
Taggart & Taggart, Inc., Augusta	10,470	56,474.64	56,474.64
Hildebrand Farms, Inc., Stuttgart Raymond Hildebrand, Moscow	11,051	55,288.12	55,288.12
Doyle & Wilmans, Diaz	12,186	53,876.35	53,876.35
Elmer Ferguson, DeWitt	10,526	53,487.70	53,487.70
Leon J. Garot, DeWitt	10,671	52,604.25	52,604.25
Robert P. Lewis and Carl Price, England	10,225	50,305.77	
C. E. Newman, Fair Oaks	9,921	48,323.36	32,743.55
Powell Bros., Eudora	9,178	48,161.44	48,161.44
Pinchback Planting Co., Grady	8,856	44,645.40	44,645.40
Lester Fetzer, Hickory Ridge	8,297	43,295.45	43,295.45
R. C. Gilbrech, Holly Grove	8,740	43,021.50	43,021.50
Lawrence Digman and Hines Digman, Walnut Ridge	7,652	42,561.74	42,561.74
Lovett Farms, Grady	8,185	42,065.99	28,589.75
J. T. Carothers, Lake Village	7,868	41,543.04	41,543.04
John Schenk, Monticello	8,260	41,064.77	41,064.77
E. R. Coleman, Dowdy	8,145	40,684.95	40,684.95
J. P. Duncan, Dermott W. R. Smith, Lake Village E. F. Smith & Sons, Readland	7,983	40,665.35	7,938.00
Ralph Wimpy, Harrisburg	8,295	40,277.51	40,277.51
Truman Loftis, Bob Carllee, and Louis Carllee, England	8,819	40,213.63	
Nehon Hagler, Cherry Valley	7,841	40,000.07	40,000.07
A. L. Marsh, Ruth Marsh, and Kathleen M. Barber, McCrory	8,403	38,396.97	38,396.97
Tommy Hillman, Stuttgart Southern Rice Farms, Carlisle	7,160	38,023.30	38,023.30
Ralph R. Watkins, Stuttgart Geeridge Farm, Inc., Stuttgart Big Ditch Irrigation Co., Stuttgart	6,729	37,844.04	37,844.04
Robert Johnson, Cash	6,859	37,667.20	35,810.10
H. B. Chambliss, Pine Bluff	6,894	37,046.70	
Chester Rutledge, Leon Rutledge, and C. S. Castleberry, Newport	7,737	36,209.16	36,209.16
Clinton and Harold Anderson, Sherrill	6,716	35,766.27	
B. O. Geunther, Sherrill	6,716	35,766.22	
McAlister Seed Service Co. and Clifford Micklish, Cash	6,281	34,929.29	34,929.29
Raymond Barrett, Jonesboro	6,802	32,873.18	32,873.18
Guy M. Beene, Wynne	6,718	32,649.48	32,649.48
Ray Weaver, Cash	5,750	32,568.10	32,568.10
Noble Lake Planting Co., M. D. Morgan, and M. N. Rush, Pine Bluff	6,446	32,399.49	3,916.60
Erskine Harriman and Harry Lauhon, Hamburg	5,994	31,807.89	31,807.89
Sam Abowitz & Son, Arkansas City	6,723	31,655.61	31,655.61
David Knoll, Stuttgart Ray and Don Daugherty, Stuttgart	6,075	30,946.05	30,946.05
R. G. Holden Land Co. and John L. Conner, Newport	6,388	30,941.50	30,941.50
R. A. Greer, Weldon	7,038	30,753.00	30,753.00
Otmar Hageman and Joe Freeman, Gould	5,629	30,446.43	30,446.43
Mary O. McGregor, Sherrill Paul Young, Sherrill	5,521	30,035.87	
Leland Jones, Alicia	5,265	29,694.60	29,694.60

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
RICE—continued			
Arkansas—Continued	*Bushels*		
Eldon Simmons, Harvey Simmons, and Rudy Jones, Minturn	6,073	$29,447.99	$29,447.99
Paul Gaines, I. N. Arnof, and G. L. Morris, McCrory	6,276	28,430.28	28,430.28
H. S. Bramlett, McCrory	6,109	27,694.39	14,102.07
Burns Bros., Palestine	4,770	27,027.90	27,027.90
R. B. Oliver, Stuttgart	5,221	26,874.81	26,874.81
Albert Bullard, Minturn; Earl Simms, Hoxie	5,702	26,713.84	26,713.84
Keiser Supply Co., Keiser	5,527	26,495.77	26,495.77
David Knoll, Stuttgart	5,062	26,477.87	26,477.87
Ralph and Anna Wood, Cherry Valley	4,860	25,952.40	25,952.40
Lamar and Willie L. Miles, Monticello	4,859	25,825.53	25,825.53
Robert Johnson and Joy Ledbetter, Jonesboro	4,657	25,816.02	25,816.02
J. C. Emenhiser, Eudora	5,670	25,636.50	25,636.50
E. W. Hahn, Hazen; Raymond Hahn, Stuttgart	4,737	25,554.01	25,554.01
Ethan Dodd, Minturn	5,262	25,546.54	25,546.54
California:			
Thomas Mezger, Woodland	9,983	43,925.20	43,925.20
Louisiana:			
Mayo Romero, New Iberia	25,380	114,509.70	114,509.70
Zaunbrecher Bros., Jones	16,799	80,654.19	45,933.54
W. P. Tomlinson, Lake Providence	15,307	76,433.63	76,433.63
Rheinoldt J. Leonards, Lake Charles; Open Al Ranch, Inc., Lake Charles	14,027	64,799.55	64,799.55
Brady Oswalt, Lake Providence	12,028	62,034.56	62,034.56
James B. Lingo, Oak Grove	10,934	56,934.30	56,934.30
Larry Guidry, Oberlin	11,916	52,978.21	52,978.21
Byron L. Rye, Pioneer	10,170	50,737.14	50,737.14
Arthur Loewer, Branch	8,298	38,813.33	38,813.33
Orin Andrepont, Kinder	7,971	36,532.49	36,532.49
Ashton S. Petitjean, Rayne	7,944	35,459.38	35,459.38
Eve Fontenot, Oberlin	7,364	33,442.87	33,442.87
Weston Monceaux, Oberlin	6,412	31,781.17	31,781.17
Clarence LaPoint, Reeves	6,531	29,648.32	29,648.32
Louis Fuselier, Mittie	5,393	26,826.62	26,826.62
Earl K. Oswalt, Lake Providence	4,859	26,813.58	
Elmo J. Bollick, Jones	5,832	26,156.52	26,156.52
John R. Denison, Iowa	4,952	25,150.93	25,150.93
Sagrera Bros., Bonita	8,100	34,720.65	34,720.65
Mississippi:			
Albert Prevot, Dwight McCollum, Frank Orlicek, and Thounissen, Hollandale	32,649	172,872.07	39,332.82
Nott Wheeler, Cleveland	25,054	130,965.82	130,965.82
J. A. Howarth, Jr., Cleveland	24,473	130,349.73	130,349.73
Allen Gray Estate, Benoit	24,600	122,516.13	122,516.13
Laudig & Cole Farms, Boyle	23,057	122,298.32	122,298.32
Dominic P. Rizzo, Cleveland	22,030	112,191.51	112,191.51
J. and V. Aguzzi, Cleveland	19,504	108,575.57	108,575.57
Greer Bros. & Son, Hollandale	21,056	103,205.64	103,205.64
Mills Bros., Benoit	18,855	102,856.62	17,471.05
J. C. O'Neal, Jr., Cleveland	18,726	96,112.86	96,112.86
W. P. Skelton, Rosedale	15,636	83,012.98	
Richard Bros., Doddsville	16,121	76,467.32	76,467.32
Edward A. Lyons, Cleveland	15,530	73,920.94	73,920.94
Maryland Planting Co., Clarksdale	12,423	67,005.50	67,005.50
Hall & Hawkins, Merigold	12,311	65,444.87	17,151.95
W. J. Chudy, Cleveland	11,576	64,308.04	
Barbour & Parker, Cleveland	12,376	63,290.09	63,290.09
Wilton Richard, Greenville	12,812	60,492.08	60,429.08
Dan Seligman, Shaw	11,235	60,130.52	21,196.02
Raymond Murrell, Avon	10,910	59,284.88	59,284.88
Kenneth Frey, Hollandale	10,044	54,257.16	54,257.16
A. R. Mann, Jr., Skene	9,247	48,824.16	48,824.16
David E. Greer, Hollandale	9,362	47,818.16	47,818.16
Harden Farms, Cleveland	9,169	47,788.46	1,719.62
Cone & Richard, Greenville	10,419	47,456.28	47,456.28
Patterson Bros., Merigold	8,465	46,652.47	
Isabell S. Welshan & W. A. Welshan, Jr., Rosedale	9,241	46,339.29	46,339.29
Heinsz & Heinsz, Shelby	8,495	45,582.30	45,582.30
McGarrh & McGarrh, Merigold	8,481	45,461.91	
Ewing & Son, Inc., Robinsonville	8,856	43,690.59	42,903.09
Verl Fullen, Shaw	7,754	42,702.66	9,934.80
Eifling Farms, Hollandale	7,983	42,179.64	42,179.64
George F. Stock, Hollandale	7,766	41,553.18	2,395.50
L. E. Grant, Isola	8,434	41,486.09	41,486.09
J. L. Wilson, Jr., Rosedale	8,617	39,772.43	39,772.43
L. F. Foreman, Clarksdale	7,293	39,127.69	12,698.98
Robert E. Smith, Cleveland	7,135	38,660.18	38,660.18
Glenn E. McCoy, Clarksdale	7,329	38,417.17	
Joseph H. Theunissen, Hollandale	7,458	38,177.10	38,177.10
H. D. and T. A. Tharp, Isola	7,123	37,503.75	
E. D. Strain, Jr., Morgan City	6,989	36,802.72	36,802.72
Homewood Farms, Inc., Greenville	7,269	36,566.46	33,078.96
W. B. Tackett, Belzoni	7,119	35,858.70	35,858.70
Gerald and Henry Frey, Hollandale	6,582	35,819.48	35,819.48
A. and N. Fioranelli, Cleveland	6,753	35,538.97	
F. P. Unkel, Shaw	6,822	34,502.04	1,940.33
Charles Berry, Memphis, Tenn	6,057	33,439.95	
Harris & Wilson, Inc., Hollandale	5,953	32,830.16	32,830.16
L. A. Peeples, Merigold	6,526	32,644.33	
S. R. Phebus, Banks	6,480	31,112.10	31,112.10
Eckward N. McKnight, Cleveland	6,099	30,638.18	
Wade McCollum, Hollandale	5,606	27,908.50	27,908.50
F. H. Nance, Cleveland	4,932	26,879.40	26,879.40
H. B. Mullins, Merigold	5,273	26,692.26	
Joe B. Dakin, Skene	4,924	26,638.84	22,814.92
L. B. Wilkinson & Purvis Richardson, Shaw	5,182	26,635.48	26,635.48
Sunrise Dairy, Cleveland	4,891	26,365.59	12,365.53
Josephine Plantation & Charles Lawrence, Merigold	4,990	25,919.40	25,919.40
RICE—continued			
Mississippi—Continued	*Bushels*		
J. C. Willis, Jr., Hollandale	4,762	$25,655.25	
M. D. Dossett, Beulah	4,957	25,558.14	$25,558.14
M. B. Litton, Shaw	4,786	25,411.61	
Turner Arant, Blaine	4,653	25,172.73	
L. B. Pate & Sons, Cleveland	4,693	25,093.69	
Texas:			
Anderson Farming Co., Lissie	45,419	217,422.39	171,935.02
Chocolate Bayou Rice & Canal Co., Alvin	36,261	162,066.47	162,066.47
J. A. Jenkins, B. M. Jenkins, and W. E. Jenkins, Jr., Hankamer	29,932	146,707.21	146,707.21
E. J. Stoesser, Dayton	25,837	135,318.09	135,318.09
Texas West Indies Co. Farm, El Campo	23,825	126,776.96	126,776.96
J. O. and G. F. Dennison, Liberty	24,105	118,435.45	118,435.45
T. F. Jenkins, Glen M. Kolemay, and Jeffrey Jenkins, Winnie	24,268	117,526.71	117,526.71
Pfeffer & Son Farms, Houston	22,876	115,106.88	74,701.45
A. J. and J. R. Carter, Victoria	23,781	114,153.04	114,153.04
J. H. Clipson, Sr., Eagle Lake	19,663	107,755.82	107,755.82
Harry Hafesnick and T. J. Babb, Edna	21,808	107,317.20	107,317.20
Henderson Farms, El Campo	20,825	103,911.28	103,911.28
R. M. Middleton Estate and Ed, Roy, George, Shirley, and L. E. Turner & Son, Anahuac	18,583	95,573.58	95,573.58
Floyd & Kenneth Henderson, El Campo	19,785	93,608.27	93,608.27
Martin Bros. & Son, Houston	19,591	92,253.42	92,253.42
Jess Mathews and Katherine Vance, Beaumont	18,694	90,315.03	90,315.03
Eddie Blackman, Sr., and Hornbeck Bros., DeKalb	18,023	85,871.06	85,871.06
Henry Huff, Edna	19,170	84,903.48	84,903.48
Francis Koop, Edna	16,719	82,209.12	59,301.63
J. R. Reed, El Campo	16,979	80,982.04	56,619.23
J. R. Thomas, Eagle Lake	15,365	80,765.10	80,765.10
Marvin Wiede and John Koop, Edna	16,689	80,751.53	41,526.53
E. P. Duke, Elmo Duke, Jr., and Anthony Duke, Rosharon	15,870	80,554.08	80,554.08
N. & M. Farms, Linke Nolte, and Rupert Myzell, Anahuac	14,578	78,461.48	78,461.48
R. L. Clipson, Eagle Lake	14,714	76,802.20	
Joe R. Anderson and T. L. Davidson, East Bernard	14,005	74,226.50	74,226.50
W. C. McBride and J. C. Emenhiser, Stowell	12,968	73,095.80	73,095.80
Harold Koop, Edna	15,394	72,837.90	72,837.90
Cinco Ranch, Clodine	14,915	70,798.35	57,409.05
Blue Creek Rice Farms & Kountz & Couch, El Campo	13,394	68,576.00	68,576.00
Blue Creek Rice Farms, by Frank L. Ramsey, agent, El Campo	14,105	66,915.21	66,915.21
Euel Dugat & E. J. Dugat, Winnie	13,058	64,888.70	64,888.70
E. P. Duke & Sons, Rosharson	12,575	63,057.58	63,057.58
Curtis A. Seaberg & Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton	12,095	62,117.14	62,117.14
Henderson Farms, El Campo	13,173	61,849.40	61,849.40
Floyd & Kenneth Henderson & Clyde DeFoor, El Campo	13,003	61,447.79	61,447.79
Roger C. Brown, Dayton	12,633	60,817.17	60,817.17
Walter A. Virnau & Sons, Sealy	11,808	60,122.40	60,122.40
T. E. Reidland & Son, Crosby	12,575	60,106.63	60,106.63
A. G. & M. T. Simons, Jr., Edna	12,167	59,972.14	47,991.26
Robert Rasmussen & D. W. Beck, Louise	12,442	59,536.86	59,536.86
Harry and Everett Anderson, East Bernard	11,569	58,847.28	23,519.82
Ed H. Helwig, Fulshear; Cinco Ranch, Clodine	12,090	58,206.39	45,509.78
John Clipson, Eagle Lake	11,993	57,732.22	57,732.22
Marsalia Bros., Eagle Lake; P. D. Gertson, Sr., Lissie	10,755	57,580.05	17,723.85
John Pearson and T. J. Babb, Edna	11,897	56,990.15	56,990.15
J. H. Taylor, Hamshire	11,750	56,323.26	56,323.26
Frank R. Duke, Liberty	13,181	55,051.68	55,051.68
Joe R. Anderson, East Bernard	10,598	54,960.11	10,937.08
Ike, Morriss and Woodrow Prejean, Winnie	11,201	54,893.67	54,893.67
Jack Stoesser, Dayton	11,781	54,623.76	54,623.76
L. D. Ware, Fulshear	11,585	53,589.73	46,061.38
B. D. Fussell, Eagle Lake	9,774	52,779.60	
Blue Ribbon Mills, Inc., Houston	10,682	52,550.02	52,550.02
Johnson & Johnson, West Columbia	11,237	51,813.78	51,813.78
Marsalia Bros., C. C. Brasher & T. L. Davidson, Eagle Lake	10,370	51,331.50	51,331.50
L. G. Raun & Sandy Creek Ranch, El Campo	10,578	50,034.65	50,034.65
Mitchell Bros., Beaumont	10,645	49,433.25	49,433.25
Jarrell E. Brown, Edna	9,757	48,942.88	48,942.88
K. Saibara & Son, Webster	10,260	48,619.63	48,619.63
Jack C. McBride, J. F. Guidry & W. S. Edwards, Winnie	9,868	48,435.66	48,435.66
Billy Halfen, Collegeport	9,495	47,911.32	47,911.32
Lowell G. Raun & Stockton Estate, El Campo	9,153	47,318.68	47,318.68
H. E. Moor & J. T. White Estate, Anahuac	10,295	46,863.70	46,863.70
Adolph S. Hankamer, Hankamer	9,774	46,812.50	46,812.50
Jack B. Willis, Eagle Lake	9,040	46,498.29	46,498.29
Paul McGown, Winnie	9,470	46,071.14	46,071.14
Clark Farms, S. J. Clark, Sr., and Gerald M. Clark, Edna	9,249	45,818.94	45,818.94
George Way and J. T. White Estate, Stowell	9,053	45,749.48	45,749.48
Frank A. Higgins, Eagle Lake	9,285	45,699.45	17,665.45

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
RICE—continued	*Bushels*		
Texas—Continued			
Maurice Willis and T. L. Davidson, Eagle Lake	9,320	$45,667.56	$45,667.56
Ferdinand J. Leonards and John Oscar Devillier, Winnie	9,099	45,657.41	45,657.41
R. M. Middleton Estate and I. Jett Hankamer, Hankamer	8,635	45,579.56	45,579.56
E. B. Kirkham and H. B. Haynes, Anahuac	8,770	45,166.64	45,166.64
Emmett Herbert, Stowell	9,371	45,014.49	45,014.49
Noel Clark, Edna	10,934	44,799.35	44,799.35
J. B. Wyatt, Clodis H. Cox, and Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton	10,129	44,457.90	40,809.75
Joe F. Terry, Victoria	9,182	43,971.67	43,971.67
Wilfred LeBlanc, Doris LeBlanc, and S. D. Fontenot, Winnie	9,730	43,365.33	43,365.33
N. S. Bean, Raymond	9,225	42,385.95	42,385.95
Naomi L. Kole, Winnie	8,118	42,166.32	42,166.32
J. S. and W. W. Winzer, Winnie	8,392	42,156.63	42,156.63
Donald Henderson, El Campo	8,579	42,139.84	42,139.84
Alfred J. Ash, Dayton	9,094	41,857.30	41,857.30
Howard Watson, Angleton	7,690	41,310.46	41,310.46
C. A. Kiker, Beaumont	7,573	41,059.56	27,404.04
C. W. Sisk; George, William D., and H. E. Dishman, Beaumont	8,159	40,401.44	40,401.44
Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton	8,129	40,252.34	40,252.34
A. W. Peveto, Flurry Joe Peveto, and Lutcher & Moore Lumber Co., Orange	8,492	40,122.02	40,122.02
Carlton W. Trant and W. H. Keenan, Liberty	8,490	39,994.56	39,994.56
William H. Whetstein Farms, Alvin	8,383	39,477.30	39,477.30
Daniel J. Hankamer and R. M. Middleton Estate, Wallisville	7,574	38,930.36	38,930.36
Louie L. W. Lunday, Alvin	7,554	38,831.78	38,831.78
Arthur Lemke, Jack Daigle, Loranzo Daigle, and W. E. Bogan, China	6,866	38,728.35	38,728.35
Bobby Shellhammer and M. L. Shellhammer, Hamshire	7,897	38,685.26	28,685.26
Albert, Jewell, and Albert Dutcher, Jr., Wells Farm, and Frank C. Gordon, Lissie	8,022	38,522.59	38,522.59
Mrs. P. H. Sherer and Phil Baker, Anahuac	8,051	38,504.00	38,504.00
E. A. Turner and W. M. McBride and Son, Winnie	7,808	38,486.43	38,486.43
Ivan Hebert and E. L. Chaney, Beaumont	7,485	38,398.05	38,398.05
James Weaver, Hankamer	7,811	38,125.00	38,125.00
C. W. Smith, Louise Sample Germer and W. F. Germer, Ganado	7,947	37,800.35	37,800.35
Lester J. Cranek, Garwood	7,826	37,773.25	37,773.25
F. W. Fontenot, Broussard and Hebert, Anahuac	7,626	37,469.94	37,469.94
J. W. and John Isaacs, Alvin	8,308	37,381.67	37,381.67
J. H. Sandlin, Anahuac	6,994	37,340.55	37,340.55
Schiurring Bros., Garwood	7,793	37,331.65	37,331.65
W. W. McBride, Winnie	7,131	37,133.10	37,133.10
L. L. Fontenot, Winnie	7,413	37,079.20	37,079.20
Jack C. and Eloise McBride, Winnie	7,043	36,812.75	36,812.75
E. J. and Euell Dugat and E. C. Devillier, Winnie	7,352	36,647.02	36,647.02
Bert Harbour and Mrs. Lucille Harbour, Hankamer	7,835	36,416.87	36,416.87
J. T. Herin, Edna	8,712	36,329.46	36,329.46
Louis Watson, Angleton	7,193	35,836.82	35,836.82
N. S. and Jesse Wittman, Hamshire	6,928	35,709.26	35,679.63
Jay and Dexter Anderson, Lissie	6,936	35,457.46	33,287.43
B. D. Hart and Frank Galloway, Devers	7,581	35,428.55	35,428.55
William Zboril, Garwood	7,232	34,203.88	34,203.88
M. A. Ellis & Son and Mitchell D. Ellis, Collegeport; H. A. Norris & Son, Bay City	6,008	34,020.84	25,767.38
Guy Myrick and Otto Truksa, Alvin	7,040	34,013.44	34,013.44
Lowell, George, and Norris Raun, El Campo	6,420	33,962.59	33,962.59
Denver Poland and Doornbos Bros., Winnie	7,495	33,803.55	33,803.55
Ivo Phend, Sr., Russell Phend, and Marie Weir et. al., Hamshire	6,734	33,772.94	33,772.94
J. W. Gober, Nome	6,659	33,496.98	33,496.98
W. J. Winzer, Winnie	6,407	33,472.36	33,472.36
P. W. Douglas, Sour Lake	6,939	33,374.81	33,374.81
P. D. Kinser and R. M. Middleton Estate, Anahuac	6,802	33,126.72	33,126.72
Charles and Quintin Shult, and Frank L. Ramsey, El Campo	6,398	32,895.26	32,895.26
Mrs. Maggie Wisegerber, Lester Ray Wisegerber, and Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton	6,672	32,834.52	32,834.52
Chester Hicks and Frank S. Bulher, Edna	7,211	32,789.01	32,789.01
M. D. Shillings, Port Lavaca	7,508	32,738.40	32,738.40
Jesse Copeland and M. L. Shellhammer, Hamshire	6,186	32,723.94	32,723.94
James R. and Henry J. Hlavinka and Boettcher & Wasicek, East Bernard	5,955	32,690.75	
E. E. and H. L. Adams, Alvin	6,981	32,690.50	32,690.50
Norris Raun, El Campo	6,371	32,681.43	32,681.43
Ben McCormick, Alvin	6,876	32,549.99	32,549.99
Jay and Dexter Anderson, Lissie	6,572	32,282.53	24,710.65
W. W. and J. S. Winzer and Edward C. Devillier, Winnie	6,611	32,133.46	32,133.46
Alvin E. Johnson, Louise	6,744	$32,129.52	$32,129.52
Billy Ray Smith, Ganado	6,854	32,048.84	32,048.84
J. C. Lewis, E. L. McDonald, and G. R. McKelvy, Bay City	6,570	31,829.76	
Joe F. and Raymond Terry and George Musselman, Victoria	6,774	31,758.84	31,758.84
Wilfred LeBlanc, Winnie	6,091	31,423.29	31,423.29
J. B. Miller, Jr., Beaumont	6,575	31,186.31	28,632.92
J. K. and R. G. Allen, El Campo	6,275	31,141.93	31,141.93
Pete Eaton and B. D. Anderson, Rock Island	6,563	31,107.38	
Richard Hahn, Ganado	6,797	30,518.53	30,518.53
C. D. Fenner, Paul Slatter, O. B. Fenner, A. J. Carter, and Floyd Slatter, Edna	5,574	30,376.66	
A. J. Hungerford, Midfield	5,915	30,315.81	28,145.78
Adolph Jr., and Calvin E. Ebner, Orange	5,830	30,097.67	30,097.67
Pat H. Flowers and Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton	5,637	30,092.30	30,092.30
Elroy J. Ortego, Alta Loma	6,399	29,971.23	29,971.23
B. G. and F. M. Elkins, Devers	5,847	29,629.34	29,629.34
Alfred J. Ash and Sophie Graves Estate, Dayton	6,606	29,580.72	29,580.72
Warren Craigen, Beaumont	6,353	29,544.33	13,256.77
B. F. Metzger, Katy; Ethel M. Campbell, Welsh, La	6,053	29,517.05	20,474.75
F. J. Merta, Louise	6,274	29,331.46	29,331.46
Schiurring Bros., Garwood	6,710	29,322.70	29,322.70
J. T. Hare, Crosby	6,143	28,958.30	28,958.30
Keith Flournoy, Liberty	6,289	28,866.51	28,866.51
Eugene Bourque, Rosharon	6,557	28,315.37	28,315.37
J. W. Parker, Arnold Wolf, Jr., and B. F. Troxell, Dayton	5,759	28,275.21	28,275.21
George V. Miller, China	6,152	28,106.58	28,106.58
N. T. Stansbury, Beaumont	6,068	28,094.84	28,094.84
C. S. Brown, Devers	5,639	28,079.06	13,460.82
Jack Duke, Rosharon	6,049	28,056.59	28,056.59
Duward Harper, Alvin	5,970	27,843.06	27,843.06
O. C. Devillier, Jr., Winnie	6,000	27,779.12	27,779.12
Curtis S. Penick, Anahuac	5,398	27,771.75	25,211.01
R. B. Christ, Sr., Hamshire	5,237	27,608.80	27,608.80
J. C. Wall, Beaumont	5,708	27,398.40	27,398.40
Raymond Randel, Liberty	5,475	27,375.00	27,375.00
C. T. Wiese, Eagle Lake	5,590	27,245.70	22,048.95
Louie Mollnar, El Campo	6,282	27,236.16	27,236.16
A. E. Elliott, Bay City	5,606	27,020.92	27,020.92
B. E. Wilber and D. L. Heckaman, Hamshire	5,079	26,545.85	26,545.85
Frank Smaistrla, Martha Losack, and Wm. Lee Frederickson, East Bernard	5,671	26,479.07	20,762.46
Lynn and Donald Herbert, Waller	5,586	26,421.78	26,421.78
Johnnie Garrett, Garrett Bros., and Walter L. Roome, Louise	5,714	26,421.49	26,421.49
Rudolph Skalicky, Ganado	5,598	26,311.41	26,311.41
W. C. Jenkins, Hankamer	5,385	26,132.42	26,132.42
Lester R. Wisegerber and Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton	5,701	25,882.54	25,882.54
Wanda S. and Wayne Bunton, Edna	5,217	25,877.81	25,877.81
J. Harland Bell, Rock Island	4,925	25,823.41	4,771.20
Buren J. Kallina, Garwood	5,260	25,601.90	25,601.90
George W. Stansbury, Raywood	4,864	25,536.00	25,536.00
Harvey E. Johnson, Port Lavaca	5,888	25,495.86	25,495.86
R. L. Poskey and Roy Dawson, Anahuac	4,871	25,475.33	25,475.33
Johnnie Garrett, Guy Stovall, Jr., and S. C. Cappell, Louise	5,265	25,444.90	21,466.90
James L. Adkins, Lissie	4,729	25,442.02	25,442.02
W. H. Huseman and Mrs. Annie Carmichael Estate, Louise	5,420	25,394.49	25,394.49
R. B. Christ, Sr., R. B. Christ, Jr., Ed Lohmann, and Elvan Bourque, Hamshire	5,480	25,373.28	25,373.28
W. H. Oetken, Anahuac	5,003	25,140.50	17,581.24
J. W. Murrell, Winnie	4,710	25,072.90	25,072.90
M. I. Janes and Remie Fontenot, Beaumont	5,310	25,010.10	25,010.10
SOYBEANS			
Arkansas:			
Arkansas Grain Corp., Stuttgart	7,103,230	16,353,580.93	10,454,477.76
McAlister Seed Service Co., Walnut Ridge	42,120	94,888.80	32,316.30
Hugh E. Richardson, H. B. Richardson and Richland Plantation, Inc., Hughes	34,344	77,960.88	77,960.88
Ralph Wimpy, Harrisburg	15,585	35,997.26	35,997.66
J. W. Prescott, Hughes	15,390	34,935.30	34,935.30
Pirani Bros., Marion	15,000	34,050.00	34,050.00
James E. McDaniel, Jonesboro; David N. Ford, Sherrill; James D. Ford, Pine Bluff	13,500	30,645.00	30,645.00
J. B. Davis, Ogden	12,375	27,225.00	21,780.00
W. B. Bynum, Dermott	11,713	26,998.47	26,998.47
Phinn Reynolds & Son, Harrisburg	11,700	26,559.00	26,559.00
Illinois:			
A. E. Deal, Morrisonville	11,070	25,571.70	25,571.70
Indiana:			
Donald Kolb, Evansville	13,500	30,375.00	30,375.00
Donald E. Stewart, Robert Revell, and Harold Revell, Lebanon	11,115	25,119.90	25,119.90

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
SOYBEANS—continued	*Bushels*		
Iowa:			
Herbert P. Turin, Odebolt	18,784	$40,484.04	$40,484.04
Kenneth Johnson, Callender	12,690	28,171.80	
Louisiana:			
W. P. Tomlinson, Lake Providence	15,840	35,640.00	35,640.00
Orville A. Coody, Lake Providence	11,681	26,581.36	12,406.36
Mississippi:			
Joe Priddy & Sons, Rolling Fork	32,168	72,802.88	72,802.88
Greer Bros. & Son, Hollandale	29,250	66,397.50	66,397.50
J. R. Flautt & Sons, Swan Lake	27,180	61,426.80	61,426.80
Evanna Plantation, Inc., Cary	23,130	52,273.80	52,273.80
F. B. Swearengen, Philipp	18,289	40,510.66	
W. P. Skelton, Rosedale	16,392	37,209.84	37,209.84
Dominic P. Rizzo, Cleveland	15,961	36,231.47	36,231.47
Annapeg, Inc., Minter City	13,265	29,382.41	
L. L. Walker, Minter City	13,050	28,904.22	28,904.22
Ray Roberson Farms, Inc., Philipp	13,009	28,815.44	28,815.44
Missouri:			
A. C. Riley, New Madrid	22,500	51,075.00	
W. V. Riley, New Madrid	22,500	51,075.00	
The Albert Painton Co., Inc., Painton	17,280	39,052.80	39,052.80
Wallace Farms, Gideon	17,100	38,304.00	38,304.00
North Carolina:			
A. D. Swindell, Pantego	41,850	93,325.50	63,220.50
McNair Investment Co., Laurinberg	19,814	44,185.22	44,185.22
South Carolina:			
W. R. Mayes, Mayesville	41,043	91,525.89	
J. A. Harvin, Sumter	26,774	59,623.65	6,021.00
J. T. Duncan, Martin	11,430	25,488.90	25,488.90
Wisconsin: Charles H. Kuiper, Union Grove	15,030	34,268.40	34,268.40
WHEAT			
Arkansas: Lake Plantation, Hughes	19,244	27,807.09	
California:			
E. L. Wallace, Woodland	59,345	83,858.11	
Jackson & Reinert, Paso Robles	50,806	69,096.16	69,096.16
Colorado:			
Sprague Bros., Holyoke	31,915	34,302.11	34,302.11
Harold Kuckartz, Arriba	27,000	31,860.00	15,525.00
Kalcevic Farms, Inc., Aurora	27,000	31,050.00	
Ralph and Jack Bowman, Wray	24,300	29,889.00	
Idaho:			
Wagner Bros., Lewiston	81,892	101,546.08	101,546.08
Ira McIntosh & Sons, Lewiston	63,102	78,246.48	78,246.48
Meacham Land & Cattle Co., Lapwai	59,997	73,738.23	18,411.00
Heglar Ranch, Inc., Burley	46,882	51,335.65	51,335.65
Drechsel Bros., Worley	41,196	49,187.57	19,298.57
Herndon Farms, Inc., Culdesac	34,162	41,408.25	31,248.00
Gaffney & Howe, Plummer	35,615	41,197.22	
Wittman Farms, Inc., Lapwai	34,839	40,111.90	
Sam Alm & Sons, Grangeville	31,497	38,111.37	
W. W. Riggers & Sons, Craigmont	33,828	37,979.34	37,979.34
Stanton Becker, Genesee	31,587	36,049.07	36,049.07
Harold Heaton & Son, Tekoa, Wash	24,266	35,598.47	
Pfaff Bros., Inc., Garfield, Wash	27,900	34,596.00	34,596.00
Arthur P. Meier, Peck	30,084	34,192.19	28,699.68
Matsuura Bros., Blackfoot	29,700	33,264.00	33,264.00
Herb Millhorn, Worley	27,610	31,496.63	31,496.63
Alvin Barker & Sons, Soda Springs	27,000	30,510.00	30,510.00
Shayne Linderman, Newdale	27,200	29,376.00	
George and Otto Brammer, Lewiston	23,220	28,792.80	28,792.80
Leland Woodbury, Burley	27,000	28,755.40	28,755.40
John Campbell, Idaho Falls	22,214	26,529.21	26,529.21
J. J. Driscoll & Son, Troy	22,604	25,881.69	25,881.69
Hilding Frick, Plummer	22,248	25,814.76	25,814.76
Anderson Bros, Troy	22,145	25,305.11	21,396.35
McLeod Bros., Nezperce	22,377	25,174.82	25,174.82
Iowa:			
Payne Valley Farms, Inc., Hamburg	21,032	26,057.06	26,057.06
Kansas:			
Earl, Elsie S., and Frank Weisenberger, Scott City	45,608	62,482.96	
Albert Frahm et. al., Colby	38,844	49,331.88	
B. A. Hutton, Brewster	37,260	47,320.20	
Robert W. Thierolf, Beloit	34,574	45,211.48	45,211.48
Neil Fuller & Sons, Beloit	31,673	44,885.63	
S. Everett Dennis, Scottsbluff, Nebr	31,495	43,153.57	
Harold N. Hobart, Sr., Harold N. Hobart, Jr., and Gano H. Tschudy, Hutchinson	28,244	40,510.93	
C. Wilber White, Goodland	27,702	36,008.19	1,931.67
Herman Bott, Palmer	24,984	34,129.44	
R. T. McCreight, Ness City	23,220	33,156.00	
Adrian Schweitzer, Osborne	22,626	32,019.58	
Vestring Bros., Burns	22,807	31,124.21	6,172.20
W. T. Rooney, Jr., Garden City	23,580	30,720.60	
John Kriss Farms, Colby	23,850	30,289.50	
Benton Jones, Glasco	21,173	29,819.66	6,010.29
Ferguson Bros., Kensington	20,250	29,767.50	
E. A. Baalman & Sons, Menlo	20,754	26,504.82	3,682.80
Hattendorf Bros., Scott City	21,884	26,466.62	19,795.87
John D. Deforest, Peabody	20,608	25,739.63	
Richard L. and Jack Spiegel, Formoso	18,900	25,515.00	
C. H. Moore Trust Estate, Dodge City	20,453	25,390.49	
Minnesota:			
Keith Driscoll, East Grand Forks	30,780	46,146.60	16,310.25
John Bogestad, Karlstad	22,500	31,050.00	
Vernon Hagen, East Grand Forks	18,879	26,767.36	
Montana:			
Campbell Farming Corp., Hardin	200,212	206,218.36	73,233.00
Nash Bros., Redstone	49,320	57,704.40	
Onstad Grain Co., Carter	51,480	56,113.20	

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
WHEAT—continued			
Montana—Continued	*Bushels*		
Kraft & Martin, Havre	44,460	$55,859.40	
J. G. Robertson, Inc., Great Falls	49,905	54,396.45	$54,396.45
Juedeman Grain Co., Geraldine	48,285	52,630.65	
Warren Swenson, Cut Bank	46,660	50,859.40	6,714.40
Otis Waters, Richey	37,170	47,949.30	1,161.00
Pryor Land Co., Billings	43,625	47,551.25	47,551.25
Floyd Warren, Inc., Hardin	44,100	45,423.00	45,423.00
Oscar A. Kalgaard, Big Sandy	40,526	43,746.68	43,746.68
Westermark Bros., Levon	38,610	42,084.90	42,084.90
Francis Maurer, Dutton	37,800	41,202.00	
Bill McCarter, Galata	34,570	36,591.30	36,591.30
Roy Killenbeck, Scobey	32,040	36,525.60	
Birkeland & Son, Inc., Fort Benton	32,850	35,806.50	
Gaylen Vernon, Ray Stoner, and Richard McCarty Outlook	28,440	35,661.60	
Lazy K. T. Ranch, Billings	32,193	35,090.37	35,090.37
Clair Schillinger and Schillinger Farms, Inc., Wolf Point	29,430	35,021.70	1,392.30
Kenneth Schillinger, Vida	26,091	34,566.57	
Adolph Fix, Ekalaka	25,524	34,148.88	1,206.00
Royce Applegate, Square Butte	30,240	32,961.60	
Sikorski & Sons, Inc., Willard	24,641	31,749.21	5,945.04
John H. Leuthold, Molt	28,800	31,392.00	
D. K. Hereford Ranch, Ballantine	27,810	30,312.90	
F. E. Davison & Sons, Highwood	27,812	30,181.23	2,713.23
John Keil & Sons, Ledger	27,000	29,430.00	
Kenneth G. Axvig, Kremlin	22,500	28,632.60	
A. C. Kammerzell, Chester	25,920	28,252.80	28,252.80
Donald Norman and Arnold Dees, Kremlin	24,660	28,225.80	
Allan and Leo Schillinger, Vida	21,240	28,170.00	
Roland and Burton Wright, Moore	25,200	27,468.00	27,468.00
Leo M. Kraft, Havre	22,320	27,342.00	
Ralph Lee, Buffalo	24,930	27,173.70	27,173.70
Conover Ranch Co., Broadview	24,500	26,705.00	
Ivan Dahlman, Forsyth	23,220	26,470.80	26,470.80
Herbert G. Bitz and Selma McClintock, Box Elder	21,150	26,464.50	
Ole Jensen, Chester	24,102	26,271.18	
Swank & Son, Poplar	21,960	25,912.80	
Elmer and Mary P. Dostal, Geraldine	23,400	25,506.00	
Frank Kukla, Blue Creek	23,130	25,211.70	
Nebraska:			
Grace Land & Cattle Co., Lewellen	52,200	64,728.00	
Raymond, Ronald, Pamela, Michael, Leo, Morris, and Ilse Jessen, Lodgepole	39,600	48,312.00	
Knipp Land Co., Big Springs	33,300	41,958.00	
Ruth Hunt, Hastings	31,178	40,227.67	10,067.40
A. L. Rosener & Sons, Daykin	26,809	37,179.88	
Bailey Partnership, Big Springs	29,700	36,828.00	
Glen F. Burns, Chappell	28,342	34,317.52	10,918.72
Svoboda & Hannah, Ogallala	26,100	32,886.00	
Eugene Schefcek, Alliance	25,038	32,048.64	32,048.64
Leo Jessen, Oshkosh	23,400	29,250.00	
Robert R. Elliott, Solvang, Calif.	22,410	28,012.50	
Ed and Beulah Jelinek, Alliance	20,002	26,807.64	
Nevada:			
Rio King Land & Investment Co., San Francisco, Calif	20,327	25,205.48	25,205.48
New Mexico:			
Archie Baker, Clovis	24,337	31,227.94	31,227.94
W. L. Lockmiller, Clovis	25,360	31,065.58	
Virgle Harrison, Texico	22,018	28,954.11	220.19
Albert and Monte Matlock, Clovis	20,510	26,765.55	26,765.55
North Dakota:			
Arvel Glinz, Eldridge	38,904	57,073.29	2,260.59
Ballantyne Bros., Westhope	36,000	50,760.00	
Benjamin Schaible, Mott	34,650	49,999.50	
The Witteman Co., Mohall	36,900	46,125.00	
L. J. Johnson, Plaza	34,200	42,408.00	
Polries Bros., Sykeston	28,512	40,487.04	
Roscoe W. Kelly, Niagara	27,900	39,078.00	
August C. Kirschemann, Mott; John D. Kirschmann, Bismarck	25,200	35,932.50	
Henry Grain & Stock Farm, Westhope	28,440	35,550.00	4,725.00
T. A. Dilse, Scranton	27,720	35,481.60	
Norman Glinz, Bottineau	26,370	35,406.00	
Alvin Kenner, Leeds	25,200	35,280.00	
Edwin Netzer, Regent; Dan Netzer, Bismarck	23,525	34,197.08	
W. J. Thoreson, York	25,000	34,125.00	
Ernest P. Jensen, Williston	24,300	33,777.00	
Stair Bros., Newburg	24,930	33,655.50	
Willis Glinz, Newburg	25,429	33,496.25	
Carl M. Hodenfield & Sons, Ray	27,000	33,210.00	1,451.40
Helen, Wayne, Cecil, and Dennis Zahnow, Roseglen	25,650	32,832.00	32,832.00
Alfred Johnson, Plaza	26,100	32,364.00	
Jack Follman, York	23,808	31,546.49	
Reginald and Kenneth Henry, Westhope	24,300	30,375.00	
August and Ronald Wagner, Englevale	20,367	29,403.00	2,268.00
Earl Schwartz Co., Kenmare	23,400	29,250.00	
Walter E. Johnson, Courtenay	18,990	27,830.70	
Roger Redel, Fressenden	18,211	25,859.62	
Leo and Anthony Muggli, Vincent Muggli, Jr., and Vincent Muggli, Sr., Carson; Rose Weinhandl, Shields	17,280	25,423.20	
Carlton Larson, Sykeston	18,203	25,309.46	
Harold Hosfstrand, Leeds	18,251	25,198.74	1,192.00
Raymond Foerster, Conway	16,420	25,048.20	

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
WHEAT—continued	*Bushels*		
Ohio:			
Ward Walton & Associates, Inc., Upper Sandusky	25,576	$33,375.96	$33,375.96
Orleton Farms, Inc., London	21,039	26,825.27	26,825.27
Oklahoma:			
John A. Francis, Kingfisher	20,250	27,315.00	
Joe Steichen, Ponca City	22,000	27,170.00	
James W. Sharrock, Ponca City	20,483	26,934.71	
Oregon:			
McCormmach Bros., Pendleton	69,570	83,622.36	83,622.36
Glenn Thorne, Pendleton	54,265	65,308.85	65,308.85
John Proudfoot and Leo Gorger, Ione	47,025	61,602.75	61,602.75
Raymond & Son, Inc., Helix	50,138	60,903.45	
Ralph S. Crum, Ione	43,647	57,177.57	
R. & T. Ranches, Athena	42,301	51,270.80	51,270.80
King Ranches, Pendleton	38,365	49,874.50	
Robert Kilkenny, Heppner	39,344	49,476.72	40,044.72
Les King, Inc., Helix	38,846	46,809.44	46,809.44
F. L. Watkins, Wasco	34,816	45,791.02	42,713.66
4 R Ranches, Wasco	38,840	45,254.20	45,254.20
Mud Springs Ranches, Pendleton Ranches, Cunningham Sheep Co., and Hoke Ranches, Pendleton	34,650	45,045.00	45,045.00
Adolph, Jr. or Georgia Shaffer, Condon	36,309	44,722.66	44,722.66
Key Bros., Inc., Milton Freewater	33,705	43,816.50	
Richard W. Hampton, Pendleton	33,735	42,774.35	13,758.34
V. R. Ranch, Helix	35,059	42,246.48	42,246.48
Weber, Inc., and Vernita Adams, Athena	30,360	39,354.24	37,908.00
R. A. Brogoitti, LaGrande	31,444	39,305.00	39,305.00
Foster, Wernsing & Coffman, Athena	32,548	39,090.96	7,969.77
Charles Carlson, Ione	29,160	38,199.60	
M. Smith, Condon	26,608	36,950.64	36,950.64
H. H. McIntyre, Pendleton	30,348	36,633.42	36,633.42
Alvin Bunch, Heppner	29,577	36,372.70	36,372.20
Holdman Ranches, Pendleton	30,078	36,352.84	36,352.84
Hill Ranches, Inc., Helix	30,000	36,150.00	
Larry E. Kaseberg, Wasco	26,100	34,713.00	34,713.00
Marion T. Weatherford, Arlington	27,756	34,567.92	
W. D. Hardie & Sons, Condon	25,043	34,259.79	4,835.75
Merton S. Wade, Lostine	28,088	33,520.74	9,180.52
E. Earl or S. Bernice Pryor, Condon	27,148	33,517.83	33,517.83
Storie Ranches, Pendleton	27,384	33,271.86	33,271.86
Coppinger & Son Ranches, Echo A. C. and R. C. Moll, Pendleton	24,750	32,175.00	32,175.00
H. T. Rea, Inc., Walla Walla, Wash	26,211	31,444.60	
F. N. Johns, Athena	24,075	31,298.79	31,298.79
McElligott Bros., Ione	23,827	31,213.37	31,213.37
H. M. Zell, Wasco	24,260	30,806.42	30,806.42
Johns Smith and Beamer, Athena	23,418	30,443.52	30,443.52
C. O. Burnet or Althea Burnet, Moro	24,496	30,378.38	
Tad O. McCoy, The Dalles	23,524	30,236.64	30,236.64
W. L. Hulse, Dufur	22,050	29,988.00	
R. M. and Delta Johnson, Wasco	23,926	29,844.28	29,844.28
A. C. Warren, Ione	22,063	28,902.53	
Bill Wolfe, Wallowa	24,183	28,740.44	10,184.24
G. W. Temple, Pendleton Albert L. McCormmach, Walla Walla, Wash	22,060	28,679.04	28,679.04
T. M. Campbell, Helix	23,444	28,303.49	28,303.49
Sieg & Sieg, Baker	23,484	27,486.05	
David Horne, Pendleton	22,732	27,392.27	27,392.27
Glen Brogoitti, Helix	22,597	27,229.18	
Powell Goodin Farms, Moro	21,841	27,192.41	16,741.76
R. & H. Farms and Archie Harris, Milton-Freewater	20,821	27,067.30	27,067.30
Sandhollow Ranches, Helix	22,163	26,928.54	12,005.71
C. N. Jones & Sons, Heppner	21,857	26,714.38	26,714.38
J. Smith, Inc., Condon	19,270	26,689.41	26,689.41
Verne W. Dale, Helix	22,025	26,540.51	26,540.51
Robert Rothrock, Adams	20,798	26,457.27	20,475.00
Rosco E. Moore, Moro	21,226	26,365.03	
Campbell Ranch, Inc., Echo	20,984	26,349.95	26,349.95
Walker Whitacre Ranch, Athena	21,500	26,122.96	26,122.96
Harvey Smith, Ione	19,593	25,862.76	25,862.76
Earl Meeker, The Dalles	18,900	25,704.00	
Stirrup Ranch, North Powder	21,664	25,248.44	
G. L. Pratt, Visalia, Calif	21,664	25,248.43	
Harry Proudfoot, Echo	20,854	25,069.17	7,177.17
South Dakota:			
William J. Stanley and William D. Asmussen, Agar	117,387	168,397.20	1,297.80
J. E. Cheek Estate, Pierre	50,797	70,326.89	
Elkhorn Farm, Martin	42,570	54,242.10	
Alfred and Johanna Ehlers, Presho	36,000	52,560.09	
Dennis L. Anderson, Rapid City	37,291	51,625.11	8,199.76
Leo J. Terca, Presho	31,500	46,076.40	
John Hippen, Martin Raymond Jessen, Lodge Pole, Nebr	32,760	41,767.20	
Louie E. Bartels, Gettysburg	25,110	37,776.60	
Bartley Mills, Winner	28,800	37,440.00	
Kenneth Kinkler, Blunt Hugo Kinkler, Littlefield, Tex	24,840	35,272.80	
Krier Bros., Presho	23,580	33,069.60	
James S. Brown, Chamberlain	23,130	31,784.40	31,784.40
Arvid Ambur, Presho	24,030	31,719.60	
Bruno Wieczorek, Chamberlain	23,580	31,131.60	31,131.60
G. K. Hutchison, Presho	21,600	29,331.00	
Robert E. Duncan, Pierre	20,430	29,316.60	
Roy Norman, Hayes	21,852	29,063.16	
Earl E. Kinder, Onida	21,600	28,728.00	1,915.20
Verdun Stanley, Presho	21,600	28,512.00	19,483.20
Orville Schwarting, Gordon, Nebr	22,950	28,458.00	
K. R. Rhiley, Creighton	22,500	28,350.00	24,080.60
Myron D. and Mildred A. Johnson, Rapid City	21,780	27,952.20	
WHEAT—continued	*Bushels*		
South Dakota—Continued			
H. G. Ehlers Sons, Presho	20,890	$27,943.80	$6,878.10
Jerry Geeringer, Castle Rock	21,330	26,875.80	26,828.10
Leonel M. Jensen, Wall	21,150	26,818.20	21,319.20
Robert Bartels, Fort Pierre	19,440	25,660.80	25,660.80
Jetter Bros., Milesville	19,880	25,542.00	
Wm. G. and Lyle Schoulte, Presho	19,000	25,080.00	
Texas:			
Hill Farms, Hart	38,760	68,379.05	
Taft McGee, Hereford	43,528	55,933.48	55,933.48
Homer Hill, Hart	32,520	55,303.86	
Buddy Hill, Hart	35,342	55,231.81	
Gerald L. Lasley, Dalhart	40,582	53,419.06	53,291.86
Frank Robinson, Panhandle	35,204	51,573.38	
Berkley Stringer, Dumas	38,561	50,520.24	50,520.24
D. G. Cluck, Gruver	36,797	48,755.59	48,755.59
Sam R. Cluck, Gruver	36,297	47,730.99	47,730.99
Harold H. Hogue, Dalhart	36,011	46,274.56	46,274.56
A & O Farms, Dumas	34,496	46,028.39	46,028.39
Mrs. M. W. McCloy & Sons, Morse	34,349	43,451.70	
Monroe Bros., Sunray	31,825	40,895.13	
Gordon Taylor, Sunray	29,697	40,536.18	
Dale Schuman, Dumas	29,944	39,076.47	8,173.64
Dale Coleman, Dumas	28,661	37,633.20	22,386.42
Rose C. or R. C. Porter, Spearman	30,000	36,450.00	36,450.00
Merrill Dryden, Sunray	26,069	35,844.65	35,844.65
Lyons Bros., Hereford	23,242	35,225.77	14,572.87
Glen Scribner, Sunray	25,860	35,040.07	
Weatherford Bros., Sunray	25,405	34,169.05	
Marshall Cator, Sunray	23,871	32,455.26	
Don Williams, Farwell	24,630	32,388.45	
A. R. Bort, Gruver	24,377	32,164.26	32,164.26
Gene Cluck, Gruver	23,471	30,394.52	
Joe Schuman, Dumas	22,260	28,826.96	
Everett Bros., Stratford	21,064	28,541.76	210.64
Fred W. Mercer, Silverton Velma W. McGraw Estate, Fort Worth	19,068	26,849.14	26,849.14
John Cole, Waka	19,235	26,832.83	
Claude Higley, Stinnett	19,379	26,453.01	26,453.01
George Farms, Charlene and G. George, Perryton	18,000	25,740.00	25,740.00
J. H. Burkett, Sunray	20,268	25,638.38	
Claude Johnson & Son, Dalhart	18,909	25,621.70	
John A. and Raymond Smith, Hereford	14,447	25,302.90	
Washington:			
Glen Miller & Sons, Amber	133,542	166,927.50	41,927.50
D. Everett Phillips, Lind	110,500	139,482.99	
Leonard and Henry Franz, Lind	86,038	106,541.33	101,626.13
Kenneth Smith, Waltsburg	63,653	79,249.74	79,249.74
George D. Brown & Sons, Pomeroy	58,563	73,360.03	13,352.53
Staley & Boyd, Pullman	58,500	73,125.00	73,125.00
Robert V. Phillips, Lind	49,995	63,204.86	
Lehn Bros., Farmington	45,180	56,475.00	
Curtis Cattle Co., Garfield	41,427	50,694.20	50,694.20
Roy Peringer, Pullman	43,753	50,683.36	50,683.36
W. M. Boyd & Sons, Moscow, Idaho	39,195	48,993.76	48,993.76
Osborne Belsby, Amber	39,150	48,549.00	48,549.00
Baumann Farm, Washtucna	37,710	48,268.80	48,268.80
DeZellen & Son, Bridgeport	37,548	47,871.96	1,517.45
Richard E. DeSpain, Winona	41,081	47,773.02	47,773.02
Urgel Bell, Lacrosse	41,578	47,708.87	47,708.87
Robert J. and Lewis Patton, Waitsburg	36,073	46,534.17	46,534.17
O. H. Woodward, Inc., Dayton	38,535	46,492.58	7,099.85
Donovan Farms, Prescott	34,747	45,171.10	45,171.10
Ford Gumm & Sons, Tekoa	38,309	44,630.16	
Thomas J. Byers & Sons, Pomeroy	34,756	44,558.61	19,580.68
J. R. Damon, Lind	35,693	44,071.22	23,140.00
Pearl Gwinn, Pomeroy	31,626	43,275.89	2,674.62
S. T. S. Farms, Inc., Prescott	33,273	43,254.90	6,048.90
Ferrell & Luvaas, Pomeroy	35,902	42,902.29	42,902.29
Joe McCown and Charles E. Neace Estate, Waitsburg	34,433	41,146.96	41,146.96
J. L. Williams, Lind	32,040	41,011.20	39,168.00
Fred and Cecil Rommel, Pomeroy	32,832	40,453.25	40,453.25
Godfrey Meilke, Lind	33,747	40,267.60	40,267.60
Higginbotham Bros., Hartline	33,163	39,629.45	39,629.45
C. C. Wolf & Sons, Pomeroy	32,671	38,214.08	
Laura C. Gilliland Estates, Lafayette, Ind	32,211	38,170.21	18,206.13
Casey Farms, Inc., Eureka	31,297	37,970.98	
Lester Camp, Lacrosse	32,793	37,876.03	37,876.03
Nelson Bros., Waterville	28,530	36,518.40	
Lasater Farms, Inc., Walla Walla	30,004	36,455.06	36,455.06
Dippel Bros., Garfield	29,070	36,337.50	
Wayne Beale, Pomeroy	29,013	35,787.62	35,787.62
John E. Hair, Walla Walla	27,276	35,458.80	35,458.80
Allen Struthers, Eureka	28,460	35,307.53	
Ralph Colley, Connell	27,000	35,100.00	4,680.00
The Sheffels Co., Govan	27,627	35,086.66	19,108.67
John W. Smith, Lancaster	28,264	34,543.40	10,018.40
Marvin Carstens, Espanola	29,518	34,403.11	19,298.47
Franklin D. Rockwell, Endicott	29,596	34,382.45	34,382.45
Jack Clodius, Waitsburg	28,408	34,343.43	34,343.43
Rockdale Farms, Edwall	28,997	34,338.89	
Harp Bros., Farmington	29,437	34,122.45	21,227.66
Heglar Bros., St. John	28,837	33,594.84	33,594.84
Wilbur Morgan, Pomeroy	26,400	33,528.00	
Calvin Raugust, Farmington	26,640	33,300.00	33,300.00
Ed Faure, Jr., Ritzville	27,500	33,109.64	33,109.64
Ellsworth Conover, Waitsburg	27,447	33,073.78	33,073.78
Howard Jorgensen, Coulee City	25,695	32,889.60	32,889.60
R. F. Young, Starbuck	27,486	32,845.89	32,845.89
Earl M. Pierson, Colfax	26,100	32,624.98	
Phillips Farms, Inc., and Merlin Phillips, Walla Walla	25,020	32,526.00	
E. E. Watkins, Spokane	27,356	32,416.33	32,416.33

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
WHEAT—continued	*Bushels*		
Washington—Continued			
Bennett Land Co., Farmington	25,830	$32,287.50	$32,287.50
Dick Edwards, Hartline	26,359	32,097.64	32,097.64
Virgil Feezell, Mabton	23,985	31,900.05	
Ferrell & Luvass, Pomeroy	27,095	31,836.12	31,836.12
Eugene Valaer, Walla Walla	24,300	31,590.00	
Morris Ganguet, Waitsburg	25,829	31,254.73	31,254.73
Yoshino Bros., Quincy	23,116	31,109.07	31,109.07
Nick Seivers, Jr., Lind	24,300	31,104.00	31,104.00
Orval Painter, Waterville	24,120	30,873.60	
George H. Ellis, Reardan	25,912	30,657.22	
Lawrence Timm, Harrington	25,760	30,525.37	
Kenny Foulkes, Lind	24,281	30,296.37	30,296.37
Dwelley Jones, Walla Walla	25,164	30,159.39	
Elmer Schoesler & Sons, Ritzville	25,354	30,159.34	
Heitstuman Bros., Clarkston Robert Heitstuman, Pomeroy	25,413	30,028.50	16,171.20
Cornwall Farms, Fairfield	24,347	30,018.39	11,604.39
Matthew Lyons, Waitsburg	24,875	29,974.38	
Klicker Bros. & Sons, Walla Walla	23,006	29,907.80	29,907.80
Blacklaw Bros., Eureka	24,408	29,771.91	
C. B. Stonecipher, Waitsburg	24,706	29,675.43	
J. I. Kupers, Harrington	24,995	29,618.72	29,618.72
Neihenke & Pavlik, Colfax	25,360	29,543.81	29,543.81
Erwin Bros., Prescott	24,384	29,306.83	29,306.83
Mary Hanger, Dayton	24,258	29,058.29	29,058.29
Feigenhauer Bros., Fairfield	23,400	29,016.00	
Hofer Bros., Waitsburg	23,998	28,917.10	28,917.10
John Stephenson, Elda Stephenson, and Ella Stephenson Estate, Benge	22,500	28,800.00	
Willard C. Hennings, Ritzville	22,500	28,800.00	28,800.00
Dave Repp & Son, St. John	24,850	28,796.07	28,796.07
Walter A. Zellmer, Davenport	24,061	28,765.28	
Carl Boyd, Pullman	22,950	28,687.50	28,687.50
Gale O. Gfeller, Lind	22,410	28,684.80	
Frank J. or Frank Wolf, Pomeroy	20,866	28,199.21	4,875.52
WHEAT—continued	*Bushels*		
Washington—Continued			
Herbert Sackmann, Odessa	23,702	$28,087.18	$28,087.18
Robison Land & Livestock Co., Walla Walla	21,600	28,080.00	
Chester Powers & Son, Starbuck	23,202	27,726.64	27,726.64
C. L. Nelson & Sons, Thornton	23,496	27,372.75	27,372.75
Byron G. Dague, Walla Walla	21,052	27,367.60	27,367.60
David V. Adams, Coulee City	22,071	27,323.10	27,323.10
Roy M. Auvil, Farmington	23,601	27,259.05	
Earl T. Sherry, Prescott	22,513	27,127.89	14,451.77
C. C. King and J. C. Kinzer, Pullman	21,600	27,000.00	27,000.00
Weishaar Farms, Marlin	21,175	26,892.25	
Ray L. Small, Jr., Lowden	22,238	26,757.66	
A. S. Miller & Son, Colfax	21,330	26,662.48	26,662.48
James F. Ferrel, Walla Walla	21,998	26,288.09	
Clarence Strohmaier, Lind	20,520	26,265.60	
Paul Webb, Jr., Walla Walla	21,833	26,212.74	26,212.74
I. A. Zakarison Estate, Pullman	20,855	26,068.50	26,068.50
Clyde Davis, Pullman	22,488	26,043.19	26,043.19
Lowell Baker, Pomeroy	22,312	26,033.78	26,033.78
Paul E. and Glenn D. Hofer, Prescott Paul S. Hofer, Waitsburg	20,025	26,032.50	
Waneita Heilman, Los Angeles, Calif.			
Harris Bros., Dayton	21,690	25,823.19	25,823.19
Edgar L. Smith, St. John	20,610	25,762.50	25,762.50
Myklebust Bros., Lacrosse	22,271	25,709.73	25,709.73
Fred Mader, Palouse	22,237	25,636.88	25,636.88
Pioneer Stock & Grain Farm, Inc., Colfax	22,043	25,443.46	25,443.46
Virgil Stevens, Wilson Creek	21,044	25,366.72	12,115.52
Norman Hansen, Tekoa	21,990	25,365.38	23,123.78
R. C. Walker, Hartline	21,028	25,339.19	25,339.19
Raymond B. Williams, Almira	21,423	25,110.00	25,110.00
Scheele Bros. and Theodore F. Scheele, Fairfield	20,250	25,110.00	25,110.00

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, by way of example, I name, under "soybeans," the Arkansas Grain Corp., Stuttgart, Ark. Quantity pledged in bushels, 7,103,230. Amount loaned, $16,353,580.93. Amount repaid, $10,454,477.76, or a net gain to this corporation of some $6 million.

Let us review the 1964 figures for wheat loans. The figures show that 88,000 price-support loans, totaling almost $254 million, were made to wheat farmers.

Of this total number, approximately 3,500 loans were payments exceeding $10,000.

When I carefully reviewed the facts for Maryland from information I could find, I found that one producer of any crop in the State of Maryland received more than $10,000.

Of the 3,500 loans, 400 received loans exceeding $25,000. But these totaled close to $15 million.

The amount of the so-called support loans over $10,000 to wheat farmers reached the sky-high figure last year of $59 million. That is $59 million that is not being spent for the benefit of the poor farmers, or even middle-income farmers. The money spent is actually serving to encourage the big farms or corporate farms to grow more wheat which is sold to the taxpayers at a profit. If these gigantic farmers are not able to sell these surplus crops, Uncle Sam—you and I and the people we represent—is ready to take it off their hands and store it at the taxpayers' expense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

A recent report prepared by the Joint Economic Committee states that losses under the price-support program have totaled $13 billion over the life of the program, and they continue to go up.

In addition, the CCC has now nearly used up all of its $14,500 million borrowing authority.

I charge that this is another way to raid the Treasury, to use a hackneyed phrase, through the back door.

During the 1964 fiscal year—last year—the CCC had a net loss of $2,700 million.

I point these losses out in order to emphasize the extent of the Federal Government's involvement in agriculture. Over the last 30 years the United States has followed the protectionist approach to agriculture. The costly results of this approach are a testament to its inadequacies.

Our price-support programs have not only cost the taxpayers and consumers vast sums of money, but have forced a sizable part of our economy to be dependent on the Government for its mere existence.

I believe that now is the time to put on the brakes. My amendment is designed, in a small way, to accomplish that job. I urge my colleagues to join me in placing a $10,000 annual limitation on the money that any single agricultural producer can receive in either price-support loans or direct payments.

In this way we can be sure that our agricultural programs are taxpayer and consumer oriented, as well as designed to help the family farmer. The family farmer, the genesis for the entire operation that we now find ourselves embarked upon, is not deriving the full benefit of the program. If Senators want to help him, I cannot see any reasonable argument that can be advanced for cutting off the large business enterprises, the corporate farmers, who produce acre after acre, bushel after bushel, and sell to the taxpayer at a profit.

I would advise the Senate that, as a prudent producer of any commodity or any product, I would not go into the venture unless I knew I could make a profit. And for the big man, corporate or individual, I see no reason why the Government—the taxpayer—should support his profitmaking scheme.

I would be happy to accept—and several of my colleagues have indicated to me that they are in agreement—amendments to my amendment. I make this talk and propound this amendment because I believe the American people should take stock of what they are doing. The program is exceedingly costly. It is ineffective. It is not doing the job that it was designed to do—to protect the small farmer, his wife, and family in the homestead or on the family farm.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer to the Senator's amendment, and can speak on my own time. I can offer my amendment and speak on my own time, if the Senator is willing.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not in order until all time on the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, my amendment is an amendment to the Brewster amendment. My amendment is No. 445, and I would like the clerk to state it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not in order until all time has been utilized or yielded back on the amendment of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia on my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment can be offered at this time only by unanimous consent. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and the Senator from Virginia may call up his amendment at this time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am in thorough sympathy and accord with the proposal that the time has come to put on the brakes. I believe it is long past the time.

I stated briefly yesterday on the floor of the Senate, when I sent the amendment to this amendment to the desk, that in 1949 I voted for farm bills—which we will secure at the end of this year—to end all price supports, and that we should return farming to where it was prior to this program since World War II.

The House insisted on it, and in conference the Senate yielded, and we have had a support program ever since. As the senior Senator from Maryland pointed out, the program has cost $13 billion; and what has it accomplished? The surpluses are worse than they were when we started.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Since the Senator is discussing his amendment—does he want to offer his amendment at this time?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Could I obtain unanimous consent to do that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The Senator has already been granted unanimous consent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a point of order.

As I understand the situation, the first vote will be taken on the amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from Virginia ask for the yeas and nays on his amendment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would like to have my amendment stated. I wish to make a change in my amendment with respect to sugar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 1, beginning with line 2, strike out all down through the period in line 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "after January 1, 1967, no corporation except a producer of sugar shall be eligible for price-support loans or payments under any program or programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, and no producer other than a corporation shall be eligible for price-support loans or payments under any such program or programs in any amount in excess of $25,000 for any one year."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to order the yeas and nays on the Robertson and Brewster amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

Is the request for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the fact that the Senator exempted sugar from his amendment because it is covered by a different type of proposal.

I wonder if the Senator recalls that wool is likewise covered by a different proposal and would be included in the same classification as sugar. They are both deficit crops.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We can develop that, but wool goes generally to the small farmer, and my limitation on corporations is that we should not subsidize corporations. We could not do so under the $25,000 provision of my amendment.

If there is anybody in Virginia who has that much wool I have not heard about it. I doubt if anyone in Florida has that much either.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it my understanding that the Senator from Virginia offered an amendment to my amendment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is time for the Senate to put on the brakes. In 1949 I favored not only putting on the brakes but going back to a system of private enterprise. Under such a system of private enterprise, when there was overproduction, we had always had low prices in the marketplace because they were regulated and the Government did not have to take charge.

This is another illustration of a favorite maxim of Thomas Jefferson, who said:

If we have to go to Washington for advice on when to sow and when to reap, we will soon lack bread.

We have looked to Washington to regulate production of farm crops, and it has not succeeded. It has cost $13 billion, as the Senator from Maryland pointed out. He proposes that from now on no one shall get more than $10,000 a year on all the crops he produces.

I could go along with that proposal, except that I know from past experience with respect to these limitations that it will not be adopted.

With the hope that something may be adopted, and in view of the fact there was a large vote at one time on a limitation of $25,000, my amendment raises the limit.

The theory is that we must preserve farming as a manner of life.

Thomas Jefferson said he hoped the time would never come when less than 50 percent of our people would be engaged in agriculture, because, he said, farmers are the backbone of our representative democracy and their independence and their manner of living must be preserved if we are to preserve our democracy and independence.

Mr. ELLENDER. Now farmers represent 7½ percent.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished chairman of the committee says that the figure is down to 7½ percent.

We have some trends in Government that I do not think are in keeping with the views of the Founding Fathers. The situation is very disturbing.

Why should we subsidize corporations that are engaged in farming? We subsidize farmers for two reasons: First, we wish to preserve a manner of life; and second, we wish to produce a sufficient amount of food and fiber to take care of our personal needs. Is there any question about our doing that?

Our cottongrowers are greatly disturbed over the fact that one-half of our fabrics are now made from materials other than cotton. We are disturbed, under the cotton bill, that if the price of cotton is too high, more and more shifts will be made to other fibers to replace cotton in clothing and various other items, such as automobile tires and materials in which cotton is used.

The Senator from Maryland pointed out the number of farmers who are receiving more than $10,000 a year.

The average farm in Virginia is less than 100 acres. The average wheat allotment in Virginia is only 10 acres. The average barley allotment is 3¼ acres.

In Virginia $10,000 would take care of 95 percent of the farmers under this program. But what do we find? We find 400 wheatfarmers getting $15 million, according to the figures of the Senator from Maryland.

I do not see how anybody can stand on the floor of the Senate and say that we owe a duty to support prices above $25,000. Agriculture is a manner of living. I do not see how anybody can stand on the floor of the Senate and say we owe a duty to insurance companies and others who bought farmland and used the various soybean, cotton, wheat, and other allotments to sell their product to the Government.

That is what the loan program means. A loan is made at a certain percentage of parity. But that is a sale to the Government. They never get it back.

As a result, we get a million bushels of wheat, thousands of bales of cotton, feed grains, and soybeans. We have everything. Unfortunately, we are now beginning to accumulate two other products that worked pretty well for a while: tobacco and peanuts. Why? We have such small acreages that Government regulators could find out what was being planted, and the allotments down from year to year. We kept production fairly in line with the visible market.

Our tobacco growers produced a heavier type tobacco, but it was a poor quality. They applied more and more fertilizer. Where they had been producing 1,000 pounds an acre, they increased the production to 1,500 pounds. I believe some of the production was as high as 2,000 pounds an acre.

Maryland is a fine tobacco-producing State. Maryland's tobacco has a fine flavor. Much of it goes into the manufacture of cigarettes. I have seen Maryland tobacco that grew as high as my shoulder. It has a heavier leaf.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. We Marylanders are proud of our tobacco, but few tobacco farmers would be affected by the $10,000 limitation. Tobacco is grown primarily in small amounts by our tobacco farmers. Only one-quarter of the Maryland tobacco farmers have more than 10 acres. This means that three-quarters of our tobacco farmers earn less than $12,000 from tobacco.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. Since we have voted down the $10,000 limitation in previous years, it may be said that this proposal is socialistic. It is not socialistic at all. We merely have a bear by the tail and do not know how to cut loose. We want to cut down the expense to the taxpayers.

The Senator from Maryland says that if we want to preserve farming as a manner of life, we want to be sure that we have enough food and fiber. If we limit the amount to $10,000, that will take care of about 90 percent of our farmers. Why should we proceed further to subsidize rich men and corporations?

I hope that my amendment will be adopted. I had offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute. But after preparing it so as to exempt all corporations, I found that sugar is in a separate category and operates under a different law.

We collect about $70 million in money to finance the sugar program in lieu of the 2-cent tariff that could be imposed under the Smoot-Hawley tariff, which is still in effect, except where it is set aside temporarily. The amount fell to $60 or $65 million in sugar.

In Hawaii—and I have had the privilege of visiting that grand State—a large amount of sugar is produced, but it is primarily for great corporations. I visited the sugar fields of the great State of Louisiana. Some of them have been hard hit by a storm called Betsy, and many of them may never spring up again. But I am told that two large corporations in Louisiana produce 80 to 85 percent of the sugar. So I modified my amendment before it was read so as to exempt corporations that produce sugar; so sugar is not covered by the amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I compliment the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. Having followed the struggle in this regard, I think it is high time that we recognize some of the factors of life. The Government operates a high-cost agriculture program. I come from a great agricultural State. I favor keeping the farmer going. But we must be fiscally responsible, and it is important that this type of legislation be enacted. I want the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Virginia to know that their amendments will have my support.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. FONG. I am happy that the Senator from Virginia has seen fit to exempt sugar from his amendment. As I read the amendment, I find that it will not do the job that I should like to have it do. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Virginia would accept a modification. I understand that I would not be able to offer an amendment to his amendment, because that would be an amendment in the third degree. But perhaps the Senator will accept my proposal by unanimous consent.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Before the Senator from Hawaii makes his proposal, and since the Senator from Louisiana is interested in sugar, I hope the Senator from Louisiana will listen to the proposal, so that I may have the benefit of his advice, since he is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. FONG. The Senator's amendment exempts producers of sugar. I should like to add the following words: "except a producer of sugar as defined in section 101(k) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended under title III of such Act."

Mr. ROBERTSON. That would be satisfactory. I accept that modification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment along the lines suggested by the Senator from Hawaii so as to refer to the Sugar Act. Then everyone will know who is covered by the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is so modified.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator from Virginia for his remarks. I should like to read one sentence from a summary of 30 years of operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The sentence reads:

> Of the $56.3 billion in price support extended by CCC since 1933, loans account for $41.9 billion, or 74 percent. Of those loans, $14.3 billion, or 34 percent, were repaid by the borrowers.

Therefore, out of every $3 that the taxpayers have put up since 1933, they have got $1 back.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is why the Senator from Virginia said the program has not worked. It was said that the production would be well within reach of a visible market and that the loans would be temporary; that the market would absorb them. But that has not happened. As the Senator from Maryland has just said, the Government has got back only $1 out of every $3. The Government has gone in the red on this program by more than $13 billion, and the Commodity Credit Corporation has about exhausted its loan money. It will be necessary to return to the Committee on Appropriations for funds, if we do not do something about putting on the brakes. We should stop providing more and more money to be paid out to more and more rich farmers and more and more corporations, to be followed by more and more surpluses. If that happens, we shall have to pass a law to give the surpluses away or sell them for soft currency, which is practically the same thing, because when we get the soft currency, we have something we cannot use. That is only a little device to say that we are not giving the surpluses away, when actually we are.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It might be well at this point to mention what recently happened when Yugoslavia devalued its dinar. The dinar was selling at the rate of 750 for $1 of American money. It was devalued by 60 percent. So the dinar became worth 1,250 for $1.

In addition, prices in Yugoslavia were increased by 24 percent when Tito, by a stroke of the pen, devalued the dinar. When prices were raised, that took from us practically 84 percent of the value of the dinars, which we had acquired under the Public Law 480 program.

That subject has not been given any attention, but it is a vital one. If the issuers of dinars and other foreign currency to our country can devalue their currency, all the soft currency we have can be reduced to nothingness by a simple devaluation of the currency which we possess and by an increase in the price, which, of course, brings less for the currency that we expend.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Ohio, has developed another phase of this matter, which shows the futility of saying, "The Government will get this cotton, wheat, or peanut oil, but we can sell it abroad."

We would sell it abroad for soft currency and then the currency would be devalued. The product would go abroad at far below what the Government had paid for it. Then, as has been pointed out in the case of Yugoslavia, they could cut the value of our money by simply devaluing their currencies.

The entire program is unsound. We should rely on private enterprise. That is the only system that has ever worked or that ever will work.

I know that this bill will be passed. It will not be passed by my vote, but it will be passed. I know that we are a long way from returning our farmers to a system of private enterprise, which the majority of us prefer. However, in the process of transition, why could we not make a small step in the right direction by reducing the enormous cost of this program?

I asked several farmers, leaders in the grain industry, and the president of the Farm Bureau Federation what this program would cost. They said that it would not make a great deal of difference under either the House bill or the Senate bill. One bill would involve a higher cost in one respect and the other would involve a higher cost in another respect. Under either bill, it is estimated that in 4 years' time it would cost $16 to $20 billion.

I received a telegram from Mr. Shuman this morning. He said that this bill is fundamentally unsound and should

not be enacted into law, but that this is one way by which we can improve the measure.

I do not know whether it will be finally enacted into law. However, I am satisfied that something will be enacted into law. We have always passed farm bills. This one will be passed.

Various provisions will be ironed out in conference. However, the fundamental procedure will be substantially the same, because, regardless of which provision prevails, or how the provisions are compromised—I do not know how much we can save—I believe that it would be encouraging to the taxpayers who must pay the bill if we were to say, "We will preserve the farm as a way of life, and we will let you have enough food and fiber, but we will cut down on those who receive more than $25,000 a year from the Government, and we will cut down on all crops except that which is covered under the Sugar Act, which is a different thing entirely." I am told that it is not actually costing the Government money. It is costing the consumers money. We put an artificial price on sugar to protect the sugar producers against cheaper offshore sugar. We have done that for a long time. However, that is neither here nor there.

I was glad to hear the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] call attention to the fact that in his State most of the sugar is produced by corporations, and it would be unfair to them, because they could not adjust their program. Incidentally, the last time I was in Hawaii, a long time ago, I was told that sugar land sold for anywhere from $500 to $700 an acre. The land is not cheap.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, some of that land costs from $3,000 to $4,000 an acre.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is what I have heard since. The average corporations can buy such land, but not many of the small farmers could pay the price for sugar land.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the fact that the exception which is incorporated in the amendment only deals with the first part of the amendment. It is very necessary, to be sure that sugar is exempted, that we incorporate another exemption in the sixth line of the amendment of the Senator, to read the same as I have presented it, so that corporations would be entitled to something more than $25,000 a year.

In the first exemption, the Senator deals with the fact that corporations should not be included in any kind of payment. In the second provision, we talk about $25,000 a year being the limit.

I ask the Senator if he will modify his amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator be kind enough to state his proposal? When I proposed an exemption for sugar, I intended to make it a complete exemption for sugar. I did not believe that the limitation of $25,000, which was for individual producers, would apply to corporations. Therefore, I did not believe that it was necessary to include a separate provision pertaining to $25,000 a year limitation for corporations when the first provision covered only individual producers. I then exempted corporations which produce sugar. When I do that, that would exempt them from everything under the first provision.

Mr. FONG. Because the amendment has two provisions, it is necessary for clarification, that we include the exemption again. After the words, "and no producer other than a corporation" insert the following: "except a producer of sugar, as defined in section 101(k) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended under title III of such Act."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, is that the language that the Senator wishes to have incorporated?

Mr. FONG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is what I intended to do and what I wish to do for clarification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it is the intent that sugar not be included under this amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I hope now that everyone is satisfied.

The Senator has asked that my amendment be voted on. Before that vote, I should like to have the views of the author of the original amendment with respect to my proposed modification.

I call attention to how gradual the change is. We make no change with respect to what is already planted and to be harvested this year, or what will be planted next spring and harvested next fall. The cutoff date is January 1967. That would give a year and a half for everyone to know that, to the extent he is not farming for sale to the Government in an amount over $25,000.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am deeply impressed by the brilliant remarks of the Senator. If the Senator from Virginia will permit me to do so, I should be very happy to accept his suggestion.

As I understand, the amendment would go to three points. First, it would raise the amount provided in my amendment from a $10,000 cutoff to $25,000. Second, it would bar the big corporate interests or any corporate interest, which is necessarily a business interest, from collecting from the taxpayer. Third, it would exempt the sugar industry, which seems to be running on a rather even keel.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the author of the amendment is willing to accept my amendment, as modified, we can dispose of the matter on one vote.

I ask unanimous consent to rescind the order for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Does the Senator from Maryland so modify his amendment?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that I have a right to so modify my amendment. I do so modify my amendment and accept the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the Brewster amendment is modified so as to include the Robertson amendment as modified.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the vote be on the Brewster amendment, as modified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I am happy that the distinguished Senator from Virginia has accepted my amendment to exempt sugar compliance payments from the provisions of his amendment.

The Brewster amendment and the Robertson amendment, without excepting sugar compliance payments from their provisions would destroy Hawaii's sugar industry.

They would deal a staggering blow to Hawaii's economy, for sugar is our leading farm crop.

In 1964, the approximate value to Hawaii's economy of raw sugar and molasses produced and Sugar Act compliance payments earned totaled $163 million.

The Brewster amendment would drastically reduce the compliance payments to Hawaii's sugar producers. For all practical purposes, the $10,000 limit and the $25,000 limit under the Robertson amendment would amount to wiping out these essential compliance payments.

For those not familiar with compliance payments, let me briefly explain.

At present, there is a Federal excise tax of one-half cent per pound on raw sugar processed in the United States. In 1964, the U.S. Treasury collected $10,837,210 on processing of cane sugar produced just by Hawaii sugar companies. The tax collected by the Federal Government on sugar produced each year by each company in Hawaii is more than the same company receives in compliance payments.

The purpose of the tax is to provide funds to pay U.S. sugar producers or processors for maintaining good wages and working conditions, promoting orderly development of the sugar industry, and stabilizing the price of sugar for consumers.

Federal law permits conditional compliance payments to producers, or to processors who are also producers, when they first, comply with sugar production and marketing restrictions; second, pay

at least the official minimum wages to workers; third, do not employ child labor; and fourth, in the case of processors, pay at least the official minimum prices for sugarbeets or sugarcane.

Compliance payments received by 25 of the 26 Hawaii sugar producers in 1964 totaled $8,679,132. Figures are not available for one company.

Thus, in 1964 the U.S. Treasury collected on Hawaii sugar processed some $2 million more than Hawaii sugar companies received in compliance payments.

In fact, since 1937, the Federal Government has collected more in processing taxes on Hawaii sugar than has been paid to Hawaii sugar producers. So it is clear compliance payments do not represent a net drain on the U.S. Treasury.

On the other hand, compliance payments are crucial to the continuance of the Hawaii sugar industry. In 1964, compliance payments to Hawaii companies ranged from $51,000 to $1,074,000, with the majority of companies receiving more than $200,000.

While these payments are large, the cost to the U.S. Treasury per ton in Hawaii is substantially less than any other domestic producing area. Payments in 1964 to Hawaii producers per ton were $8.96, whereas compliance payments to sugar producers in other areas of the United States ranged from $12.93 a ton to $16.20 a ton.

Even with these compliance payments, the return on invested capital in Hawaii's sugar industry is extremely nominal. In a substantial number of years, the majority of Hawaii sugar companies have wound up in the red despite receiving compliance payments.

Limiting compliance payments to $10,000 or $25,000 per producer, as the amendments respectively propose, would for all practical purposes hurt Hawaii's sugar producers as much as outright elimination of these payments.

Our sugar producers just could not survive such a blow. Last year, without these compliance payments, 17 of Hawaii's 25 sugar producers would have suffered net losses.

I would also like to point out that production of cane sugar in Hawaii is vastly different from production of other commodities, which can be grown by thousands of small farmers on small acreage.

Hawaii sugar can be efficiently produced only by corporate entities. They cannot operate on a fragmented basis. Thousands of acres are needed for efficient and profitable operations. Also, sugarcane requires 22 to 24 months before harvest; other crops only a single growing season.

This is why Hawaii's sugar yield of 1,110,000 tons annually is produced by only 26 companies in operations integrating production and processing. A $10,000 limit on compliance payments for any one company is completely unrealistic for Hawaii.

The sugar industry in Hawaii provides year-round employment for some 12,500 workers. The payroll totals about $65,500,000. Hawaii's sugar workers are the highest paid in the world.

These workers would face unemployment if Hawaii's sugar industry collapses, as it would under the Brewster amendment. Where would these workers find jobs?

Hawaii's sugar industry, although owned by only 26 companies, is owned by about 12,300 individual stockholders, of whom almost two-thirds live in Hawaii.

Hawaii's sugar industry is a world leader in sugar technology and mechanization. It has served America well in war and in peace to help supply our Nation with sugar so basic to human needs.

I am happy that the distinguished Senator from Virginia has accepted my amendment to exempt sugar compliance payments from the provisions of his amendment. I am also happy that the distinguished Senator from Maryland has accepted the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Virginia as amended.

I will now support the Brewster amendment as modified by the Robertson amendment as modified by my amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland controls the time on his amendment. Is he willing to yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield as much time to the Senator from Ohio as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The statement shows the name of the producer, the quantity of bushels pledged, the amount of money loaned by the Government to the producer, and the amount repaid.

It was my original understanding that the farm program was intended to preserve the existence of the small farmer, the family farmer. On the subject of barley, the Westlake Farms of Stratford, Calif., pledged 971,000 bushels and borrowed $933,000.

I point to the following examples: Youngker Farms Co., amount repaid, $200,748.60; Westlake Farms, $937,336.20; Five Points Ranch, Inc., $284,519.04; Tulana Farms, $157,682.29.

How different those figures are from the principle that the program was intended to preserve the family farm, the little farm. The point I am trying to make is that the program has departed far from its original structure. There are many other examples, involving huge sums of money. On the first page of the report dealing with barley and dried beans, the high figure is $937,000 and the low figure is about $25,000. There is one item of $200,000, another of $284,000, and a third of $157,000.

The number of borrowers whose loans exceed $25,000 is rather substantial. It seems to me that if the program was intended originally to preserve the small family farm, it has departed completely from that objective. Mr. President, I ask that this tabulation be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator was momentarily absent from the Chamber. I have already placed that same report in the RECORD.

Referring to pages 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the report that he is quoting from, I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that we find few repayments to the Government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. With respect to soybeans, let me emphasize that, as shown on page 20, one company, the Arkansas Grain Corp. of Stuttgart, Ark., borrowed $16 million, and paid back $10 million. I ask the Senator, Does that make any sense?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the reason why I shall support the Senator's amendment. As to the Arkansas Grain Corp. which borrowed $16,353,580 and paid back $10,454,477, I do not know whether it means that the balance of $6 million is a loss, but it might be. I cannot subscribe to the program, and I support the proposed amendment of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The amendment of the Senator from Maryland would limit the amount of price support loans or payments which could be made to any producer for any year to $25,000.

Much consideration has been given to limitations of that kind in the past. A limitation of $50,000 was enacted in the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1960. The General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture issued a 33-page opinion covering a number of questions concerning that limitation, but still it was found unworkable. It was not extended after 1960.

Price support purchases would not be covered by the pending amendment, but even if they were, how could the amendment be applied to dairy products, which are purchased from brokers, where the producer of the product cannot be identified? How would corporate producers be covered? Where price support is made through payments, the amendment might wipe out the larger producers, but where the price is supported by loans, it is probable that enough of the product would be put under loan to support the loan price for both large and small producers.

At present, the Secretary of Agriculture has considerable discretion to use either price support payments or diversion payments to accomplish program purposes. The Senator's amendment would not apply to diversion payments.

Price support programs are designed to protect both producers and consumers, and to achieve price stability and

orderly marketing. The provision proposed by the Senator from Maryland would make it most difficult to achieve the purposes of the program.

Mr. President, from the discussions I have heard today, I believe it is possible that the Senator does not quite understand the workings of the program. I was particularly interested in the comments by my good friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the Senator yield for a moment on that question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Just a minute.

The purpose of price support loans is to provide for the orderly marketing of wheat, corn, or other commodities produced in large quantities by making it possible to remove them from the market temporarily, in many instances, so as to stabilize it. Of course, such action assists all growers of the particular commodities. It inures to the benefit of the small farmer, because if such large amounts of wheat or corn were to be dumped on the open market, it would break the price of the commodity drastically. This would hurt all producers, not just the large producers. As a matter of fact, it is highly likely that small producers would be hurt most, because they cannot stand much of a price reduction without being in grave trouble.

From the beginning of the program, the purpose was to provide a method whereby producers could borrow money and store their crops as harvested and later could repay the loans if the market price went up, or if they could sell at a profit. That happened in many, many cases. The law provides, of course, that if the market does not improve, the commodity remains in the hands of the Federal Government.

I think that the program has worked well. I agree that it is costly. But it has been a savior to the producers of these commodities.

If the Senator's amendment is adopted, it would mean that many of the larger producers would continue to produce much more than our requirements are, and thereby break the market hurting the small farmers. I know that my good friend, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], would not wish to see that happen.

I hope that my good friend the Senator from Maryland would not wish to see that. I believe that the program has directly stabilized the production of our major commodities, our five or six main commodities, such as corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, and other staple commodities, and indirectly stabilized the production of others. If the amendment is enacted into law, it will be akin to throwing a bombshell into the whole program. The purpose of the law is to try to keep production, if possible, in line with our requirements. The adoption of the amendment would do just the opposite.

As I said before, in 1961 it was necessary for us to devise a new program for corn and other feed grains. The stocks had grown so large that it was necessary for us to reduce the surplus.

How could we reduce the surplus? By encouraging producers not to plant, by offering them a diversion payment or a price support if they will comply by cutting back on their acreage.

In my opinion, this is the only way to do it. I do not know of any other way which could be devised to accomplish that end.

Inasmuch as the principal purpose of the diversion payments and the loan payments is to reduce surpluses, it goes without saying that the larger farmers who produce most of the commodities can contribute most. That is why the program should be uniform. And that is why there should be no limitation on the payments. If ever we amended the law whereby payments to the producer would be limited we would destroy the purpose of the act because it is, in effect, the larger producers, be it individuals or corporations—we have them with us—that account for the greatest cut in production. To limit their opportunities, we would cetrainly, in my opinion, be increasing surpluses. The purpose of all the laws we are considering today is to keep our production in line with consumption requirements both at home and abroad.

Accordingly, I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let me point out, first of all, that the amendment is an amendment to another amendment. The Senator obtained the drafting services of the Senate to prepare the amendment. The original amendment was prepared by the drafting service. No one needs to tell me that the staff of the drafting service is so dumb that it does not know how to prepare an amendment that would be useless and of no effect. The fact is that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has finally admitted the fact that it would have effect, when he called it a bombshell. That is what we hope it will be, by going over the heads of the little farmers and hitting the farmers receiving $25,000 or more, whom we should not subsidize.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The protection the small farmer obtains is due to the fact that we keep a great deal of production off the market. If we did not have a place where the larger producers could obtain loans to keep his product off the market, there is no doubt that the price of the commodity would go down. In other words, if we caused the larger producers to dump all their production on the market, it would ruin the market. Those who would lose most would be the small growers.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not see how the small grower would lose. Why should we assume that the big grower is going to produce at a loss when he knows it will cost more? He will go out of business.

Mr. ELLENDER. If we wish to put the large growers out of business, we can succeed by doing the very thing the Senator is advocating now. But my fear is that there will be shortages, because today many farmers receive some kind of protection for the production of their crops, or they would not be in business.

I repeat that the method of providing for loans on the commodity as it is harvested has stabilized the price of the commodity in the market; and unless we have such a device, the large producer would be forced to dump his commodities on the market, it would lower the market price and seriously affect the small farmer, because he would have to sell at lower prices.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield back the remainder of his time, except for 1 minute, after he is through speaking?

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to make a few closing remarks but prior to doing that would like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator from Maryland will withhold his request for a moment I should like to yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] to file a privileged matter.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

(At this point Mr. MCNAMARA submitted a report from the Committee on Public Works, which appears elsewhere, under an appropriate heading.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quroum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to summarize the present status of the amendment which I originally introduced and which has been amended by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

This is what we propose:

First. The Department of Agriculture, or the taxpayer, makes no loan or payment to any producer for more than $25,000 in any 1 year. Let me point out that this provision would not go into effect until January 1, 1967, and, therefore, no crop now on the ground would be affected.

Second. We propose to bar payments to corporate business ventures.

Third. At the suggestion of both Senators from Hawaii, the sugar industry is in no way affected.

By way of example, I point out one venture which I discussed earlier in the day. In soybeans, the Arkansas Grain Corp., of Stuttgart, pledged, over 7 million bushels of soybeans, received a loan in excess of $16 million, and paid back $10 million.

The overall record since 1933, when we got into this business—and I read from the Department's own report—shows that of the $56 billion in price supports extended by CCC since 1933, loans account for nearly $42 billion, or 47 percent.

Of these loans, $14 billion has been repaid, or only 34 percent.

For every $3 expended by the taxpayers on commodity loans, the Government has received back $1.

I do not argue that our cutoff amendment is the answer to the agricultural program. I argue that we must put a brake on it. It is wasteful. It is extravagant. It does not work. It is time for someone to do something to stop it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I support the Senator's amendment. On previous occasions I have supported similar amendments. The amendment is in line with the President's stated objective when he said in his message last January that in any approach to the farm problem he wanted to make sure that the benefits would go to the small farmers. If that is what the administration wants, this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator for his support.

Mr. President, there are only two basic reasons for the Government's intervention in the field of agriculture, as the Senator from Virginia pointed out. The first is that we want to have adequate food and fiber in the United States to protect our population. Second, we want to protect the small family farmer.

My amendment would not affect either of those two objectives. I have heard no one else suggest any other approach to the problem.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield back my time.

Mr. TALMADGE Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. The amendment which the Senator has at the desk does not apply to the shipbuilding subsidy, does it?

Mr. BREWSTER. As the Senator from Georgia knows, it does not apply to the shipbuilding subsidy. I really do not think that has anything to do with the "price of eggs."

Mr. TALMADGE. Would the Senator be willing to modify his amendment to have it apply to shipbuilding?

Mr. BREWSTER. As the Senator knows, I would not.

Mr. TALMADGE. Would the Senator be willing to modify his amendment to have it apply to magazine postal subsidies, which have been estimated at $10 million?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is a subject with which I am not conversant. If we are subsidizing magazines, it is news to me.

Mr. TALMADGE. It is my understanding that considerably cheaper postal rates apply to magazines distributed through the mail, hence, a subsidy. Why should the Senator limit his amendment only to farmers, who have average annual incomes of approximately one-half the average annual incomes of nonagricultural workers?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator included two subjects in his earlier questions. One is shipbuilding and the other is magazines? I happen to be of the opinion that the Post Office Department—which, I gather, is what the Senator is referring to—has the obligation to all Americans to get them as much information as possible, at reasonable rates, so they can form adequate judgments on policies of the Government, and, indeed, on our own performance here.

Mr. TALMADGE. The obligation of the U.S. Government to supply her peoples with an abundance of food and fiber is, in my opinion, no less binding than her obligation to supply them with educational materials. Subsidies for farmers are criticized by people, mostly urbanites, who have not give full and considerate thought to the fact that the greatest subsidy existing in our country is the subsidy that the rural areas provide our cities. There are two examples of this subsidy.

First. The rural areas incur enormous expense educating young people out of county revenues. When these same young people mature, rather than remain on the farms, they migrate to the cities in search of better employment opportunities. Although these young people were educated with rural tax dollars and used county public facilities all their lives, it is the city that collects taxes from these migrants once they become taxpaying citizens.

Second. The American farmer produces for the people of the United States the greatest abundance of food found anywhere in the world, which is sold at lower prices than anywhere in the world. The American consumer can buy more food of a greater variety with 1 hour's wages than can most people anywhere else in the world with 1 week's wages.

It seems to me that if the Senator is determined to attack subsidies, instead of limiting his amendment to farmers, who earn the lowest net return of any group in our economy, he ought to include shipbuilders, for example, who have huge subsidies, much greater than any farmer receives.

Mr. BREWSTER. I agree that perhaps the entire subsidy program should be reviewed. I happen to look at shipbuilding as a part of our national defense program.

Mr. TALMADGE. If the Senator will yield, does he not think farm production is an essential component of our national defense?

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not yield. Since we have an army, air corps, and navy, I also think we should have a viable merchant marine. But, as the Senator knows, this subsidy does not go to the family farmer, so it does not go to the heart of the agricultural problem. My amendment would eliminate the big producers who are profiting at the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, while I am in complete sympathy with the desire of my good friend the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], to reduce the costs of farm programs and to eliminate the subsidization of those for whom farm payments are just additional income, not a part of their basic livelihood, I must oppose his amendment to impose a blanket ceiling of $10,000 a year on price support loans or payments for any agriculture program.

In my opinion, this proposal does not take into account the wide variety of operations and the vast latitude in expenses and incomes which exists in the various segments of our agricultural industry. To try to impose a simple ceiling with no regard to the operating conditions of the individual farmer and the differences in costs and procedures from one type of operation from another and between various sections of our Nation would be unfair to many farmers, who for reasons beyond their control, have had to depend upon some type of Federal assistance to remain on the farm.

However, Mr. President, I would like to point to section 705 of the bill now under consideration and suggest that it contains the seeds for the development of a workable program for eliminating useless assistance in our farm programs. This section provides that the Secretary of Agriculture conduct a study on a county-by-county basis to determine the degree to which the multiplicity of programs under his direction benefit the farmer and to develop criteria for defining commercial family farms and how these criteria might apply in the implementation of farm programs. This report would be due on February 1, 1966. I commend it as a reasonable means of approaching the problem at issue here which could provide for its settlement in a logical and consistent manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired or has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] as modified, to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 56, as follows:

[No. 256 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Bartlett	Douglas	Moss
Bayh	Fong	Nelson
Bible	Gruening	Neuberger
Boggs	Hartke	Prouty
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Burdick	Jackson	Ribicoff
Cannon	Lausche	Robertson
Case	McGovern	Russell, Ga.
Church	McNamara	Saltonstall
Cotton	Miller	Smith
Dodd	Morton	Williams, Del.

NAYS—56

Allott	Holland	Montoya
Bass	Hruska	Morse
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Mundt
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Murphy
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Muskie
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Pastore
Curtis	Kennedy, Mass.	Pearson
Dirksen	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell, S.C.
Dominick	Kuchel	Simpson
Eastland	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Ellender	Long, La.	Sparkman
Ervin	Magnuson	Stennis
Fannin	Mansfield	Talmadge
Fulbright	McClellan	Thurmond
Gore	McGee	Tower
Harris	McIntyre	Yarborough
Hart	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	Mondale	Young, Ohio
Hill	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—11

Aiken	McCarthy	Symington
Anderson	Pell	Tydings
Bennett	Randolph	Williams, N.J.
Clark	Scott	

So Mr. BREWSTER's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 707. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no producer shall be eligible for price support loans or payments under any program or programs administered by the Department of Agriculture in any amount in excess of $50,000 for any one year. The foregoing dollar limitation shall include the fair dollar value (as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture) of any payment in kind made to a producer."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 5 minutes. I see no reason for debating the amendment extensively. It is exactly the same principle as that which was defeated by the Senate a moment ago, except that the amendment which was just voted on proposed to place a $25,000 limitation. I supported that amendment and wish it had been adopted. But since it was rejected, I am offering the same proposal except with a limitation of $50,000.

In his state of the Union message on January 4, the President stated:

Our economy owes much to the efficiency of our farmers. We must continue to assure them the opportunity to earn a fair reward. I have instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to lead a major effort to find new approaches to reduce the heavy cost of our farm programs and to direct more of our effort to the small farmer who needs help most.

On February 4, when the President submitted his farm message to Congress, he mentioned the words "small farmers" at least half a dozen times. He said he wanted his program to be directed to the benefit of small farmers and not large, corporate-type farmers. If it is the small farmers whom we want to help, by all means this amendment should be adopted.

Certainly, $50,000 is adequate and is more than a liberal amount. It is double the amount proposed in the amendment just rejected. My amendment will take care of the so-called small farmers throughout the country but will eliminate the corporate-type farming. What we are deciding is whether we want to help the small farmers of America or to perpetuate underwriting large corporate types of farm operations as we have been doing in the past.

The arguments for my amendment are the same as those which the Senator from Maryland made in behalf of his amendment, therefore I will not take the time of the Senate to repeat. With that suggestion, I rest my case.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do I correctly understand that the proposal offered by the Senator from Delaware is precisely the same as the amendment just voted on, except that the $25,000 limitation with respect to any producer, not including sugar producers, would be raised to $50,000, and that all corporate enterprises would be eliminated?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct, except that my amendment does not include the exception of sugar. I did not know that that had been offered by the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. FONG. My proposal was accepted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am willing to accept that proposal as a modification of my amendment, so as to make it the same amendment as that which was offered earlier.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment so as to include the proposal of the Senator from Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 707. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no producer, except a producer of sugar, as defined in section 101(k) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended under title III of such act, shall be eligible for price support loans or payments under any program or programs administered by the Department of Agriculture in any amount in excess of $50,000 for any one year. The foregoing dollar limitation shall include the fair dollar value (as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture) of any payment in kind made to a producer."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I am curious to know why sugar should be exempt.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Personally, I would be agreeable to including sugar if there were enough votes to adopt such an amendment, but I do not know whether there are sufficient votes. I am trying to have some amendment along this line adopted. This amendment does cover all commodities mentioned under the pending bill.

Mr. PASTORE. In other words, we can sustain the rich sugar producer but not the poor cotton producer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would be perfectly willing to support an amendment to include sugar producers, and we could vote on both amendments, if that would suit the Senator from Rhode Island. I am trying to have some amendment adopted that will provide a limitation. If an amendment were offered later to include sugar production, I should be glad to support it.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. One reason for excluding sugar is the nature of the crop and the fact that in order to grow sugar efficiently, it must be produced on a large scale.

In Hawaii, the average wage of a worker in the sugar fields is $24.50 a day. Such a wage could not prevail—it would be $6, $8, or $10 a day—if it were not for the large-type operation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The statement of the Senator from Kentucky is true.

In addition, the sugar quota is related to a tax on imports which will be coming over from the House in the next few days and will be before the Senate, and in which sugar can be dealt with as a separate issue. If it is not dealt with as a separate issue before we adjourn, there will be no sugar program of any kind that would be affected. It is only appro-

priate that the sugar question be handled in a sugar bill.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. FONG. Is it not true that the sugar program is the only self-financing program in the entire agricultural program?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not wish to engage in a discussion of how the program is financed, but I will agree that the sugar program is a separate act. Sugar is not one of the commodities which is stored by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The sugar program is administered under a separate law, entirely apart from the general farm program.

As I just said, a bill will be coming from the House in the next few days that will deal with the entire question of renewing or establishing a sugar program. Any modification that may be made in relation to that program should be made on that bill, which will be before Congress before this session is concluded.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. While the sugar program is self-financing through the imposition of excise taxes, the wheat program, too, would be practically self-financing if the use of wheat certificates was not disturbed. Does the Senator's proposal include loans as well as subsidy payments?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, it does.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Loans that are repaid?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. This would present a real problem to the average operator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. We pay a very high price for labor in the wheatfields in North Dakota, too.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that, but this would cover the situation. I read the amendment, "No producer shall be eligible for price-support loans or payments under any program or programs administered by the Department of Agriculture in any amount in excess of $50,000 for any 1 year. The foregoing dollar limitation shall include the fair dollar value—as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture—of any payment in kind made to a producer."

It does include all payments or loans which would be made on the various commodities affected under this bill, I want no misunderstanding on that.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I want to ask about that corporation provision. I did not understand it. Would this provision eliminate any payment of any kind to a corporation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would limit payments to $50,000 to any group, whether corporation or individuals.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, any corporation in a nonfarm business can go to the bank and borrow money. This would not prohibit a nonfarm corporation from going to a bank and borrowing money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, this would pertain to a Government loan subsidy under this bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have no further argument to advance. All of the arguments against the amendment of the Senator from Maryland apply equally to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. Everything that Congress has worked out in the way of a farm program would be destroyed by this amendment. We have provided that prices shall be supported but this amendment would prevent their being supported. We have provided incentives for reducing production, but this would remove those incentives. This would play havoc with the balance between commodities. It would not apply to milk at all, but it would be destructive of the cotton program, the corn program, and the wheat program. The purpose of a price-support loan is to take crops off the market, particularly, during the flush marketing period at harvest time, and more or less stabilize the price of the commodity and assist the smaller farmers.

I hope that this amendment will receive the same vote as it did the last time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I point out the overall sorry record of the so-called loans. Since 1933 $42 billion has been loaned and, of this amount, $14 billion has been repaid.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the figures used by the distinguished Senator from Maryland are rather out of date with the present program.

Years ago we had a high price support with loans on a high value. Under the cotton bill now, there are low-level loans. We have the same situation with respect to wheat. Most of these loans are repaid.

This provision would seriously interfere with the operation of the farm bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

AGRICULTURE EFFICIENCY SHOULD NOT BE PENALIZED

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in considering the various amendments proposed today that price support loans or payments for any 1 year be limited to $10,000, $25,000, $50,000, or $100,000, I believe it important that we keep in mind the fact that these are economic and not welfare programs.

Never before in the history of the world have the people of any nation been so well fed and clothed at so small a percent of their income. This is the direct result of the productive genius of the American farmer, genius that has been a blessing for us all.

Under the American system, we believe that those making this bounty of food and fiber possible should have the opportunity to share in the wealth they create according to their contributions.

If the farm people could individually cut their total production to 98 or 99 percent of market needs, we could discontinue the price support and loan programs. Our farm people would then be in a sellers' market and would be receiving far more for their production. We can all be thankful that instead of scarcity we have plenty.

In Missouri last year, 154,500 farms produced feed grains—corn and small grains. Of this number, more than 12,000 had a feed grain base of over 100 acres. These 12,000 farms, although only about 8 percent of all the farms in the State, accounted for one-third of the grain production in Missouri.

Were these farmers, each of whom produced more than $10,000 in price supported crops, to be limited to $10,000 maximum in price support loans or payments, they would logically cease to cooperate in the programs, would produce the maximum on their farms, and sell on the open market at prices just below the umbrella furnished by price-support loans to the covered producers.

Once again production would far exceed consumption, our feed grain stocks would be on the rise, and the cost to the Government would go up rather than down.

What would happen on feed grains under such a limitation would also take place on cotton and all other supported commodities.

If we were to set a limit on price support loans or payments, then it would seem equally reasonable to limit present subsidies on shipping, on postal rates, and benefits under the tariffs.

The owner of 10,000 shares of General Motors stock profits from the automobile tariff on each share of stock just as does the owner of 10 shares.

I know of no suggestion to put a ceiling on the benefit an individual could derive from tariff subsidies, nor should there be.

Neither should there be a dollar ceiling on the amount of participation in the farm programs, and I hope the Senate will continue to vote down these proposals.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware as modified. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 257 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Allott	Dominick	Moss
Bartlett	Douglas	Mundt
Bayh	Gore	Nelson
Bible	Gruening	Neuberger
Boggs	Hartke	Prouty
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Burdick	Jackson	Ribicoff
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Robertson
Case	Lausche	Russell, Ga.
Church	McGovern	Saltonstall
Clark	McIntyre	Simpson
Cotton	McNamara	Smith
Curtis	Miller	Williams, Del.
Dodd	Morton	Young, Ohio

NAYS—49

Bass	Hruska	Morse
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Murphy
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Muskie
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Cooper	Kennedy, Mass.	Pearson
Dirksen	Kennedy, N.Y.	Randolph
Eastland	Kuchel	Russell, S.C.
Ellender	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Ervin	Long, La.	Sparkman
Fannin	Magnuson	Stennis
Fong	Mansfield	Talmadge
Fulbright	McClellan	Thurmond
Harris	McGee	Tower
Hart	Metcalf	Yarborough
Hayden	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Hill	Monroney	
Holland	Montoya	

NOT VOTING—9

Aiken	McCarthy	Symington
Anderson	Pell	Tydings
Bennett	Scott	Williams, N.J.

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment ordered to be printed in the RECORD is to insert, at the proper place in the bill, the following new title:

TITLE VII—EGGS

(1) Subsection 8c(2)(B) is amended (a) by inserting "and laying chickens, which, when used in this title, shall be deemed to include baby chicks and pullets produced, acquired, or handled for the production of table eggs," after "turkeys" where it first appears; (b) by inserting "and chicken table and hatching eggs other than chicken hatching eggs used for producing poultry meat," after "turkey hatching eggs" where it first appears; (c) by inserting "except as to liquid, frozen, or dried chicken eggs" after the phrase "including canned or frozen commodities or products" where it first appears; and (d) by striking the word "and" where it first appears in (ii) and inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and striking the period in (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", and (iii) chicken table eggs, chicken hatching eggs, laying chicken hens, baby chicks and pullets may be treated as individual commodities under individual orders or may be combined in any combination under one order and treated as a single commodity for the purpose of regulating the quantity of chicken table eggs to be marketed in order to improve the economic conditions of chicken table egg producers."

(2) By adding a new subsection as follows:

"8c. (20) Laying chickens and chicken table eggs—Terms and conditions of orders.

"In the case of laying chickens and chicken table eggs, orders issued pursuant to this subsection shall contain one or more of the following terms and conditions and (except as provided in subsection 6, other than paragraphs (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), and (I) thereof, and subsection 7 of this section) no others; for the purpose of this section the hatching of baby chicks shall be considered handling of hatching eggs; and further for the purpose of this subsection it is determined that by reason of the widespread production and handling of laying chickens and chicken table and hatching eggs throughout the United States and the competition in marketing of such commodities throughout the United States all handling of such commodities is in interstate commerce or directly burdens or affects such commerce in laying chickens and chicken table and hatching eggs in the United States.

"(A) Limiting or providing methods for the limitation of the total quantity of laying chickens which may be marketed or otherwise handled during any specified period or periods by any or all handlers thereof.

"(B) Distinguishing, or providing methods for distinguishing, the different persons in the chicken table egg industry involved in the production and marketing of such eggs, including, but not restricted to, defining and classifying such groups of persons and providing for such different terms and conditions applicable to persons within each such class and to such classes as is determined to be appropriate to effectuate the purpose of the program in an equitable manner. Producer status may be limited to persons having a flock of laying chickens above a certain size where the Secretary determines, after hearing, that the regulation of the marketing of eggs from smaller flocks is not necessary to effectuate the policy of the Act and would impose an unwarranted burden upon the owners thereof or unnecessarily burden the administration of the order.

"(C) Determining, or providing methods for determining, the desirable quantity of chicken table eggs to be produced and marketed during any period and the desirable quantity of laying chickens necessary to allow the production and marketing of such desirable quantity of chicken eggs as determined. Table eggs shall be defined as edible eggs for human consumption other than those used for hatching.

"(D) Allotting, or providing methods for allotting, the total quantity of laying chickens or chicken table eggs available or to be available during a specified period, or periods, equitably among chicken table egg producers upon the basis of the total quantity of laying chickens acquired by each producer, or chicken table eggs marketed by each producer, during such prior period which the Secretary determined to be representative, and the size, production and age of the laying chickens in his current flock(s), due allowance being made in the provisions of the order for abnormal conditions, hardship cases, and producers who did not produce chicken table eggs during all or part of the representative period; such apportionment shall constitute an allotment fixed for the producer within the meaning of subsection 8a(5) of this title.

"(E) When allotments for producers with respect to laying chickens or chicken table eggs have been established under this section, the order may contain provisions allotting or providing a method for allotting the quantity which any handler may handle so that any and all handlers will be limited as to each producer to the quantity allotted to each producer, and such allotment shall constitute an allotment fixed for each handler within the meaning of subsection 8a(5) of this title.

"(F) Providing for a market diversion program for chicken table eggs and/or laying chickens which may include open market purchases of chicken table eggs, and liquid, frozen, or dried eggs, of any grade, size, type, or quality, when the Secretary determines that the then current or the estimated price for chicken table eggs is such that the average return therefor to producers would not be reasonable in view of the prices of feed, the available supplies of feeds, economic conditions affecting table egg production, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for chicken table eggs in the production area, and providing for the distribution of the net return derived from the disposition of such eggs or laying chickens to the market diversion fund and any amount determined by the Secretary to be in excess of such funds requirements to be equitably distributed among those contributing to such fund.

"(G) Establishing or providing for the establishment of marketing research and development projects designed to assist, improve, or promote the marketing, distribution, and consumption of eggs or egg products; the expense of such projects to be paid from funds collected pursuant to the marketing orders.

"(H) Subsections 8c(8), 8c(9), the first section of 8c(10), 8c(11), 8c(12), 8c(13)(B), and 8c(19) of this title shall not be applicable to orders issued under this subsection.

"(I) The authorization for provisions contained in subsection 8c(7)(D) shall be applicable to orders containing provisions under this subsection with the same force and effect as though this subsection was specified therein."

(3) By adding a new subsection 8c(21) as follows:

"8c(21) Producer referendum for approving orders applicable to laying chickens and chicken table eggs.

"The Secretary shall conduct a referendum among chicken table egg producers for the purpose of ascertaining whether the issuance of an order under subsection 8c(20) is approved or favored by them. For the purpose of such a referendum a chicken table egg producer shall be a person (a) who provides the labor for caring for a flock of egg producing hens, which flock would be subject to an order, if approved, and (b) who has an interest in the resulting egg production, and (c) who owns or leases and operates the producing facilities resulting in production of chicken table eggs subject to the order. No order shall be issued under this section unless approved by more than one-half of the eligible producers voting in said referendum. The terms and conditions of the proposed order shall be described by the Secretary in the ballot used in the conduct of the referendum. The nature, content, or extent of such description shall not be a basis for attacking the legality of the order or any action relating thereto."

(4) The prefatory language of subsection 608c(6) is amended by inserting after the words "other than" as they first appear, the words "laying chickens, chicken table eggs, and".

(5) Subsection 10(b)(2)(ii) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Orders issued under subsection 8c(20) may provide for such assessments to be paid only by handlers of baby chicks, laying chickens, or chicken table eggs and, further, if the order provides for a market diversion program for chicken table eggs, the Secretary may determine the amount of funds necessary for such a market diversion program and this amount shall be assessed upon all handlers of chicken table eggs and each such handler shall pay his pro rata share of this amount to the authority or agency established to administer the order: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary may, after hearing, establish such quantities of chicken table eggs handled as he determines necessary to be exempt from both the administrative and market diversion assessments to avoid unnecessary burdens on handlers and, further, that the Secretary, after hearing, may determine at what point in the handling of baby chicks, chickens for laying, or chicken table eggs such assessments shall attach."

Renumber present title VII, title VIII.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], to H.R. 9811, would authorize an eggmarketing order.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article from the Newark Evening News of May 5, 1965, entitled "Egg Income Down."

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

EGG INCOME DOWN: FARMERS' TAKE FROM MILK ALSO OFF

TRENTON.—Farm income from poultry and egg sales in New Jersey declined 15 percent in 1964, the New Jersey Crop Reporting Service announced today.

The reporting service, a division of the State agriculture department, said that receipts from milk sales also declined, but only about 3 percent.

Income from sales of eggs and poultry totaled $53.3 million during 1964 compared to $62.7 million in 1963, the department said. Eggs accounted for $48.6 million of last year's total, down from $56.7 million the preceding year.

FEWER HENS

The number of layers on New Jersey farms declined 11 percent to 8.2 million. White egg production dropped 10 percent to 1.6 billion.

Average production for each bird was 199 eggs for the year, a new record, the department said.

Monmouth County led the State in egg production, accounting for 316.4 million eggs. Cumberland was second and Ocean third.

Agriculture officials said that income from meat chickens amount to $2.5 million, down 30 percent from 1963. Farm chicken sales declined 9 percent to $2.2 million, but turkey sales were up 48 percent to $1.4 million.

The dairy industry reported $57.3 million in income from milk in 1964 compared to $59.3 million in 1963.

PRICES HIGHER

Wholesale milk prices were up 4 cents per hundred pounds in 1964 to $5.08 from a 12-year low in 1963.

Some 112,000 milk cows, 5,000 less than in 1963, produced an average of 9,770 pounds of milk each, a record high for New Jersey. The rate is topped only by California and Arizona.

Sussex County's milk production was tops in New Jersey again in 1964 with 240 million pounds. Warren was second and Hunterdon third.

Mr. CASE. Our amendment would amend the Agriculture Marketing Act of 1937 to authorize an egg marketing order. Such an order would provide for allocation among table egg producers of the estimated human egg consumption during specified periods.

The procedure to be followed is similar to that used for other marketing orders. The Secretary of Agriculture would publish a proposed order and hearings would be held, followed by a referendum among eligible producers. A majority would have to approve before the order would go into effect. Thus our proposed amendment is only enabling legislation.

Among other things, the purpose of such an order would be to, first, improve the economic conditions of producers of eggs for human consumption, and second, insure the public interest by keeping egg production widespread, in the hands of many people instead of a few. Prevention of a monopoly is the best insurance against exploitation of the public. Dispersion is also a protection against disaster to our total egg supply.

There are approximately 150 Federal and State marketing orders in effect today covering a wide variety of commodities including fruits, vegetables, tree nuts, cranberries, and milk among others. I am told that a survey conducted among those directing these orders indicates that they have resulted in developing order out of chaos, eliminating cutthroat activities in most cases, and stabilizing the price structure of the commodities involved.

Egg producers in my State are in dire straits. In 1957 gross cash receipts from egg production amounted to $92.2 million. In 1958, it dropped to $90.6 million, a loss of $1.6 million. In 1959, the cash receipts dropped to $72.6 million, a drastic reduction of $18 million. And in 1964, preliminary estimates indicate that cash receipts from eggs will amount to only $49.7 million. This represents a total drop in an 8-year period of $42.5 million.

As of January 1, 1959, the number of farmers keeping poultry flocks in my State was 9,200. As of January 1, 1965, this figure was reduced to 3,900. Thus 5,200 farmers who kept poultry flocks went completely out of business. A similar decline has occurred in a number of other States. If we do not do something about this trend, we shall soon find a handful of giants in complete control of egg production, a situation in nobody's interest.

There are no subsidies provided in this legislation. But there is provision for purchases of eggs and egg products on the open market by the Secretary of Agriculture in times of oversupply. Under our amendment these purchases and administration of this program will be borne entirely by the producers themselves through an assessment at either the hatchery, producer, or egg processor level.

This amendment would give egg producers the right, enjoyed by so many other farmers, to decide whether they want a marketing order. I emphasize that the costs of administering the order would be borne by the egg farmers themselves.

I should be happy, Mr. President, to hear any comment that the chairman of the committee might have concerning my amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this amendment has been before the committee for the past 4 years, but this year no hearings were held on it.

The amendment would authorize the issuance of marketing orders for, first, laying chickens—including baby chicks and pullets for the production of table eggs, second, chicken table and hatching eggs—other than eggs used for the production of poultry meat, and third, liquid, frozen, or dried chicken table eggs.

The Senator's amendment was referred to the committee on August 26. The committee has had no bill before it on this subject this Congress, and the subject matter was not brought up at the committee's hearings. It is a very complex amendment and a very complex subject. In 1961 the committee studied somewhat similar suggestions at great length, and it was a subject of considerable controversy in the passage of the Agricultural Act of 1961. At that time the Senate decided to limit this authority insofar as poultry and eggs were concerned to turkeys and turkey hatching eggs.

Mr. President, there is much opposition to this amendment. Personally, as chairman of the committee, I would suggest to my good friend the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] that he not press his amendment. Early next year, when

the committee meets, I shall be glad to hold special hearings on the subject, in an effort to find ways and means of assisting the egg and chicken industry if possible. But I hope that the Senator will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have discussed the measure with the chairman of the committee on several prior occasions, and just before I offered the amendment this afternoon. I realize that its subject matter is controversial. Those of us who represent northern States, in particular, feel that our situation is becoming more drastic all the time in regard to the egg business, and that if something is not done soon, we shall be out of business and, in effect, a monopoly will very quickly result, to the detriment of the consumer as well as the economy as a whole.

I am not minded to press the amendment at this point, because, as the chairman says, there were no hearings before the committee on it at this session. I feel, however, that the situation has drastically changed for the worse since the matter was previously considered, and that we must have hearings at the earliest possible date. I accept the chairman's offer of hearings for early next session in complete good faith, and with that understanding, I am happy to withdraw the amendment from consideration on this particular bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out, the Senator submitted his amendment on the 26th of August, when we had already had hearings on the bill.

Mr. CASE. The chairman is absolutely correct. That was called to my attention, and this is the only course I have at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the reason we did not conduct hearings on the amendment. But I assure the Senator that if he submits his amendment and has it referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, hearings will be held early next year.

Mr. CASE. With that understanding, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment ordered to be printed in the RECORD is to add, at the end of the bill, a new section, as follows:

SEC. 707. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no producer except a producer of sugar as defined in section 101(k) of the Sugar Act of 1948 as amended, under title III of such act shall be eligible for price-support loans or payments under any program or programs administered by the Department of Agriculture in any amount in excess of $100,000 for any one year. The foregoing dollar limitation shall include the fair dollar value (as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture) of any payment in kind made to a producer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This is the same amendment voted upon previously today, except that this time I am trying to see if the Senate will agree to a limitation of $100,000 in Federal payments to any one individual or corporation as far as the farm program is concerned. It affects, again, all the commodities included in the bill, except sugar, which will be dealt with in a special sugar bill when it comes over from the House of Representatives.

This amendment is the same language as the former amendment, as was offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] except that it proposes a limit of $100,000 instead of $25,000. Otherwise, it is identical. The same arguments that were made before are made in behalf of this proposal. Surely when we increase the limitation to $100,000 to any individual, no one can say, "You are limiting this too strict as far as the small-type farmer is concerned."

The President, in his state of the Union message, mentioned specifically his interest in legislation for the small farmer. He never said a word about being interested in taking care of the large-type operator, the corporate-type operator. As the Senator from Maryland pointed out earlier, there was one individual company engaged in the production of rice which received $2,609,820 in price-support loans in 1 year. There was another receiving over $11 million on another commodity. Certainly no one can say those are small-type farming operations. There should be a reasonable limit.

I regret to delay the Senate in voting on numerous amendments, but I know of no other way than to move forward progressively to see whether the Senate really means what it says, whether it wishes to pass a farm bill for the bona fide farmers, or for the corporate type of operation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I say to the Senator, as he knows so well, that it is unpopular to vote against such an amendment as the Senator from Delaware is offering. However, does not the Senator believe that the success of any farm program depends upon compliance by a large number of farmers, and certainly the larger farmers?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is no question about that.

Mr. COOPER. Does not the Senator know that the kind of amendment which he offers and continues to offer, if it should be adopted, would really strike at a program which itself benefits all farmers, large and small, and gives them an opportunity to earn a reasonable income, as well as providing the food needed by all the people of this country. I believe that the Senator knows that it might be one of his purposes to defeat the farm program. Am I correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; the Senator is not correct. I admit I do not like the farm program which is before the Senate. I do not mind saying that. But, on the other hand, the small farmer who has 100 or 200 acres cannot afford to take advantage of the provisions of the bill, and accept payments to cut back his acreage. He has to buy a tractor to cultivate the 100 or 200 acres. He has to buy cornpickers, combines, and all the other machinery that goes with any farm operation.

When the small farmer cuts back his acreage his cost of operation is almost the same as it would be if he did not cut back. Therefore, he cannot afford to cut back. A farmer with a thousand acres or several thousand acres can cut back a few hundred acres, put it in the Soil Bank and collect his money from the Government, and put the rest of his production in a price-support loan. All he has to do is lay off one or two of his hired men. He can efficiently utilize his machinery on the reduced acreage.

By subsidizing big operations under the farm program, we will gradually force the small-farmer type of operation out of business.

Theoretically, under the bill, the small farmer has the same benefits as the large farmer except that, as I said before, in order to maintain the efficiency of his operation, to efficiently make use of the equipment which he must buy for 100 acres or 200 acres, he cannot afford to take advantage of the Soil Bank provisions of the bill.

Therefore, it is not exactly true to say that the small farmer will benefit under the bill to the extent that the large operator will, because the small farmer cannot take advantage of the programs. Certainly a man operating a farm with a $100,000 annual income, should be able to do it without coming to the U.S. Government for a subsidy.

Mr. President, I see no reason for delaying this matter further. I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time. I ask again for a yea and nay vote, because I wish to know exactly how far the Senate wishes to go with the farm program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD immediately following my earlier remarks, a list prepared by the Department of Agriculture, as of June 21, 1965, showing the loans that were made in excess of $100,000 in price support loans under this program.

This list includes "loans only" and does not include the amounts these same people may have received under the feed grain program or other programs.

The amendment I offered covers all together under the proposed limitation.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

1963 crop price-support loans made of $100,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
CORN			
Illinois:			
Tallmadge Ranch, Inc., Momence	115,930	$128,682.28	
Cote Farms, Inc., St. Anne	167,239	180,618.12	
Iowa: V. Bell, Chrystal Bros., E. E. Reid, Roy Reid, Max Naylor, Jake Bell, Toshiama Co., R. Garst, Tr. et al., A. Stein, Dr. W. Mackin, Garst Co., and L. M. Brannon, Coon Rapids	153,123	153,123.00	
Nebraska: Hundahl Farms, Tekamah	99,120	100,111.20	
BARLEY			
Arizona: Youngker Farms Co., Buckeye	192,357	173,121.30	$173,121.30
California:			
Five Points Ranch, Inc., Five Points	219,147	201,615.24	201,615.24
Westlake Farms, Inc., Stratford	833,333	766,666.40	766,666.40
BEANS, DRY EDIBLE	*Hundredweight*		
California: C. J. Segerstrom & Sons, Costa Mesa	12,000	122,400.00	
GRAIN SORGHUM			
Arizona: Jack Robinson & Sons, Willcox	52,365	100,017.15	
OATS	*Bushels*		
Oregon: Tulana Farms, Klamath Falls	718,750	524,687.50	524,687.50
RICE	*Hundredweight*		
Arkansas:			
Producers Rice Mill, Inc., Stuttgart	486,000	2,609,820.00	2,609,820.00
Arkansas:			
Alice Sidney Farms, Lake Village	24,456	123,502.80	123,502.80
W. B. Bynum Cooperage Co., Inc., Dermott	34,102	169,476.33	169,476.33
Craighead Rice Milling Co., Jonesboro	41,178	190,578.73	190,578.73
James M. Thomas, Tuckerman	18,810	105,524.09	6,452.62
Redbud Farms, Inc., Wabash	34,161	171,077.76	171,077.76
Willard C. Wilson, Harrisburg	20,938	104,269.43	104,269.43
Louisiana:			
Edmond and Vincent Zauenbrecher, Bonita	27,146	126,756.06	126,756.06
J. C. Larrison, Wilmot, Ark	46,533	220,932.23	220,932.23
Mississippi:			
Allen Gray Estate, Benoit	22,928	117,921.79	27,145.80
Greer Bros. & Son, Hollandale	25,052	126,770.79	126,770.79
Texas: Anderson Farming Co., Lissie	39,377	204,756.09	204,756.09
SOYBEANS	*Bushels*		
Arkansas: Arkansas Grain Corp., Stuttgart	5,036,039	11,644,375.24	2,701,898.61
WHEAT			
Montana: Campbell Farming Corp., Hardin	179,429	269,125.32	269,125.32
Oregon:			
Ralph S. Crum, Ione	59,604	107,160.49	29,154.62
Kay Bros., Inc., Milton Freewater	59,670	109,196.10	109,196.10
Glenn Thorne, Pendleton	60,491	105,027.53	105,027.53
Washington:			
Leonard and Henry Franz, Lind	77,821	137,464.42	137,464.42
Glen Miller & Son, Amber	66,463	118,304.12	118,304.12
COTTON	*Bales*		
Alabama: James & Bamberg, Uniontown	634	110,326.98	
Arkansas:			
Miller Lumber Co., Marianna	923	142,173.82	
W. M. Smith & Son, Birdeye	759	129,861.54	18,219.52
S. C. Chapin, Traumann	1,450	255,728.01	
Louisiana:			
West, Inc., Oak Ridge	1,209	209,345.72	
M. P. Utz, Tallulah	1,199	191,276.85	60,382.18
Mississippi:			
J. W. Patrick, Jr., Brandon	605	102,520.37	
J. T. Brand, Prairie	558	101,037.75	
Allen-Brashier Planting Co., Indianola	840	136,506.82	
F. B. McKee, Friars Point	801	135,886.07	

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
COTTON—continued			
Mississippi—Continued	*Bales*		
J. & M. McKee, Friars Point	675	$110,358.86	
Billups Plantation, Indianola	1,187	203,088.33	
Emile T. Schaefer, Yazoo City	858	138,392.87	$124,494.14
S. C. Coleman, Yazoo City	705	120,985.42	68,630.60
H. M. Haney, Jonestown	783	136,693.87	1,492.17
Oasis Plantation, Stovall	673	114,440.65	2,140.88
Yandell Bros., Vance	1,661	272,683.28	
C. B. Box Co., Midnight	2,004	335,685.95	174,734.49
Kline Planting Co., Alligator	1,325	231,709.86	
King Plantation, Greenwood	1,822	316,586.80	31,596.76
Roberson Plantation, Minter City	1,201	208,667.91	741.83
O. F. Bledsoe Plantations, Greenwood	1,667	283,244.90	2,080.38
Klondike Planting Co,, Greenville	1,380	218,490.54	167,649.06
Billups Plantation, Inc., Indianola	794	134,347.50	90,502.05
Self & Co., Marks	1,206	212,717.27	
L. H. Fedric Farms, Glendora	1,010	170,162.65	14,650.73
Trail Lake Planting Co., Greenville	1,195	194,876.87	193,051.76
Withers & Seabrook, Tunica	657	109,225.32	
J. J. Hill & Co., Webb	1,000	170,587.69	37,186.14
Posey Mound Planting Co., Marks	553	100,198.11	
M. J. Commer, Jonestown	588	100,207.73	736.16
Byron A. Seward, Louise	596	102,968.68	155.82
Greenhill Plantation, Midnight	812	142,339.50	
Roy Flowers, Mattson	2,868	468,995.13	13,321.37
Flowers Bros. Planting Co., Dublin	822	132,965.89	683.86
H. R. Watson & Sons, Tunica	1,595	262,395.17	
J. R. Flautt & Sons, Swan Lake	870	138,163.73	18,780.51
T. E. Pemble, Merigold	1,010	168,589.65	15,875.20
Torrey Wood & Son, Hollandale	994	173,821.92	23,928.55
Race Track Plantation, Greenwood	1,121	182,735.23	43,030.07
Ralph T. Hand, Jr., Glendora	600	100,240.82	4,509.09
W. P. Scruggs, Doddsville	1,376	235,227.56	97,711.88
Sturdivant & Bishop, Inc., Minter City	849	146,313.17	
Borles Bros., Inverness	1,040	167,441.20	167,441.20
Oaklawn Plantation, Dundee	587	103,613.87	235.00
W. M. Duncan, Inverness	1,807	305,621.63	305,621.63
Evans Townes Estate, Minter City	706	116,670.88	51,805.22
Ed Hunter Steele, Morgan City	757	131,570.01	2,196.23
Howard & Blythe Planting Co., Lake Cormorant	944	163,277.20	49,442.38
William M. Pitts, Indianola	833	136,817.59	44,607.94
Stonewall Plantation, Greenwood	760	124,750.57	8,919.35
Buchkorn Planting Co., Greenwood	635	102,410.34	
Jerry Falls, Webb	819	131,695.52	1,801.22
New Hope Plantation, Greenwood	640	110,315.48	11,077.98
Dean & Co., Tribbett	783	124,804.26	115,058.22
S. H. & Dorothy W. Kyle, Clarksdale	1,040	169,605.40	
T. G. Flowers, Mattson	1,372	224,066.43	7,720.34
W. T. Touchberry, Glen Allan	1,703	267,219.56	187,289.38
J. E. Cunningham, Jr., Tchula	744	123,432.02	5,108.95
R. W. Owen, Tunica	770	130,906.18	124,064.18
L. W. Wade, Greenwood	2,213	373,149.17	9,381.81
Fred Tavoleti & Sons, Clarksdale	843	134,052.64	7,384.78
R. W. Jones & Son, Lula	611	100,132.47	13,365.88
B. W. Smith Planting Co., Louise	921	161,552.51	9,624.57
Fairfax Plantation, Tribbett	918	152,914.52	33,692.18
Byron B. Sharpe, Tchula	771	126,831.29	11,391.90
Mike P. Sturdivant Plantation, Glendora	2,243	382,870.53	
Norman Brown, Duncan	712	118,716.79	5,595.83
Chiana Grove Plantation, Belzoni	937	163,050.85	74,597.24
Tennessee:			
Atlantic Place, Memphis	735	118,231.80	
Pacific Place, Memphis	1,785	286,369.87	
Texas:			
Mike Maros, Fabens	483	131,092.92	
Lee Moor Farms, Clint	1,263	315,489.96	
L. R. Allison, Tornillo	382	101,741.92	
Mrs. R. T. Hoover and estate, R. T. Hoover, El Paso	1,515	404,493.42	
E. Cockrell, Jr., Fort Stockton	856	135,963.82	
Chandler Co., Fort Stockton	875	130,048.90	
COTTON			
Mississippi:	*Bales*		
Mississippi County Farm, Blythville	158	27,266.20	
Mississippi State Penitentiary, Parchman	476	82,999.38	82,820.13
Do	523	91,348.42	91,348.42

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This list includes those receiving in excess of $100,000. Some go as high as $11 million for one operation.

In defeating the proposed amendments the Senate has established that it does not want limitations at all. I see no need to debate it further.

I notice from the list that the Mississippi State Penitentiary gets over $175,000.

I wonder how any State penitentiary could be described as a small farmer.

The question comes to mind: If they violate the provisions and are brought to court, how can a penitentiary be prosecuted? But I am sure this Great Society will have a ready explanation. Perhaps even the inmates may be invited to the bill signing.

In the future I do not want to hear administration officials making pious speeches about how interested they are in the small farmer. It is evident they are not interested in the small farmer. They are more interested in a bill that takes care of the larger corporate type of operations.

I suggest that they discontinue the hypocrisy of referring to the farm program as being in the interest of the small farmer.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in 1960 it was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I recall that at that time—in the committee and later on the floor of the Senate—I argued as strongly as I could in support of the dollar limitation on amendments. As I recall, we managed to place a $50,000 ceiling on. I like to think that my position was sound at that time.

I have voted consistently today, and will vote again in a moment, against the application of a dollar ceiling to present programs.

Briefly, let me explain why. First, in 1960, we had no experience with the administrative problems of a dollar ceiling. Second, unlike today, the programs then were largely nonvoluntary. In the intervening years, we attempted to develop a farm program based upon voluntary use and application.

It seems to me, therefore, that to apply a dollar ceiling would be self-defeating. The situation was not thus in 1960. The question which confronts us is not so much whether it should be $25,000, or $50,000, or $100,000, but whether there should be a voluntary or mandatory program.

So long as the majority seek to develop a voluntary program, we are fooling ourselves when we treat it as though there is some difference in the results achieved between $25,000 and $200,000.

Under the present programs a limitation on payments would not—in itself—increase the incomes of small farmers. It could well cut their income by encouraging large farmers, who would lose incentives for program cooperation, to increase production and depress the marketplace returns of small producers.

The money saved by forcing large farmers out of program participation could well be lost in the cost of storing and handling the additional surpluses.

We are adding, I believe, desirable flexibility to our farm and food policies and programs through the 1965 legislation. This flexibility must run through the entire fabric. The payment limitation, meaningful in earlier programs, is not suited to the present situation.

This does not imply that the payment limitation concept might not be reasonably restored in the future in response to new situations.

The Senate bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study of commercial family farms that will indicate, among other things, the degree to which farm programs are of benefit to such farmers. Certainly such a study must give attention to program payment limitations and the results that might be anticipated, favorable or unfavorable to farmers, consumers, and taxpayers.

Therefore, Mr. President, unlike my position in 1960, today I have opposed and shall continue to oppose the application of a dollar ceiling.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have no further arguments to advance. If the Senate wishes to destroy the farm program the way to do it is to vote for the Williams amendment. Whether the limit is fixed at $25,000, or $50,000, or $100,000, so long as it has any effect at all, that effect is to prevent the farm program from working as it has been written by Congress.

I think before we wreck the program designed to provide our citizens with plentiful food and fiber, we might look at some of the other programs which may involve subsidies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point, a listing of such subsidies, as contained in a joint committee print of materials prepared for the Joint Economic Committee, entitled "Subsidy and Subsidy-Effect Programs of the U.S. Government."

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

CHAPTER II. SCOPE OF SUBSIDIES

A better understanding and appreciation of the sweeping, amorphous character of subsidy programs may be gained by a mere listing of the various Federal programs, past and present, which, by one criterion or another, might be considered to partake of or involve an element of subsidy regardless of original intent of any particular program. This chapter undertakes such a classified listing. Needless to say, it would be easy in such a listing to overlook some program which should be included, just as it is to expand the listing unduly in order to underscore the many and graded facets of the concept. It will be readily apparent, moreover, that in a number of instances the listed subsidy programs could be included in more than one category. To avoid duplication, an attempt has been made to classify each program only in its primary category.

I. GRANTS TO BUSINESS FIRMS AND CORPORATIONS TO CARRY OUT SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

Shipbuilding differential subsidy—Maritime Administration.[1]

Shipbuilding subsidy for fishing vessels—Interior Department.

Ship-operating differential subsidy.

Subsidies to wartime producers of various raw materials and consumer items to stimulate production without violating price ceilings.

Land grants and cash contributions for railroad construction.

Government subscriptions to railroad securities.

Subsidies for carrying mail—ship and civil air carriers.

Partial financing of plants to generate electricity from atomic fuels.

[1] This subsidy is supplemented by (1) Government's assuming the full cost of defense features built into a ship; (2) generous trade-in allowances on old vessels; (3) easy payment plans for vessel purchases; (4) Government loans of up to 75 percent of a vessel's purchase price; and (5) exemption of profits of subsidized shipping companies from corporate income tax, when placed in reserves for new construction.

II. FARM SUBSIDY PROGRAMS

Commodity price support program, administered by the Commodity Credit Corporation, which maintains a floor under the price of certain agricultural commodities, by guaranteeing such prices through nonrecourse loans to farmers.

Surplus disposal programs, domestic and export.

Conservation and soil bank payments.

International Wheat Agreement, under which the price of wheat to American farmers is maintained at levels above those on the world market.

Sugar Act payments, a subsidy to domestic sugar producers who meet certain conditions of employment, production, and marketing.

Irrigation and flood control.

Grazing rights in national forestry and other public lands.

Agricultural extension services.

III. TAX BENEFITS TO SPECIFIC ECONOMIC GROUPS

Depletion allowances to minerals producers and other extractive industries.

Accelerated amortization of defense facilities, for holders of certificates of necessity.

Specific concessions to small business under the Technical Amendments Act of 1958.

Liberalized depreciation schedules.

Tax credits to modernize plants and machinery.

Authorized deductions on income tax computations are of particular assistance to particular groups of individuals, such as borrowers (including home mortgagors), the elderly, blind, and sick.

Any reduction in taxes will, of course, benefit certain individuals and firms more than others.

IV. INDIRECT ASSISTANCE TO SPECIFIC ECONOMIC GROUPS

Financing of highway construction, costs of which may be borne unequally, resulting, some maintain, in a subsidy to the trucking industry.

Financing of airport construction.

Construction of air navigation aids—traffic control equipment, weather reporting facilities, radio beams, instrument landing systems.

Improvements to harbors, dredging of rivers, construction of canals, and assisting in financing construction of canals.

Protective tariffs.

Government purchase restrictions under the Buy American Act.

Reserving coastal trade and trade with noncontiguous areas of the United States to American-flag shipping.

Cargo preference—several laws stipulating various kinds of cargo preference; e.g., requiring goods purchased for the Army and Navy, exports financed by Government loans, and half of foreign aid shipments to be transported in American-flag vessels.

V. GOVERNMENT ECONOMIC PROGRAMS WITH INCIDENTAL ECONOMIC EFFECTS SIMILAR TO THOSE OF SUBSIDIES

Letting of Government contracts for supplies, research, and development, etc.

Special provisions favoring (1) small businesses, and (2) depressed areas in awarding of Government contracts.

Disposal of surplus property, e.g., manufacturing plants, ships, and many other items at less than market value.

Stockpiling of mineral and other strategic materials.

Silver purchasing.

VI. FREE SERVICES OR SERVICES BELOW COST, OFFERED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT[2]

Statistical information of many kinds of importance to business, industry, and labor. The more important Federal agencies fur-

[2] Loan, loan guarantee, and insurance programs are listed separately, below.

nishing statistical services free or at small charge to the public are:

Department of Agriculture: Agricultural Marketing Service.

Department of Commerce: Bureau of the Census; Office of Business Economics.

Department of Labor: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Department of the Interior: Bureau of Mines.

Post Office Department.

Treasury Department: Internal Revenue Service.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Civil Aeronautics Board.

Federal Communications Commission.

Federal Trade Commission.

Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Interstate Commerce Commission.

Securities and Exchange Commission.

Maps, charts, and aids to navigation by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and Geological Survey.

Crop estimates by the Crop Reporting Service.

Weather forecasts by the Weather Bureau.

Scientific and industrial research by such agencies as the National Bureau of Standards, Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Tennessee Valley Authority, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Agriculture, Food and Drug Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Certain postal services, provided free and various others below cost, such as second- and third-class mail and rural free delivery.

Management and technical assistance to small businesses and area redevelopment agencies.

Assistance to small business in obtaining Government contracts.

Protection against forest fires.

Land grants and land sales to farmers.

Construction and assistance in maintaining farm-to-market roads.

VII. LENDING AND LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAMS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES IN EFFECT IN FISCAL YEAR 1965

(a) Direct loan programs:

Department of Agriculture:

Rural Electrification Administration: Loans, chiefly to cooperatives, to provide electric power and telephone service to farms.

Farmers Home Administration: Loans to farmers to "strengthen the family type farm and encourage better farming methods"; include operating, ownership, rural housing, land use, watershed, and emergency loans.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Loans to farmers with commodities as collateral.

Department of Commerce: Area Redevelopment Administration: Loans for industrial, commercial, and public facilities in redevelopment areas.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Office of Education: Loan funds for student financial aid, construction, and acquisition of teaching equipment.

Department of State: Agency for International Development: Loans under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act to promote unilateral trade and economic development, and other loans to develop resources of underdeveloped nations.

Department of the Interior: Bureau of Commercial Fisheries: Loans to fisheries.

Export-Import Bank: Loans to finance exports and imports and to promote economic development in lesser developed countries.[3]

Housing and Home Finance Agency: Federal National Mortgage Association: Purchase of Government-insured mortgages.[3]

Urban Renewal Administration: Loans to local public agencies for slum clearance and urban renewal projects.[3]

[3] Currently self-supporting.

Community Facilities Administration: Construction loans for college housing, for public facilities, and for facilities for the elderly.

Public Housing Administration: Loans to local authorities for construction of low-rent public housing.[3]

Office of Economic Opportunity:

Loans to combat poverty in rural areas.

Loans to small businesses and individuals interested in establishing small businesses.

Small Business Administration:

Business loans to small busineses.

Disaster loans to small businesses.

Purchases of debentures of and loans to small business investment companies.

Loans to State and local development companies.

Veterans' Administration: Direct housing loans in rural areas and small towns.[3]

(b) Loan guarantee and insurance programs: [4]

Housing and Home Finance Agency, Federal Housing Administration: Insures wide range of real estate loans.

Veterans' Administration: Housing, business, and farm loans to veterans guaranteed.

Farmers Home Administration: Insures farm ownership and soil and water conservation loans.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Private loans on commodities guaranteed.

Maritime Administration: Guarantees private construction loans and mortgages on most types of passenger and cargo-carrying vessels.

Civil Aeronautics Board: Guarantees loans for aircraft purchases by local air services and other small airlines.

Interstate Commerce Commission: Guarantees loans to railroads for certain purposes under Transportation Act of 1958.

Defense Production Act (sec. 301): Authorizes guarantees by various agencies on loans to defense contractors and subcontractors.

Export-Import Bank.

Small Business Administration.

VIII. INSURANCE PROGRAMS UNDERTAKEN BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT [5]

Agricultural crop insurance—Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

Bank deposit insurance—Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Savings and loan association deposit insurance—Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Federal employees group life insurance—Civil Service Commission.

Federal employees civil service retirement insurance—Civil Service Commission.

Health insurance for Federal employees (participation in)—Civil Service Commission.

U.S. Government life insurance—Veterans' Administration.

National service life insurance—Veterans' Administration.

Veterans' special term life insurance—Veterans' Administration.

Old-age and survivors insurance—Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

Disability insurance—Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

[4] Several of these programs do not now involve net losses to the Federal Government. Insurance and loan guarantee programs involve Federal commitments which could result in losses to the Government at some future time. These programs are in the nature of subsidies in the sense of providing insurance or loan guarantee services not available or available only at higher cost from private enterprise.

[5] See above, pp. 14–15, for loan and mortgage guarantee and insurance. Several of the programs listed here do not involve net contributions by the Federal Government. See also footnote 4, p. 14.

Service-disabled veterans' insurance—Veterans' Administration.

Unemployment insurance (jointly with the States)—Bureau of Employment Security.

Railroad unemployment and sickness insurance—Railroad Retirement Board.

Maritime war risk insurance—Maritime Administration.

Aviation war risk insurance—Department of Commerce.

IX. FEDERAL AID PAYMENTS TO STATES AND LOCAL UNITS [6]

Department of Agriculture:

Agricultural experiment stations.

Cooperative agricultural extension work.

School lunch program.

National forests fund, shared revenues.

National grasslands, shared revenues.

Cooperative projects in marketing.

State and private forestry cooperation, etc.

Watershed protection and flood prevention.

Special milk program.[7]

Removal of surplus agricultural commodities:

Food stamp program.[8]

Value of commodities distributed.

Commodity Credit Corporation, value of commodities distributed.[9]

Department of Commerce:

Bureau of Public Roads, construction:

Federal-aid highways (trust fund).

Other.

Grants for public facilities.

State marine schools.

Department of Defense.

Army:

Lease of flood control lands, shared revenues.

National Guard.

Civil Defense.

Funds appropriated to the President:

Disaster relief.

Accelerated public works program.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

Office of Education:

Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts.

Cooperative vocational education.

Assistance for school construction.

Maintenance and operation of schools.

Library services.

Defense education activities.

Expansion of teaching in education of the mentally retarded.

Public Health Service:

Control of venereal diseases.

Control of tuberculosis.

Community health practice and research.

Mental health activities.

National Cancer Institute.

National Heart Institute.

Water supply and water pollution control.

Chronic diseases and health of the aged.

Radiological health.

Communicable disease activity.

Construction, hospital activities and health research facilities.

Construction, waste treatment works.

Welfare Administration.

Children's Bureau.

Maternal and child health services.

Services for crippled children.

Child welfare services.

Bureau of Family Services:

Old-age assistance.

Aid to dependent children.

Aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

Aid to the blind.

[6] As reported in the 1964 Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury.

[7] Cash payments to States to increase consumption of fluid milk by children in nonprofit schools; net of refunds.

[8] Federal share of the value of food stamps redeemed under the pilot food stamp plan.

[9] Cost of food commodities acquired through price-support operations.

Aid to the aged, blind. or disabled.
Medical assistance for the aged.
American Printing House for the Blind.
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration.
Department of the Interior:
Federal aid in wildlife restoration and fish restoration and management.
Migratory Bird Conservation Act and Alaska game law, shared revenues.
Payments from receipts under Mineral Leasing Act, shared revenues.
Payments under certain special funds, shared revenues.
Bureau of Indian Affairs.
Department of Labor: Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration (trust fund).
Federal Power Commission: Payments under Federal Power Act, shared revenues.
Federal Aviation Agency: Federal airport program.
Housing and Home Finance Agency:
Office of Administrator:
Low income housing demonstration programs.
Open space land grants.
Urban renewal program.
Urban planning assistance.
Public Housing Administration: Low-rent public housing program.
Small Business Administration: Grants for research and management counseling.
Tennessee Valley Authority: Shared revenues.
Veterans' Administration: State homes for disabled soldiers and sailors.
Miscellaneous grants.[10]

X. FEDERAL AID PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS, ETC., WITHIN THE STATES [11]

Department of Agriculture:
Agricultural conservation program.
Sugar Act program.
Conservation reserve program.
Land-use adjustment program.
Great Plains conservation program.
Rural housing grants.
Department of Commerce: State marine schools (subsistence of cadets).
Department of Defense:
Army National Guard.
Air Force National Guard.
Civil defense.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:
Office of the Commissioner:
Cooperative research.
Assistance to refugees in the United States.
Juvenile delinquency and youth offenses.
Office of Education:
Educational improvement for the handicapped.
Foreign language training and area studies.
Defense educational activities.
Cooperative research.
Expansion of teaching in education of the mentally retarded.
Expansion of teaching in education for the deaf.
Educational television facilities.
Public Health Service:
Mental health activities.
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities.
Allergy and infectious disease activities.
Neurology and blindness activities.
Chronic disease and health of the aged.
National Cancer Institute.
National Heart Institute.
National Institute of Dental Research.
Community health practice and research.
Cancer research facilities.
Hospital and medical facility research.
General research and services.
General research support grants.
Nursing services and research.
Water supply and water pollution control.
Air pollution control.
Milk, food, interstate and community sanitation.
Occupational health.
Radiological health.
Accident prevention.
Hospital construction activities.
Construction of health research facilities.
Dental services and resources.
Communicable disease activities.
Child health and human development.
Environmental health sciences.
Welfare Administration:
Children's Bureau:
Services for crippled children.
Child welfare research and demonstration grants.
Child welfare training grants.
Other.
Bureau of Family Services: assistance for repatriated U.S. nationals.
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration:
Grants for special projects.
Training and traineeships.
Department of Labor:
Unemployment compenstation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen.
Area Redevelopment Act.
Manpower development and training activities.
National Science Foundation:
Research grants awarded.
Fellowship awards.
Atomic Energy Commission: fellowships and assistance to schools.
Veterans' Administration:
Automobiles, etc., for disabled veterans.
Readjustment benefits and vocational rehabilitation.

It will be apparent from an examination of this list that, first, there is some inevitable duplication and, second, there are a number of the programs, particularly in section IX, "Federal Aid Payments to States and Local Units," where the subsidy element may widely be considered to be negligible. Sections IX and X, which list Federal-aid payments to States and local units, and Federal-aid payments to individuals within States, are taken directly from the 1964 Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury. Much of the health and education assistance indicated in section IX is of such broad and general benefit and does not involve payments to businesses or subsidies as commonly defined that it need not be of further concern in this report.

From this list a further problem suggests itself. It is in many cases impossible to determine the incidence of these subsidy and subsidy-like programs. The school lunch program subsidizes the farmer by helping cut back on farm surpluses, but clearly also subsidizes the recipients of this food and their parents. The second-class postage rates are far from covering the costs of carrying the magazines and newspapers within this class, but the benefit of the subsidy is shared among publishers, advertisers, subscribers, and other readers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has now been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 50, as follows:

[No. 258 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Allott	Dominick	Mundt
Bartlett	Douglas	Nelson
Bayh	Gore	Neuberger
Bible	Gruening	Prouty
Boggs	Hartke	Proxmire
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Ribicoff
Burdick	Jackson	Robertson
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Russell, Ga.
Case	Lausche	Saltonstall
Church	McGovern	Simpson
Clark	McIntyre	Smith
Cotton	Miller	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Dodd	Moss	Young, Ohio

NAYS—50

Bass	Hruska	Morse
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Murphy
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Muskie
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Cooper	Kennedy, Mass.	Pearson
Dirksen	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Eastland	Kuchel	Randolph
Ellender	Long, Mo.	Russell, S.C.
Ervin	Long, La.	Smathers
Fannin	Magnuson	Sparkman
Fong	Mansfield	Stennis
Fulbright	McClellan	Symington
Harris	McGee	Talmadge
Hart	McNamara	Thurmond
Hayden	Metcalf	Tower
Hill	Mondale	Yarborough
Holland	Montoya	

NOT VOTING—8

Aiken	McCarthy	Tydings
Anderson	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Bennett	Scott	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have the honor to move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 436

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 436, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Delaware [Mr.

[10] Includes transitional grants to Alaska, flood-control payment, open space land, low-income housing, Federal payment to District of Columbia, Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West, White House Conference on Aging, drainage of anthracite mines, loan program of the Bureau of Reclamation, land acquisition of National Capital Park, Parkway and Playground System, Internal Revenue collections for Puerto Rico (shared revenues).

[11] As reported in the 1964 Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury.

BOGGS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], on behalf of himself, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], is as follows:

TITLE VIII—ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON UNITED STATES FOOD AND FIBER POLICY

Declaration of policy and purpose

SEC. 801. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote the effective utilization of the agricultural production of the United States so that (1) the markets for United States agricultural commodities, insofar as possible, will be competitive in the markets for such commodities in the world, (2) the present and future requirements for such agricultural commodities in the United States and the world can be fully met, (3) the interests of taxpayers and consumers may be fairly safeguarded, and (4) the producers of agricultural commodities in the United States will receive a return on their investment and labor commensurate with their contribuiton to the national welfare. It is further declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote programs recognizing the necessity for consumers in this country to be assured an adequate supply of agricultural commodities of the best possible quality and at the lowest possible prices. It is, therefore, the purpose of this title to provide for a study and investigation of the Federal laws and programs pertaining to agriculture with a view to revising and modernizing such laws and programs in order to achieve the policies stated above, and to provide for a better coordinated national food and fiber policy.

Establishment of the Commission on United States Food and Fiber Policy

SEC. 802. In order to achieve the purpose set forth in section 1 of this joint resolution, there is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on United States Food and Fiber Policy (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

Membership of the commission

SEC. 803. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life.

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life.

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Of each class of two members mentioned in subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from each of the two major political parties.

(c) VACANCIES.—Vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

Organization of the commission

SEC. 204. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

Quorum

SEC. 805. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

Compensation of members of the commission

SEC. 806. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—Any member of the Commission who is in the executive branch of the Government shall receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary not exceeding $22,500; and he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive not exceeding $75 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

Staff of the Commission

SEC. 807. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

Expenses of the Commission

SEC. 808. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Expiration of the Commission

SEC. 809. Sixty days after the submission to Congress of the report provided for in section 10(b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

Duties of the Commission

SEC. 810. (a) INVESTMENT.—The Commission shall make a comprehensive study and investigation of all Federal laws and programs pertaining to agriculture, including all matters relating to the food and fiber policies of the United States and the effect of such policies on all segments of our society, with a view to revising and modernizing such laws and programs to achieve the aims set forth in section 701 of this title. In carrying out such study and investigation the Commission shall consider such matters relating to agriculture as it deems necessary or appropriate, but shall specifically consider, with regard to the various agricultural commodities produced in the various regions of the United States, (1) effectiveness of price support and production controls, including acreage allotments and production and marketing quotas, which may be in effect for such commodities, (2) the future requirements of the United States and the world for such commodities, (3) suitable uses for land which may not be needed at the present time for the production of such commodities, but which may be needed for such purpose in the future, (4) methods for effectively coordinating domestic agricultural policies with the export opportunities for such commodities, (5) the effectiveness of our present policies in the use of food and fiber internationally and how such policies might be improved, (6) the problems of rural economic opportunity in the United States, (7) the national requirements for the stockpiling of agricultural commodities, (8) import and export policies of the United States with respect to food and fiber and the effect of such policies on the foreign policy of the United States, (9) methods of extending and expanding programs under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, without adversely affecting commercial markets, and (10) the need for consolidating the activities of the United States Department of Agriculture with other Federal agencies on the development of rural resources. The Commission shall also give particular attention to the formulation of programs to facilitate the economic adjustment of agricultural producers who decide to transfer to other occupations. Such programs may include, but shall not be limited to, retraining programs, relocation allowances, assistance in obtaining alternative employment opportunities, early retirement, and provision for minimum compensation for land, dwellings, and equipment which such producers no longer want or need.

(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress on or before February 1, 1967, and may submit interim reports prior thereto.

Powers of the Commission

SEC. 811. (a)(1) HEARINGS.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions and duties, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, or such member.

(2) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection, any district court of the United States or the United States court of any possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is being carried on or within the jurisdiction of which the person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee thereof, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under inquiry; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(b) OFFICIAL DATA.—Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this title.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana will yield me 4 minutes on the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I yielded myself time but if the Senator wishes to speak he may do so. I reserve my time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I voted "nay" today on every one of the recent amendments. I think they are wrong because the approach is wrong. It is so completely wrong to deal with these matters without sufficient hearings and in ignorance of the results that would be accomplished.

I believe it is wrong, after weeks of hearings and after weeks of effort in the Committee on Agriculture to apply arbitrary limitations on the floor without there being any knowledge to supply to the Senate as to how they would apply to various commodities.

There has not been a single proposed amendment that excluded both of the deficit crops, wool and sugar, although the Senator from Florida suggested that course earlier during debate. The amendments proposed to exclude sugar but made no such provision for wool.

The Senator from Florida does not have to explain his position on agricultural legislation. He has been one of the cosponsors of the so-called Farm Bureau bills in every Congress for the past 8 or 10 years, along with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Everybody knows that those bills make a much more conservative approach to this entire program than existing law and everyone knows it is a much less expensive approach.

But I cannot make myself a party to this kind of attack on the floor of the Senate when we do not have the necessary information.

Senators offering amendments have not realized that along with the exemption of sugar, which has customarily been exempted, wool should have been placed on the same basis.

It seems to me that this is the wrong way to approach a problem affecting the most vital industry of our Nation.

I thank the Senator from New York for yielding.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The purpose of the amendment is to seek the appointment by the President of a U.S. Commission on Food and Fiber Policy, whose function would be to consider every aspect of the farm policy which we are following with respect to the subjects of limitations on production, the effectiveness of price support programs, the conservation of land, and the reservations of land use, the problems of rural economic opportunities in the United States, national stockpile requirements, and the import and export policies of the United States with respect to food and fiber, including the food-for-peace program. In short, it would include every aspect of the farm-price policy of the United States, with the purpose of relating one program to others in a final way, so that we may put our farm policy on a new and constructive road. The purpose of this Commission, is to reexamine the effectiveness of our Federal agricultural laws and programs and to conduct a thorough review of our national food and fiber policies in order to provide recommendations to the Congress for updating and improving them. This amendment takes the form of legislation which I previously introduced in the 87th Congress as Senate Joint Resolution 238, and with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] in the 88th Congress as Senate Joint Resolution 152, and in the 89th Congress as Senate Joint Resolution 20. The establishment of such a Commission is expressly called for in the President's farm message which he submitted to the Congress on February 4, 1965.

Similar legislation was introduced in both the 88th and 89th Congresses by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS]. On January 16, 1964, the then senior Senator from Minnesota and now the Vice President introduced similar legislation and on March 2, 1964, introduced an amendment to this end to H.R. 6196, the wheat-cotton bill. I also introduced an amendment to H.R. 6196 to establish such a Commission and assurances were given at that time that consideration would be given to these proposals by the Agriculture Committee.

It is most important in this respect that I point out that this Commission is exactly what the President recommended in his farm message to the Congress of February 4, 1965. He called for the appointment of exactly such a commission for exactly this purpose. The President has not appointed the Commission since February 1965. It is our understanding that an Executive order has been prepared for this purpose for some time, but that no action has been taken on it as yet.

In any case, it is important that such a policy should be proceeded with. I should like to read into the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the President's message of February 4, 1965, in which he said:

COMMISSION ON U.S. FOOD AND FIBER POLICY

All Americans have shared in the fruits of an efficient agriculture. All Americans share also the problems we face in the farm economy and in rural America in the years ahead.

Accordingly, to assist in adapting our farm programs to the needs of tomorrow, and in making rural America a full partner in our national economic progress, I intend to conduct a fundamental examination of the entire agriculture policy of the United States. I will reorganize the National Agricultural Advisory Commission—which has made an invaluable contribution in years past—into a new Commission on Food and Fiber. It will be broadly representative of rural communities, consumers, producers, industry, government, and the public. I expect it to make a detailed study of our food and fiber policies and to bring additional viewpoints to bear on the place of rural America.

I point out that the National Agricultural Advisory Commission is a body which has a very much more limited purpose. It is to deal with review of the policies and administration of farm programs within the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and is composed principally of farm representatives including some distinguished citizens like the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard. It does not presently serve the intended purpose which the President himself described as the intended function of the U.S. Food and Fiber Commission. That is why he said he would reorganize it. Proposed purposes of this new Commission are described in the amendment which is now pending before the Senate.

That an overall approach and review to the farm problem is vitally necessary is very clear from the fact that farms are becoming much bigger.

I have today voted to defeat amendments embodying arbitrary dollar limitations on farm loan and price support programs.

The business of trying to back up a deficient program and cover up by putting some overall dollar limitation on farm payments only permits the deficient program to continue to fester unimproved. So I consider it completely inconsistent with the policy that I think is best for the people of my State, 18 million strong, and therefore voted against those fixed-dollar limitations. What we need is a general review of all farm programs on existing Federal farm loan and payment programs. The President himself has recognized that.

In my judgment, there is powerful support for this approach in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry itself. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], who has honored me by joining in offering the amendment, has written an extremely important set of individual views on this very bill. He says:

For example, we considered the farm bill without knowing how this country's tremendous production capacity can best be used in relation to the world's fast-expanding population.

The Senator from Delaware also said:

One of the miscellaneous sections of the bill provides for a study by the Department of Agriculture of the extent to which farm programs are of benefit to full-time commercial family farms. This is a good step as far as it goes, but agriculture includes much more than full-time family farms. We need to look at the whole picture.

The Senator from Delaware concludes as follows:

Unless we do devise an overall agriculture program I have grave fears that the representatives of the urban areas of our country will soon despair of priming the agricultural pump with money.

In my judgment, that is exactly what is bound to happen. As time goes on, this problem is bound to catch up with us, unless we have some basic policy which is different, because the situation now is totally different from the wartime policy. At that time, we wanted everybody kept on the farms to produce. Today, approximately one-third of the farm families are producing all the food and fiber we need, including healthy surpluses, as against production a little more than a decade ago. Today, there are some 7 million families on the farm compared with 20 million at that time.

In addition, the country is becoming increasingly urbanized. A program of this character, backed up by the sound factual findings of a high-level commission, will be most beneficial.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Does not the Senator believe that the vitality of a strong farm economy is highly important to the United States? Although we are now producing surpluses, is it not conceivable that with the anticipated growth in population in the not too distant future we shall need all the production capacity we now have plus additional capacity?

Mr. JAVITS. I agree that this may be entirely possible and that is what we ought to be looking forward to and anticipate.

I hold with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that we can afford surpluses. They are the most powerful asset we have in this country. I am not afraid of the production of our factories; I am not afraid of the production of our farms. But let us produce intelligently and with a minimum of governmental intercession. There must be some governmental intercession in order to keep the farm economy vitally effective and stable. I thoroughly agree with that. But we have not taken an overall look at the system by an independent Federal comprehensive study. The amendment which is sponsored by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and myself is designed to provide authority for such a Federal review. The President himself agrees with us, as is evident from his farm message.

This is like the situation in the Gilbert and Sullivan opera "The Pirates of Penzance." The police are supposed to go and catch the pirates. They say, "We must go; we must go."

But the fact is that they do not go.

The President says, "You must go"; and the general opinion is, "You must review the program from the ground up."

But no action has been taken yet on this important problem.

There is no Senator for whom I have higher regard than the manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I am sure all Senators agree with me. But the bill leaves no alternative. We have been trying to stimulate interest in this necessary review of agricultural policy for a considerable time, in fact since 1962. On March 4, 1964, former Senator Keating, of New York, and I sponsored a similar amendment. At that time I said:

> I ask the chairman of the committee whether, in pursuance of his usual generous practice, he feels that he could provide for a hearing on these measures—my own, introduced with my colleagues and measures introduced by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]—
>
> Who is now the Vice President of the United States—
>
> at some appropriate time which would fit in with the other work of the committee.
>
> Mr. ELLENDER. I can give that assurance, provided the hearings on the measures referred can fit in with the other work of the committee; and I understand that is the course contemplated.
>
> Mr. JAVITS. Exactly so.

Mr. President, we have not had a hearing since then. I am not in any way complaining about individual action. The committee chairman is a dear friend. We esteem him highly. But the fact is that we still have not had an opportunity to consider the question.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I am happy to join with the Senator in offering the amendment. I have sponsored similar legislation in the past. We are not indulging in preconceived notions about what should or must be done by this legislation. We are only asking for a comprehensive, nonpartisan study that will help to remove the farm problem from politics, so that we can reach to realistic solution and, hopefully, restore the farm program to market regulation.

Mr. JAVITS. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Texas.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from New York has brought up an important matter. I am happy to support his efforts. I am not so sure whether the policy is as I would propose it, but certainly the idea is excellent.

I realize the President intended to do this, as he said so a long time ago, but it has not yet been done. So I shall support the amendment of the Senator from New York, who is a devoted public servant.

Mr. JAVITS. I cannot tell the Senator from Vermont how much appreciated his words of support are. I know that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] agree with me when I say that the Senator from Vermont is an outstanding expert on farm policy. So it is extremely gratifying that he should think so well of these efforts.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York and also the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] for their interest in this important, basic subject.

I consider it a high honor and privilege to serve as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. My association with the members of the committee is most pleasant. I hold every one of them in high esteem. It is a distinct privilege to work with our distinguished and able chairman, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

But my experience on this committee in the past 4 years has led me to believe more and more, every day, that a study of the overall agricultural program in depth and detail is essential if we are eventually to devise an agricultural policy that will serve not only the hopes and ambitions of the agricultural population, but will best serve and strengthen our whole economy and our national objectives.

We have been trying a variety of farm programs for many years now, and the result always seems to be the same. The efficiency and hard work of our farmers outstrips the programs, and the surpluses and costs remain too high.

Again this year we have a farm bill which attempts to patch up the leaks in the dike holding back the surpluses, but I do not have much hope that these patches will surpass the productivity of the farmer.

Instead of stumbling on year after year it appears to me to be essential that we take a long look at agriculture. We need to devise a policy which looks ahead as far as possible and takes into account the well-being of the farmer, the needs of the consumer, the health of our economy, and the strength of the Nation's domestic and foreign policies.

Because mechanization and automation are changing the farming industry drastically, it is essential to the continued success of American agriculture that this Nation develop and follow a sound and comprehensive policy for agriculture.

As matters stand, each crop is considered largely on its own. Too little attention is given to the interdependence of crops, and the vital role farming plays in the Nation's overall economy. As has been pointed out before on this floor, farming is the largest single industry in the Nation. Not only are we all dependent on it for our daily bread, but it is the largest single cog in our industrial machine.

The 12-member commission provided for in Senator JAVITS' bill would represent a cross-section of informed citizens. Its recommendations would serve as a basis for taking a fresh look at our agricultural problems, and hopefully, at the same time, these recommendations would contain ideas for making better use of our tremendous ability to produce food and fiber.

Mr. President, nearly 2 years ago I introduced a bill calling for a Hoover-type commission to study the Nation's agriculture. No action was taken on this proposal. I am very happy now to join the senior Senator from New York in cosponsoring his amendment which I sincerely believe is needed if we are to begin to solve our agricultural problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, this study is as basic, essential, and necessary for the good of our economy and for the good of every aspect of our national life as anything that I know of.

I hope this amendment will be accepted. I am very proud to be associated with the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] in offering this amendment for the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I point out that I am especially gratified to join with my two colleagues in offering this amendment. We are on the minority side, 2 to 1. I believe that the challenge to us is to make affirmative, positive, and

constructive contributions to the welfare of the country.

It seems to me that when we propose a measure of this kind to take cognizance at last of the things that have happened in the agricultural field and relate them, one to another, and to take cognizance of the shift of population from the farms to the cities and the shift of people from the farm to even the rural nonfarm areas, and to suggest, as this proposal suggests, a practical way in which to develop a new policy more intelligently adapted to the needs of the farmers and to the needs of the country which may be adopted by the Nation, we are performing a true and meaningful function of the minority.

I am gratified to be associated with my two colleagues in this endeavor. I point out one thing which I believe is very important. The question relates to what is being done now along this line. There is very good evidence that the Commission which we are suggesting is badly needed.

I am gratified to see that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] supports this proposal. I say in answer to the statement of the Senator from Vermont that, as to the composition of the Commission, there would be 12 members, 4 appointed by the President, 2 from the executive branch of the Government and 2 from private life; there would be 4 appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; there would be 4 appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House of Representatives and 2 from private life. The Commission members would be from both political parties, equally represented.

If that is not the right way to do it, it can be easily dealt with in conference. That is not the main thrust of what we are debating. This work should be undertaken. It is not being done.

The President himself recognized that in calling for such a Commission in February of 1965. That is the most conclusive evidence. The President called for exactly what we are seeking now.

I have already pointed out that the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, which was organized by Executive order on July 20, 1953, and recognized by another Executive order on May 5, 1961, is devoted to advising the Secretary on the programs which are now underway in agriculture. This does not take a complete look at the entire existing and future agricultural picture of shifts in population, new methods of production, the domestic and the foreign responsibilities, and how the programs have worked out.

The National Advisory Commission, composed of 25 members, is concerned with the internal operations of the Department of Agriculture and advising concerning such problems. That is fine. However, it does not approach the performance of the job which the President says needs to be done, and which this amendment seeks to set up a commission to do.

There is a National Commission on Food Marketing by virtue of a law adopted on July 3, 1964. That law deals with machinery for study of the marketing structure of the food industry. That is a specialized application and is very desirable in its way and is entirely worthy of support. However, it is not getting to the basic job of trying to build a basic farm program to meet the needs of the country.

This amendment is the only proposal for that, other than the proposal made by the President, which can be implemented by the proposal contained in this amendment.

Our proposal does not conflict with or invalidate anything in the farm bill. It does not knock anything out. It only tries to place us, in a national way, by the use of the best brains we can muster, on a new and better road. Who would not agree that there is a new and better road and that it is high time that we start to seek it? The President himself has affirmed this.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, one of our needs is for a fuller and better understanding of the farmers' problem, the agricultural problem.

I cannot think of a better way to get across to the entire country a fuller appreciation of the dependence which all of us have on agriculture than to have a careful and full study such as this made.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to my colleague whose views, as expressed in the report, were highly persuasive and very important in what we are seeking to do.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], cosponsored by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is most interesting because at the present time the President has on his desk an Executive order which would establish a President's Committee on Food and Fiber, a National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber.

It is my understanding that the President intends to issue an Executive order shortly to establish this National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber. The National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber would be composed of 25 members appointed by the President. The President would designate the Chairman of the Commission from among its members.

It is my understanding that the members of the Commission have been selected and cleared and that the President has decided on a Chairman. The Commission would have a number of functions, including the following:

First, the making of a comprehensive study and appraisal of the current economic situation and trends in American farming, including productivity, costs, prices, incomes, farm employment, labor standards, foreign trade, and related matters.

Second, evaluating current farm policies of the Federal Government as they bear upon the welfare of farmers, workers, consumers, and taxpayers upon the stability, growth, and efficiency of American economy and upon our foreign relations.

Third, exploring and evaluating alternative policies available to American agriculture and to the Federal Government.

Fourth, developing such recommendations for action by the Government or private enterprise as it deems appropriate.

The Commission would submit its final report and recommendations not later than 18 months after the date of its first meeting, and could make any interim reports which it deemed would expedite the work of the President's Committee on Food and Fiber.

In view of the proposed President's Commission and the fact that it would be in operation shortly, and because the Commission would have a great deal of flexibility, it would be my feeling that we should not pass the pending amendment, but rather allow the President to go ahead with the filing of his Executive order at an appropriate time so that this work which the distinguished Senators would want to see done can be done more expeditiously.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I say with a smile that I had a similar experience with the President on the National Advisory Council on the Arts. The very morning on which I asked for the prompt announcement of the appointment of the Council the witness before us in the Labor Committee announced that the President that day, was going to appoint a commissioner to work with the administration. So I am not unfamiliar with the alacrity with which the President can act when he wants to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. While I cannot give the distinguished Senator that much in the way of specific information, I can say that the matter has been on the President's desk and has been waiting for an appropriate time to make the announcement, which I think will be forthcoming within a month.

Mr. JAVITS. Within the month? Within September?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would think within September.

Mr. JAVITS. Could the Senator give us one further word of assurance? I have been consulting with my colleagues on this matter. Does the Senator know whether the President would contemplate a bipartisan commission?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I cannot speak for the President in that respect, but on the basis of his appointments heretofore, I

would say that to my mind there would be no question that any commission created would be bipartisan.

As far as the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the distinguished ranking minority Member [Mr. AIKEN], whom I am glad to see on the floor at the moment, and I are concerned, we would all urge upon the President that this be done, although I do not think such urging would be necessary, especially in view of the question just raised.

Mr. JAVITS. One other question, if the Senator will allow me—my colleagues may have some further questions—is whether or not this could be a Hoover-type commission, so that Members of Congress might be named upon it? The Senator may have some ideas as to the disposition of the President in that respect.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That I cannot say. But in view of the fact that there is a somewhat similar commission operating at the present time on the domestic basis—I believe it is called the Food and Marketing Commission—which does include Members of Congress, I suppose that this commission likewise would include Members of Congress on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. JAVITS. Could we hope, then, that Senator MANSFIELD, Senator ELLENDER, and Senator AIKEN, if they feel that way, as they obviously do, on the bipartisan point, would lend their influence toward that end, so that this might truly be, generally speaking, a very authoritative, Hoover-type commission?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee, care to make a comment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hesitate to comment about what ought to be done. The Senator from New York knows my position on all the commissions and subcommittees that have been created in the past and have spent a great deal of money, but got nowhere.

If the President desires to create such a commission as the Senator from Montana has stated, of course I would have no objection.

But I say to my good friend that before we went into the hearings on the bill that we are now discussing, I wrote to every agricultural college in the country for advice. We have stacks of correspondence and data that we obtained before we went to the hearings, and I think the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill.

We have stacks of information now that the committee has studied, and as the Senator knows, a commission was created on food marketing, to study the food industry from the processor to the consumer. I, of course, opposed it as I did others in the past, because I do not believe we would get data sufficient to enact any legislation to change our pattern. I wish to add that in my judgment, the commission which is now at work could do a good deal of the work that is proposed in the Senator's proposal.

As I have stated, I am opposed to it. If the President desires, by Executive order, to create a commission to make a study, I certainly will not interfere. But I doubt that anything more can be done than has already been accomplished by the committees.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished majority leader whether he personally thinks well of the idea of having some congressional representation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think it has a great deal of merit. However, I do not believe we should infringe upon the President's responsibility and prerogatives.

I know that the Senator from New York is well aware of the line which divides us, but I am sure the President, based on his experience in both Houses, would not be at all adverse to that; and so far as I am concerned, as majority leader I should certainly recommend that he give it due consideration.

Mr. JAVITS. May I suggest to the distinguished majority leader, so that I may have time to consult with my colleagues, that there be a quorum call, with the time charged against the bill? I make that request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, this is a most important amendment. For several years now I have joined in sponsoring legislation calling for creation of a nonpartisan commission of experts to examine the entire American farm problem and the governmental policies involved.

In the last session I was pleased to cosponsor with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] a resolution that would create just such a commission. This session, we again introduced the plan as Senate Joint Resolution 20.

I was glad to see earlier this year that the President had endorsed the idea in his original farm message to the Congress.

We simply must, in my opinion, conduct nonpartisan studies into the problems of our farms, and act upon the findings of those studies in a nonpartisan manner.

We never will achieve any real attack on farm problems unless we get politics out of agriculture. Farm lands are worked by men and women of all parties. Those American farmers deserve better than the political manipulation they have gotten in the past.

We have created a patchwork of laws, often temporary expedients adopted to meet crises of varying degrees and kinds. Our farm laws, because they too frequently conflict with economic principles, have become the progenitors and perpetuators of our current farm problem. The farm programs have become a part of the problem.

American agriculture has passed and is passing through a period of vast and rapid change. No longer are our farms characterized by man-and-mule operation. As recently as 1940, 1 farmworker supplied 11 people with food and fiber. In 1961, 1 farmworker supplied the needs of 26 people. Productivity per manhour in the past 10 years has increased 80 percent in agriculture, compared with 25 percent in industry. About twice as much capital is invested per worker in agriculture as in industry.

Technological change in agriculture has not reached any end point. There are some signs that the agricultural revolution is even accelerating. Technological change is remaking American agriculture at a pace unprecedented in human history.

Farm programs are necessarily based upon prices, practices, production, yields, and marketing of the past. But the past never fits the future. Farm programs try vainly to prevent change. To the extent they are able to delay change, they create new problems. Controls have bred many of the problems with which farmers are now confronted.

One of the inescapable results of the farm programs as they have operated is that they have held an umbrella over the world price, have encouraged expansion of competitive production in other countries. Actually, this problem would have been more crucial than it has been, except for the political turmoil and uneconomic practices of governments in other countries which has interfered with their normal growth and productive development.

A second inescapable result of price fixing is the development of substitutes. Ask any informed cotton man what price support programs for cotton at too high levels have done to substitute synthetics for cotton in Europe and in the United States. Markets once lost are hard, often impossible to regain.

Controls cannot be imposed on one crop without affecting others. Land idled by a control program for one crop is likely to be used to produce other crops. Much of the land taken out of cotton and wheat production, for example, has been shifted to feed grains with the result that there is currently a surplus of feed grains.

The economist speaks of the inelasticity of demand for farm products. By this he means that consumption does not change very much when price is lowered. Therefore, a small excess of production results in a major change in price. This is most clearly illustrated by the case of tobacco. Consumption of tobacco appears to be virtually independently of change in price. Therefore, a small surplus of tobacco, in the absence of price supports, would result in a drastic reduction in the price of tobacco.

Acreage controls and price supports cannot provide an adequate income for a farm family with an acreage allotment

too small for efficient and modern farming practices. A farm family with inadequate land resources cannot hope to increase its income from agriculture materially unless it is able to enlarge its operations so as to permit the adoption of modern technology. The rigidities of farm support and control programs are an obstacle to such progress.

The efficient farm, small, or large, is penalized by controls. Costs for many farm operations are about the same, even if acreage is reduced. Controls, therefore, increase unit costs. Efficient farmers, who could profitably produce for export and domestic markets at a particular price, are foreclosed from producing for such markets if the price is raised to a level resulting in the loss or reduction of such markets.

During the emergency of the depression of the 1930's, many measures were taken to alleviate desperately critical situations, including price support, and production controls for a number of farm commodities. I am not inclined to be critical of everything that was done in New Deal Days although I have criticized most things that were done in the New Deal Days. Desperate situations sometimes warrant desperate remedies. But it does not follow that what may have been desirable, or at least warranted during the dark days of the depression is necesarily the desirable approach to the problem under different circumstances. In fact, I am sure it is not. Amazing as it may appear, some of the congressional debate of the farm problem still harks back to the depression years. The argument is still made that if it was good then, it is good now. It is even suggested that all that keeps agriculture out of the conditions that existed in 1930–33 are the Government farm programs. This is ridiculous when it is recalled that only some 22 percent of U.S. farm production has been subject to production control programs. Actually, the most prosperous part of American agriculture has been that part not involved with controls and price supports.

To continue down the road of controls and high, artificial price supports is to court disaster.

The choice confronting us is clear. One is based on Government intervention and control, the other on a farmer's freedom to farm; one on a Government market, the other on a free market; one on dependence on Federal appropriations for farm income, the other on consumer demand.

For all these reasons, Mr. President, I hope we can adopt this farseeing amendment in an attempt to remove politics from agriculture and to permit dispassionate, reasoned study of where we are in the farm economy, how we got there and what best we can do to get ourself out of the current confusion.

I urge adoption of this amendment to create a nonpartisan commission to study agriculture problems. I believe the amendment is fully consistent with stated desires of the White House, represented by one party, and I know it is consistent with the desires of those on this side of the aisle, representing the other party.

It is time for the parties to join in a nonpartisan approach to farm problems. The commission provided by the amendment would enable us to do just that.

I should like to note further that one of the first measures I introduced during my first year in the Senate was a measure calling for a study, by the Secretary of Agriculture, comparable to that now proposed.

I believe the approach of having a commission of experts, nonpartisan in character, to study the matter, as proposed by this amendment, is far better. I believe it would result in a more comprehensive and objective study. The principle is a good one. Such a study is long overdue, and is needed from every angle.

In any study, it should be kept in mind that we must maintain a strong, viable agricultural economy, because the time will come when, instead of producing too much for our people to consume, we shall be producing perhaps too little, by reason of the growth in population and reduction in the amount of land available for cultivation and pasturage.

All these things must be taken into consideration. We must have in mind long-range solutions, and not merely transient, temporary, politically oriented solutions that turn out not to be solutions at all. The idea, in principle, is good, and I think it is one that should be voted upon. Should it fail of agreement at this time, we should probably pursue the matter further, unless the administration comes forth with a program that meets the objectives of the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I have consulted with my colleagues and with our distinguished ranking Member, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. It seems to us that we have every right to expect that the proposed Commission would be promptly appointed, and that the composition would include the element of bipartisanship in a significant way, and the element of congressional representation, so that we may have a Hoover-type commission with great responsibility.

Congress will be in session, apparently, for 3 or 4 more weeks, and we feel, after assessing our collective judgment, that under the circumstances, in deference to the dignity of the Presidency and the dignity of the Congress, we should at this time withdraw our amendment, to give the President an opportunity to take the action which he says he is going to take. But I do it, in all fairness I should state to the Senate, for myself and my cosponsors, with the thought that if we do not arrive at a fruition of the idea, as now seems to be assured, before Congress adjourns, we reserve the right, on a future bill, to again propose an amendment of this character; and we serve such notice, so that no one will accuse us of trying to block or obstruct anything at a later date.

I have every confidence, and my cosponsors feel the same way, as I believe the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] does, that the Commission will be appointed as scheduled. I make the reservation on behalf of all of us only as a matter of prudence and not as a matter of doubt.

Therefore, if it is satisfactory to the majority leader and the Senator in charge of the bill, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment, and that the order for the yeas and nays be revoked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn; and the order for the yeas and nays is revoked.

OBSTRUCTION OF PERFORMANCE OF DUTY BY THE ARMED FORCES BY OBSTRUCTION OF TRANSPORTATION OR PERSONNEL OR PROPERTY THEREOF

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several days ago, I introduced a bill, S. 2482, which would make it a crime for any person to purposely and willfully obstruct by physical force the movement of troops, military equipment, and military property of the United States. The bill would give authority for the imposition of a severe penalty, graduated down to practically nothing, giving discretion as to the severity of the penalty to be imposed.

Any person who willfully and purposely, by resort to force, interferes with the movement of troops, military equipment, or military property, would be guilty of a crime against the dignity of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] be added as cosponsors to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me point out the significance of the bill. Reports are coming out of California concerning a mass movement of sit-downers for some time in October to interfere openly with the free movement of military equipment.

In my judgment, the bill is needed.

I asked the experts of the Justice Department to examine the law to determine whether there is any criminal prohibition now in existence. I was told that there is not.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its

reading clerks, returned to the Senate the amendment of the Senate, in the nature of a substitute, to the bill (H.R. 3157) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits, and transmitted the resolution of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1588) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research, development, and demonstrations in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARRIS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RONAN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. WATSON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10014) to amend the act of July 2, 1954, relating to office space in the districts of Members of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President, with the exception of House bill 8469:

S. 76. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Heiland;

S. 135. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Kam Oi Hu;

S. 136. An act for the relief of Angel Lagmay;

S. 192. An act for the relief of Maria Liberty Burnett;

S. 440. An act for the relief of Jose L. Rodriguez;

S. 454. An act for the relief of Lee Hyang Na;

S. 517. An act for the relief of John William Daugherty, Jr.;

S. 521. An act for the relief of Maria Gioconda Femia;

S. 573. An act for the relief of Dr. Sedat M. Ayata;

S. 584. An act for the relief of Ming Chup Chau;

S. 586. An act for the relief of Maria Tsillis;

S. 614. An act for the relief of Evangelia Moshou Kantas;

S. 653. An act for the relief of George Paluras (Georgios Palouras);

S. 703. An act for the relief of Kimie Okamoto Addington;

S. 828. An act for the relief of Cha Mi Hi;

S. 853. An act for the relief of Charles N. Legarde and his wife, Beatrice E. Legarde;

S. 861. An act for the relief of Alva Arlington Garnes;

S. 879. An act for the relief of Kim Sa Suk;

S. 971. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elena Guira;

S. 1084. An act for the relief of Shu Hsien Chang;

S. 1170. An act for the relief of Chung J. Clark;

S. 1186. An act for the relief of Kris Ann Larsen;

S. 1209. An act for the relief of Specialist Manuel D. Racelis;

S. 1736. An act for the relief of Jennifer Ellen Johnson Mojdara;

S. 1919. An act for the relief of Laura MacArthur Goditiabois-Deacon;

H.R. 725. An act to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters;

H.R. 727. An act to provide for the administration of the Coast Guard Band;

H.R. 1402. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Rosendo Barahona;

H.R. 1892. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Richard G. Smith, U.S. Air Force, retired;

H.R. 2305. An act for the relief of Zenaida Quijano Lazaro;

H.R. 3039. An act to amend section 1006 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned, under certain conditions, to make payment of pay and allowances to members of an armed force under his jurisdiction before the end of the pay period for which such payment is due;

H.R. 6431. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain forms of nickel be admitted free of duty;

H.R. 7779. An act to provide for the retirement of enlisted members of the Coast Guard Reserve;

H.R. 8027. An act to provide assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and other personnel, and in improving capabilities, techniques, and practices in State and local law enforcement and prevention and control of crime, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8333. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a program of cash awards for suggestions, inventions, or scientific achievements by members of the Armed Forces which contribute to the efficiency, economy, or other improvement of Government operations;

H.R. 8469. An act to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10586. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10775. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. On the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

SEC. 707. Section 301 (a) (8) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(8) The term 'person' means an individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or any agency of a State or Federal Government; and in the case of any State in which lands granted to such State by the Federal Government or owned by the Federal Government are under lease. The Federal Government and such State shall be considered as a separate 'person' with respect to each farm unit in which it has an interest."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with several Senators, including the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If the amendment is what I understand it to be, the language would take care of a situation that is present not only in my State, but also in other States, including Kansas—and I believe the Senator from Kansas has an amendment thereon. It is an amendment that should be taken to conference, and if the particular language we have suggested is not satisfactory, the language could be modified to take care of the situation.

Mr. President, I do not propose this amendment myself. It comes as a result of an actual situation in my State and other States in the Union.

I wish the RECORD to be made clear that what we are trying to do is to correct what we believe to be a bad situation.

The Washington State Department of Natural Resources, which is comparable to State commissions in other States having to do with the development of resources, manages approximately 130,000 acres of State-owned cropland on a share-crop basis. There are 481 share-crop leases in 16 counties. The State's share of the revenue helps to support State public schools. The same situation applies to the timber land which we use to support our State schools. But there are 130,000 acres which are suitable for small grain production, mainly wheat.

The State director, Mr. Bert L. Cole, has sent me communications on this subject, and I have talked with him on the telephone concerning it. His problem is real. He states that:

Due to certain provisions of the 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act, set forth in Agricultural Handbook 192, State of Washington, educational funds may lose as much as 30 percent of the revenue from the 1965 crop.

This is the reason why:

As the regulation now stands, the Department of Natural Resources falls under a definition of a single "person" for purposes of determining compliance or noncompliance with the Federal farm wheat allotment or cereal grain program. What this means is that if 99 percent of our lessees comply with the Federal programs and 1 percent fails to comply, the State and all its

lessees are not eligible for Federal crop diversion payments. This is true even if the 1 percent failed to comply through a misunderstanding, or because of other circumstances.

For example—

And this happens all the time in my State, particularly on the eastern side, in the mountain area where much of this land is located—

perhaps land left standing in 1964 has "volunteered."

Mr. President, this is an agricultural term with which I am not familiar, but this is what the Department says:

This term means that scattered seeds from a previous crop may take root and grow spontaneously. When this occurs, the ACSC's current ruling is that the farmer is growing wheat on normal conserving areas. Some county provisions allow farmers to leave wheat standing on diverted acreage as a soil conservation measure, and this wheat in some cases has "volunteered." One case of this happening can result in a ruling of noncompliance so that the entire State—

The 130,000 acres presently leased by the State—

is ineligible for crop payments on any of its leased crop land.

As far as can be determined, the degree of noncompliance yields in these 340 wheat farm leases this year is about 1 percent, as stated in the second letter.

The percentage on other cereal grain leases may, says the director, run a little higher, since guidelines for the program were not laid down until after part of the 1965 crop had been planted.

Much of it is winter wheat, planted in the fall, for the programs were not laid down until after part of the 1965 crop had been planted.

In essence, the present regulation penalizes 99 lessees for every 1 who fails to comply, even unknowingly. No State lessee can receive diversion payments if one State lessee fails to comply. The rules could even be interpreted so that a farmer who leases part of his land from the State is ineligible for diversion payments on any of his farm acreage, even though he had complied fully with the Federal program.

It has always been the policy of the department of natural resources to encourage and virtually insist on compliance by lessees with Federal farm program regulations. The State regards it as a sort of moral obligation in the interest of controlling farm surpluses and maintaining stability in our farm economy.

The exemption is very specific, and it would in no way alter efforts to obtain as complete compliance as possible. I also want to point out that individual State lessees who do not comply would still be ineligible for Federal diversion payments.

I urge the committee to give serious consideration to this proposal. It appears that the loss to the Washington State education trust funds for the 1965 harvest could be as high as $125,000 to $150,000.

From reading an explanation of the situation, and based on a letter as recent as July pointing out the whole situation, and by virtue of the experience in 130,000 acres in previous years, it seems to me this is a good amendment. It would clear up a matter which may be peculiar only to the State of Washington. I understand there are other States where the same situation occurs in Federal lands, which may be leased grazing lands. I see present the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. I am sure there are some such lands in eastern Oregon.

All that is attempted is to make the law uniform, so that State funds, or even Federal funds from Federal lands, will not be lost. The money goes to schools. No one gets any profit from it.

I do not know what is wrong with it, but the distinguished chairman of the committee said he had checked with the Department and the Department had some objection to it. I cannot find any real reason in my mind why the Department should object. The situation exists. I have referred to language from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Those involved have suggested this amendment. I hope the committee will accept the amendment and take it to conference. Perhaps the conferees will want to change the language, but this was the language that was presented to me.

Mr ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

As the Senator from Washington stated, this amendment was submitted to me last week. I told him I would take the matter up at the time, in an effort to try to devise appropriate language. But the Department is opposed to this amendment, as I was when it was first presented to me. Both Federal and State land are involved. We are having trouble now with surpluses under the law as it now stands. If an individual or corporation owns, let us say, 10,000 acres of land, and the individual or corporation should lease those 10,000 acres of land to 20 tenants, it would be necessary for all to comply with the program if anyone of them were to receive the benefits of the program. The law does not permit some to comply and others not. That is the law now. The amendment would place the State and Federal Government in a preferential position which would not apply to the individual. I do not believe that is right.

A little later I should like to read into the RECORD the objections stated by the Department. I think they are valid ones. Under the existing law, in the event it can be found that an error was made by a tenant, or he did something he did not mean to do, the Department has the right to adjust any deficiencies that may have been made, or for any overplanting that may have been made, and in many instances, the Department does just that.

There was mentioned by the Senator from Washington a case in Kansas in which a widow who had inherited a farm subsequently married another farmer who had land of his own. Since, after the marriage, these two farms under the law were to be considered as one, in order to obtain benefits from the program, it was necessary that both the husband and wife comply with the law. If one did not, it meant there would be no benefits. And this did occur. But under the authority that was vested in the Department of Agriculture, as the Senator from Kansas stated last week, the matter was adjusted. A good case was made by the farmer and his wife.

There is now authority for the Department to adjust cases in which there has been error or in which ignorance may have resulted in violations.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. It was adjusted for 1 year.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. But this farmer was assured that he could not continue this type of operation.

That is the point I want clarified. That situation is different from the one stated by the Senator from Washington. I do not want to become involved in this. The situation is as the chairman mentioned.

One farmer had been farming, and they had to get farms in compliance. There was the case of a young man, who had been farming for 6 years. His farm was not in compliance. They forced his father to go in compliance, or out of compliance. I do not see the justification for that.

If the chairman can give me any encouragement or help, I will be grateful. I have an amendment which I did not offer. I have such a high regard for the chairman I will not offer it again.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was done in this case. But if a farm is owned by one person and is worked by two or three, all of them should comply. It would not be fair if two complied and the other did not comply and as a result more of the commodities are produced than should be on that one farm.

Let me state the Department's objections to the amendment.

The proposed amendment—that is, the amendment of the Senator from Washington—of section 301(a)(3) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, would permit the Federal Government or a State to act as a completely separate entity with respect to each farming unit in which it has an interest. This would allow participation and benefits under diversion or allotment programs on one or more farms although there may be an interest in other farms not complying with the crop reduction programs. In short, it would eliminate the current offsetting-compliance provision that is now applied to all producers.

We are opposed to this amendment for the following reasons:

First. We do not believe that voluntary programs can be expected to accomplish their objectives if any entity, including the Federal Government and any State or agency thereof, is permitted to receive program benefits on one farm while counterbalancing crop reduction by overplanting on another farm.

Second. To grant special privileges to Federal and State Governments would be inviting extreme dissatisfaction and criticism from private producers not granted such leniency.

Third. Federal and State Governments have ample opportunity through the

terms of leases to require compliance with programs as a condition of access to the land for farming purposes. This is not an uncommon condition applied to leases involving privately owned land.

Diversion programs for wheat and feed grains as proposed under pending legislation would be offered on a voluntary basis. Any producer or entity feeling the need to produce in excess of the total base or allotment established for his farm or farms could do so without incurring any penalty or jeopardizing his opportunity to participate for program benefits in a later program year. Such a producer only foregoes program benefits in the year of excess.

Further, in the case of wheat a producer may plant as much as 150 percent of his allotment without being considered in noncompliance provided he stores his excess production in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary. This should provide some relief for a wheat producer who feels it is not feasible to plant within his allotment even though he is not participating in the program with respect to a particular farm.

Participation in diversion programs is voluntary. Therefore, it is axiomatic that producers cannot be permitted to participate and earn benefits on one farm while this compliance is offset by increased production on other farms. To do otherwise would not only make the programs self-defeating, but would also be poor public policy.

If this privilege were granted only to the Federal or State governments, it would tend not only to defeat the purpose of the programs but would create strong resentment and dissension from producers who are dependent on farming for a living.

When publicly owned land is operated by private producers, leases which require compliance with allotments and bases can be required. Owners of privately owned land commonly require this of their tenants.

If the Senate should adopt this amendment, it would mean giving preferential treatment to State and federally owned land in contrast to privately owned land.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself as much time as I may need within the time limitation.

I believe there is some misunderstanding, and this is what I am trying to correct.

If 1 sharecropper out of 431 in the entire State leasing program says, "I do not want to be in compliance," none of them can be in compliance.

This is what I am trying to correct. The Department does not answer that argument.

Secondly, they say this might be done in a lease now, but we are talking about leases that have already been made. Some were made for a long period of years by the State to allow people to cross crops on this land because we have a great amount of land, the proceeds go to schools. This is timber and farming land. The Department does not answer that point.

I would withdraw the amendment if we could figure out how to take care of this situation.

I do not see why one person, who has a lease for perhaps 10, 12, or 15 years on State land, because they fall within the definition of a single person for the terms of compliance, can say, "I do not want to be in," so the other 430 cannot.

It seems to me that that situation ought to be corrected. Two years ago we had this same matter of crosscompliance. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that one farmer should not have it both ways. Let us put it that way.

But we encountered situations in which a man owned his own farm and he wanted to be in compliance. He was a tenant farmer. Up the road 10 miles there was a section of wheat owned by a bank for some heirs; the bank being of such political persuasion as banks usually are, did not like this system of agricultural allotments and it said "No."

The result was that the farmer could not go in, and we left it up to the county committees. They would determine whether or not it was the fault of the person.

Here it is the fault of no one, but the two, and the 130,000 acres, are treated as one entity.

What we not are trying to do is to get them out, but to get them in so there will be less production. This is what the State wants to do. I do not know how it can be done in any other way than by this amendment. I do not believe the Department answers what I conceive to be the problem.

If I am wrong, I would be the first one to say in conference, "Do not accept the amendment; it is taken care of by what the Department says."

I included Federal land. I did not intend to include Federal land, but certain Senators said the situation has been true on some Federal grazing land. All should be under compliance, so that less wheat will be raised.

But less than 1 percent of State lands are not under compliance, and they keep all of the rest of them out. I do not think that is right. I want to have them under compliance. Otherwise, I would not be for this bill.

I hope the Senator will take this amendment to conference to discuss it a little.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I did my level best to try to frame language to do what the Senator states.

There are quite a number of corporations and individuals that own large areas of land. Under the laws as they now stand, the lessor, the owner of the land, can make it a condition precedent that the lessee plant within the regulations of the Department.

The only way by which this could be done would be when a lease was entered into with the State by the Federal Government, or with anyone else who leases land. Many farmers want to get in under the program; others do not.

It seems to me that if the State of Washington or any other State that had lands of this kind would insist that no wheat or corn may be planted except in compliance with the rules and regulations established by the Department, there would be no trouble. But as I said, the Secretary, under the law, now has the authority to rectify any mistake that may have been made. But where it is done irrespective of whether the farmer desires to violate the law or not, the Department took that into consideration. Where it was found that there was an error, even in Washington, the Department paid. I do not know how much was paid; I do not have the record before me. But many of the farmers were paid—in fact, all the farmers except the few who had actually violated the rule. That was done under the present law, and it can still be done.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Louisiana is surely more knowledgeable about the various rules and interpretations of the agricultural acts in the Department than probably most other Senators. If he could suggest to me, and I in turn could suggest to the State officials, who are the ones involved, that if they have 481 leases on State-owned land, with one person leasing 100 acres and keeping all the rest out, and the Department would show us the rule, I would take my seat. But they say they are a single person, under the ruling of the Department, and they have to take it, too.

A corporation that owns a great deal of land can make separate leases. But the State has to make the same type of lease to each person on the same basis, by law, and the return to the school fund of the State is the same percentage. That is the problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said at the beginning, if any farmer or lessee of a large landowner or corporation owning a large tract of land produces more than he should, all of the tenants of the corporation or landowner are affected. I do not want to change that system; I want the law to remain as it is, because if that is not done, violence will be done to the program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That still does not answer the problem; 481 farmers want to get in, while 1 fellow sits there and says, "No." So none of them can get in.

Mr. ELLENDER. The State should cancel the lease of the one who says no.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Perhaps the State cannot do that under the law.

Mr. ELLENDER. But that is the way to reach him. There is an easy way to reach it, and that is to provide that the State shall insist that the tenant comply with the law.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The State director, in a long letter, says that he personally wants to have them all under compliance, because that would mean a better regulated use of State lands. It would mean that the State school fund would get its share of the rental. The present operation of the program results in complete chaos.

With the State lands comprising 130,000 acres, I cannot see why the Department should be so concerned over big corporations that are trying to cheat. A

sovereign State is not trying to cheat; it is trying to reduce surpluses.

I seems to me that the Department is acting out of pure stubbornness. It can handle corporations and big farmers, whom we are trying to eliminate. But this situation relates to State-owned land. The State could not sell it if it so desired. The State is subject to State law as to the way in which the lands may be leased.

In this instance, one person is obstructing action. Instead of having 130,000 acres in compliance, which is the objective, one person, having 100 acres, is saying that 129,000 acres should go out. So the farmers plant fence to fence and add to the surplus, and we cannot get any help. We are trying to do what every supporter of the bill has been trying to do for years—to secure compliance and reduce surpluses.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter lated June 29, 1965, addressed to me by Bert L. Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands, Department of Natural Resources, State of Washington. The letter deals with the entire problem.

I suggest to the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and to the Department of Agriculture that if they want to have 129,900 acres of land out of compliance, this is a good way to proceed.

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

DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCES,
Olympia, Wash., June 29, 1965.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WARREN: The Washington State Department of Natural Resources manages about 130,000 acres of State-owned cropland on a sharecrop basis. There are 481 sharecrop leases in 16 counties, and the State's share of the revenue helps support our State's public schools.

Due to certain provisions of the 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act, set forth in Agriculture Handbook No. 192, states our educational funds may lose as much as 30 percent of the revenue from the 1965 crop.

As the regulation now stands, the department of natural resources falls under the definition of a single "person" for purposes of determining compliance or noncompliance with the Federal farm wheat allotment or cereal grain program. What this means is that if 99 percent of our lessees comply with the Federal programs and 1 percent fails to comply, the State and all its lessees are not eligible for Federal crop diversion payments. This is true even if the 1 percent failed to comply through misunderstanding or other special circumstances.

For example, perhaps land left standing in 1964 has volunteered. This term means that scattered seeds from a previous crop may take root and grow spontaneously. When this occurs, the ACSC's current ruling is that the farmer is growing wheat on normal conserving areas. Some county provisions allow farmers to leave wheat standing on diverted acres as a soil conservation measure, and this wheat in some cases has volunteered. One case of this happening can result in a ruling of noncompliance so that the State is ineligible for crop payments on any of its leased cropland.

As far as can be determined, the degree of noncompliance in our 340 wheat farm leases this year is just over 1 percent. The percentage on other cereal grain leases may run a little higher, since guidelines for the program were not laid down until after part of the 1965 crop had been planted.

In essence, the present regulation penalizes 99 lessees for every 1 who fails to comply, even unknowingly. No State lessee can receive diversion payments if one State lessee fails to comply. The rules could even be interpreted so that a farmer who leases part of his land from the State is ineligible for diversion payments on any of his farm acreage, even though he had complied fully with the Federal program.

It has always been the policy of the department of natural resources to encourage and virtually insist on compliance by our lessees with Federal farm program regulations. We regard it as a sort of moral obligation in the interest of controlling farm surpluses and maintaining stability in our farm economy.

The exemption is very specific, and it would in no way alter efforts to obtain as complete compliance as possible. I also want to point out that individual State lessees who do not comply would still be ineligible for Federal diversion payments.

I urge you to give serious consideration to our proposal. It appears that the loss to our education trust funds for the 1965 harvest could be as high as $125,000 to $150,000 and we are extremely anxious to prevent this loss in future years.

We will be most happy to provide you with any additional technical information you think would be helpful.

Sincerely,

BERT L. COLE,
Commissioner of Public Lands.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, although the Senate adopted yesterday by an extremely close vote the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] to strike out section 706 of the committee amendment to H.R. 9811, the Holland amendment relating to agricultural labor, I wish to invite the attention of Senators to certain important communications on this topic which deserve consideration for future reference. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD remarks from a letter dated September 10, addressed to me by Mr. Ernest Falk, manager of the Northwest Horticultural Council, Yakima, Wash., and a wire dated September 10, addressed to me by Mr. William M. Carson, president of the Nampa Beet Growers Association.

I have also received two wires in support of the Proxmire amendment relating to the dairyman's class I base plan which was adopted by the Senate yesterday, and which had my support. The communications to which I allude were addressed to me by Messrs. Richard Sorensen, president of the board of directors of the Lower Columbia Cooperative Dairy Association of Astoria, Oreg., and Harry L. Graham of the National Grange. I ask unanimous consent that these items be included in the RECORD.

In addition, I have received a wire from Mr. Al Lamb, manager of the Morrow County Grain Growers, Inc., Lexington, Oreg., relating to the exportation of wheat. Mr. R. J. Elkins, president of the Oregon-Washington Farmers Union expressed support of the Ellender cotton bill in a wire dated September 10. I ask unanimous consent that these communications also be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

NORTHWEST HORTICULTURAL COUNCIL,
Yakima, Wash., September 10, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wired you as follows:

"Strongly urge your support section 706 of H.R. 9811, Senator Holland amendment to farm bill which would transfer responsibility of determining availability and need for farmworkers from Secretary of Labor to Secretary of Agriculture. Based on current experience harvesting apples in Massachusetts this is vital to Oregon pear and apple growers."

I want to explain the reference to Massachusetts. The Massachusetts apple industry asked for authorization to bring in a number of Canadian apple pickers. This request was rejected on the assertion that unemployed Massachusetts workers could harvest the crop. This morning I was told of the experience of one fairly large Massachusetts grower using pickers furnished through the employment service; 61 pickers picked less than 2,300 bushels, or an average of 38 bushels per day. (Our pickers have averaged about 110 boxes per day, according to our State department of labor releases.) To compound the matter, the fruit picked in Massachusetts by these people recruited from the unemployment rolls was terribly bruised.

The U.S. Department of Labor as a prerequisite to permitting the growers to request use of the Canadian apple pickers required that each domestic employee be guaranteed a minimum hourly wage, even though they did not earn this amount at established piece rates. This regulation is completely without congressional authorization; in fact, the Congress rejected proposed bills which would have made the minimum wage applicable to agricultural labor. The net result has been that the per box picking cost for this Massachusetts grower was more than doubled—the fruit was not harvested at the proper time, and its quality was further reduced due to excessive bruising.

Finally, the U.S. Department of Labor belatedly agreed that Canadians could be cleared to help harvest the Massachusetts crop but by the time the clearance was granted, the Canadian workers were gainfully employed elsewhere and the Massachusetts grower was taking a beating. This is only the most recent example of the way the foreign farm labor program has been misadministered by the U.S. Department of Labor and why we believe the grower should get a fairer break if the responsibility of making the factual determination is transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture.

In passing, may I add that we are just beginning to get into our apple harvest. It is too early to tell what problems we will be faced with this season. We were fortunate in that crops in the Northwest are about a week early this year. This gave us a good jump on the season before school started; also, as you know, we have only about a 65-percent apple crop in Yakima. If we had a full crop this year and a normal or delayed season, we could be in serious trouble. Under the circumstances, we are hopeful that

we may be able to get the crop off without too serious a loss. However, last year about one-third of the apples remained on the trees too long belong they were harvested. This resulted in advanced maturity, reduced storage life, and forced sales for much of this fruit at heavy discounts. This condition will be seriously aggravated in the future if the agricultural labor supply is arbitrarily diminished and necessary labor is not available.

We have always paid fair piece rates in the Northwest. Experienced pickers have been able to make good money. The average, willing picker has earned from $18 to $20 per day but the unemployed worker who is unwilling to pick fruit cannot solve our problem and if we have to pay transportation from centers of employment throughout the United States for these unwilling workers, we will be face to face with disaster.

It looks like Medford may come through on pear picking. The early season was a big help because the Bartlett harvest was finished and a start made on Anjous before school starts. Two benefits were obtained:

(1) Use of students as pickers.

(2) Students worked as baby sitters freeing housewives for picking.

As you know the pear harvest is touchy and growers sustain heavy losses if harvest help is not available.

Therefore, we urge that you support the Holland amendment.

Yours very truly,

ERNEST FALK,
Manager.

CALDWELL, IDAHO,
September 10, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This association urges your support of the amendment to the labor section of the farm bill, under section 706 of title VII to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make all determinations of the amount of labor needed or available for the production and harvesting of any agricultural crop whenever such a determination is required in the application of any laws of the United States.

The experiences of farmers in the Southwest where tremendous crop losses were sustained because of shortage of needed labor at harvesttime indicates the Secretary of Agriculture should be the determining factor on the subject of farm labor. Our reasons are as follows:

1. The Department of Agriculture is the logical agency to make determinations in matters relating to agriculture.

2. The Department of Agriculture, through its county and State committee system, its extension services, and its land-grant college system is better equipped to evaluate the needs of agriculture throughout the United States. Adoption of this amendment will not alter the responsibilities of the Secretary of Labor under existing law but will merely make available to him the specialized knowledge and experience of the Department of Agriculture on the subject of farm labor supply and production and harvesting needs.

Crop losses, resulting from a short supply of labor at crop harvesttime will destroy our national agricultural superiority and will place an unnecessary and unreasonable additional cost upon each family in our Nation dependent on agriculture for its daily provisions.

WILLIAM M. CARSON,
President,
Nampa Beet Growers Association.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
September 10, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Deletions of dairy section by committee from farm bill prolongs critical situation in major milk markets by denying producers right to vote on program to reduce production of unprofitable surplus while retaining historical share of profitable class 1 market. Respectfully request that you again support Proxmire bill when offered.

HARRY L. GRAHAM,
National Grange.

ASTORIA, OREG.,
September 10, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Lower Columbia Cooperative Dairy Association of Astoria, Oreg., asks your support of amendment to farm bill as regards the class 1 base plan on milk when introduced on floor of Senate.

RICHARD SORENSEN,
President of Board of Directors.

LEXINGTON, OREG.,
September 9, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We submit 100-percent parity principle for wheat used for domestic consumption and are in favor of a 4-year program. We feel these provisions will provide efficient growers an opportunity to make a living if we maximize the exportation of wheat. Short-range solutions make financing for farmers and their bankers almost impossible. The necessity of long-range planning cannot be overemphasized. Shipping restrictions on sales of wheat to Russia serve no useful purpose and hold down exports that would help both wheat farmers and our balance-of-payments position.

Sincerely,

AL LAMB,
Manager, Morrow County
Grain Growers, Inc.

MOLALLA, OREG.,
September 10, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your support of the Ellender cotton bill. We do not support the Talmadge amendment to the bill. This is very urgent in support of the Texas Farmers Union.

R. J. ELKINS,
President, Oregon-Washington
Farmers Union.

AMENDMENT NO. 444

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 444 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 44, between lines 8 and 9, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 507. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by changing the period at the end of the third sentence to a colon and adding the following: *"Provided,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not make any sales of wheat at less than 115 per centum of the current support price for wheat, plus reasonable carrying charges."

Renumber subsequent sections accordingly.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that out of my time there be a short quorum call, so that Senators who are interested in the amendment may be alerted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators, my amendment has been read. It seems to me that we have in this approach an opportunity to reduce the cost of the agricultural program, to increase the net income of the wheat farmers, and, at the same time, to move in the direction of a free agricultural economy.

The amendment which I have sent to the desk is offered on behalf of myself, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment would provide that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not make sales of wheat at less than 115 percent of current support prices plus reasonable carrying charges, rather than the prevailing rule of 105 percent of current support prices now provided.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, it is seldom that all of the major farm organizations agree on any segment of our farm policy. However, on this matter there is complete agreement on the need to change the resale formula. All have testified before the Agricultural Committees of the Congress in support of the change.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for yielding to me.

I hope the Senate will agree to this amendment. I am a coauthor of the amendment. I urge that the amendment be agreed to.

It seems to me that the enactment of this amendment into law would be of direct benefit to the wheat farmers of the country. In addition, it would be a move in the right direction from the standpoint of the entire farm program.

I believe that the purpose of farm programs is to raise the prices paid to farmers for a particular commodity. If farm prices were not too low, no one would be in favor of a farm program.

The individual farmers cannot receive a fair, just, and equitable price for what they produce. Today there is a tendency on the part of the farmer toward depending on the Federal Government for his income.

Our amendment would use the support price loan in such a way as to raise the price in the marketplace. That is the real objective.

I hope that the amendment will be agreed to. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his contribution. What the Senator has said is exactly correct. The purpose of these farm programs is,

first, to prevent the piling up of unconscionable surpluses; and second, to increase the net returns to American farmers.

I believe that this amendment moves in that direction.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, Mr. "Wheat," who has had an important part to play in developing what I believe to be some highly commendable improvements in the wheat program as they appear in the pending bill.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I thank my friend for those very gracious comments. I do not know of anyone who has been a better friend of agriculture than he.

This amendment would do what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota says. It would permit the market to operate much better. It would, in effect, hold cash prices considerably above the loan level. There would be many advantages to that. It has a direct relationship to the amendment offered awhile ago, to limit the amount of loans that any one farmer could receive and the so-called farm subsidy.

If the cash prices were allowed to be a little higher than the loan level, I believe that most, if not all, of the loans on cotton, wheat, and the major commodities would be repaid. There would be little need of taking out loans if the cash price were a little above the loan level.

I believe this would be a most important feature and accomplishment of this amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senator makes an excellent point. I am glad that he emphasizes that because this would provide the goal toward which we all work ultimately when dealing with farm legislation. It seems to me that that goal can be succinctly stated in a few words, and that would be to provide a fair price for a full crop to the American farmer.

This has no magic about it. It would not do it all alone, but, in combination with the rest of the farm legislation, it would help markedly to move it in that direction.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not like to disagree with my colleagues from the North Central States, and very seldom do. However, in this case, I believe Senators may have overlooked the rapid shift in grains used for feed in the Northeast.

There has been a shift to wheat of a good many million bushels from the other feed grains for use in chicken feed, cow feed, duck feed, or any other feed uses. I do not know exactly how many million bushels are involved.

I am afraid that if the price went up, we would see a shift back, with a consequent accumulation of more wheat in the hands of the Government, which would please the storage interests immensely, I am sure, but which would not help the poultry and livestock growers of the East.

I do not know how much feed is used in other States. I believe that my own State buys about 700,000 tons of feed a year. I do not even know how much of this is wheat. I do know that a great deal more wheat is being used than was used formerly.

So I would guess that the principal beneficiaries of the amendment among my friends from the West would be the storage interests. At 25 cents a bushel a year for storage and handling, it is worth looking into on their part.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I believe my friend, the Senator from Vermont, is correct to this extent: It raises the cash price above the low level to some extent, but we must bear in mind that under the administration's farm program, loan rates for both wheat and cotton are going to be lowered. Wheat price supports are now tied to those of feed grains. The price support—that is, the loan plus other cash payments—will keep the return to the farmer at about the same level, so the farmers from the northeastern part of the United States who want cheaper feed grain will, I think, be receiving it as cheaply as they are now.

Mr. AIKEN. Not much corn is used now in the dairy business but is used mostly by the poultry producers in my area. But apparently the amendment does help the wheatgrower, and I am glad it does.

As I understand, the President desires two conditions for a farm bill: One is that it reduce the cost to the Government, and the other that it discourage the accumulation of surpluses. At least that is the information I get from the administration.

We are adding 9 cents a bushel over and above the price voted by the House of Representatives. Adding to that the increase in land readjustment payments and the increase for cotton producers of some $700 or $800 million, I believe we should be very generous with the wheatgrower, but not generous at my expense, If the Senator will understand.

Mr. MUNDT. This might help the President achieve the second part of his goal, which the bill as now written does not achieve, and that is the reduction in costs, because it would enable recapture by the Government of considerably more than it is now getting .

Mr. President, the figure of 105 percent of support price worked reasonable well when we had price supports for wheat in the 75 to 90 percent of parity range. However, when the Congress adopted the certificate program for wheat it gave a more important role to the CCC resale operations and also made unrealistic the 105-percent minimum for triggering resales by CCC. As we now know the support price of wheat is $1.25 per bushel, national average. Thus, the 105-percent figure permits the CCC to sell wheat at $1.31¼ or allows a range in which the market can operate of only 6¼ cents. This is much too narrow and the result is that the normal channels of grain trade are hesitant to move into the market and purchase wheat for their use. Further, they are hesitant about storing any grain and as a matter of statistical fact the Government is becoming the complete storage of all wheat inventories. It was pointed out in testimony in hearings on the farm bill that the Government now owns between 75 and 90 percent of all of the wheat in the Nation.

If this amendment is adopted it will add to the range of price spread before CCC can sell wheat another 12.5 cents, or a total range of 18.75 cents in which the market can operate. This would have the wholesome effect of removing the straitjacket from the marketing system.

By freeing the marketing system we move toward the goals of President Johnson when he said in his farm message of February 4:

> Our objective must be for the farmer to get improved farm income out of the marketplace, with less cost to the Government

In this same message he also stated:

> To do this I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture to so utilize the Commodity Credit Corporation as to make the free market system work more effectively for the farmer. We must encourage the private segment of our economy to carry its own inventories, bought from farmers rather than depending on the Government as a source of supply. We must urge the private sector to perform as many services as possible now performed by Government agencies.

I agree 115 percent with that statement.

There is no reason why the Government should pay the storage to maintain inventory for the private grain trade or for the processors. If we adopt this amendment the private sector of the grain trade will enter the marketplace and seek its own grain for its own uses and provide its own storage and inventory and thus reduce those charges to the American taxpayer.

It is a known fact that under the present 105-percent figure the Secretary has dumped some 500 million bushels of wheat on the market in order to, in his words "keep prices below supports—to make the program effective." He further stated:

> We must not yield to the temptation to make prices so high the programs become unworkable.

While the Secretary professes that the wheat program is a voluntary program, he testified before the committee in opposition to legislation to increase the CCC resale price and makes the statement:

> This can't be done if we are required to hold stocks from the market to obtain prices so far above loan levels that we can't get farmers into the program.

Mr. President, it does not seem to me that we should give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to make coercive and compulsory a program which we in the Congress are tailoring to keep voluntary. When we give him the power to dump great quantities of wheat into the market, we give him the power to force reluctant wheat producers into a program which they might prefer to avoid entering.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a

broadcast under the heading "GTA Daily Radio Roundup," for Thursday, September 2, as a part of my remarks.

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

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, SEPTEMBER 2, 1965

We're talking about Commodity Credit Corporation's grain resale price today because it is very important. There have been a lot of half-truths, quarter-truths, and 100-percent untruths bandied around about this, so there is some confusion and misunderstanding. Let's look at the facts.

This is fact: The law permits the Secretary of Agriculture to sell Government-owned stocks of wheat back on the market at 105 percent of loan level and feed grains at the loan level.

Fact No. 2: The Secretary does not have to sell these grains at those minimum prices. He doesn't have to sell at all. He can set the resale price higher if he does sell.

Here is fact No. 3: CCC is not selling wheat in the domestic market for unrestricted use at present. It hasn't for some months—a highly commendable bit of restraint. But it has the unrestrained and absolute power to jump into the market and start dumping wheat at 105 percent of loan today, tomorrow, or whenever it darn well pleases. CCC has an uncommitted stock of 562 million bushels of wheat that it can dump if it so decides. It can legally put the whole kit and kiboodle of that wheat on the market.

Fact No. 4: Wheat today in the Minneapolis market is selling at 107 percent of loan.

These facts bring us to a supposition: Suppose that Secretary Freeman decides to start dumping his wheat on the markets at 105 percent of loan. We hope he doesn't, but if he did, what do you think would happen to that 107 percent of loan price on the Minneapolis market? Would it go down? It has in the past when CCC sold.

That's what Representative QUIE, of Minnesota, meant when he said that "the Secretary of Agriculture has been successful in depressing farm market prices."

It is a matter of record that the Secretary personally told the House Agriculture Committee that "we purposely sold in order to move prices down far enough so that they would be way below the support level, the loan level, so that we could thereby get compliance."

Well, that's the record. Now wheat prices are at 107 percent. And how about farmer compliance with the wheat program? It's wonderful. Kinda blows up the argument that better prices discourage compliance, doesn't it?

Yet the USDA bureau chiefs are dutifully trudging the halls of Congress telling that strictly nonfactual story about noncompliance and also saying unfactually that it would cost the Government $90 million to raise CCC's resale price to even 110 percent. That's just guff, but it seems to work, and the administration isn't doing anything to stop it. So the efforts of farm-State representatives and Senators from both parties, with a notable exception or two, to raise CCC's resale price by act of Congress are defeated time after time. That's something to keep in mind.

Meanwhile, USDA continues its firm grasp on the unrestrained and unprecedented power to whop grain farmers over the head with a low-ceiling price any time it decides to do so. Is this what Congress intended?

Please don't misunderstand what we say. We are strong advocates of good farm programs. Those are the words of none other than the general manager of your GTA. M. W. Thatcher said just the other day that "Good farm programs and good administration of them, have no stronger advocate than your general manager. We'll match our record with anybody's, and we'll continue to work for a more just and effective margin between loan value and the price at which CCC can sell its stocks."

Mr. MUNDT. It has been said by opponents of the change that by increasing the resale price by CCC which would result in an increase in the market price that the number of cooperators would go down. Well, now let us look at this charge. I know that farmers in my State of South Dakota do their farm planning with a sharp pencil. I know that they will figure out a method of operation for their unit which will bring them the optimum return on their investment. If he drops out of the program he stands a chance of receiving in the marketplace about $1.43 to $1.44 per bushel for his wheat in the marketplace on all of the acres he can plant. However, will he forego for that price the right to participate in the voluntary program under which he will receive a certificate valued at the support price of $1.25 on domestic wheat plus payments on diverted acres, plus a share of export certificates purchased from CCC which will bring him a told blend price of at least $1.90 on allotted acres on projected normal yield. Will he forego the advantages of good soil conservation practices as developed by the diverted acre program? Knowing the farmers of South Dakota it would be my prediction that all those who are cooperators today under the present resale program would be cooperators under the program even with the adoption of this amendment.

In fact, Mr. President, during the past marketing months the Secretary has not sold wheat in the domestic market. What has happened? Wheat prices are at 107 percent of support price on the market and farmer compliance with the program has remained high.

Let me say in conclusion what I believe some of the results would be should my amendment to raise the minimum resale price be agreed to.

First, it would raise the net returns to wheat producers by approximately 10 cents per bushel, on an average.

Second, there would be substantial savings to the Government by greatly reducing transportation costs and elevator in-and-out charges which now accrue as a result of selling farm products with one hand, and buying equivalent amounts through the storage loan program. As a result, this could provide a greater return to the taxpayer on his investment in surplus grains now owned by the Government, thereby reducing the overall cost of the wheat program and of the farm program in general.

Third, the farmer would receive his increased income in the marketplace and not through a direct Government payment. This would result in less cost to the Treasury, and be a move toward the second objective which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has pointed out, which he says he was advised by the President that he would like to see incorporated in the Farm Act of 1965.

Fourth, it would provide tighter restrictions on CCC sales, thus giving farmer-owned cooperatives and the private grain trade an increased opportunity to carrying out their historic function as the buyers and merchandisers of the output from American farms. There would be added incentive for all segments of the trade to carry larger inventories of farm commodities, thereby reducing the Government's enormous storage costs.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the Senate to adopt this amendment and while the Secretary of Agriculture seems unwilling to support the President in his objective of assisting the farmer to get improved farm income out of the marketplace with less cost to the Government we can by our action here today give the President that support which he asked us to make available to him last February 4.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the text of a broadcast dated September 10, 1965, produced by the GTA Public Relations Department at St. Paul, Minn., and broadcast over a great many States in a five- or six-State area of the Midwest.

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

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, SEPTEMBER 10, 1965

We understand from sources in Washington that an increase in the Commodity Credit Corporation grain resale price to at least a compromise at 110 percent has a fair chance of being included in the farm bill when it finally reaches the President's desk.

It would be good news to all concerned—farmers, the legitimate grain business, and Government—to have a higher minimum resale price established. Now it must be stated that for some time it has been USDA's policy not to sell wheat on the domestic market for unrestricted use, and this policy has been widely and highly commended. But CCC can go back today, tomorrow, next week, or next month to selling wheat freely at 105 percent of loan value. That's a bargain for the millers and other buyers, and naturally they shop at the Government's big discount house.

It must also be pointed out that the Government now owns unrestricted less than 600 million bushels of wheat, an adequate but not overlarge national reserve. Farmers and the private and cooperative grain industries are perfectly capable of storing and handling commercial supplies. The Government does not have to load up its inventories with more wheat and is not forced to do so.

For example, right now a good many farmers have 1964 wheat stored under the loan program. They are intelligent and capable people, and they work with sharp pencils to determine how to market that wheat to their best advantage. Should they turn it over to the Government or market it at their elevators and pay back the loan?

If they desire to pay back the loan, they must pay interest for the period they have used the Government loan money. They were forced at the time they took out the loan to pay the first year's storage. So, they must realize in the marketplace at least 10 cents more per bushel than the loan value to come out even. That means the market price would have to be at least 110 percent of loan. We figured the market price one day last week, and it was at 107 percent of loan, approaching the point where farmers could redeem without loss.

These redemptions keep grain out of Government bins which is considered to be desirable at this time. Thus the Government saves money. Farmers benefit. Farmers' cooperatives are able to market and

merchandise grain and use their arsenal of facilities to improve returns to farmers. It also gives the co-ops a chance to bargain for better protein premiums, which they obtained for farmers in the first place. When grain goes into Government hands CCC enforces rigid control of protein premiums with its own schedule of values.

But if CCC resumes wheat sales at only 105 percent of loan, you know from experience that market prices will hover at just about that level. The lower CCC schedule of protein premiums will prevail. Farmers will have little or no incentive to redeem their grain. They are almost forced to turn it over to the Government. Then the whole round robin of putting wheat into and selling it out of Government bins goes on. USDA is put on the defensive, forced to try to defend itself against its critics in and out of Government. Farmers get a bad name with taxpayers. They get lower prices for their grain. Their cooperatives are hamstrung in the marketplaces.

So you see the value in simply raising the CCC grain resale price to allow the CCC to operate within the charter given to it by Congress—and in full recognition of farm program goals as outlined by President Johnson himself.

NOTE.—Reprints of this radio broadcast, prepared by the public relations staff, are available from Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that we can get favorable action on what I believe to be a most constructive proposal.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. First, let me say that I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the amendment with the Senator from South Dakota, and I compliment him on the thoroughness and logic of the argument he has presented to the Senate today.

I should like to ask the Senator, if it is not true that under section 407 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949, as amended, it is specified that in selling commodities for unrestricted use in the domestic market, the sale price to the Government should not be less than 105 percent of the current support price, with reasonable care and charges for storage and handling? I believe that the experts who testified at the hearing stated that the Secretary of Agriculture, in truth and in fact, could sell at a higher percentage?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. We would elevate the floor of 105 percent as it presently appears in the act to 115 percent; and still, if the Secretary wished to do so, he could sell at a higher price.

Mr. PEARSON. I ask the Senator, in line with the recommendations of the President in his agricultural message of February 4, from which the Senator quoted at some length, why it is, when he specifically referred to action of the Secretary of Agriculture and to the use of the CCC mechanisms, that the percentage has not been raised by Executive action pursuant to law?

Mr. MUNDT. The Secretary of Agriculture made that clear in his testimony, when he said he was reluctant to hold up the price because, by dumping Government storage into the markets, there could be some compulsion on nonparticipants to become participants in the program. This is a club he likes to exercise, to provide a little Executive coercion in the legislative "volunteerism" which we have written into the act.

Mr. PEARSON. What is the magic in 105 percent? If we accept the argument as being valid, would not the same coercive action exist if it were 110 percent or 115 percent?

Mr. MUNDT. No, because every percentage point we push it up, we would restrict the ability of the Secretary of Agriculture to dump into the market at harvest time great quantities of storage grain, thereby forcing down the cash price which should be received by the noncooperative.

Mr. PEARSON. Let me ask the Senator this question: I understand that the Secretary of Agriculture has opposed the amendment because of the increased cost to the Government. Is that correct? Is that the second leg he stands on?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not believe that would be a defensible leg, if he does that, because this should actually reduce the cost to the Government.

Mr. PEARSON. Let me say to the Senator that I came in a little late, and the Senator may have covered the point, but I should like to make note of the fact that in all the controversy concerning farm legislation, and in all the differences of opinion in farm organizations, this particular amendment has their support, with some reservations, as to whether it should be 125 percent, 115 percent, or 110 percent. It has the support of the Farmers Union, the American Farm Bureau, the Farmers Grain Terminal Association, the National Grain Trade Council, the National Grain Feed Dealers Association, the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, and the National Association of Farm Growers.

I should also like to note that on the House side, when the amendment was presented in the Wheat Subcommittee, the 115 percent failed by a 7-to-6 vote. When it was presented in the full committee on the House side, the 110 percent failed by 18 to 17. Therefore, it has wide support, not only from the words of the President, not only from the action of the House on both sides of the aisle, but also from various farm agencies and bureaus throughout the country.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Kansas makes an excellent point in his usual cogent manner.

During the many long years I served as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the many additional years I served on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture, and the full Committee on Appropriations, I believe that this is only the second time I can recall when all the major farm organizations have been able to agree on farm policy.

I remember when the distinguished, hard-working and perceptive chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry called in all the leaders of the farm organizations at one time, and said to them:

We wish to help the farmer of this country. Therefore, we are going to lock you up in this room, and have you sit around this table. We wish you to sit there and cooperate with one another and discuss this problem and arrive at a consensus. We will send you in coffee and luncheon, and when you have arrived at a farm policy, call us back in and we shall be most happy to enact into law what you have decided.

I do not know whether he was bluffing or not. I do not believe he was. In those days, we all lived with a sense of frustration.

However, the farm leaders did not call the bluff. They did not sit there and agree. They did not call us back in.

The first time I can remember when the farm organizations were all agreed was when I was sitting as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and all the farm organizations came up together with approval of the soil bank. It was adopted, as everyone knows. It also developed many bugs, loopholes, and escape hatches. Some people even chiseled a little bit in connection with it. They let out whole farms in areas of the country where they deprived areas of tax returns, and small towns of their customers.

But it is interesting to note that the concept of the soil bank has continued. We have never quite gotten away from it. It is back in the bill again. It has a new, fancy name. We will support it. We will have plugged up some of the loopholes. We will make refinements. We have learned from experience. But when the farm organizations of this country agreed on a formula, Congress went along. It is still going along with the soil bank concept.

The second time I find them in agreement is in connection with the pending amendment. All the various farm organizations have testified for this concept, as the Senator from Kansas has pointed out. On the formula, some wish to go a little higher, some a little lower, but all higher than 105 percent, because they do not believe it is good to place the American farmer in competition with his Government when it can dump tens of millions of bushels of wheat into the market at harvestime to force prices down.

Therefore, I believe that we are on sound ground in finding ourselves in concert with the various farm organizations of the country, which certainly have a great interest in the overall agricultural economy, whether it be the producer, the man who buys feed, or the man who lives in one section of the country or another.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Let me say to the Senator from South Dakota that I recognize the merit in his arguments but, at the same time, I am concerned over why the amendment does not include feed grains as well as wheat. It is my recollection that many of these organizations to which the Senator from Kansas referred have advocated an increase in the resale percentage rate from 105 percent by the CCC not only for wheat but also for feed grains as well. I was wondering whether the Senator has some basic reason for not including feed grains be-

cause it seems to me that they should be handled in the same way.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I have a very good reason: the practical reason that it is good agricultural legislation. As in so much other legislation, we have to make progress one step at a time. We cannot cure all problems in one particular legislative act. Therefore, I feel that the logical place to start at this time is with wheat. As the able Senator from North Dakota pointed out in colloquy a few moments ago, there is an interrelationship between the prices of feed grains and wheat. This will help all of it, to a certain extent, as it helps wheat primarily and will work so effectively that the next time we deal with the problem, we can include the same formula for corn and for feed grains.

Mr. MILLER. Let me say to the Senator from South Dakota that I recognize there is a different interrelationship. It is for that reason, it seems to me, that since there is this interrelationship, the same resale percentage should apply to them.

I was hoping that I could persuade my friend the Senator from South Dakota to modify his amendment so as to cover both wheat and feed grains.

Mr. MUNDT. I would not be willing to do that for the simple reason that it would weigh down the ship too heavily when we are wallowing in stormy seas now. I am not convinced that the chairman of the committee would accept the amendment. We must move slowly, but move in the right direction.

Mr. MILLER. It is true that if the ship is loaded down too heavily it may sink, but that is begging the question. The question is whether we are going to have an adequately loaded ship. That is what I am advocating now. I do not believe the problem will be solved and the ship adequately loaded unless feed grains and corn are included.

I emphasize that most of the farm organizations to which the Senator alluded, which have advocated an increase in the percentage, have done so in terms of feed grains and wheat both. They have not singled out feed grains or wheat. They say, "We want both to be covered."

We had extensive testimony before the committee by various representatives of the grain trade, who pointed out that, because of the present unstable situation now which results from the 105 percent, the grain trade is reluctant to buy and store its own grain with the prospect that the Secretary of Agriculture may direct the dumping of some of these stocks, which would result in losses to them. They assured us that if this percentage were increased, it would mean the grain trade would buy and store more of its own grain, which would cut down the cost of storage to the Government.

I think they made a good case, but they talked not only of covering wheat, but wheat and feed grains.

While I recognize that this would be progress, we ought to make progress across the board with respect to both feed grains and wheat, as the different farm organizations have advocated.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I had agreed to yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] such time as he might desire. Then I think the subject would have been pretty well covered on this side.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if the Chair will let the chairman of the committee speak first, I shall be glad to speak later.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this amendment would increase the CCC minimum sales price from 105 to 115 percent of loan plus reasonable carrying charges. This would result in an increase in CCC sale minimum of about 12.5 cents.

It would discourage voluntary diversion.

It also would result in an increase in substitution of wheat for feed grains, especially barley, thus resulting in a rather substantial increase in wheat production.

The higher market price that would result under a higher minimum resale provision would destroy the present favorable competitive relationship between wheat and feed grains in terms of their feeding equivalent. This would result in considerable less wheat consumed for livestock feed purposes.

The net result of these three unfavorable effects would be an increase rather than a decrease in Government stocks. This in turn would increase storage and other related costs—and would substantially destroy the effectiveness of the wheat program.

The committee rejected a similar amendment which provided for an increase to 110 percent, instead of 115 percent.

OBJECTIONS TO INCREASING WHEAT RESALE MINIMUM PRICE TO 115 PERCENT OF SUPPORT

With $1.25 per bushel support for wheat, not accompanied by certificates, the legal minimum the first month of the marketing year would be $1.44 per bushel; and midyear about $1.53 per bushel; and from April on, about $1.59 per bushel.

Undesirable effects of increasing the wheat minimum include:

First. Reduced compliance: The man with a small allotment in comparison to available cropland would probably stay out of the program and plant all available land. A man with a 100-acre allotment, diverting the minimum under the 1965 program, gets benefits of $1,200. Accepting $1.51 per bushel he would need to produce only about 795 bushels more wheat to equal the $1,200 benefit. With a 27-bushel per acre yield, he would need to plant only about 29 more acres than his allotment. It should be recognized that in the major wheat producing areas, substantial quantities of fallow land would be available for planting in excess of the allotment.

Second. Reduced voluntary diversion: If participants anticipated a price of around $1.51, those who participated would not divert additional acreage.

Value of production per acre—$1.51 per bushel × 27 bushels	$40.77
Less production cost	8.00
Total	32.77
Diversion payment—50 percent × $1.25 per bushel × 27 bushels	16.90
Advantage to be gained by planting	15.87

Third. Additional program costs: Each 1 cent increase in the price of wheat means 1 cent increase in export subsidy on about 60 percent of the crop. Assuming an increase of only 12 cents per bushel times 700 million bushels equals $84 million more subsidy costs.

Fourth. Benefits to producers would be limited: In the past 4 years approximately 46 percent of the entire wheat crop was sold by producers during the first quarter of the marketing year. Fifteen percent was sold in the second quarter, 19 percent was sold in the third quarter, and only 20 percent in the last quarter. It is reasonable to assume that higher market prices resulting from the resale policies of CCC would not occur until well into the third quarter of the marketing year. On the basis of the past pattern of marketing, it becomes obvious that only a limited number of producers could obtain any monetary benefits from an increased resale price, since much of the wheat would be marketed before the market would reflect the increase.

Fifth. Substitution: The basic principle of substitution is that wheat and feed grains be completely competitive in terms of their feeding equivalent. If wheat is priced even a cent higher on the basis of its feeding value than corn or milo, the smart feedlot operator or independent feeder would not feed wheat. While we cannot control market prices to make these equal to all times throughout the year, we do have the mechanics of the loan and resale policy to try to keep these in line.

Mr. President, I express the hope that my good friend from South Dakota will not press the amendment. The committee considered this matter, not at 115 percent but at 110 percent, the same as provided in the amendment the Senator from Kansas desires to offer. The committee voted it down.

It is my belief that the producers of wheat have a very fine bill in the pending measure. My fear is that the adoption of this amendment would doubtless raise the cost of the program. I have no doubt it would do violence and would probably kill the substitution clause in the corn as well as the wheat provisions. That substitution provision provides that a farmer may plant corn on wheat acreage and retain his history, and vice versa.

The amendment would increase the price of wheat. It would no doubt affect the cost of feed grains to poultry and other farmers who feed animals.

The problem of increasing price supports in addition to what is provided in the law has been before our committee for some time. As chairman of the committee, I am still willing to continue a study of this matter.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if we could arrive at some kind of understanding—we all desire to be cooperative with the distinguished chairman—that would be in the interest of the whole agricultural economy. Hearings have been held from time to time, but usually in conjunction with other legislation. I wonder if the

distinguished chairman would be willing, if we desist from offering the amendment—we want to see the farm bill passed—to assure us that hearings will be held on this particular aspect of the farm problem, in which the Secretary of Agriculture will appear, and in which he can give his point of view, and in which the farm organizations can be heard, and in which the Senator from Iowa can propose his corn and feed grains provision, so we can see where we come out with respect to this problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure I can do that. I am confident that I can get the committee to cooperate in order to settle this matter. It has been before us——

Mr. MUNDT. Many, many times.

Mr. ELLENDER. I give assurance that I am willing to have hearings held on the matter.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate that. I was on the Senator's committee, and I recall——

Mr. ELLENDER. I will go further. I would like men like the distinguished Senator from South Dakota to be present and participate.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been on this committee for almost 29 years. My objective has always been to assist the producer and keep him in business, because I consider agriculture the main foundation of our economy. I shall be glad to comply with the suggestion made by the Senator from South Dakota. I am sure I shall not have any difficulty in persuading the members of the committee to cooperate. My good friend from Iowa is a member of the committee. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is a member of the committee. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] will be there to protect the feeders. All those matters can be considered by the committee.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I remember being on the Senator's committee at the time we wrote into the law the 105-percent provision. There is nothing sacred or holy about that figure. We had debate as to whether it should be more or less. I think it would be good to ventilate the whole subject, on which the Secretary, the grain operators, the producers, can concentrate their attention, and the committee can learn what is the best policy in the national interest.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think it would be a good idea. If we could have all those interested in the matter present, we might be able to come to some conclusion.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will go further and say that it might be well to get some of the departmental heads who oppose this proposal to be present and listen, and, while we examine the proponents, let them answer the proponents.

Mr. MUNDT. I think it is perfectly proper that they should be.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. With that understanding—and I understand the pressure of time under which the distinguished majority leader is operating—I am perfectly willing to withdraw my amendment, on the assurance of the chairman of the committee, and in view of the comments and remarks which have been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman mentioned an amendment which I had pending at the desk. The amendment is No. 422 and would set the resale of Commodity Credit wheat to 110 percent of parity loan support and carrying charges.

I offered this amendment because I thought it was time, based on the present marketing system and the present price of crops, that we should have 110 percent of parity.

I will say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that I was encouraged with what happened to cotton the other day.

That beginning August 1, 1964, the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at not less than 105 per centum of the current loan rate for such cotton under section 103(a) plus reasonable carrying charges.

I find that the amendment passed last Friday dealing with cotton reads as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, for the period August 1, 1966, through July 31, 1970, (1) the Commodity Credit Corporation shall sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at the same prices as it sells cotton for export, in no event, however, at less than 110 per centum of the loan rate.

In order to secure increased farm income, it is necessary to either increase farm payments or increase the price of the farm commodity in the marketplace—or both.

I had offered an amendment to the pending farm legislation which would prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from selling wheat at less than 110 percent of the current support price, plus reasonable carrying charges. Presently, the Commodity Credit Corporation is permitted to sell wheat in the open market at 105 percent of the current support price, plus carrying charges.

I believe it is urgent that we take action to remove, or at least ease, the ceiling price provisions of the present law.

Presently, we are applying ceiling prices on our wheat producers at levels which penalize in a most drastic manner the wheat farmer when he takes his production to market.

Price supports for wheat have been drastically reduced from an average of $2 per bushel just a few years back to approximately $1.25 per bushel this year. I do not believe it is fair to wheat farmers, nor that it is a sound national policy to prevent the market price from operating above these support levels if the market system indicates that it should.

Under the existing law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to move Government-owned wheat into the market when the cash price reaches a level equal to 105 percent of the support price—plus carrying charges.

The Secretary has exercised this authority—and by so doing—has placed a ceiling price on wheat in the marketplace at this level, and in fact, in many instances has purposely sold wheat at these levels in order to hold down the price. In simple language, the Secretary has used the weight and size of Government stocks of wheat to break the market price. This, of course, reduces the income of the Nation's producers.

Government manipulation of prices impairs the market system and can ultimately destroy it.

Government-owned wheat begins to move into the cash market when the cash wheat price increases about 6 cents over the loan price. This complies with the 105-percent requirement.

Under the proposal that I have offered, Government-owned wheat cannot move into the cash market until it reaches $1.38 per bushel, which would be 110 percent of the loan price—plus carrying charges.

The proposed farm bill will give Congress an opportunity to include a provision which would authorize the Secretary to sell Government-owned wheat at a price higher than the 105 percent of loan price.

The principle of securing an increase in the sale of this Government-owned wheat is approved by most of the farm organizations in our State, and while they favor a much higher release price than 110 percent of parity—they all agree on the principle.

Personally, I would favor a much higher cash release price for Government-owned wheat, but I believe one must be practical. By this I mean we must not get the release price so high that the Government would be forced to build even greater surpluses, which would be a deterrent to increased price for wheat.

At the present time we have a carryover—or a surplus—of some $819 million bushels, plus a very large crop produced this year. Our domestic consumption stays at about 650 million bushels for food, feed, and seed. Our exports have been running between 600 to 800 million bushels and present indications are that this year's exports will maintain that level.

There is no doubt that the world needs more of our wheat, but the problem, of course, is to get it into the world markets through Public Law 480 and cash sales.

We need to get more wheat into the private trade channels of our Nation and under the 105 percent sales policy, the Government will own 90 percent of our wheat. This policy has a way of nationalizing the wheat business.

What we need is a system which will permit—which will make it attractive to people with capital to invest in wheat, so that the Government does not have to carry all of the wheat. One way to do this is to keep up a progressive program of reducing our stocks as rapidly as possible—but at the same time—increase the Government sales to at least 110 percent of loan.

There is only one way that the Government can own less wheat, and that is for somebody else to own some wheat and the only way we are going to make it interesting for anybody with money to own wheat is to up the sale price.

The sale of Government-owned wheat at 110 percent of loan would raise farm income—reduce Government costs—and help restore a healthy grain market system.

I felt somewhat encouraged when I read that, so far as 110 percent would be concerned for wheat. Other commodities we can consider separately but I understand our distinguished chairman agreed to hold hearings. I am in accord with that. I shall not offer my amendment.

I appreciate his understanding of the problem and his generosity in trying to work with us. I shall cooperate with the chairman.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am pleased to hear the exchange between the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the chairman of the committee, because I believe these hearings can be helpful in throwing light on these problems.

I am in sympathy with what Senator MUNDT tried to accomplish, and I am in sympathy with what Senator CARLSON tried to accomplish.

I agree that we should not do anything at this point to delay passage of this important farm bill.

I believe the spirit of the two Senators, in being willing to withdraw their proposals so the committee can go into the whole question, is commendable.

I assure the chairman of the committee that I shall be more than happy to cooperate in attending hearings.

Mr. ELLENDER. I appreciate that.

Mr. MILLER. I express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman for agreeing to hold hearings on this subject.

I am sure the chairman will recall that there was a great division on the part of not only members of the committee, but officials of the Department of Agriculture on how resale price is computed. Hearings can be helpful in clearing up not only how price is computed, but its effect on the market and its distribution.

I appreciate what the chairman said, and I assure him that I will be interested in and be present at the hearings.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this morning I had a discussion with my good friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the author of the cotton amendment adopted by the Senate on Friday last.

I read his speech over the weekend. In that speech, he outlined benefits accruing to producers under his amendment. As I understood it, it was his intention to provide cotton farmers of the Nation at least 65 percent of parity on allotted acres and perhaps more as the surplus was reduced.

Since that is his stated intention, and in order to clarify the matter and make certain that that will be the case; that is, that the cotton farmer will receive between 65 and 90 percent of his allotted acres either through direct loan, direct payment, or diversion payments. I have prepared an amendment. I have discussed this amendment with the Senator from Georgia, and it carries out his intention.

I would like to explain my amendment to the Senate.

Under existing law the cotton producer is guaranteed support of at least 65 percent of parity on all of his production from his allotted acreage. The amendment I have proposed would merely preserve this protection for him. This would give the cotton producer about the same treatment accorded producers of other basic commodities. Wheat producers are assured by the bill of at least $1.90 on the yield from their full-planted acreage within their allotments.

Corn producers are assured of at least 65 percent of parity on all the acres planted within their permitted acreage.

Rice and peanuts are supported at not less than 65 percent of parity on all of the crop produced on the acreage allotment.

Tobacco producers receive support on their entire quota at a level fixed by Congress.

Similarly for wool, the Senate has seen fit to provide a precise statutory support price.

Congress has seen fit to assure dairy farmers of price support between 75 and 90 percent of parity on their full production.

But under the pending legislation the cotton support price is left to the discretion of the Secretary, except for a guarantee of 65 percent of parity on 65 percent of the farm allotment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. —. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each of the 1966–1967–1968–1969 crops of upland cotton, the total amount of price support made available to a cooperator shall not be less than an amount determined by multiplying the farm acreage allotment by the projected farm yield by 65 per centum of the parity price for cotton as of the beginning of the marketing year.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. As the able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has said, we discussed this amendment earlier today. I believe it is a very good amendment, and strengthens the bill. I hope the Senate will adopt it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the comittee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment, in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I offered an amendment last night, which was printed, I believe. I offered that amendment because it appeared to me that the cotton section of the bill was slanted wholly toward cotton manufacturers and left the producer far out in left field.

I believe the amendment just approved, which was offered by the Senator from Louisiana, assures that the cotton producer can at least get honorable mention once in a while and a little of the money, a little more than he otherwise would have gotten.

In view of the fact that the Senate accepted the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana, I announce that I shall not offer or ask for a vote on my amendment to restrict the cotton program to 2 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate voting against the bill.

I earnestly hoped that this would be the year that the Congress of the United States would take affirmative steps toward the development of a sound and realistic farm program.

Experience has proved that Government acreage allotments and marketing controls do not work. Experience has demonstrated that Government rigged prices do not help farmers, adversely affect consumers, and are exorbitantly expensive to taxpayers. Experience has called for a complete revision of our farm programs. This is why I joined with other Senators in introducing S. 891 which represented a fresh approach for wheat and feed grains. S. 891 would, first, abolish acreage and marketing controls for wheat and feed grains; second, establish price supports for wheat based on the 3-year world market average; third, establish price support for corn at 90 percent of the 3-year market average, with price supports on other feed grains related to corn; fourth, permit the market to operate by requiring that the Commodity Credit Corporation not release stocks at less than 125 percent of the support price; and, fifth, establish a cropland retirement program designed to reduce an over-expanded agricultural plant through the voluntary retirement of cropland on a competitive bid basis.

Such a program would reduce Government intervention in agriculture and reduce substantially the expenditures from the Federal Treasury. Such a program would signal the return of our great grain

industry to an effective market-price system.

It was a great disappointment to me therefore to see in the House-passed bill, H.R. 9811, what appeared to me to be a rehash of programs which had proved ineffective and which have been largely discredited.

H.R. 9811 contained programs for dairy, wool, feed grains, cotton, and wheat. In view of the complexity, expense, and futility of these programs, it is little wonder that the Senate Agriculture Committee decided that these programs had to be substantially revised. I am only sorry that the committee did not find it possible to completely rewrite the bill.

With respect to wheat, the House bill would establish price supports at the world market price, or about $1.25 per bushel. Payments would be made to farmers who joined the program of about $1.25 per bushel on that portion of the wheat crop estimated by the Secretary to be consumed domestically by humans. Seventy-five cents of this payment would be financed through a processing tax placed on domestic mills, and 50 cents would come out of the Federal Treasury. Additional payments would be made to farmers who reduced their planted acreage by at least 10 percent, but not more than 50 percent.

As we consider H.R. 9811, the language of S. 1702 has been substituted by the Senate committee. S. 1702 would also support the price of wheat at the world market price with payments on all wheat produced—based on the projected yield—sufficient to bring the total price support to approximately $1.90 per bushel. For example, if the price support were $1.25 per bushel, payment to producers in the program would amount to 65 cents per bushel.

PROCESSING TAX

The bill contemplates a processing tax of 75 cents per bushel on domestically milled wheat to finance a part of the subsidy payment, with the remainder coming out of the Federal Treasury.

I will vote against the farm bill for the following reasons: First, the bill contemplates a processing tax of 75 cents per bushel on domestically milled wheat to finance a part of the subsidy payments, with the remainder coming from the Federal Treasury. I oppose financing the wheat program through a processing tax on the American consumer. I believe this is a device to hide the most of the program, and that it is a mechanism designed to tax those least able to pay. It does not make sense to me for the Senate in the same session to remove excise taxes on jewelry, furs, perfumes, and cosmetics, while imposing a processing tax on wheat, the ultimate cost of which must be paid by the buyers of bread.

The processing tax will cost $375 million. The greater the purchase of bread by the consumer, the greater will be the contribution to the fund necessary to finance the bill, in accordance with the intention of the drafters and promoters of it.

How can I go back to Ohio and say we have eliminated the excise tax on jewelry and furs, but have imposed indirectly a tax on bread?

It cannot be done.

Second, the wheat program in the bill is not voluntary. When a wheat farmer is dependent upon the Government for payments for more than one-third of the price of his wheat, and when such payment is denied unless he joins the program, this, in my opinion, constitutes compulsion and cannot be placed in the category of a voluntary subscription by the wheat growers of the United States to the Federal program.

Third, the program discriminates prejudicially against wheat producers who produce wheat that is in short supply. For example, the Soft Red Winter wheat grown in Ohio is not in surplus, as many other types of wheat are. Yet the Ohio producer of wheat is forced to cut his acreage the same as a producer whose wheat is in surplus.

Practically every bushel of wheat farmed in Ohio is Soft Red Winter wheat. Ohio produced 38,316,000 bushels for the year ending June 30, 1965. That is practically our whole product. At the end of June 30, 1965, 819 million bushels of all wheats were in surplus. Only 8 million bushels of the 819 million were the Soft Red Winter wheat—1 percent of the 819 million bushels. Yet the Ohio wheat producer will have to cut back, in order to get domestic certificates, in the same manner as the producer of wheat that is in huge surplus.

Fourth, the certificate plan contained in the bill is especially discriminatory so far as Ohio producers are concerned. Payments are supposedly made on the basis of domestic consumption for human use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have more time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield an additional 4 minutes to the Senator from Ohio, and shall yield additional time after that if he needs it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yet this percentage is an arbitrary, across-the-board percentage which is computed without regard to quality of the wheat produced or the actual use of the wheat.

Fifth, the bill continues, through indirect taxes, to subsidize the manufacturer of cotton goods. These manufactures will double in the sum of $382 million under the bill, a bill which is supposed to help the cotton farmer. Within the past 10 minutes, some improvement of this aspect has been made.

I cannot subscribe to a bill which is supposed to help the farmer, but which contains $382 million of aid to the processors of cotton goods. Let us remember that the cotton surplus has gone up; the price of cotton goods paid by the consumer has not gone down. Every prediction and promise made when the subsidy for cotton processors was passed has proved to be untrue.

Sixth, the bill, because of its complexities and uncertainties, ought not to be made operative for a 4-year period. The controversies on the bill demonstrate that there is no clear thinking by a consensus on the provisions of the bill. There is a deep difference of judgment growing out of the complicated, complex aspects of what we are trying to do. Yet the bill provides that the program shall continue for 4 years. In my judgment, the program ought automatically to come before Congress for review at an earlier time than at the expiration of 4 years.

The producers of scarce Soft Red Winter wheat will receive domestic certificates for 45 percent of their normal yield. Even if the Ohio producer raises high quality wheat that goes 100 percent for domestic food, his allocation would still be 45 percent of his normal yield.

During the 5-year period 1959–63, 188 million bushels of American Soft Red Winter wheat were used; 71.3 percent of that wheat went for domestic uses. Nevertheless, the Soft Red Winter wheat producer received a 45-percent allocation just as a producer received whose low quality wheat may have gone entirely to export or feed.

Mr. President, I believe that the cropland adjustment program contained in S. 1702 is based on a sound principle of long-term retirement of cropland which is not needed for current market requirements. This is a program very similar to the one which I have previously advocated and which is contained in S. 891. However, I very much fear that its effect will be seriously impaired by other features in the bill.

In the feed grains, cotton, and rice titles of S. 1702, we again have programs of tremendous expense and little likelihood of success.

We have spent over $7 billion in the years 1961–65 on a feed grain program and may well see a record production in 1965.

COTTON

We continue a cotton program with export subsidies, mill subsidies, and producer subsidies despite the fact that the program has resulted in the prospects for the highest cotton carryover in history. The cost to the Federal Treasury for the cotton program is indefensible—over $800 million. Despite these subsidies, the price of cotton cloth did not decline over the past year. In fact the average price of 20 cloth products has been consistently higher this year as compared to last. Yet the combined value to farmers of cotton and cottonseed from the 1964 crop totaled $2.5 billion, 8 percent less than the $2.8 billion value for the 1963 crop. This was true even though the 1964 crop was as large as the 1963 crop.

The fact has been demonstrated—we cannot buy our way out of the cotton chaos. We must drastically revise the cotton program. The drain on the Federal Treasury is too great; the results are too meager. Payments to producers or to mills are not the answer. We must start from where we are and cut the subsidies drastically.

Mr. President, both the House and Senate bills contain very complex and

highly expensive farm programs. The fact that these programs differ so widely in many of their aspects indicates the dilemma that we are in. It is very likely that the conference bill that finally emerges will be quite dissimilar to the bill we are now considering.

Therefore, I urge that we not pass a bill authorizing such programs for 4 years. Obviously there is a great deal of disagreement over many of the essential features of the programs. Prudence demands if this bill is passed by the Senate that the authority be limited to one year and that this Congress immediately move to the task of designing a long-term farm program which will increase farmers' opportunities, expand markets, and reduce Federal expenditures.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, as in the case of any omnibus farm bill providing for many commodities, this bill is bound to be controversial. It is bound to contain some bad as well as some good. I am disappointed that more improvement has not been made to the bill than could have been made. I still have hope that because the bill is so much different from the bill passed by the House, the committee of conference will in effect be authorized to write a new farm bill, one which will delete from the bill now before the Senate some of the portions which I consider to be undesirable.

I made extensive comments on this point in my remarks in the committee report. I am particularly interested in what I considered to be a step forward when the committee adopted an alternate feed grains program, one which, in my judgment, is far superior to the present program, and will, I think, upon close examination by the Secretary merit being put into effect following the next feed grains year, when I understand he will follow the program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that extracts from the report as noted by me on pages 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29 of the committee report be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with that portion of my supplemental views from pages 136 through 144 with the deletions as noted.

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

TITLE II—FEED GRAINS

Short explanation

This title provides the Secretary of Agriculture with a choice of using either of two voluntary feed grain programs for the 1966 through 1969 crops. Subtitle A provides authority for continuation of the voluntary program in effect during the current year, but makes possible improvements in the program. Subtitle B provides an alternative program, which can be used at the Secretary's discretion, under which no price support payments would be authorized, but diversion payments could be made at levels adequate to assure program participation. Under this alternative program, land could be voluntarily diverted on either an annual or a 5-year basis.

* * * * *

Subtitle B retains many of the provisions contained in subtitle A, and differs primarily as follows:

(1) Price support for corn at 60 or 90 percent of parity (and comparable levels for grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye).

(2) Price support payments are not authorized except up to 25 cents per bushel could be paid to participants who were unable to plant, due to natural disaster.

(3) Payments for diverting acreage to conservation uses under the 1-year diversion program could not be less than 50 percent of the county support rate on the projected yield of the acreage diverted; payments for that diverted for 5 years could not be less than 70 percent.

(4) A minimum of 40 percent of the base would have to be diverted under the 5-year diversion program.

* * * * *

BACKGROUND

This title provides for a 4-year extension of the voluntary feed grain program—1966 through 1969 crops—and is designed to consolidate the gains made by the 1961–65 programs. This legislation builds on the experience gained under the voluntary feed grain programs of the 1960's to date. The legislation is aimed at (1) reducing feed grain surplus stocks, (2) reducing costs to taxpayers, (3) providing greater freedom and flexibility to feed grain producers in their farm operations, (4) providing an opportunity to feed grain producers to maintain and strengthen their farm income, and (5) providing adequate supplies of feed grains to livestock producers and other users at fair and equitable prices.

The Secretary of Agriculture would have a choice as to whether the voluntary program authorized by subtitle A or by subtitle B could best achieve the objectives of this bill. The Department of Agriculture advises that the 1966 program would be one authorized by subtitle A. In future years, a program authorized under subtitle B could be used if farm income could be maintained or increased, production more effectively controlled, and costs reduced by such a program.

The committee received assurance from the Department representatives that there was no objection to having this alternative program in the bill and that, since the bill provides for a 4-year farm program, such an additional "tool" for the Department to use instead of the program under subtitle A would provide flexibility to meet changing situations which cannot now be foreseen. Moreover, the Department will have the time needed to contact farmers to assess their potential responsiveness to the alternate program and to evaluate it in terms of overall cost and effectiveness relative to developing situations in feed grains production.

The alternative program provided in subtitle B, like the program provided in subtitle A, seeks to meet the problem of feed grain surpluses through the diversion of acreage devoted to the production of feed grains to soil conserving uses. However, it provides the farmer with a choice between retiring a limited portion of his feed grains acreage base for 1 year (20 percent minimum under present regulations) or retiring 40 percent of his feed grains acreage base for 5 years. Instead of providing complying farmers with both diversion payments and payments per bushel of "projected yield" on nondiverted acres, the alternate program provides only for diversion payments, but in an increased amount intended to be substantially as attractive as the combination of payments under the program established by subtitle A. Thus, the diversion payments are to be not less than 50 percent of the support price on the normal production of the diverted acres for a 1-year period; but in order to provide an incentive for farmers to choose the 5-year retirement plan (taking out at least 40 percent of their feed grains base acreage from production), diversion payments of not less than 70 percent are authorized.

As an additional incentive to participate, the alternative program provides a form of insurance to complying farmers who are not able to plant feed grains on their nondiverted acres, because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster. In such a situation, a payment of not to exceed 25 cents per bushel of expected yield may be made with respect to such acreage.

It is specifically provided that the alternative program be administered in such manner as will limit the amount of reduction in production in a county or local community area to prevent the program from adversely affecting the economy of the country or community.

It is recognized that under a 1-year program, entered into from year to year, a farmer can retire 20 percent of his base acreage, for example, in 1 year and a different 20 percent in the next year; that this enables him to bring the first 20 percent into production in the next year and, after lying fallow for 1 year, it would be more productive. Also, there is the likelihood that more of better productive land would be retired if one farmer elects to keep the same acres continuously retired for 5 years in an amount equal to at least 40 percent of his base acreage than two farmers electing to take out only 20 percent of their base acreage, with the same amount of acres being diverted in each case. Thus the alternative program is calculated to effectively achieve the reduction in production goal of the Secretary of Agriculture with a possible lower cost for the program.

It is recognized that the cropland adjustment program provided for under title V permits contracts for a period as short as 5 years and as long as 10 years. However, Department representatives indicated that efforts would be made toward longer term contracts and the retirement of whole farms and substantial portions of base grain acreage, so that if the alternative program provided under subtitle B is put into effect, it would harmonize with the program established under title V.

The remaining provisions of subtitle B are substantially the same as those contained in subtitle A.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF MR. MILLER

The bill reported out by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is a better bill than the one passed by the House of Representatives and much better than the bill recommended by the administration. However, as is always the case with an "omnibus" bill, it has both good and bad features—leaving the Members of the Senate with the difficult task of balancing the good against the bad in reaching a decision on how to vote.

I have said many times that there are few Members of Congress who advocate doing away with farm programs. Studies by research economists at Iowa State University, Cornell University, Penn State University, and Oklahoma State University make it clear that without Government farm programs, net annual farm income would fall from $12 billion (for 1964) to $6 billion, and this would have a disastrous effect on all segments of the national economy. This is why I have consistently supported the appropriation bills for the Department of Agriculture, without which no farm program could have been put into effect. Those who speak of the "danger" of Congress doing away with farm programs at a time when the agricultural sector of our economy is not sharing fairly in the national net income, are merely throwing up a "strawman" in an effort to fool the farmers.

Nor do farmers have to be apologetic about the cost of so-called farm subsidies. The annual appropriations for the Department of Agriculture amount to around $5 billion, but farmers receive only half of this amount through the various farm programs—the balance being used for foreign aid, Veterans' Administration, Armed Services, school lunch, disaster, and similar programs. Subsidies for American business amount to $1.5 billion, and American labor receives subsidies amounting to over a half billion dollars. One could also point to the billions of dollars in Federal Government contracts as a source of income for American business and their employees; and billions of dollars are being spent on numerous programs designed to meet the needs of the poverty and low-income sectors of our society.

If they understand the facts about our agricultural economy, I do not believe the American taxpayers should or would complain about the costs to the Federal Government which must be met to help provide a decent living for our farmers and their families. Throughout our history, the American public has been abundantly supplied with food and raw materials for manufacturing, and prices for these goods have been low. Moreover, our Nation's farmers have furnished large quantities of food for the relief of hunger in other countries. In 1964 only 19 cents of the consumer dollar was spent for food. Ten years ago it was 22 cents. Last year it was 30 cents in Western Europe, 50 cents in Russia, and up to 90 cents in some of the underdeveloped countries. In short, our national farm policy has provided both abundance and rapid technical progress, which are of great value to the Nation. But this policy has failed, at the same time, to bring to farmers the rewards commensurate with their hard work, managerial competence, initiative, and enterprise—particularly in comparison with other segments of our economy.

Some facts about agriculture

In order to evaluate the farm programs of recent years, it is necessary to bear in mind the following:

1. From 1961 through 1964, over 2,600,000 farmers and their families left the farm.

2. From 1960 through 1964, the number of farms declined by over 470,000. The Department of Agriculture projects nearly another 100,000 decline for 1965.

3. From 1961 through 1964, farm employment dropped by 920,000, including 287,000 hired farmworkers.

4. Farm parity prices were at 81 in December of 1960 and have been consistently below this figure ever since. In fact, the figure has averaged 76.5 since October of 1962.

5. From 1961 through 1964 costs of farm production increased over $3 billion, and farm debt increased by over $12 billion (from $26.2 to $38.3 billion).

6. From 1961 through 1964, Federal Government payments to farmers under farm programs increased by $1,475 million.

7. From 1961 through 1964, total net farm income increased by $700 million (from $12 to $12.7 billion). Since "total net farm income" includes Federal Government payments, it is clear that without anv increase in such payments, total net farm income for 1964 would have been $775 million less than in 1960. In other words, farm prices were depressed $775 million in 1964 as against 1960, which is why the parity ratio has been so poor.

8. It is true that total cash receipts from livestock and products have increased; but this is deceptive unless one realizes that the quantity marketed has increased still more, so that farmers have actually received less per unit marketed and less for their labors—not more. For example, such cash receipts amounted to $19,929 million for 1964 as against $19,880 million for 1963, an increase of $49 million. But aggregate live weight of meat animals marketed in 1964 was 4 percent more in 1964, so that a comparable increase in cash receipts would have been $795 million instead of the $49 million actually obtained.

9. Although total net farm income in 1964 was $700 million more than in 1960,[1] the dollar was worth 46.9 cents (yearly average) in purchasing power (compared to a 1939 dollar worth 100 cents) in 1960 as against only 44.8 cents (yearly average) in 1964. Therefore, to calculate the "real value" of the total net farm income for 1964 of $12.700 billion, one would have to reduce it by 4.5 percent, or $530 million, leaving a total of only $170 million increase in real net farm income over 1960. Gross farm income in 1964 amounted to $42.2 billion compared to $37.9 billion in 1960, an increase of $4.3 billion. In other words, out of $4.3 billion increased gross income, our Nation's farmers received a real net income increase of only $170 million, or 4 percent. The normal relation between net and gross runs around 30 percent (gross of $42.2 billion in 1964 produced net of $12.7 billion). During the same period (1961 through 1964), total compensation of employees in other businesses increased by over $52 billion ("real" income). The record is clear that, since 1960, the Nation's farmers have been falling far behind the rest of the economy in their share of our national net income. Long-term comparisons are just as bad or worse. The well-known farm economist Carl H. Wilken has compiled figures comparing a base period (1946–50) to 1964, which show that wages increased 176 percent, national net income increased 140 percent, corporate profits (before taxes) increased 88 percent, and net farm income declined 16 percent.

Some conclusions

If one is willing to face the facts, it is apparent that the cost-price squeeze on farmers has been worsening.

On the cost side of the ledger, the November issue of the Farm Cost Situation, published annually by the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture, shows an increase in the index of costs of goods and services used in production from 103 to 108 from 1960 through 1964. Feed, farm machinery, seed, and wages represent the largest increases. Inflation is a major factor. When the purchasing power of the dollar goes down, one cannot blame the wage earner for asking for a wage increase. Since all of his dollars are worth less, he needs more dollars to meet his family responsibilities. Many farm machinery factories operate under an escalation clause which provides for an automatic wage increase when the retail Consumer Price Index goes up. The net result of all these reactions is an increase in farm costs of production.

On the price side of the ledger, the problem has been an excess of supply over demand (both domestic and export). Until production and consumption are brought into balance, farmers are fighting for higher prices for their production with one hand tied behind their backs. Farm programs have been designed to achieve this balance so that farmers will receive fair prices, and while these programs are supposedly moving toward this objective, Government payments to farmers through the various programs are provided as a means of seeing them through the difficult transition period.

It is alarming to farmers that notwithstanding substantially increased costs of farm programs, farm prices have remained depressed. And the programs themselves do not appear to be effecting the reduction in production required to bring about a balance with consumption. I have the uneasy feeling that some of my colleagues prefer to wink their eyes at the capitalistic economic system when it comes to agriculture in favor of "cheap" food and "cheap" feed, but whatever their motivation they should not use our farmers and their families as pawns in their game of market control. Their voices would be among the first to be raised if the Federal Government imposed wage or price controls for industries in their States.

Evaluation of the bill

Like the House bill and unlike the administration's bill, the bill reported by the committee leaves the processing tax on wheat milled for domestic consumption at approximately 75 cents per bushel. The administration would have increased this by 50 cents per bushel to around $1.25. While this is one way to increase the income of wheat farmers, it does so in a way that bears most heavily on large family, low-income groups. Naturally the flour millers pass the additional cost on to the bakers, who in turn pass the additional cost on to the consumers, principally through an increase in bread prices. Whether the wheat certificate costs 75 cents or $1.25, the principle is wrong, and this is one reason why I voted against the cotton-wheat bill last year. Government price supports for farmers should be paid for out of the general fund of the Treasury into which tax money is largely paid on the basis of relative ability to pay.

The administration bill would have provided an exemption for wheat milled for other than human consumption, thus bringing about an artificially low price for wheat clears used for starch. This would have had a seriously disruptive effect on the cornstarch industry, which uses in the neighborhood of 300 million bushels of corn annually. The committee bill meets this problem so that the wheat starch industry will not be prejudiced in relation to competition from foreign imports while at the same time preserving the relative shares of the market of the wheat and cornstarch industries.

The committee bill continues the multiple-price program for wheat resulting in an artificially high price for food wheat and an artificially low price for feed wheat which, of course, competes with regular feed grains still in overproduction. The danger to regular feed grains from this artificial, Government-sponsored competition is revealed by the following figures on sales of wheat for feed:

[In millions of bushels]

Marketing year:	*Quantity*
1960–64 (average)	41
1964–65	72
1965–66 (estimated)	95

The committee bill is defective in that it continues the power of the Secretary of Agriculture, through sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation, to depress the market price of grains. This action, of course, has been taken in the past for the purpose of "encouraging" farmers to "voluntarily" participate in the programs; but the result has been a lowering of farm income generally. It is true that surplus stocks have been reduced, resulting in a savings to taxpayers through reduced storage costs of such stocks, but this has been at the expense of a segment of our economy which has not been receiving its fair share of our national net income. Some idea of the relationship between large disposals of Commodity Credit

[1] $12 billion for 1960 and $12.7 billion for 1964, according to Economic Indicators for July 1965, prepared for the Joint Economic Committee by the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Corporation stocks can be obtained from the table set forth below:

[In bushels]

Month	Quantity of CCC sales	Average price No. 2 corn Chicago market
October 1961	36,328,886	$1.12
November 1961	43,401,624	1.12½
December 1961	73,977,718	1.12½
January 1962	109,121,759	1.09
February 1962	113,091,495	1.10
March 1962	214,091,495	1.12
April 1962	159,351,950	1.14
May 1962	86,514,940	1.16½
June 1962	91,946,649	1.15½
July 1962	4,739,862	1.14
August 1962	15,298,448	1.11
September 1962	22,829,715	1.13
October 1962	48,071,730	1.13
November 1962	41,790,605	1.10
December 1962	44,041,933	1.16
January 1963	62,297,911	1.19
February 1963	87,654,186	1.21
March 1963	152,999,412	1.22
April 1963	96,224,168	1.21
May 1963	78,610,432	1.24
June 1963	84,987,788	1.31
July 1963	1,488,507	1.33½
August 1963	12,695,861	1.33
September 1963	20,846,425	1.36
October 1963	16,096,342	1.25½
November 1963	14,958,929	1.17
December 1963	13,510,265	1.22½
January 1964	24,159,603	1.24
February 1964	27,358,474	1.22
March 1964	19,058,069	1.24½
April 1964	13,653,048	1.26
May 1964	8,172,163	1.29
June 1964	21,902,406	1.27½
July 1964	1,105,504	1.25
August 1964	4,026,550	1.26
September 1964	3,515,475	1.29
October 1964	4,191,798	1.23
November 1964	4,415,923	1.19½
December 1964	4,885,740	1.27½
January 1965	25,497,367	1.29
February 1965	61,440,178	1.31
March 1965	55,129,660	1.33
April 1965	63,962,681	1.35
May 1965	41,190,156	1.37½

Present law requires that Commodity Credit Corporation stocks be disposed at not less than 105 percent of the loan price plus "reasonable carrying charges." The Department interprets this to mean 105 percent of $1.10 for 1964 corn, or $1.15½. Its interpretation of "reasonable carrying charges" is interesting. These are computed at 1½ cents per month, starting in October and running through July, with nothing for August and September. Then the charges are dropped, and the 1½ cents per month starts all over again in October. Thus, using the $1.15½ as a base, the Department is able to add from 1½ to 15 cents per bushel onto the disposal price. It would seem that the variation of as much as 15 cents per bushel during a year has a tendency to unstabilize the market.

The Secretary of Agriculture has made it clear that he has fully intended to use his power to dispose of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks as a means of depressing the market. Thus, he testified before the House Agriculture Committee:

"We must not yield to the temptation to make prices so high that the programs become unworkable."

And again:

"To interpret the feed grains situation, we must remember that in 1961 and 1962, heavy sales of feed grains by Commodity Credit Corporation were an integral part of the program. Congress intended and Congress directed Commodity Credit Corporation to sell corn to keep prices below supports to make the program effective." (Hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, 89th Cong., 1st sess., Apr. 6, 1965, pp. 10–11.)

The Secretary did not reveal where such "intention" by Congress was set forth, but the fact that Congress gave him so much discretion in disposing of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks might be said to "intend" the consequences of the grant of such power. In any event, it is time for the Congress to curtail this power by placing a higher disposal price on the sale of such stocks.

It might be pointed out that the supply of feed grains is down to around a 4½-month supply. The Department of Agriculture "tentatively" suggests that a national security reserve level of 3½ months is required (p. 1369 of hearings), so that the opportunity for the Commodity Credit Corporation to depress the market by disposing of its stocks is somewhat more limited than it has been. The committee, unwisely in my opinion, decided to not legislate minimum national security reserves of stocks for grain—although earlier this year in his farm message the President recommended that such reserves be established.

An evaluation of the feed grains title appears below.

Feed grains

The feed grains program provided by the Congress prior to 1961 was anything but successful. However, to claim that the programs provided by Congress in 1961 and subsequent years are an "improvement" over what went before does not necessarily mean that they have been a "success." Nor is it responsive to say that the programs for 1961 through 1965 are better than no programs at all. It is claimed that a net reduction in carryover of feed grain stocks for the years 1961 through 1964 amounted to 29 million tons. But this reduction was not due to the new feed grains program, because the reduction is more than accounted for by a reduction in the production of barley and oats (not covered by the feed grains program) totaling 12.5 million tons; and by an increase in domestic use and exports totaling 23.5 million tons.

The 1961 so-called emergency feed grains program was extended in 1961 to cover the 1962 crop, and in 1962 to cover the 1963 crop year with some alleged "improvements"; and it was further extended to cover the 1964 and 1965 crop years with some more alleged "improvements."

Unfortunately these "improvements" haven't worked. Since 1961, production of feed grains has increased 16.9 million tons. Production of corn, grain sorghums, and barley for 1961 totaled 124.4 million tons. It increased to 126.6 million tons in 1962; and to 140.7 million tons in 1963. In 1964, a year characterized by abnormal drought conditions, the total was 122.8 million tons.

Apologists for the present program say that what is needed is "more compliance"; that the loan price for corn, for example, should be lowered to "force" more farmers to "voluntarily" come into the program. For 1965 the support price for those who are in the program is $1.25, with a loan price of $1.05 and a payment of 20 cents per bushel of projected yield on nondiverted acres. In 1964 the loan price was $1.10 with a 15-cent-per-bushel payment. Now there is talk of the Secretary's dropping the loan price to $1 with a 25-cent-per-bushel payment for 1966.

The trouble with this approach is that it ignores the fact that what is wrong is not so much the number of farmers who are in the program as the quality of their compliance. In Iowa, one of the two leading corn-producing States, 65 percent of the farmers are in the program. On the other hand, only about 25 percent of the corn acreage has been diverted from production. What is needed is more diversion of better productive acres from production. A mandatory program is not needed as some have suggested. Also, it is doubtful that a further reduction in the loan price is going to be effective in bringing more farmers into the program, because (*a*) a number of smaller farmers cannot afford to reduce their feed grains acreage and make a living; (*b*) a number of farmers who followed recommended crop planting methods were left with too low a base acreage in comparison with their neighbors who had overplanted their acreage to feed grains; and (*c*) a large number of farmers feed their own feed grains production and prefer to take their chances with the livestock market.

Under the present program, a farmer can qualify by retiring only 20 percent of his base feed grains acreage. The next year he can qualify by retiring a different 20 percent of his acreage, bringing back into production the acres which have lain fallow for a year and which will be more productive as a result. Moreover, it is only natural that the poorest 20 percent of the feed grains base will be retired each year.

The committee would continue this program notwithstanding its obvious defects. And authority in the Secretary to further reduce the loan price and increase the payments per bushel of projected production on nondiverted acres has been provided under section 201 of subtitle A as follows:

"Such portion of the support price for any feed grain included in the acreage diversion program as the Secretary determines desirable to assure that the benefits of the price support and diversion program inure primarily to those producers who cooperate in reducing their acreage of feed grains shall be made available to producers through payments-in-kind. * * * that portion of the support price which is made available through loans and purchases for the 1966 through 1969 crops may be reduced below the loan level for the 1965 crop ($1.05) by such amounts and in such stages as may be necessary to promote increased participation in the feed grain program, taking into account increases in yields, but so as not to disrupt the feed grain and livestock economy: *Provided,* That this authority shall not be construed to modify or affect the Secretary's discretion to maintain or increase total price support levels to cooperators."

Present law provides for price support between 65 and 90 percent of parity, which is currently calculated at $1.58 per bushel of corn. Thus the support price is set at $1.25 per bushel for 1965. Under section 201 of the committee bill, the Secretary could drop the loan price to below $1 and make up the difference by increased production payments as long as this does not "disrupt the feed grain and livestock economy." It is my view that this type program has been given ample opportunity to work, and that the record is clear that it has not worked and has at the same time cost the taxpayers a great and increasing amount of money. I don't believe that they would or should be heard to complain if the program was resulting in a reduction in production, but when it has resulted in increased production their complaints are understandable.

Alternative program

Although the committee refused to substitute a program which would overcome the defects in the present program, it did write into the bill an alternative feed grains program which the Secretary may decide to change over to as the situation develops during the next 4 years. It is impossible for anyone to forecast developments, and since the bill is designed to legislate for the years 1966 through 1969, it would seem prudent to give the Secretary another "tool" to use when he finds that the continued use of the present program is not producing the results intended at a reasonable cost to the taxpayers.

The principal differences between the program authorized under subtitle A and the alternative program authorized under subtitle B are these:

1. The alternative program offers a feed grains farmer a choice between a 1- and a 5-year program. Under the 1-year program he

can retire the minimum amount prescribed by the Secretary (currently 20 percent of his feed grains base). Under the 5-year program he must retire at least 40 percent of his feed grains base.

2. With a view to encouraging farmers to retire 40 percent of their feed grains base and keep this retired for 5 years, payments for diversion under the 5-year program would be substantially higher. The Secretary is authorized to pay not less than 50 percent of the support price on the projected yield of the acreage diverted from production for 1-year contracts; and not less than 70 percent for 5-year contracts.

3. Under the alternative program, there would be only diversion payments (much higher than under the present program) and no production payments, as under the present program.

4. A form of insurance to compliers would be furnished by providing that where they are unable to plant on their nondiverted acres due to flood, drought, or other natural disaster, they will receive a payment of not to exceed 25 cents per bushel on their projected yield.

An example of how the alternative program would work in comparison with the present program is set forth below. The example assumes the case of a farmer having a 100-acre corn base acreage with projected yield of 80 bushels per acre and $1.05 loan price established by the Secretary. It further assumes that the Secretary decides to pay at a rate of 70 and 85 percent for diversion payments on the 1- and 5-year programs, respectively. (NOTE.—If the loan price was set at $1.10 per bushel, for example, the diversion payment rate could be lowered to result in a like amount of income to the complier.)

1. If the farmers retired 20 percent or 20 acres

Under Present Program

He receives one-fifth of the support price of $1.25 ($1.05 loan plus 20 cents payment), or 25 cents per bushel, or $20 per acre, or $400 diversion payment.

He also receives 20 cents per bushel of projected yield of 80 bushels per acre on the remaining 80 acres, or 6,400 bushels, or $1,280.

Total received under present program: $400 plus $1,280 equals $1,680.

Under Alternative Program

He receives a diversion payment of 70 percent of loan price of $1.05, or 73½ cents per bushel, or $58.80 per acre, or $1,176.

2. If the farmer retires 40 percent or 40 acres

Under Present Program

He receives the higher rate on all 40 acres, or 50 percent of price support of $1.25, or 62½ cents per bushel, or $50 per acre, or $2,000 diversion payment.

He also receives 20 cents per bushel of projected yield of 80 bushels per acre on the remaining 60 acres, or 4,800 bushels, or $960.

Total received under present program: $2,000 plus $960 equals $2,960.

Under Alternate Program

He receives a diversion payment of 85 percent of loan price of $1.05, or 89¼ cents per bushel, or $71.40 per acre, or $2,856.

From the foregoing, it may be noted that it is costing taxpayers $84 per acre to retire 20 acres for 1 year ($1,680 total payments divided by 20). Under the alternate program it would cost $58.80.

Where 40 acres are retired, it is costing taxpayers $74 per acre, whereas under the alternate program it would cost $71.40 per acre.

Thus it is seen that under the present program, there is far more incentive to retire only 20 percent of the base acreage. Under the alternate program there is far more incentive to retire 40 percent of the base acreage. The alternate program places the incentive where it should be if better results are to be obtained.

It should also be pointed out that under the alternate program it is provided that the Secretary is to administer it in such a way as to limit the amount of production retired in a county or community area so that the business economy of the county or community area will not be adversely affected.

JACK MILLER.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall vote "nay" on the farm bill. I think it is still a makeshift bill which fails to take account of the enormous shift of population from the farm and the enormous needs of the consumers. We must get a much better and sounder policy before we properly and prudently spend this huge amount of Government money.

I certainly favor the stated overall objectives of H.R. 9811, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965; namely, the need for maintaining farm income, stabilizing prices, assuring adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, reducing surpluses, lowering Government costs, promoting foreign trade, and providing greater economic opportunity in rural areas. These bill's objectives are absolutely essential to this Nation's agricultural economy and should be implemented. But in totality this bill does not effectively carry out these objectives. I believe the cotton provisions of the bill as contained now in the Talmadge amendment which the Senate approved on the floor and which I supported and voted for does carry out many of these important objectives. In endeavoring to obtain "one-price cotton" the new cotton provisions of the bill will do much to improve the competitive position of this country's textile industry. A major part of the textile industry is located in New York. I believe the textile industry will be aided materially by the Talmadge amendment which incorporates the principle of Government loans to cotton farmers at a level which will permit and encourage the movement of cotton into expanded trade channels. U.S. cotton is expected to be fully competitive in world markets with foreign produced cotton and surplus stocks of cotton are expected to be reduced as well as Government storage costs. I believe the new one-price cotton plan as passed by the Senate and in essentially the same form in the House will help the textile industry and I support it.

However, as happened last year, farm programs which probably could not have passed independently, were thrown together in a package in the House committee in an omnibus bill, in an effort to obtain support for all the component programs. I believe this procedure is most unfortunate in that it prevents consideration by the Members of Congress of the individual commodity programs on their own merits. The practice of jamming imperfect bills together impairs the capacity of the Congress to improve and perfect the individual programs.

Among the problems presented by the bill are:

The base excess production quota dairy plan which the Senate included in the bill by a vote of 57 to 27 yesterday afternoon is, in my judgment, on the whole inadvisable. This plan, as it was on October 10, 1963, was opposed by almost every Senator representing the Northeast portion of this country. A substantial number of the dairymen in my State have opposed the plan and strongly resist the principle of tight controls on dairy production. In my judgment, it is not in the best interest of our dairymen or consumer to permit the imposition of tight production controls. I do not believe that the curtailment of productive incentive for a sustained period provides the best method of improving the dairyman's income. As I mentioned yesterday, there is a marked lack of consensus among representatives of the dairy industry behind this plan which the Senate adopted and noticeable lack of enthusiasm by the administration as indicated by testimony by the Department of Agriculture before both the House and Senate Agriculture Committees. The Senate Agriculture Committee by an overwhelming vote chose to eliminate the base excess dairy plan from this bill.

Also, I am not in accord with the provisions of the bill which permit the continuation of the processing tax on wheat milled for domestic consumption at approximately 75 cents per bushel for 1966 and possibly more for 1967 and subsequent years. The administration's original proposal would have increased this so-called bread tax by 50 cents per bushel, the increase, it was expected, being passed on by the flour millers to the bakers and then on to the consumers. The House bill was rewritten to prevent the imposition of this additional burden by requiring financing of the additional 50 cents from Treasury general revenues. While the Senate bill differs from the House wheat program, it does provide a possibility that the burden of the 50-cent increase may be transferred from the Treasury to the processor for the 1967 and subsequent crops and, in turn, would permit the processor to pass on this additional cost to the consumer in the form of increased bread prices, which would, of course, have the most serious economic impact on low income families.

Consequently, while I support the important cotton provisions of the bill which the Senate adopted on the floor in the form of the Talmadge "one price" cotton plan, I cannot support the bill as a whole. I very much hope that future farm legislation will be considered on the basis of the recommendations of the U.S. Food and Fiber Policy Commission which I, together with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] called for today, and which the majority leader advised us will be appointed within the month by the President, and will be available for an improved farm program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has made an excellent statement about the bill. I shall, however, vote "Yea."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I support the pending bill together with the Talmadge one-price cotton amendment, but I must say that I approach both the amendment and the committee bill with a sense of regret and reservation.

With regard to the Talmadge amendment, I must say that I do not believe that our ailing textile industry can be cured by piling subsidy upon subsidy. It would be far preferable if our domestic industries did not have to contend with an artificial price structure in acquiring their raw materials. But since they do, the Talmadge amendment at least means that our domestic textile mills can at least enjoy the initial opportunity, which they should have, of buying their raw materials on the same basis as mills outside the United States. In the past, we have had an unconscionable system whereby U.S. taxpayers subsidized the purchase of U.S. cotton abroad, but under which equal treatment was denied to domestic users of cotton. Under the one-price system, the domestic mills at least have been given an equal break at the starting line, as it were, and I believe the system should be continued. But while I have voted for the Talmadge amendment, I must emphasize that while I believe it improves a questionable bill, I am not overwhelmed by the merits of the principal bill itself.

On past agricultural bills, I have frequently voted to support measures which seemed to decrease surpluses and diminish artificial stimulation of our farm economy and to oppose measures which seemed to overly subsidize one element of our ecomony and to expand artificial stimulation of that economy. I shall continue to do so.

In the present case, I must say that there have been pervasive forces within my constituency which have favored at least those portions of the bill which deal with the production of fibers so essential to our New England textile industry. Last week, for example, the Governor of my State telephoned my office to urge continuation of the one-price cotton system. His call was followed by a visit from influential businessmen, leaders in the textile industry, with the same message. Their official trade organization, the Northern Textile Association, then followed with a most persuasive letter, pointing out that 23 percent of Rhode Island's manufacturing employment is involved in the textile business and therefore greatly is dependent, one way or another, on continuation of the present cotton and woolen programs. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Providence Evening Bulletin entitled "Dropping One-Price Cotton Would Be a Senseless Step," be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, these are persuasive voices in support of the one-price cotton provision of the farm bill. But I must say that I regret exceedingly that we are not given the opportunity to vote separately on the different portions of the bill relating to separate sectors of the farm economy. It seems to me an outrageous imposition on our loyalties that we from New England, in order to help our struggling industries, must also accept as part and parcel of the same bill, a jerry-built structure of price supports for such unrelated crops as wheat, rice and feed grains. We are given no opportunity to sort out those elements of the programs which may provide Government assistance where it is least needed, or which may be perpetuating drastic chaos in the natural relationship of supply and demand. Such legislation really offers us no opportunity to exercise legislative selection and judgment and I regret that it comes before us at all. Only the most pressing involvement of my constituency in what amounts to a small part of the bill compels me to support this legislation.

I realize, too, that we as U.S. Senators must think of the overall effect of such legislation. And I realize too that the total cost to the Nation of our farm programs will be more rather than less if no farm bill is passed and we revert to older support plans, or as in the case of wheat face the prospect of vastly expanded production and storage. The costs of our present programs, for example, are $3.840 billion, while under the provisions of H.R. 9811 as it passed the House they will drop to $3.796 billion. Only in the light of these facts can I cast my vote with reluctance for this legislation.

EXHIBIT 1

H.R. 9811

NORTHERN TEXTILE ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., September 7, 1965.

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: We in the New England textile industry are dismayed by the action of the Senate Agriculture Committee in reporting a farm bill which would reestablish a two-price system for the sale of American cotton. The Agriculture Committee last week in considering H.R. 9811, which has been adopted by the House, voted substantial changes in the cotton section which would set up a system whereby cotton is sold to American mills at one price and sold for export to foreign competitors at a substantially lower price. We consider this inequitable and unfair and damaging not only to the textile mills but to the raw cotton industry as well.

The National Cotton Council says of the committee bill: "It would turn back the clock to a system which has failed and which would destroy the American raw cotton industry." The New York Cotton Exchange points out that foreign mills would be subsidized by anywhere from 5 to 12 cents a pound or as much as 40 percent lower than the American price, and that the selling procedure for export would amount to dumping. Textile manufacturers have characterized the committee proposal as tragic.

As you will recall, one-price cotton was established in 1964 for 2 years. The cotton textile industry responded to the 1964 legislation by increased employment, increased consumption of cotton, increased capital expenditures, and increased earnings for workers and investors. It would be most unfortunate to return now to a two-price system advocated by the Agriculture Committee. If no legislation is enacted, we would also automatically return to a discriminatory two-price system. Imports of cotton textiles into this country already exceed 1 billion square yards annually.

H.R. 9811 as adopted by the House will reduce the cost of the present program by $100 million annually by providing incentives to farmers to reduce acreage and overproduction and by providing a lower loan level to stimulate exports. Payments would no longer be made to mills, but would be made directly to the cottongrowers. Cotton would be marketed through the regular free channels of trade instead of piling up in warehouses at great expense to the Government.

We realize that certain cotton growers do not support the House-passed version and have succeeded in having the Agriculture Committee report a two-price bill with relatively high supports and a subsidy provision. The committee bill is contrary to the position of the administration. It is our understanding that Senator TALMADGE will introduce an amendment which would substitute a cotton section substantially similar to that contained in the House bill. We respectfully urge you to support this amendment and if adopted to support the passage of H.R. 9811.

As you know, there are still in New England 100,000 workers in textiles and an additional 100,000 engaged in producing apparel. Together they account for 13 percent of New England and 23 percent of Rhode Island manufacturing employment.

Enactment of this legislation is important not only to the cotton mills but to the wool textile mills in New England because it extends the National Wool Act of 1954 for 4 years and provides incentive payments to growers to encourage the production of raw wool.

New England mills manufacture one-half of the wool fabrics produced in the United States, and the continuation of a substantial supply of raw wool in this country is of obvious importance to us. At present, about one-half the raw wool domestically consumed is produced in the United States. If the act is not renewed, U.S. raw wool production would undoubtedly decline further and the domestic wool industry would be even more dependent on foreign stocks. We believe that it is in the national interest, both in peace and war, to encourage production of raw wool in this country.

A number of our mill representatives are planning to come to Washington on Wednesday and Thursday of this week and I hope that we will have an opportunity to talk with you about these matters personally before debate begins.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM F. SULLIVAN.

DROPPING ONE-PRICE COTTON WOULD BE A SENSELESS STEP

If anything needs knocking down in a hurry, it is this notion in the Senate Agriculture Committee that the one-price cotton system which is now law, should be abandoned.

In a closed-door session, secret because the committee has not completed action on cotton, it was voted eight to seven not to continue equalized prices for another 4 years.

That leaves the committee, unless it does something about it, with a program proposed by committee chairman, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, which calls for 3-cents-a-pound payment instead of full equalization to "persons other than producers" or, in other words, cotton mills.

Up to the time when the existing law was passed, cotton was sold to mills at the U.S. support price which was 6 to 8 cents higher than world market prices. Foreign competitors of the mills thus had a 6- to 8-cent cost advantage which they put to good use in

manufacturing cotton fabrics for shipment into this country at prices domestic mills simply could not meet.

It took a long time to convince Congress that this kind of competition was wrong, but finally the present law was passed which provides for Government payment to mills of the difference between the U.S. support price and world prices.

Now Senator ELLENDER wants to go back to something approaching the old dual price system. He has managed to prevail, persuading a majority of the Agriculture Committee to accept his complicated proposal.

This may be a good deal for Louisiana cottongrowers, but it makes no sense at all, either for mills having to compete with foreign producers or for that segment of the U.S. economy depending on textiles, and it is large.

The Senate Agriculture Committee went fully into the pros and cons of dual cotton prices and foreign competition when the existing law was passed. It ought to remember this, get back on track, and continue the only system that gives U.S. mills a fair shake in the competitive open market.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as one who has been privileged to represent the greatest agricultural State, for over 20 years, I feel I should help put the record straight on the way we are swiftly moving with agricultural programs.

Current Government programs have failed and will continue to fail if the bill now before the Senate should become law. As I study this bill, I am convinced that it would just place more patches on a wornout, discredited program.

What is the record of the farm programs we have had these last 5 years?

They claim to protect the family farm, yet in these last 5 years the farm population has decreased about 3 million.

Net budget expenditures for USDA for fiscal year ending July 1, 1965, were $7.3 billion, the third highest on record. They amounted to $7.7 billion in fiscal 1963 and $7.9 billion in 1964. This compared with $5.4 billion for the year ending July 1, 1960. Who in agriculture is proud of this? Problems do not go away just by throwing money at them—there must be constructive use of the money; spending should have a purpose.

The parity ratio—at 75 percent—average for the entire year of 1964, averaged the lowest since 1934. I have heard no one brag about this fact.

Realized net farm income, at $12.9 billion, in 1964, was up from $12.5 billion in 1963. This $400 million increase in realized net farm income was $81 million less than the $481 million increase in direct Government payments to farmers in 1964 as compared to 1963. It takes real genius to write checks to farmers for an additional $481 million in order to raise realized net farm income $400 million. What happened to the other $81 million?

In 1964 about $2.1 billion of the $12.9 billion in realized net farm income was in direct payments from Government to farmers. In 1965 close to $2.5 billion will be in direct payments to farmers. Thus, we have the unhappy and dangerous spectacle of about 20 percent of total realized net farm income being paid by direct payments to farmers from the Federal Treasury. Who on this floor is there to boast about this fact? The farmer would prefer to get his income in the marketplace—but this omnibus bill would increase the ratio of direct payments and the dependence on the Government, and lower the ceiling further on the farmer's receipts in the market.

In spite of the continued heavy Federal payments to farmers and total USDA expenditures—at an alltime high—because of the so-called emergency programs for feed grains, wheat, and cotton, the amount of commodities under price support programs and in CCC inventory continue to be extremely large. As of May 31, 1965—the latest available figure I have—CCC had $13.5 billion of its $14.5 billion in use. Is this anything to brag about?

Expanded use of direct Federal Government payments to farmers to offset depressed market prices, caused by unwise Government programs, continues. In many cases Government programs and dumping of CCC stocks have helped depress market prices.

By design, now, we have Government programs to hold the domestic market price down to world price or below, so that direct payment to farmers from the Government can be used to force compliance with the programs. The new concept is to hold the domestic market price down rather than use Government influence to increase market prices to farmers.

Many people in and out of Congress have promoted unworkable market-wrecking farm programs that have failed. These same people, in order to cover up this failure, are now the strongest advocates of direct-payment programs.

We now have various forms of compensatory payment programs for feed grains, wheat, cotton, sugar, and wool. This list has grown each year and is the prime reason why the USDA budget annual expenditures have averaged the highest on record the last 3 years—$7.7 billion.

Congress realized back in the late 1940's, when the Brannan plan direct-payment approach was made, how futile and costly this type of program would be, if applied to all of agriculture. They wisely rejected the approach. Now it is creeping up on us step by step, encouraged by cheap food and fiber advocates who do not believe in the market system. The surest way for Government controllers to take over is to force farmers to get their incomes from checks from the Federal Government.

This year will be the fifth year of the so-called emergency feed grain program.

In the face of strong producer opposition to compulsory controls on feed grain production, Congress rejected the compulsory approach and extended the emergency program on three separate occasions.

The program now uses compensatory payments and a low loan rate in order to bribe or force compliance.

The program has been one of the most expensive of any program we have had for any commodity since the beginning of farm programs in the early 1930's.

Feed grain program costs and acres diverted

Crop year	Acres diverted	Payments to farmers
1961	26,700,000	$782,000,000
1962	32,700,000	843,000,000
1963	25,700,000	845,000,000
1964	34,300,000	1,171,000,000
1965 (estimate)	36,700,000	1,600,000,000
Total	156,100,000	5,241,000,000

In spite of this expenditure of money, the August crop report of USDA indicates an alltime high record feed grain production in 1965. In 1963 we also had an alltime high feed grain production up to that time.

Feed grain carryover has been reduced, but not as much as feed grain consumption has increased, since the beginning of the feed grain program. The increased feed grain consumption—because of CCC dumping of feed grain stocks in order to hold prices down to force compliance—helped cause the depressed livestock prices in 1963 and 1964. I believe analysis would show this loss to livestock producers was far more than the payments made under the feed grain program. When will Congress and the administration give the feed grain producer and the livestock producer a fair shake?

The current wheat certificate program is a stopgap 2-year program, which was put into effect after a majority of the producers voting in a 1963 referendum had rejected a similar program.

Here are a few facts that should be considered in evaluating this program as well as its extension in this bill before us.

First. Farmers from my State have long opposed the principle of multiple price plans because the Government rigged pricing is detrimental to producers of other crops and livestock and poultry. Wheat used for feed in competition with feed grains under this program has jumped from 1960 to 1964—average—of 41 to 95 million bushels this year and is still increasing. This is unfair to feed grain producers, for it adds considerably to the feed supply and forces down the market price. Cheap feed means cheap hogs, beef, and poultry—as any farmer knows.

Second. The certificate plan for wheat is a bread and flour tax on the user of the product; only part of the certificate cost is to be paid from general revenues.

Third. The certificate plan does not give producers a choice between supported prices and a free market.

Fourth. The use of CCC stocks to depress prices—a key necessity of the certificate plan—imperils the market system. The program is designed to hold the market price down to feed grain price level. The administration has succeeded in defeating any amendment to prevent CCC dumping on the market at some level higher than 105 percent of loan level—it wants this power to break the market.

Fifth. Wheat acreage is increasing under the certificate plan.

Wheat production, according to the USDA August crop report, is up 7 percent from last year and 16 percent above average.

It has now been proven that the 1964 emergency cotton law, in effect for the 1964 and 1965 crops, has failed to fulfill the claims made for it at the time it became law last year. Proponents of the current law claimed that under the program consumption of cotton would increase, cost to the U.S. taxpayer would decline, consumer prices of cotton goods would be lowered, the upward trend in manmade fiber use would be halted, and farm income from cotton would be maintained.

As Al Smith once said, "Let's look at the record."

First. Cotton consumption did increase domestically but much less than the increase shown by manmade fibers. Cotton's share of the fiber market actually dropped by more than a full percentage point.

Second. Exports of cotton for the marketing year ending August 1, 1965, are now estimated to be down by a fifth or more from a year earlier.

Third. Total cost of the cotton program ran to more than $900 million, far exceeding the cost of the previous program.

Fourth. Prices of cotton cloth did not decline; in fact, the average price of 20 cloth constructions was 64.65 cents in May 1965, compared to 61.29 cents in May 1964.

Fifth. Cotton mill margins in May 1965, as reported for 20 major cloth constructions, averaged 37.30 cents compared to 25.62 cents in May 1964.

Sixth. The combined value to farmers of cotton and cottonseed from the 1964 crop totaled $2.546 million, or more than 8 percent less than the value of $2.784 million from the 1963 crop. The production in 1964 was about the same as 1963.

Seventh. Carryover of cotton is up again dramatically. The USDA cotton situation of July 26, 1965, indicates that carryover of cotton on August 1, 1965, at 14.2 million bales was estimated to be at the highest level since the alltime high record set in 1956. The carryover is up 2 million bales from just 1 year earlier. If anyone calls this a success story, I do not know the meaning of the word.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there is indeed irony in the situation that exists with regard to agriculture in the United States and in the rest of the world. We have developed our agricultural efficiency to the point where we can easily produce much more than we need. Much of the rest of the world, meanwhile, and many of our own people suffer in an agony of hunger.

Our own ability to produce more than we need would be fine, were it not for the operation of the inexorable law of supply and demand. It is elementary economics that in a free market, if supply exceeds demand at a given price, the price will fall. Because we are a humane society, we would not stand idly by when it became apparent that our agricultural productivity was increasing to the point where if nothing was done, farm incomes would fall drastically, millions of farmers would lose the fruits of the toil of many generations, and poverty and misery would descend upon rural America.

And so the Federal Government stepped into the agricultural picture with programs aimed at easing the transition to an extremely high productivity agricultural sector. Our objectives all this time, as I understand them, have been to maintain farm income, to assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, and to reduce agricultural surpluses.

Mr. President, I believe the time is coming when we are going to have to expand this list of objectives. For we as a nation have dedicated ourselves to the eradication of poverty in our midst. Thus far we have not used all the resources at our disposal.

We are talking about cutting back agricultural production when we cannot feed all our people properly. A former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, a very able economist but mistaken in his analysis of agriculture, argues for the removal of millions of farmers from the land to the cities, when in 1963 probably one-third of the excessive unemployment was due to workers forced off the land during the previous decade.

The fact is that we have not been making optimum use of our agricultural productivity. And now that we have made a commitment to aid the poor among us, we should give thought to our agriculture programs in connection with our war on poverty.

And so I urge the Secretary of Agriculture to institute a study and come back to Congress next year with a report on how the agricultural sector of our economy can more effectively be utilized to deal with unemployment and undernourishment in this country. We have been rather shortsighted and unimaginative thus far. I do not believe it is asking for the impossible to suggest that fresh ideas may come from a Government bureau; it has happened before, but in agriculture we are suffering from an inability to take a large enough view of the situation. Our agricultural programs should be more to our country than they have been.

For the next few immediate years, and in terms of our traditional concepts of agriculture programs, this farm bill is very important.

COTTON

The cotton section of the bill is of immense importance to my State, the leading cotton-producing State. Although I favored the cotton section as reported out by the Senate Agriculture Committee, I am hopeful this cotton program adopted by the Senate and so ably presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia, will accomplish what it is intended to. It is far better than the House bill. I believe it to be a good bill also. It will provide a basic price support for cotton at a rate not to exceed 90 percent of the world market price. For the 1966 crop the price will be set at 21 cents per pound. In addition, a cash payment of at least 9 cents per pound will be made to offset the lower price support of 21 cents per pound in the new program. Finally, acreage diversion payments will be made to farmers who divert up to 35 percent of their domestic allotment. This payment shall be not less than one-half of the basic price support. Farms of 10 acres or less will not have to divert in order to receive payments under this provision, because they are so small already that requiring them to reduce their activity still further would not serve a useful purpose, but would reduce their already small incomes to a disastrously low point.

WHEAT

Mr. President, wheat brings in cash receipts of $1,786 million annually. The wheat program in the bill would boost the price for wheat to about $1.90 per bushel, $0.09 higher than in the House bill. The price support would be about $1.25 per bushel. Then direct payments would bring the price to the farmer up to at least $1.90. This is a voluntary program. Farmers who wish to participate must divert part of their wheat-producing land to land-conserving purposes.

FEED GRAINS

The feed grains section of the bill, provides improved means of dealing with feed grain surpluses. There are two alternative voluntary programs. The first continues basically the present program but lowers the support price and raises the direct payment. Thus, participating farmers incomes would not be hurt, but since the price level would probably fall, there would be added incentive to participate and thus lower our surpluses.

The alternative feed grain program would offer a low support price and longer and more lucrative land diversion contracts. The farmer could retire 40 percent of his feed grain acreage base for 5 years and receive diversion payment of not less than 70 percent of the support price.

RICE

Over the past several years, rice has maintained a reasonably good relationship between supply and demand, primarily due to increased exports. There was no rice section in the House bill. The Senate provision provides a diversion program if the national rice allotment for 1966–69 is increased above the current allotment. The goal here is to maintain the income of rice growers if national allotments are reduced.

WOOL

The Senate bill extends the National Wool Act for 4 years. It sets a 1966 price for shorn wool of 65 cents a pound, compared with the 64 cents in the House bill. In addition, small producers who do not market more than 1,000 pounds will be supported at a level not more than 5 cents a pound higher.

DAIRY

And finally, Mr. President, the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin on milk was added yesterday on the Senate floor. Under this plan if two-thirds of the farmers in a market order area vote to do so, they can modify the prevailing blend price system whereby dairy farmers producing under the same marketing order receive a relatively higher price for the part of the

milk that actually goes into fluid consumption and a relatively lower price for the excess which goes into cheese and other milk products. Under the old plan, the farmer receives the single blend price, no matter how much he produces. This can hurt the dairy farmer because as production increases, the amount of fluid going into excess production increases, and the blend price drops lower and lower. Thus he cannot protect himself against overproduction by others.

Under the new plan the farmer will receive the established price for each part of his own production that goes either into production of fluid or the excess that goes into cheese, et cetera. This will enable the farmer to protect himself against overproduction by others, since he could count on the established fluid price. Second, overall production would decrease, since he would receive a lower excess price for his own increased production.

Mr. President, I urge enactment of this very important measure. I also renew my call for an overall study within the Agriculture Department to determine how our agricultural production can better be utilized by our whole society. With better utilization of the fruits of production, the problem of surplus would disappear.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the omnibus farm bill, H.R. 9811, is a culmination of many months of long and thoughtful consideration by the members and staff of the Senate Agriculture Committee.

This complex and difficult legislation has been studied with special diligence by this Senator and his staff because not only do its provisions affect many aspects of American agriculture, but also because farming and ranching now, and far in the future, will dominate Nebraska's economy. Farm legislation is vital to all of our citizens.

The bill is lengthy. It covers a wide variety of subjects. It includes intricate arrangements, provisions, and formulas. It contains both good features and bad. The task of weighing the good against the bad is not easy.

On balance, and after careful analysis, it is my judgment that this bill's shortcomings far outweigh its advantages. I cannot, in good conscience, support it.

THERE IS A NEED FOR A FARM PROGRAM

For a Senator to reach this decision, of course, does not mean that he is opposed to all farm bills. It does demonstrate that he believes that not all farm bills are good, and that some are unworthy of support.

Too often, we are told that the danger of Congress doing away with all farm programs and the catastrophe that would result. Attention is called to the study released during the presidential campaign of 1964 which concluded that the net farm income would drop $6 billion—from the $12.5 billion of 1964—if all programs were eliminated.

Those who raise such thoughts now, as then, were clearly erecting a "straw man" or a "bogey man" in an effort to mislead and to frighten and especially to mislead and frighten farm folks.

There is no movement, nor any expressed thinking in the Congress that this Senator knows anything about, which advocates or even proposes complete and sudden repeal of all farm programs. Such a course would be foolhardy and unthinkable; any fair and thoughtful person knows this.

Those who say a vote against the bill now before us is a vote against the farmer or a vote against all farm programs, are necessarily assuming that they alone have a monopoly of wisdom and knowledge on the subject; that they alone in the present bill know how to deal with it, and that anyone who disagrees with them is derelict. Such a claim to infallibility is scarcely worthy of passing consideration.

This Senator is for a farm program and for the farmer. But he wants a program that will help, not hurt; one that will improve the position of the farmer, and not just repeat the mistakes of the past, and continue to worsen his economic position.

POSITION OF FARMER STEADILY DECLINES

Statistics clearly demonstrate how the position of the farmer has steadily declined these past 5 years.

Farm income has not significantly improved. In fact, when compared with the gains made in nonfarm income, it has substantially decreased.

Farm indebtedness has soared to alarming levels. The farmer has been forced to borrow against the inflated value of his land in order to survive; or simply to postpone the time he must leave the land.

Farm families have engaged in steady exodus from the land because they simply cannot make ends meet. Over a half million families have left in the past 5 years. What a dreary monument to the failure of the administration program.

Yet in the bill before us the Congress is asked to continue those unsuccessful programs for 4 more years.

For any prospect of improvement a different approach is required. We must shift away from the goal of making the farmer and rancher completely dependent on the U.S. Treasury for his income.

Let us consider the consistent record of failure which has accompanied pursuit of that goal.

USDA EXPENDITURES—FARM INCOME

Net budget expenditures for U.S. Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, are estimated to be $7.3 billion, the third highest on record. They amounted to $7.7 billion in fiscal 1963 and $7.9 billion in 1964. This compares with $5.4 billion for the year ending June 30, 1960.

The complete tabulation is as follows:

Fiscal year:	*Billions of dollars*
1960	5.4
1961	5.9
1962	6.7
1963	7.7
1964	7.9
1965 (estimated)	7.3

Source: USDA.

However, there is a billion dollars in CCC losses for fiscal year 1961 that the administration has not asked Congress to reimburse and almost another billion dollars for fiscal 1964.

These last two amounts will have to be paid for sooner or later. The $2 billion will have to be added to the totals when appropriated. In the meantime, we are paying interest on this deception.

It should be noted, however, that only about one-half of the farm budget goes for the direct benefit of the farmer. Included in Agriculture expenditures are billions for food for peace, public works, school lunches, food stamp plan, Veterans' Administration, strategic stockpile, and other similar projects which are primarily of benefit to others than the farmer. A detailed analysis of this fact appears in the hearings of the Senate Agriculture Appropriations Committee for the fiscal 1966 appropriations.

The parity ratio—at 75 percent—for the entire year of 1964, was the lowest yearly average since 1934.

Realized net farm income, at $12.9 billion in 1964, was up from $12.5 billion in 1963. This $400 million increase in realized net farm income loses its glamour almost completely when we note the $481 million increase in direct Government payments to farmers in 1964 as compared to 1963—an $81 million shortchange for the farmer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the detailed table of farm income figures be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

Farm income, United States, 1960–64

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Cash receipts from farm marketings	Government payments	Realized nonmoney income	Realized gross farm income	Farm production expense	Realized net farm income
1961	34,923	1,484	3,179	39,586	27,013	12,573
1962	36,187	1,763	3,146	41,069	28,526	12,543
1963	37,253	1,686	3,134	42,073	29,572	12,501
1964	36,899	2,169	3,122	42,190	29,249	12,941

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in 1964 about $2.1 billion of the $12.9 billion in realized net farm income was in direct payments from Government to farmers. In 1965 close to $2.5 billion will be in direct payments to farmers.

Thus, we have the unhappy and dangerous spectacle of about 20 percent of total realized net farm income being paid by direct payments to farmers from the Federal Treasury. Like the Nation, agriculture cannot exist half slave and half

free. If the trend of providing a substantial share of farm income from the Treasury continues, we can expect increasing control and domination of the farmer amounting to economic slavery.

In spite of the continued heavy Federal payments to farmers and total U.S. Department of Agriculture expenditures because of the so-called emergency programs for feed grains, wheat, and cotton, the amount of commodities under price support programs and in Commodity Credit Corporation inventory continue to be extremely large.

The sorry, overall situation of our farmers is seen in the following facts: From 1961 to 1964 over two and a half million farmers and their families have left the farm. The number of farms has declined almost a half million. Another 100,000 farms are being lost this year. Farm employment has dropped by almost a million in the past 4 years. Farm debt has increased by $12 billion to a total of $38 billion—a 50-percent increase. Farm production costs have increased over $3 billion while net farm income has remained on about the same average level of $12.5 billion.

This dreary record was achieved under virtually the same provisions we are now being asked to ratify for another 4 years.

COMPENSATORY PAYMENTS

Expanded use of direct Federal Government payments to farmers to offset depressed market prices, caused by unwise Government programs, continues. In many cases Government programs and dumping of CCC stocks have resulted in worsening the problem.

By design now we have Government programs to hold the domestic market price down to the world price or below, so that direct payments to farmers from the Government can be used to force concept is to hold the domestic market compliance with the programs. The new price down rather than use Government influence to increase market prices to farmers.

Many people, in and out of Congress, have promoted unworkable market-wrecking farm programs that have failed. These same people, in order to cover up this failure, are now the strongest advocates of direct payment programs.

We now have various forms of compensatory payment programs for feed grains, wheat, cotton, sugar, and wool. This list has grown each year and is the prime reason for the sky-high USDA budgets of the past 4 years.

Congress realized in the late 1940's, when the Brannan plan direct payment approach was made, how futile and costly this type of program would be, if applied to all of agriculture. It wisely rejected the approach. Now this discredited scheme is creeping up on us step by step, encouraged by cheap food and fiber advocates who do not believe in the market system. The surest way for Government controllers to take over, is to force farmers to get their income from a check from the Federal Government.

The following table show how direct Government payments to farmers have grown from 1933 to 1964.

It shows such payments totaling $693 million in 1960.

The annual average for the 10 years ending 1960 was about $670 million.

In 1964 the total was $2.16 billion.

For 1965 the estimated total is $2.5 billion. If this farm bill is approved, it will push the total to over $3 billion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I refer be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Government payments, by programs, 1933–64 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Conservation	Sugar Act	Wool	Soil bank	Feed grain	Wheat	Rental and benefit	Cotton [2]	Price adjustment	Parity	Total [3]
1933							131				131
1934							395	51			446
1935							558	15			573
1936	24						213	41			278
1937	324						11				386
1938	309	22						114			446
1939	527	28						8	201		763
1940	496	27							10	190	723
1941	382	27								134	544
1942	450	25								175	650
1943	332	36								254	623 [4]
1944	378	27								1	406 [4]
1945	259	24									283 [4]
1946	285	31									316 [4]
1947	277	37									314
1948	218	39									257
1949	156	30									185
1950	246	37									283
1951	246	40									286
1952	242	33									275
1953	181	32									213
1954	217	40									257
1955	188	41									229
1956	220	37	54	243							554
1957	230	32	53	700							1,016
1958	214	44	14	815							1,089
1959	228	44	82	323							682
1960	217	50	51	370							693
1961	230	45	56	334	772	42					1,484
1962	224	54	54	304	841	253					1,736
1963	222	57	37	304	843	215					1,686
1964	227	67	25	199	1,163	438		39			2,169 [5]

[1] Details may not add to totals due to rounding.
[2] Includes cotton price adjustment and cotton option and producer's pool payments.
[3] Includes Great Plains conservation payments since 1958, 1 in 1958, 5 in 1959, 6 in 1960, 1961, 1962, 8 in 1963, and 9 in 1964.
[4] Excludes wartime production subsidy payments on dairy products 1943–46 and beef cattle, sheep, and lambs 1945–46 because these payments are reflected in the published index of prices received.
[5] Includes milk indemnity payments ($155,000).

Source: American Farm Bureau Federation.

COTTON

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last week an amendment to this bill was proposed and adopted calling for payments to cottongrowers to supplement the price support loans. The very substantial majority by which this amendment carried undoubtedly resulted from the fact that the only available alternative was much more expensive. The alternative, which was contained in the bill reported from the Senate Agriculture Committee, would have cost almost $4 billion over the 4-year period. In contrast, the plan which was approved by the Senate is estimated to cost $2.8 billion, a difference of $1.1 billion. In addition to the reduced cost, the substitute version will result in a far lower cotton surplus carryover. At the end of 4 years the carryover under the amendment should be about 8.7 million bales as against 12.6 million bales under the plan which was rejected. To this Senator it was clear that the version which was adopted was the better of the two available choices for maintaining and improving the industry until such time as the Congress acts to remove the Government from the business of financing, storing, and merchandising cotton at prices established in Washington.

WHEAT

The current wheat certificate program is a stopgap, 2-year program, put into effect after a majority of the producers

voting in the 1963 referendum had rejected a similar program. This bill would extend that program for another 4 years with some modification.

This Senator has consistently opposed the principle of multiple price plans because Government-rigged pricing is detrimental to producers of feed grains, livestock, and poultry. It is especially harmful to the feed grain program because in recent years we have seen substantial substitution of wheat for feed due to low prices. This, in turn, has depressed feed grain prices.

Here are a few facts that should be considered in evaluating this program:

First. The certificate plan allocates the premium market for milling wheat to cooperating producers without regard to quality or actual use.

Second. The certificate plan does not give producers a choice between supported prices and a free market.

Third. The certificate plan operates to bear most heavily on large-family and low-income groups, even though it is one way to increase the wheat farmers' income. The better way of achieving such income increase is to make payment out of the Treasury general fund, into which tax money is largely paid on the basis of relative ability to pay.

Fourth. The use of CCC stocks to depress prices—a key necessity of the certificate plan—imperils the market system.

Fifth. Contrary to what some would have us believe, wheat acreage is increasing under the certificate plan. Wheat production, according to the USDA September 1965 crop report is up 5 percent from last year and 14 percent above average.

THE FEED GRAINS PROGRAM

This year will be the fifth year of the so-called emergency feed grains program. We are asked to extend it another 4 years. On at least two occasions, this Senator voted for this program in the hope that it would be succeeded by a bill which would improve the situation. The hope was a vain one.

In the face of strong producer opposition to compulsory controls on feed grain production, Congress rejected the compulsory approach and extended the emergency program on three separate occasions.

The program now uses compensatory payments, a low loan rate, and dumping of CCC-owned inventories in order to bribe or force compliance.

It has been one of the most expensive programs we have had for any commodity since the beginning of Government farm programs in the early 1930's.

Feed grain program costs and acres diverted

Crop year	Acres diverted	Payments to farmers
1961	26, 700, 000	$782, 000, 000
1962	32, 700, 000	843, 000, 000
1963	25, 700, 000	845, 000, 000
1964	34, 300, 000	1, 171, 000, 000
1965 (estimated)	36, 700, 000	1, 600, 000, 000
Total	156, 100, 000	5, 241, 000, 000

Source: U.S.D.A.

In spite of this expenditure of money, the September crop report of the USDA indicates an alltime high record feed grain production in 1965. In 1963 we also had an alltime high feed grain production up to that time.

Feed grain carryover has been reduced, but not as much as feed grain consumption has increased, since the very beginning of the feed grain program.

SOYBEANS

There is no need whatsoever for the incentives proposed by the administration and partially reflected in the Senate bill to encourage greater production of soybeans—a crop widely known as the wonder crop.

The soybean crop is the third largest cash crop a farmer grows. It is the largest cash export. The United States produces about 90 percent of the soybeans that find their way into the world export arena. Truly an amazing story when one considers that it was a novelty crop less than 30 years ago.

But the biggest story of all is that soybeans is the only major field crop that is free of Government incentives, controls, and doles.

The price of beans is good. Our carryover from year to year is minimal. All this occurs in a true supply and demand market.

Now comes the administration, seeking artificially to increase production by allowing the planting of soybeans on acreage diverted from wheat and feed grains. But soybean production this year is up a whopping 24 percent over last year's record production, and 38 percent above average, and without Government incentives.

Why can we not leave this crop alone?

There is no necessity, no justification for this interference.

CCC BORROWING AUTHORITY

The Commodity Credit Corporation operations are financed largely by borrowings, mostly from the U.S. Treasury, under statutory borrowing authorization of $14.5 billion. This amount is the limit on borrowings that may be outstanding at any one time. CCC reserves a sufficient amount of this borrowing authority to purchase at any time all loans and other obligations held by financial institutions under the Corporation's programs. As of May 31, 1965—the latest figures available—CCC had in use $13,488,893,000 of this authority. Actual borrowings from the Treasury amounted to $12,995 million and obligations to financial institutions financing commodity loans amounted to $493,893,000 includes interest of $9,946,000. This left a statutory borrowing authority available of only $1,011,107,000 at the end of May.

Last January, we had witnessed the spectacle of the CCC's operations being temporarily suspended because it had run out of borrowing authority. A supplemental appropriation of over $1½ billion was needed and enacted to bail the CCC out of its difficulties.

The Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, under the able leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], added almost a billion to the House-passed version of the fiscal year 1966 budget for the Department of Agriculture to make a start in returning the CCC's activities to a sounder basis. I am hopeful that this action will be upheld by the conferees on the money bill who are still meeting.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Current reports indicate that the Johnson administration is about to give the go-ahead for sales of wheat to the Soviet Union.

With or without the cargo preference requirement, about which there was much debate, this Senator is opposed to such sales. It only gives aid and comfort to our enemies. That they are our enemies is well known to all. The annual Defense budget expenditures of almost $1 billion a week are a continuous reminder that they are in fact our enemies.

The fact is that the Soviets have failed woefully in their collective approach to farming. It is now being abandoned in favor of a return to a limited form of private ownership in farming.

It is not because of lack of technical know-how that the Soviets have failed. Numerous Soviet agricultural missions have come to this country to pick our brains. Even Chairman Khrushchev himself visited our farms.

Secretary Freeman has gone to Russian farms.

Russian farming to date is the classic failure of communism versus capitalism.

But there is no compulsion that Soviet agriculture succeed. They are apparently confident that if their crops fail, Western nations, including the United States, will jump at the chance to bail them out. The substantial purchases abroad this year are ample evidence of that.

What this means is that the Soviets have been able to direct their resources and talents in other efforts such as aid to Cuba—which is currently running at a rate of a million dollars a day—continued subjugation of the captive nations; sending missiles and technicians to Vietnam to shoot down American planes and pilots; and continued space exploration and development for military purposes.

While certain nations are exporting wheat to Russia, she is continuing to export Communist totalitarianism throughout the world.

The wheat that we and other nations are selling the U.S.S.R. helps it to continue its nefarious schemes. It will get around to agriculture when it feels like it.

Without wheat from the free world, the Soviets would be faced with a serious crisis on the homefront. To eliminate that disadvantage by wheat sales is not in the national interest for the United States.

Mr. President, food for peace, yes; food for war and to our enemies in that war, no.

SUPPLEMENTAL FARM LABOR

One of the provisions of the bill that had my support is section 706. In it the Secretary of Agriculture would have been given authority and responsibility for determining what supplementary labor is needed for the production and harvesting of farm crops.

As often as Mr. Freeman and this Senator have had our differences of opinion

on agricultural issues, the Secretary of Agriculture gets my complete endorsement as being the Cabinet member most able to decide the important question of what supplemental labor is needed to plant, care for, and harvest certain crops.

Virtually all of the crops where the assistance of Mexican and other nationals are needed to help are perishable commodities which are not in surplus or underwritten by Government farm programs. These include strawberries, tomatoes, peaches, citrus fruit, sugarcane, and the like.

Many States were hard hit this year by the administration's arbitrary and unreasonable policy of drastically reducing the number of Mexican nationals and others to be allowed to enter the country to help our farmers. The junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and several others have so effectively brought to the Senate the grim story of the hardships and financial losses the present policy has cost many of our farmers.

In any event, the transfer of authority from the Secretary of Labor to the Secretary of Agriculture would have been in the best interest of American agriculture.

I regret the Senate's decision to delete this section. Had only one more vote been cast on the side of the farmer, Vice President HUMPHREY's tie-breaking vote for the union-supported position would not have been necessary.

ALTERNATIVES

Mr. President, while this bill has some objectives which may be laudable, I cannot support it. It perpetuates programs which have failed. It makes the farmer increasingly dependent on the Federal Government. I believe the American farmer is entitled to something better than the administration has given him in the form of this bill.

Fortunately, there are alternatives. Other Senators as well as I have suggested them during debate on agricultural legislation for the past few years. We can set for ourselves goals which will go in precisely the opposite direction to which the present bill aims. The direction of the farm program toward ever-increasing dependence on direct checks from the Government to bolster farm income can lead only to making of agriculture a virtual public utility, with a Washington bureaucracy in effect issuing licenses and franchises.

The opposite direction is the one which holds greater promise. That is toward fewer, not more, Government controls.

Let us decide on a transition with order and equity.

We should begin by taking the farmer from the precipice where the present bill puts him with an order to jump or else, and lead him gradually to the safety and benefits of the free and open market.

We should develop a long-range program which each year will see the Government withdrawing more and more as farmers adjust to the changing situation.

This transition period would necessarily be a long one. It would take years. It would not be a cessation of all farm programs at once.

During the transition period, the farmer must be assisted financially and, even more important, he must be supported with sensible programs of research which find new uses for his products, new markets, and new approaches to reducing his cost of doing business.

The direction toward a solution to our difficulty has already been pointed out. Its ingredients include an effective land retirement program which profits from the mistakes of the past and avoids them in the future; elimination of the vicious competition between the farmer and the Government with its huge stores of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks; an orderly cutoff of wheat allotments and marketing quotas; a relationship between the support price for wheat and that for corn and other feeds that will be sensible and practical; limitation of agricultural conservation payments.

This approach is to be found in bills I have cosponsored in the past. In fact, a bill for this congressional session, namely, S. 891, is still pending in the Senate Agriculture Committee. Unfortunately, scant consideration has been given to this measure. Bills such as this provide a vehicle, however, upon which to embark in this quest for a new approach and a new philosophy in our Government farm programs. One in which there will be hope. One which will not constantly continue to drag agriculture down to ever lower depths.

It can be done.

I cannot believe that the genius which can place men in orbit around the earth for days on end, and that can aspire to landing men on the moon and bringing them back; and that can produce revolutionary farm technology as well as other wonders in industrial and commercial areas—I cannot believe that such genius cannot solve the problem of abundance. It can be done if only we have the will to set ourselves to the task.

Mr. President, these remarks are based on the assumption that the American farmer wishes to be free.

It is more than an assumption. It is a conviction.

Unhappily, this bill delays the day that he will be freed of Government interference and Government dictation under self-defeating programs which have failed in the past and will fail in the future.

The American farmer deserves something much better than this bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am supporting H.R. 9811—the farm bill—not because I feel this bill will bring the farmers the full parity of income to which they are entitled but because it appears this is the best farm bill we can enact at this time. I am disappointed in the fact that with rising farm costs and with the parity figure standing at 78 percent that the legislation before us does not contain provisions to bring the farmer full parity and assuring him of the right to equal status in our economic society.

It is encouraging to note that the Senate Agriculture Committee and the Senate as a whole has determined that the program will be effective for 4 years. This will give the farm operator an opportunity to plan his operations on a systematic basis so as to implement his sagging economic status.

It is encouraging that the Senate Agriculture Committee and the Senate have adopted provisions advanced by "Mr. Wheat," Senator MILTON YOUNG, of North Dakota, which would assure wheat farmers of a blend price of $1.90 for their wheat in the next 4 years. This is 21 cents over the blend price of the past crop year and 9 cents above the blend price as approved in the House of Representatives. I sincerely hope that the Senate version will prevail in conference and that wheat farmers will be able to make their plans for the next crop years based on a minimum blend price of $1.90 per bushel.

While there are only few minor changes in the feed grain portion of the bill I am disappointed that more discretionary authority is granted to the Secretary to lower the loan price still further and to make up the difference through increased production payments, if he so desires. This increased flexibility could well mean a reduced return to the farmers in the future.

The new provision in the extension of the Wool Act is most encouraging. It should increase price support levels by at least 2 to 3 cents per pound.

Both bills contain land retirement programs which compensate the farmer for his idle crop acres. These contracts will be for from 5 to 10 years and they can be either made on a bid basis or on a negotiated price basis. Provisions are contained to protect the various communities from suffering economic losses by prohibiting the placing under soil bank contracts too many acres in any one area.

All in all the new programs mean some improvement over present programs. While it does not provide as high an income to our farm producers as it should it does help. I hope that the programs will be administered as effectively as possible to give to our farmers an improved financial return at least moving their income upward from the disastrous 78 percent of parity which currently prevails after even worse disparities running as low as 75 percent of parity the past few years. Our farmers are entitled to a fair price for a full crop. Unhappily, this bill does not even remotely approach that goal but it does at least provide a modest step in the right direction.

I am also encouraged and gratified by the fact that Chairman ELLENDER has agreed to hold special committee hearings on the desirability of increasing the present 105-percent floor under which CCC stocks of wheat cannot be sold. I am hopeful these hearings will produce changes increasing this floor to 110 or 115 percent of current price supports plus carrying charges.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, we have spent many hours of late in discussion of the farm bill, but I would now like to turn, for a short while, to the other end of the transmission belt of life. We have all heard a good deal of late, too, about the rising cost of food; indeed, about the rising cost of living. And many people have been wondering, no doubt, why they spend so much on groceries.

Mr. President, Changing Times, the Kiplinger magazine, this month carries an elucidating article entitled "Why You Spend So Much on Groceries." It amounts to a good explanation of at least part of the factors that go into determining the price the American housewife pays for her family's sustenance at the supermarket checkout counter—including an explanation of the margin used by the retailer to determine what he makes on any given item. Many practices common to the trade are discussed briefly in this article—practices which currently are being examined in minute detail by the National Commission on Food Marketing, which has been charged by the Congress with probing the gap that exists between the prices paid to producers of our food and those charged the consumer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from September's issue of Changing Times be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHY YOU SPEND SO MUCH ON GROCERIES: UNLESS YOU'RE SAVVY INSIDE THE SUPERMARKET, YOU ALWAYS SPEND MORE THAN YOU MEAN TO

You've just done your weekly stint at the supermarket. As you unload, a question nags you: Where did all that money go?

It's not that you mind the grocer's getting his. You really don't feel the farmer has sandbagged you, either. In general, you appreciate that food is one of the biggest bargains around. What nettles you in this sense of personal ineffectiveness, this feeling that your spending is out of control. You always come out of the supermarket having spent more than you meant to. How come?

Well, look at that price tape again. How many items are nonfood items—cooking utensils, phonograph records, cosmetics, light bulbs, even encyclopedias and stretch pants?

Only a few years ago, you would have bought those things elsewhere, not at a food store.

Now they all go on one ticket. So maybe it isn't just your food buying that is out of line; several kinds of spending may share the blame.

To understand what comes over you in the supermarket, though, you've got to recognize that you may know less about shopping there than you think you do—and that the supermarket men may know things about your habits that you hardly suspect yourself.

DO YOU REALLY KNOW PRICES?

One food industry executive claims that the average housewife can "give lessons to a Yankee horse trader." As he sees it, her computer-like mind leads her straight past all promotional pizzazz to the best buys for her money.

The sad truth, however, seems to be that the average shopper knows the exact price of hardly anything.

A couple of years ago, a study by the Colonial food chain and Progressive Grocer magazine found that among 59 heavily advertised products, shoppers could consistently and accurately give the price of only one item—cokes by the carton. Even with such staples as Crest toothpaste, Heinz catsup and giant-size Tide soap, no more than 15 shoppers in 100 could hit the exact price and only 1 out of 4 could come within 5 percent.

"Our typical shopper," the report concluded, "can recognize a bargain in only about 20 percent of the items regularly promoted. She has only a vague idea of what the regular price of the promoted item is."

DO YOU KNOW THE GROCER'S WAYS?

That isn't all the grocer knows about you, either. His insight into your psyche also tells him that many of you are restless, never satisfied and lousy at arithmetic.

He knows you'll spend about 30 minutes in his store and that, if you are feeding four mouths, you'll spend about $40. He also knows that for every minute you tarry over half an hour, you'll spend 50 cents more.

Accordingly, he does all he can to encourage you to come in—and to linger. He cools his store, pipes in soft music, paints the ceiling mauve, cashes your checks, installs kiddie corners and coffee bars.

Then he has many little ploys and gambits to tempt the hand that fills the basket, such as multiple pricing. If a can is stamped "two for" sales soar. Sales of a 46-ounce can of tomoto juice at 33 cents each zoomed 70 percent when offered "3 for 99 cents." Sales of items normally sold in multiples plummeted when switched to singles.

The grocer can even make you spend just by the way he shows his wares, whether or not the item is a bargain.

One Saturday recently a mountain of canned fruit punch stood at the end of an aisle. A modest blue-lettered sign announced it was a "spotlight-of-the-week" item. But the price was the same as usually charged.

Meanwhile, farther back and harder to reach was another stack of a similar fruit punch. Over this hung a very large red sign marking these as specials, which indeed they were. Yet the "special" lay almost untouched while the "spotlighted" item—offering no bargain at all—was moving briskly.

Apparently, if you have to stretch or bend to get at anything, you won't buy it. If you have to walk into it, you will buy. And you'll buy more from a full shelf or display rack than from one that's half empty.

Attention getters like bright little signs, shelf extenders and dangling baskets are magnets for your money, too. An extender display of hand lotion in one store's detergent section, for instance, boosted lotion sales 60 percent.

Who is most vulnerable to these blandishments? The shopper who enters the store with only a sketchy shopping list or none at all?

A Du Pont Co. survey showed that while about 30 percent of supermarket patrons carefully chart their course ahead of time, more than 50 percent shop with only fuzzy notions of what they will buy. And more and more buying decisions are being made after the customer gets in the store—58 percent in 1949, 73 percent in 1959.

IS CONVENIENCE EXPENSIVE?

Once when you shopped for potatoes, that was what you got—potatoes, by the sack. Today the store still carries "old-fashioned" potatoes, but you also can get them au gratin, scalloped, hash browned, flaked, dehydrated and in little frozen puffs.

Hundreds of other foods have, like the potato, become convenience foods. That is, they have undergone away from home some of the preparation traditionally done in the home. These partly prepared foods now account for about 15 percent of all foods sold in grocery stores.

As you might expect, convenience has its price. But it would be a mistake to assume that its price is always high. Indeed, when the Agriculture Department studied 158 convenience foods, it found 42 that would have cost more to buy and fix from scratch.

In this category, the biggest bargain was frozen concentrated orange juice. Others were frozen lima beans, canned orange juice, packaged and canned spaghetti, canned cherries, chicken chow mein and devil's food cake mix. At the other end of the scale ready-to-serve yeast rolls, brown-and-serve yeast rolls, frozen chicken and turkey dinners, frozen broccoli and precooked rice were the items most expensive in comparison to their do-it-yourself equivalents.

SHOP THE WEEKEND SPECIALS?

During 1 year an Agriculture Department survey found two neighboring Greensboro, N.C., supermarkets advertised 20 weekend specials on chuck roast at 33 cents to 49 cents a pound. Had you bought 5 pounds of chuck roast on each of these weekends, your bill would have come to $39.30. Had you bought the same meat on Tuesday, it would have cost you $62.30, or $23 more.

After pricing 230 items in the two stores, the report concluded: "Tuesday prices averaged from about 7 percent to 10 percent higher than Friday (weekend) prices."

It was found that one store changed prices more often than the other, but the second store's price cuts were more substantial. Yet prices between the two averaged out almost exactly over a 3-month period. So you can't watch prices for a short time, conclude that "prices always are lower" at one store and shop there forever after. To benefit from special prices, you have to keep comparing.

WHAT ABOUT STAMPS? AND DISCOUNTS?

Debate still rages over whether trading stamps are good or bad and who pays for them. The grocer knows they cost him 2 to 2½ cents out of every sales dollar, but just who absorbs this cost is still in question.

Willard Mueller, a Federal Trade Commission economist, says "Quite obviously the increasing use of trading stamps has accounted for a substantial share of recent increases in operating expenses of large retailers. Trading stamps may prove an effective promotion technique for an individual store because they expand its demand, thereby cutting per-unit costs by an amount exceeding the cost of the stamps.

"But they lose most of their effectiveness once a majority of food retailers in an area adopts them. They then tend to increase costs by an amount nearly equal to the cost of the stamps. While people may disagree as to the net effect of trading stamps on retail margins, stamp costs clearly raise margins when all, or most, retailers in an area employ them."

The moral: If everybody in town is giving stamps, you probably can ignore the stamps in making your buying decisions and shop on the basis of normal price comparisons.

Many shoppers apparently would prefer lower prices to stamps anyway. When Colonial asked its customers if they would continue to shop there if stamps were eliminated and prices lowered, only 11 percent said they would take their business elsewhere; 6 percent were undecided.

A still newer wrinkle is the "discount supermarket." These are growing fast. There were six discounters in Detroit in 1961 and 79 2 years later. Many try to look austere. Appearances are no substitute for comparisons, though. A spot check of a large discount operation and a nearbly "regular" chain retailer uncovered a number of items on which the "regular" store undersold the discounter.

DO YOU FIGURE PRICE PER UNIT?

You can't make your money go further unless you know what you get when you spend it. That principle is easier to preach than to practice, thanks to the oddities of modern packaging with its incomparable confusion of weights, measures, and sizes.

Esther Peterson, the President's Assistant for Consumer Affairs, put it this way to a convention of grocers: "I defy anyone to figure out the best buy among these choices in a relatively short period of time:

"Family size—6.75 ounces, 66 cents; extra large—5 ounces, 55 cents; large—3.25 ounces, 42 cents; medium—1.75 ounces, 25 cents."

All these, incidentally were products made by a single manufacturer. Your problem is multiplied by the number of competing brands standing cheek to cheek on the same shelf.

When you come to a package with a measure too intricate to fathom by normal arithmetic, there is something you can do. Buy another brand and be sure to tell the store manager why you switched.

FOUR KEYS TO CONTROL

It's an enticing world, inside that supermarket. It's exciting, even bewildering. But there's no reason to despair. You can enjoy your shopping and yet stay solvent by following four rules.

Pay attention to prices. Even prices for the lowliest staples go up and down. You'll never be able to recognize a good buy until you know what you usually pay.

Note cost per unit. When things are sold in multiples, figure out what you pay for one. Do the same for things sold by weight. Then you have a solid basis for comparing prices.

Make a list. Know what you need, go get it and fight back that impulse to pick up stuff you neither want nor need.

Compare. Simple rules. They don't oblige you to cinch in your belt, vow poverty, or lower your living standard.

In fact, you can live as high as you please. Luxury in the supermarket is okay—if you want it, if you can afford it, and if you can learn the art of living well while keeping your spending under control.

WHERE YOUR MONEY GOES

Out of every dollar you spend at a chain supermarket, the store uses 78 cents on the average to buy the merchandise it sells you. The other 22 cents goes for the store's (and the chain's) operating expenses—everything from salaries to cash register repairs—and profit. After all the expenses are paid, including income taxes, the company will have a little over a penny of your dollar left. And when all the pennies have been added up, the stockholders will show a profit of about 10 percent on invested capital.

Those figures are national averages—actual amounts vary from chain to chain, place to place, store to store. They are the 1963–64 results of a continuing study of supermarket economics that has been carried on for years by Harvard and Cornell.

The key figure in grocery-store accounting is a percentage that is commonly called "margin." It's the share of sales revenue that goes for expenses, taxes, and profit, and it currently averages about 22 percent. You can learn some interesting behind-the-scenes facts by inspecting margin figures.

The trend is up

Average supermarket margins have inched up over the past 10 years. Higher payrolls plus two other cost items account for most of the rise. Proportionately more is spent on real estate, heat, light, refrigeration, etc.—a reflection of bigger and fancier stores. And more is spent on advertising, including "promotional giveaways" and trading stamps. Look at this comparison:

[In percent]

In the year—	Margins in large supermarkets averaged—	Expenses for advertising, stamps, and giveaways averaged—
1955	18.1	0.7
1963	22.5	2.6

Some items yield more than others

The store's margin is not the same on everything it sells. On some merchandise—gourmet foods, some nonfood items, for example—the margin tends to be relatively high; on others—coffee, flour, sugar—the margin is generally small. The Du Pont survey mentioned in the text checked item-by-item margins in 225 supermarkets across the country. Here are some samples. Note both the difference between items and the range among the various stores:

	Margin (percent)
Bread	16–25
Coffee	8–14
Candy	25–30
Meat—fresh	18–28
Baby food	12–16
Flour	9–13
Gourmet foods	25–50
Soups	10–15
Spices	29–32
Soap, soap flakes, detergents	10–30
Eggs	9–15
Milk—fresh	11–17
Tomatoes	28–38
Frozen juices	17–20
Drugs, toiletries	23–35

Where do the profits come from?

Margins on individual items are only one little piece of the store's profit picture. High-margin items may contribute relatively little to the overall profits, and low-margin ones may contribute a great deal. It depends on such things as sales volume, shelf space used, the inventory kept in stock.

The study of the Colonial supermarket chain, referred to in the accompanying article, gives a good idea of how all the pieces fit together. The average Colonial market was operating on a 20-percent margin—of the $44,000-plus that went into the cash registers in an average week, it had just under $9,000 left for operating expenses and profit. Margins on individual items ranged all over the lot: as little as 3 percent on corn bread mix, as much as 57 percent on toothbrushes. But suppose you were a typical Colonial shopper. By the time you had spent $100 in the store, here is what you would have bought, and here is what the store would have realized from your spending:

The items you bought	The amount you spent	The store's percentage margin	The store's dollar margin
Meat	$24.09	17.4	$4.20
Produce	6.80	28.4	1.93
Dairy products	9.34	16.6	1.55
Frozen foods	3.75	27.3	1.03
Bakery goods	4.63	18.1	.84
Dry groceries	45.78	19.2	8.81
Nonfood items	5.61	29.3	1.64
Total	$100.00		$20.00

A LOGICAL APPROACH TO THE WOOL SECTION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the section of the bill we are now considering which relates to our domestic wool industry is to me a most commendable section and one which will go a long way toward preserving and strengthening the economic independence of this vital part of our agricultural economy. This is not to say that I consider this section without shortcoming, and I would like briefly now to spell out its advantages vis-a-vis the House provisions of this same section and what I consider to be some shortcomings in our version of this proposal.

The Senate version of the wool section establishes the formula for incentive price supports based on the cost of production for determining the incentive price. This price would increase or decrease in direct relationship to production costs. However, the House version would establish a floor of 77 percent of parity for the incentive price level. This proposal fails to take into account that the parity price of wool is affected by prices of other farm commodities and will vary from month to month regardless of factors affecting sheep and wool production.

A second difference in the two versions of this section is that the Senate bill would put to rest any speculation that the incentive level could or should be increased simply to spend all of the funds authorized. In our version of this section, the 3-year period—1958–60—was selected as the base to calculate the level since wool production increased during that period. The House version provides for a minimum incentive level so it still could be contended that the Secretary should increase the incentive level beyond logic and reason.

The version of the section proposed by this body relieves the Secretary of Agriculture of the responsibility of establishing each year the incentive price level and would thus relieve the wool industry from annual distress and uncertainty as to what the incentive level would be for the next year.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that the incentive price level for wool has remained at 62 cents during the 11 years that the National Wool Act has been in effect, even though production costs have risen 15 percent during that time. The version of this bill we have considered would permit an increase in the incentive level of 4½ percent for 1966 and a moderate increase of ½ to 1 cent per pound annually provided the cost-of-living index continues to rise.

The preceding is an explanation why I think our version of this bill is demonstrably superior to the version considered by the other body. However, in one instance, I believe that we have included a provision which has not been sought by any segment of the wool industry and which will create considerable confusion and promote inequities in this program. I refer to the provision which would "make price support available to producers marketing not in excess of 1,000 pounds of wool in any marketing year at a level not more than 5 cents per pound higher than the level made available to producers marketing in excess of 1,000 pounds in such marketing year."

Under this provision the distinct possibility arises that unscrupulous growers could defraud the Government through the splitting of sales and the selling of wool under the names of different members of the same family to obtain the higher price supports per pound.

This provision would also increase the costs of this program by more than $2 million annually and would create a substantial increase in the costs of the administration of the program.

It should be pointed out that, under this provision, payments would vary from a few cents to some producers to a maximum of $50 to others. The average would be approximately $12.50 per year, a figure which I do not believe would spell the difference between economic success and failure for any farmer.

The proposal to make payments on a flat per pound rate would discourage the efficient production and marketing of wool by increasing payments to the small producer who markets wet and dirty wool and thus would receive more money because of the heavier shearing weight. And, finally, Mr. President, it seems to me incongruous that we are supporting a program which would pay higher payments to a man marketing 1,000 pounds of wool than to a man who markets several hundred pounds in excess of that amount.

The above reasons, Mr. President, explain why I believe that this bill has basic strengths which make it superior to that considered in the other body and point out a significant weakness in the proposal to provide additional incentive payments to the small producer.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield back the remainder of my time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been requested and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RIBICOFF (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] is absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 22, as follows:

[No. 259 Leg.]

YEAS—72

Aiken	Hartke	Mundt
Allott	Hayden	Murphy
Bartlett	Hill	Muskie
Bass	Inouye	Nelson
Bible	Jackson	Neuberger
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Pearson
Carlson	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Church	Kuchel	Prouty
Clark	Long, Mo.	Proxmire
Cooper	Long, La.	Randolph
Dirksen	Magnuson	Russell, S.C.
Dodd	Mansfield	Russell, Ga.
Dominick	McCarthy	Smathers
Douglas	McClellan	Sparkman
Eastland	McGee	Stennis
Ellender	McGovern	Symington
Ervin	McNamara	Talmadge
Fannin	Metcalf	Thurmond
Fulbright	Miller	Tower
Gore	Mondale	Tydings
Gruening	Montoya	Yarborough
Harris	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Moss	Young, Ohio

NAYS—22

Bayh	Fong	Morton
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Brewster	Holland	Saltonstall
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Simpson
Cannon	Javits	Smith
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Lausche	
Curtis	McIntyre	

NOT VOTING—6

Anderson	Monroney	Scott
Bennett	Ribicoff	Williams, N.J.

So the bill (H.R. 9811) was passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill (H.R. 9811) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make certain technical corrections in the engrossment of the Senate amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the bill as passed be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. COOPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE NATIONAL WOOL ACT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the sheep industry of this country has been hard pressed for many years. It has suffered principally from cheap foreign competition in form of excessive meat imports and excessive wool and wool products imports. As I pointed out in this Chamber on March 5, 1964, during the debate on the Hruska amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1964 (H.R. 6196), lamb and mutton imports from Australia increased from 1957 to 1963 by 4,583 percent, or from 1.4 million pounds in 1957, to 67.5 million pounds in 1963. Virtually no domestic industry could survive such a situation, and the sheep industry is no exception. Unlike the cattle industry, the sheep industry is based on two crops: namely, wool and meat. Both markets must be in a reasonably healthy condition in order for the sheepman to come out on his expenses in these days of high costs. Imports of finished woolen products have also greatly increased over the years, while at the same time consumption of wool by domestic mills has greatly decreased. In 1957 our imports of finished woolen apparel exceeded our exports by 67 million pounds, whereas in 1963 our imports exceeded our exports by 112.4 million pounds. Virtually all of the domestic wool production finds its way into domestic mills, whereas wool imports, now entering this country primarily in the form of finished products, are merely distributed to the retail outlets. Consequently, the economic health of the domestic woolgrower has a direct bearing upon the economic health of the domestic woolen mill, and this in turn has an effect on the level of unemployment and upon the economy as a whole.

Statements have been made that the National Wool Act has failed to boost wool production in the United States. While it is true that shorn wool production in 1964 was 14 million pounds less than it was in the year of enactment of the National Wool Act, 1954, nevertheless, during the first 6 years of its operation there was a steady increase in the domestic production of shorn wool by about 29 million pounds: from 236 million pounds in 1954, to 265 million pounds in 1960. By correlating this trend with the increase in lamb and mutton imports one can see that these imports were an important factor in offsetting the beneficial effects of the National Wool Act.

Another important factor is the administration of the program. The Secretary of Agriculture established the incentive price at 62 cents 11 years ago when the National Wool Act became law. Since that time the incentive price has not changed. Considering the inflation we have experienced during recent years, a price that may have been an incentive price 11 years ago will no longer have that effect. While the incentive price remained static at 62 cents per pound, farmers were experiencing an increase in their costs by about 12.6 percent. Another way of expressing it is that when the 62-cent incentive price was established it was approximately parity or a little above, however, that price is now only about 75 percent of parity. For whatever reason, the incentive price was not increased to keep pace with changing conditions. Since 1960, at least, it has not only not produced the desired results, but in fact, domestic production in 1964 dropped to a level which was 14 million pounds less than in 1954. The crop for 1965 promises to be even

smaller. An incentive price that fails to keep pace with changing conditions becomes ineffective. It is not the National Wool Act that has failed, it is the administration of the Wool Act that has failed. While our sheep production continues to decline from the 1960 level and domestic wool production has also necessarily declined, foreign goods are taking an increasingly larger share of the U.S. market.

Another factor contributing to the decline of wool production has been the serious drought conditions that have affected several of our important sheep-producing States since the inception of that program. Texas, for example, which accounts for approximately one-fifth of the Nation's wool production, has had several serious drought periods since 1954. New Mexico in the last year has had a decline of sheep production due to drought conditions.

Other contributing factors to the decline of wool production have been reductions in grazing allotments on Federal lands, difficulties in securing efficient herders, and losses from predatory animals.

It can be seen, therefore, that while there are several factors contributing to our failure to reach the statutory production goal of 300 million pounds of shorn wool per year, the two chief obstacles to achieving that goal were the failure to keep the incentive price alined to any degree with the increases in costs, and massive imports of foreign meat which depressed the lamb and mutton market. By 1961 the average farm price of lambs had dropped to a low of $15.80 per hundred pounds. This hit the sheep producers in my State of Colorado particularly hard because income from lamb is a most important factor in Colorado sheep production. This is also true of a number of our Western States. However, the February 1964 meat agreements between the United States and Australia and New Zealand did have some effect in stabilizing the situation by limiting increases in the level of imports from those countries.

It should also be pointed out that the National Wool Act was responsible for alleviating the liquidation trend caused by drought and marketing conditions. Furthermore, the Wool Act was a factor in increasing our sheep production during the 3 years 1958 through 1960. Many growers have stated to me that they would not be in the sheep industry today if it had not been for the National Wool Act.

Because the Secretary has failed to act or has declined to act for whatever reason, it has become obvious that if wool is to remain a domestically produced commodity of any significance, affirmative action must be taken by the Congress. The formula contained in this measure as reported by the committee would automatically adjust the incentive price to a level which would approximate 78 percent of parity. According to recent Department of Agriculture figures, prices for all farm products averaged at 78 percent of parity. So, establishing the wool support formula at approximately 78 percent of parity would be in keeping with the general economic level of agriculture, and would not amount to a windfall for the woolgrower. Increases in the incentive prices would be triggered by increases in production costs, and by the same token, decreases in production costs would trigger decreases in incentive prices.

Under the terms of the National Wool Act, up to 70 percent of the duty collections on wool imports may be utilized to make payments to the wool producer under the incentive price program. Total incentive payments have decreased to nearly a third of their 1960 level of $59 million to an estimated $21 million in 1964. Whereas, 70 percent of the duty collections have climbed from $72 million in 1960, to $85 million in 1964. In other words, the differential in 1960 of about $13 million has increased to a differential in 1964 of about $64 million. The cost of the modest increase under the committee bill would be more than offset by the increase in duties collected on wool imports. However, to the woolgrower this modest 3-cents-per-pound increase may make the difference between economic life and economic death.

The National Wool Act has been one of the better farm programs, and it was for that reason, that I was happy to join with over 40 of my colleagues as a cosponsor of the bill to extend this legislation. It is my belief that this measure will tend to stabilize the domestic wool industry, and, it is hoped, arrest its further decline.

DAIRY FOOD PURCHASES PROVISION STRENGTHENS OMNIBUS FARM BILL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the farm bill which was passed today includes a most important new provision, significant both in terms of increased dairy farm income and of greater expansion of agricultural markets overseas. This badly needed shift in national food policy also has an important humanitarian purpose.

It authorizes purchases of dairy products at market prices to meet the needs of foreign and domestic food programs. This will permit orderly and reliable planning of these programs, resulting in more effective administration.

I am pleased that this is in the bill because it is similar to my proposal to permit the Government to make long-term commitments for overseas sale and donation of farm commodities that normally are in surplus.

Domestic and foreign school lunch, welfare and other programs have been extremely important outlets for large stocks of dairy products acquired under the mandatory dairy price-support program. Using cheese, dried milk, and other manufactured dairy products for these programs has prevented accumulation of stocks beyond available storage space.

Donation programs of this size require extensive long-range planning and negotiating and, as a result, program supplies must be committed well in advance. Wide fluctuations in supplies and temporary interruptions in the flow of supplies have led to major problems in establishing and operating these programs.

Fluctuating supplies of surplus nonfat dry milk, for example, have made it difficult to assure a reasonably uniform and continuous flow to donation outlets, both in this country and overseas. And a few months ago butter surplus stocks dipped so low that school lunch allocations were sharply cut and oleomargarine was substituted in domestic programs for welfare and charitable institutions.

There are two major reasons why this occurs. One is the wide seasonal variation in production—and therefore in volume—of surplus available for program uses. The second is the wide fluctuation in commercial sales. Sales of dairy products by the Commodity Credit Corporation to both the domestic and export commercial market have been extremely erratic as a result of changing market supply and demand conditions.

Authorizing the Government to purchase for the purpose of guaranteeing a steady supply also is good for the dairy producer because it tends to strengthen the domestic market. The uneasiness of unprogramed supplies tends to depress the market.

The ability to supply overseas programs on a predictable basis is essential. At the present time the United States is feeding about 40 million schoolchildren in about 80 countries. The main limitations are the shortage of high protein foods such as dairy products and the problem of supplying this program on an orderly basis.

In Latin America, as a result of an intensive Operation Ninos child-feeding food for peace program, the number of schoolchildren participating in school lunch programs has increased to more than 12 million. This means that a generation of bread eaters and milk drinkers is growing up in this area of our hemisphere, creating a major U.S. farm market opportunity for the years ahead.

Assurance of high protein commodities on a predictable basis will encourage governments or other agencies overseas to invest in port, storage, transportation, processing, and distribution facilities needed to utilize more U.S. imports and to integrate the use of more U.S. food into permanent school and welfare programs. These facilities are needed both for intergovernmental and commercial sales through private channels.

This new provision of the farm bill will remove the uncertainty of supply that nations and private relief agencies now face in trying to plan long-range projects involving high protein surplus commodities. It will make it easier to build permanent dollar-earning markets for agricultural commodities, especially dairy products, by guaranteeing supplies for present programs and encouraging new market development projects modeled after the Japanese school milk program.

This program, which has been built on an unofficial long-term commitment policy to assure an adequate and steady supply, has helped make Japan one of our best markets for U.S. farm exports. The supply feature, used first for donations and later for sales to Japan, was essential in developing the lunch program into a major dollar market.

The program began in 1947 with Japanese school distribution by U.S. military forces of fluid milk made with 5 million pounds of nonfat dry milk. At that time Japanese children normally did not drink milk. Since then the program has developed into a permanent cash market with Japan.

The 99 million pounds of nonfat dry milk sold to the Government of Japan on June 2 of this year for use in the school lunch program brought total sales since 1950 to nearly 868 million pounds. In 1964–65 more than half of Japan's school age children were supplied at school with high quality U.S. milk.

It is clear that Japan has become, by virtue of this program, an assured and growing dollar market for nonfat dry milk. It is clear too, that the demand for milk also is strong among those now grown beyond school age and that these milk-consuming adults constitute a major market for private commercial exports from this country.

This dairy products provision of the farm bill will make this major condition of the successful Japanese experience—a dependable supply over a period of several years—more generally available to other nations and to our many overseas relief agencies. It also will make our domestic school lunch and other welfare programs more orderly and effective.

Mr. McCARTHY subsequently said: Mr. President, I believe the farm bill approved by the Senate today is a very constructive measure.

It does not represent a radical departure from the progams of the past but continues what is valuable from the traditional programs and adds to them.

First. The programs will provide substantial assistance to farmers in their efforts to secure a fair return for their work and investment. In the absence of commodity programs, net farm income would be cut in half and the entire farm family system put in jeopardy. Of course, the programs provided by the bill will not fully solve the farm income problem. Even if the programs can be carried out to the maximum support level permitted by the bill, the American farmers would not receive full parity of income. However, the programs approved today will provide a floor under the market price of several important farm commodities. From this it will be possible to move with a variety of other means to improve farm income.

Second. The bill is a comprehensive measure. It contains an extension of the feed-grain program which has enjoyed general acceptance and greatly reduced the feed grain problem. This program is important in itself as an assistance to feed grain producers. It is also important to livestock and poultry producers. If we had no feed grain program, there would be a sharp drop in feed prices and a resulting overproduction of livestock and lower prices.

The bill provides a continuation and improvement of the wheat program with a provision to raise wheat income. The McGovern amendment further improves the program and provides a better procedure for exports. I believe that the proposal of Senator TALMADGE for the cotton program which was adopted on the floor, offers a better long-run prospect for improving the cotton situation and will be more effective both to maintain cotton income and to make cotton competitive for export and for use by domestic mills.

The measure also extends the wool program and improves it by fixing the support at a percentage level and by providing a higher support to producers whose annual marketings do not exceed 1,000 pounds. The costs of production for wool have increased year by year but the support level has been the same since 1955. Wool production has decreased in recent years. The provisions of the bill will help this situation.

The bill also includes a cropland adjustment program, which is a revision and improvement of the soil bank. Taken together with the diversion provisions of the commodity programs, it will be useful in bringing supplies somewhat into line with the demand for food and fiber.

Third. The Senate bill extends the major commodity programs for 4 years. The recent feed grain, wheat and cotton programs have been approved for only 2 years, and the effectiveness of the programs has been limited by doubt and insecurity about the future of the programs. The 4-year authorization will make it easier for farmers, processors and all related farm industries to plan with greater knowledge and confidence.

Fourth. The provisions of the bill provide more flexible programs and will give farmers a better opportunity to make adjustments suited to their individual farming operations.

I regret that the bill does not contain a provision for a comprehensive dairy program. The return to dairy farmers has been discouragingly low for several year. A large surplus continues to hang over the market and tends to keep the price at the 75 percent of parity support level. In my opinion the Proxmire amendment is a minor adjustment and inadequate to meet the serious dairy problems. It is possible that over a period of years, depending upon how many Federal orders are amended to adopt the class I base plan, the incentive to expand milk production will be reduced. However, the provision is of little or no value in meeting the present serious economic difficulties of dairy farmers in areas where production is used largely for manufacturing purposes.

Since 1959 dairy farmers and their families have earned less for their labor than have farmers generally. The average hourly return to the dairy farmer is only one-half to two-thirds as large as the hourly earnings from farming generally—and that general average is only $1.06 per hour in 1964. Dairying is a demanding occupation and it requires farmers to be most attentive to their work every day of the year. Dairy farmers, as have other farm producers, have been making adjustments in their operations and increasing productivity and the efficiency of their operations. Yet they are economically worse off than before.

The bill adopted by the House contained language not only for a class I base plan but also to clarify that Federal order markets can be established for milk used for processed dairy products. I urge that this section be accepted in conference. I hope that the conferees will consult with Department officials about the most effective language to authorize Federal orders for manufacturing milk and that they will give consideration to the provision in the bill which I introduced, S. 2242, relating to Federal orders for manufacturing milk.

However, even if both the class I base plan and authorization of orders for manufacturing milk are included in the conference report, the major problems of dairy farmers will still remain. It is my hope that with the adoption of 4-year programs for wheat, feed grains, cotton and wool, the Congress will have the opportunity to make a thorough study of the dairy situation and to develop a better dairy program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, few legislative measures are as vital to the economy and well-being of this country and at the same time as complex as the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, which the Senate has just passed. A brief statement of the purposes of the agriculture bill is sufficient proof of both its importance and its complexity. The goals of the bill are to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices, and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, and to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas.

Mr. President, that is a mouthful. But one thing has been made very clear by this body's treatment of the bill—that is, that it would require an equal mouthful to sing the praises of the Senate as a whole and of the able manager of this bill in particular for the meticulous and complete treatment which this vital measure has received.

There is no floor manager of any bill who is more diligent, fair and well-prepared than the very capable senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. In his own inimitable fashion, he has educated himself on all aspects of the complicated farm problem; he has investigated all suggestions and all possibilities; he has patiently put together a piece of legislation which has gone far toward satisfying many interested groups and coping with a multitude of problems. He is to be congratulated and thanked for his unselfish dedication to the goal of solution of the very difficult problems faced by our farming community.

There is no doubt that the task of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana was lightened by the hard work and unselfish participation of the other members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Each member of that committee, both Democrat and Republican, has performed ably and conscientiously in hammering out the provisions of this bill. Important amendments were persuasively presented by committee members, including especially the distinguished junior Sen-

ator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

Equally important amendments were inserted in the bill in committee at the capable suggestion of many of its members. Of special import were the proposals of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. And undaunted efforts were consistently put forth, by way of participation in debate and discussion and just plain hard, deliberative work on the bill and amendments, by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS].

But—and this is an indication of both the importance of the farm bill and the typically high level of the deliberation of the Senate—committee members were far from alone in their work on this bill. Amendments were also proposed and ably argued by Senators not on the committee. I refer especially to the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and others.

Debate and discussion by many other Members of this body was of a uniformly high character. I could literally go down the entire roll of Senators in congratulating and thanking individual Senators for hard and thoughtful work on this measure. I will not, however, detain this body longer except to say that I am especially proud to be a Member of this body in view of its unparalleled deliberation on the farm bill.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the program for the remainder of today, and also for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, it is the intention of the joint leadership to request shortly that the Chair declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving two distinguished guests, their families, and others in their party. I refer specifically to the two astronauts.

Following the convening of the Senate again this afternoon, the leadership has indicated that it would like to take up the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and Optional Protocol, which is, to the best of my knowledge, noncontroversial, having been reported unanimously out of the Foreign Relations Committee. It has to do with etiquette and things of that sort. There will be a yea-and-nay vote on it.

Next will be the consideration of conference reports and others which have been acceded to.

Then, the highway improvement bill will be laid before the Senate, and will be the unfinished business tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], be allowed to speak for 20 minutes at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow on the Louisiana disaster.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY ASTRONAUTS LT. COL. L. GORDON COOPER AND COMDR. CHARLES CONRAD, JR.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself and for the entire Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator withhold until the Chair appoints a committee of escort?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], as a committee of escort for the astronauts and their party.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I now renew my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate stands in recess subject to call of the Chair.

Thereupon, at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess, subject to call of the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings in connection with the reception be printed as a part of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The astronauts, Lt. Col. Gordon Cooper and Comdr. Charles Conrad, Jr., escorted by the committee appointed by the Presiding Officer, and accompanied by Dr. Charles Berry and Dr. Robert C. Seemans, Jr., entered the Chamber and took the places assigned to them immediately in front of the Vice President. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate, distinguished astronauts, members of the NASA organization, wives and families, today, our Capital City has been singularly honored by the presence of Lt. Col. L. Gordon Cooper, Comdr. Charles Conrad, Jr., and Dr. Charles Berry, three gentlemen who have been honored today by the President of the United States, who presented to them the NASA Medal for Exceptional Service. [Applause.]

We are also greatly honored to have with us today Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., Associate Director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Early today, the National Academy of Sciences was host for a presentation by these distinguished astronauts to scientists and engineers, as they described their 8-day orbital flight.

Later this afternoon, the House of Representatives received them.

I am sure that the Senate wishes to hear from them; and I now take the liberty to present, first, the command pilot, one who has been in outer space in flight time longer than any person in the world, who has broken all records. He has been with us before, because his previous flight was for some 34 hours.

I now present to the Senate, with great honor and privilege, Lt. Col. Gordon Cooper, astronaut. [Applause, Senators arising.]

Colonel COOPER. Mr. Vice President, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, it is a rare privilege to be here again. I hope we can visit frequently. [Laughter.] It is a rare honor. We appreciate it very much.

Some 5 years ago, we were working very hard to see how many experiments we could put on board a manned space flight. That flight was to go a little over 100 miles in altitude and it was to last the sum total of 15 minutes. We made it.

We conducted several experiments on board, and we proved several people wrong. We proved that man really could last for 15 minutes in space.

As time went on, we moved the flights up to a little longer time, and still a little longer in time, and we got up to the orbital time of six orbits.

Then I was fortunate enough to be able to make a flight of 22 orbits, about 28 months ago. At that time, I was privileged to appear here before many of you.

I was hopeful at that time that I would be given the privilege of making another space flight in which I would have enough time to do many of the things that I ran out of time to do in that 34 hours.

We finally made a flight in which we had enough time to do quite a number of things. The flight lasted a few minutes short of 8 full days, or 190 hours of flight time.

The prime mission of the flight was to show that the man-machine combination could exist in space, that it could do a good job, and return in good shape

for a period equal to that of a manned-stay lunar mission.

We have proved that it can be done, that we have environmental control systems which will do the job, that man can remain in a healthy condition and be in a healthy condition when he returns to earth.

Second, we were proving a great many systems on board, including our radar, including onboard computers, including a stable table, by which we could navigate, all of which are vitally necessary for the lunar mission. We have proved that these systems will work, that they are accurate and reliable, and that they do the job they are supposed to do.

Third, we took along some 17 scientific experiments, some of which we did not quite complete. We completed the great majority of them by 100 percent. Several were 85 percent or more completed, and one we were unable to complete.

We had some minor problems onboard. These were primarily concerned with the new and to a certain extent unknown cryogenics, oxygen and hydrogen systems which powered our fuel cells; also several complete new items which had never been flown before in this type of configuration. The fuel cells worked very well, the cryogenics power did not work very well at first, but did work later after we determined that it would operate at a lower pressure than that designed. We managed by "catch as catch can," in some cases, while in drift in flight, to conduct most of the experiments.

We learned a great deal.

I felt many of the same things on this flight that I felt on previous flights.

It was a great deal of pleasure to me, for instance, to observe the feelings of my fellow pilot, Pete Conrad, on many things of great beauty and significance encountered in space, and to observe his reaction as he noticed them for the first time.

We found a great many new things we had not found in space before. We had plenty of time to do it, and a great deal more opportunity to do a great deal of data gathering than we had an opportunity to do before.

I thank you very much for this privilege of appearing before you. I hope I shall have the privilege before very long again, when we have some later space flights. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The partner in Gemini 5, a gentleman who brought honor to himself, his family, and his country, just as did the command pilot, Colonel Cooper, is with us today. He is affectionately known as "Pete." So I introduce to you Comdr. "Pete" Conrad. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Commander CONRAD. Mr. Vice President and Senators, it is a great pleasure to be here today. I mentioned at the press conference, after the flight was over, that the most significant scientific fact that I had noted was that after the flight was over, addressing a group such as this, my heart was at least 50 beats higher than it was at the time of the flight. However, I have my doctor here 'n case I get into trouble.

"Gordo" has mentioned some of the things about the flight. In particular, it was my joy to see some of the interesting phenomena that we observed. I might mention a few of them to you. Probably for the first time, we observed meteorites entering. I do not remember any other flight reports that mentioned these. The meteorites entered below us. I had to stop to think about that for a minute. When it was said that we might see them, I realized we were going to fly high. I had completely forgotten that we were flying above the atmosphere and that would be the place where we saw the meteorites entering—below us. That was a beautiful sight.

In scientific terms, we observed the aurora south of Australia, and many other interesting phenomena.

We as test pilots are curious people, and I think we like answers to questions, as scientists do. I believe we have brought back some useful data. As I said in the House of Representatives, I have had 11 days of rest and debriefing and 11 days of good sleep, and I am ready to fly again. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. While Dr. Berry was not in the space capsule, he operated a good deal of equipment in the space capsule that was attached to these two great astronauts. This noon, as I listened to Dr. Berry explain the medical findings of this flight, I noticed Colonel Cooper and Commander Conrad squirm and twitch as they thought about the little gadgets that were hooked onto them for the purpose of pleasing this doctor. But we are very proud of Dr. Berry. I want him to take a bow and say a few words to the U.S. Senate.

Dr. Berry. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Dr. BERRY. I am very glad that I am not censored at the moment, myself, because I am sure my heart rate would be better than 200 right now. I had no idea, Mr. Vice President, when we talked about coming in earlier to your office that it would be this way.

We are conducting a program such as this, of course, to make man a vital part of such a research effort and to show the facility that man has to gain scientific information, using vehicles such as we are able to build in this country.

"Pete" and Gordon have shown remarkable ability to utilize these vehicles to the fullest extent. Our job is to try to see that they always remain in good condition to perform that particular function.

I think I can report, so far as information has been obtained in this country to date and at the moment, that we are the only ones who have that sort of information for the duration of which we are speaking. We can confidently say that man has been able to perform very well up to 4 days in a weightless State earlier, and on this mission 8 days in a weightless State. He has then been able to readapt back to a 1–G environment. We have living proof of that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Lest fear and trepidation come to the hearts of the male Members of the Senate, I want you to know that the three ladies in the front row are not as yet Senators, but I think Senator SMITH has been talking to them about that possibility.

May I, therefore, on behalf of the Senate, present to the Senate and to our fellow Americans three ladies with us today, Trudy Cooper, or Mrs. Cooper; Jane, or Mrs. Conrad; and Mrs. Berry. [Applause.]

May I present to my colleagues the members of the families who are in the diplomatic galleries—the Cooper family, the Conrad family, and the Berry family. I believe, Bob Seemans, there must be some of your family up there. I know that Commander Conrad's mother is there.

Is Mrs. Conrad there?

(Mrs. Conrad stood in the diplomatic gallery.) [Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. I know also that three of the Berry children are here. Will they stand?

(The three Berry children stood in the diplomatic gallery.) [Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. I understood that the 2 daughters of Colonel and Mrs. Cooper are present. Will they stand?

(The two daughters of Colonel and Mrs. Cooper stood in the diplomatic gallery.) [Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. I must inform the Senate that the four junior astronauts of the Conrad family whom we met earlier today are drifting about as though in orbit. They are not in orbit right now; they are drifting, and apparently they are not with us. They are at the zoo. [Laughter.] But we had them with us. To show you their intellectual attainment, they were at the National Academy of Science earlier today.

We are very honored to have you with us today, gentlemen. Your achievements, while they are great personal honors to you, and indeed, to our Nation, are also great personal honors to your respective families.

Our space program is a team enterprise—Government, industry, science, universities, skilled workers, astronauts, Department of Defense, NASA.

It sets a good example for the whole country. I am pleased to find a principle of excellence and performance. What better principle could we have than the living manifestation of excellence and performance in our two astronauts, Commander Conrad and Colonel Cooper?

Welcome to the U.S. Senate.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. I am sure that Senators will want to greet our guests.

Thereupon, the astronauts were greeted by Senators in the well of the Senate Chamber.

The Senate reconvened at 4:41 o'clock p.m., upon the expiration of the recess, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MONDALE in the chair).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider Executive H, the Hague Protocol to the Warsaw Convention.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

VIENNA CONVENTION ON DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS, TOGETHER WITH THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL CONCERNING THE COMPULSORY SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider Executive H (86th Cong., 1st sess.), the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Together with the Optional Protocol Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, signed at Vienna under date of April 18, 1961, which was read the second time, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON DIPLOMATIC INTERCOURSE AND IMMUNITIES—VIENNA CONVENTION ON DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

The States Parties to the present Convention,

Recalling that peoples of all nations from ancient times have recognized the status of diplomatic agents,

Having in mind the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations concerning the sovereign equality of States, the maintenance of international peace and security, and the promotion of friendly relations among nations,

Believing that an international convention on diplomatic intercourse, privileges and immunities would contribute to the development of friendly relations among nations, irrespective of their differing constitutional and social systems,

Realizing that the purpose of such privileges and immunities is not to benefit individuals but to ensure the efficient performance of the functions of diplomatic missions as representing States,

Affirming that the rules of customary international law should continue to govern questions not expressly regulated by the provisions of the present Convention,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

For the purpose of the present Convention, the following expressions shall have the meanings hereunder assigned to them:

(a) the "head of the mission" is the person charged by the sending State with the duty of acting in that capacity;

(b) the "members of the mission" are the head of the mission and the members of the staff of the mission;

(c) the "members of the staff of the mission" are the members of the diplomatic staff, of the administrative and technical staff and of the service staff of the mission;

(d) the "members of the diplomatic staff" are the members of the staff of the mission having diplomatic rank;

(e) a "diplomatic agent" is the head of the mission or a member of the diplomatic staff of the mission;

(f) the "members of the administrative and technical staff" are the members of the staff of the mission employed in the administrative and technical service of the mission;

(g) the "members of the service staff" are the members of the staff of the mission in the domestic service of the mission;

(h) a "private servant" is a person who is in the domestic service of a member of the mission and who is not an employee of the sending State;

(i) the "premises of the mission" are the buildings or parts of buildings and the land ancillary thereto, irrespective of ownership, used for the purposes of the mission including the residence of the head of the mission.

ARTICLE 2

The establishment of diplomatic relations between States, and of permanent diplomatic missions, takes place by mutual consent.

ARTICLE 3

1. The functions of a diplomatic mission consist inter alia in:

(a) representing the sending State in the receiving State;

(b) protecting in the receiving State the interests of the sending State and of its nationals, within the limits permitted by international law;

(c) negotiating with the Government of the receiving State;

(d) ascertaining by all lawful means conditions and developments in the receiving State, and reporting thereon to the Government of the sending State;

(e) promoting friendly relations between the sending State and the receiving State, and developing their economic, cultural and scientific relations.

2. Nothing in the present Convention shall be construed as preventing the performance of consular functions by a diplomatic mission.

ARTICLE 4

1. The sending State must make certain that the agrément of the receiving State has been given for the person it proposes to accredit as head of the mission to that State.

2. The receiving State is not obliged to give reasons to the sending State for a refusal of agrément.

ARTICLE 5

1. The sending State may, after it has given due notification to the receiving States concerned, accredit a head of mission or assign any member of the diplomatic staff, as the case may be, to more than one State, unless there is express objection by any of the receiving States.

2. If the sending State accredits a head of mission to one or more other States it may establish a diplomatic mission headed by a chargé d'affaires ad interim in each State where the head of mission has not his permanent seat.

3. A head of mission or any member of the diplomatic staff of the mission may act as representative of the sending State to any international organization.

ARTICLE 6

Two or more States may accredit the same person as head of mission to another State, unless objection is offered by the receiving State.

ARTICLE 7

Subject to the provisions of Articles 5, 8, 9, and 11, the sending State may freely appoint the members of the staff of the mission. In the case of military, naval or air attachés, the receiving State may require their names to be submitted beforehand, for its approval.

ARTICLE 8

1. Members of the diplomatic staff of the mission should in principle be of the nationality of the sending State.

2. Members of the diplomatic staff of the mission may not be appointed from among persons having the nationality of the receiving State, except with the consent of that State which may be withdrawn at any time.

3. The receiving State may reserve the same right with regard to nationals of a third State who are not also nationals of the sending State.

ARTICLE 9

1. The receiving State may at any time and without having to explain its decision, notify the sending State that the head of the mission or any member of the diplomatic staff of the mission is persona non grata or that any other member of the staff of the mission is not acceptable. In any such case, the sending State shall, as appropriate, either recall the person concerned or terminate his functions with the mission. A person may be declared non grata or not acceptable before arriving in the territory of the receiving State.

2. If the sending State refuses or fails within a reasonable period to carry out its obligations under paragraph 1 of this Article, the receiving State may refuse to recognize the person concerned as a member of the mission.

ARTICLE 10

1. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the receiving State, or such other ministry as may be agreed, shall be notified of:

(*a*) the appointment of members of the mission, their arrival and their final departure or the termination of their functions with the mission;

(*b*) the arrival and final departure of a person belonging to the family of a member of the mission and, where appropriate, the fact that a person becomes or ceases to be a member of the family of a member of the mission;

(*c*) the arrival and final departure of private servants in the employ of persons referred to in sub-paragraph (*a*) of this paragraph and, where appropriate, the fact that they are leaving the employ of such persons;

(*d*) the engagement and discharge of persons resident in the receiving State as members of the mission or private servants entitled to privileges and immunities.

2. Where possible, prior notification of arrival and final departure shall also be given.

ARTICLE 11

1. In the absence of specific agreement as to the size of the mission, the receiving State may require that the size of a mission be kept within limits considered by it to be reasonable and normal, having regard to circumstances and conditions in the receiving State and to the needs of the particular mission.

2. The receiving State may equally, within similar bounds and on a non-discriminatory basis, refuse to accept officials of a particular category.

ARTICLE 12

The sending State may not, without the prior express consent of the receiving State, establish offices forming part of the mission in localities other than those in which the mission itself is established.

ARTICLE 13

1. The head of the mission is considered as having taken up his functions in the receiving State either when he has presented his credentials or when he has notified his arrival and a true copy of his credentials has been presented to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the receiving State, or such other ministry as may be agreed, in accordance with the practice prevailing in the receiving State which shall be applied in a uniform manner.

2. The order of presentation of credentials or of a true copy thereof will be determined by the date and time of the arrival of the head of the mission.

ARTICLE 14

1. Heads of mission are divided into three classes, namely:

(*a*) that of ambassadors or nuncios accredited to Heads of State, and other heads of mission of equivalent rank;

(*b*) that of envoys, ministers and internuncios accredited to Heads of State;

(*c*) that of chargés d'affaires accredited to Ministers for Foreign Affairs.

2. Except as concerns precedence and etiquette, there shall be no differentiation between heads of mission by reason of their class.

ARTICLE 15

The class to which the heads of their missions are to be assigned shall be agreed between States.

ARTICLE 16

1. Heads of mission shall take precedence in their respective classes in the order of the date and time of taking up their functions in accordance with Article 13.

2. Alterations in the credentials of a head of mission not involving any change of class shall not affect his precedence.

3. This article is without prejudice to any practice accepted by the receiving State regarding the precedence of the representative of the Holy See.

ARTICLE 17

The precedence of the members of the diplomatic staff of the mission shall be notified by the head of the mission to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs or such other ministry as may be agreed.

ARTICLE 18

The procedure to be observed in each State for the reception of heads of mission shall be uniform in respect of each class.

ARTICLE 19

1. If the post of head of the mission is vacant, or if the head of the mission is unable to perform his functions, a chargé d'affaires ad interim shall act provisionally as head of the mission. The name of the chargé d'affaires ad interim shall be notified, either by the head of the mission or, in case he is unable to do so, by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the sending State to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the receiving State or such other ministry as may be agreed.

2. In cases where no member of the diplomatic staff of the mission is present in the receiving State, a member of the administrative and technical staff may, with the consent of the receiving State, be designated by the sending State to be in charge of the current administrative affairs of the mission.

ARTICLE 20

The mission and its head shall have the right to use the flag and emblem of the sending State on the premises of the mission, including the residence of the head of the mission, and on his means of transport.

ARTICLE 21

1. The receiving State shall either facilitate the acquisition on its territory, in accordance with its laws, by the sending State of premises necessary for its mission or assist the latter in obtaining accommodation in some other way.

2. It shall also, where necessary, assist missions in obtaining suitable accommodation for their members.

ARTICLE 22

1. The premises of the mission shall be inviolable. The agents of the receiving State may not enter them, except with the consent of the head of the mission.

2. The receiving State is under a special duty to take all appropriate steps to protect the premises of the mission against any intrusion or damage and to prevent any disturbance of the peace of the mission or impairment of its dignity.

3. The premises of the mission, their furnishings and other property thereon and the means of transport of the mission shall be immune from search, requisition, attachment or execution.

ARTICLE 23

1. The sending State and the head of the mission shall be exempt from all national, regional or municipal dues and taxes in respect of the premises of the mission, whether owned or leased, other than such as represent payment for specific services rendered.

2. The exemption from taxation referred to in this Article shall not apply to such dues and taxes payable under the law of the receiving State by persons contracting with the sending State or the head of the mission.

ARTICLE 24

The archives and documents of the mission shall be inviolable at any time and wherever they may be.

ARTICLE 25

The receiving State shall accord full facilities for the performance of the functions of the mission.

ARTICLE 26

Subject to its laws and regulations concerning zones entry into which is prohibited or regulated for reasons of national security, the receiving State shall ensure to all members of the mission freedom of movement and travel in its territory.

ARTICLE 27

1. The receiving State shall permit and protect free communication on the part of the mission for all official purposes. In communicating with the Government and the other missions and consulates of the sending State, wherever situated, the mission may employ all appropriate means, including diplomatic couriers and messages in code or cipher. However, the mission may install and use a wireless trasmitter only with the consent of the receiving State.

2. The official correspondence of the mission shall be inviolable. Official correspondence means all correspondence relating to the mission and its functions.

3. The diplomatic bag shall not be opened or detained.

4. The packages constituting the diplomatic bag must bear visible external marks of their character and may contain only diplomatic documents or articles intended for official use.

5. The diplomatic courier, who shall be provided with an official document indicating his status and the number of packages constituting the diplomatic bag, shall be protected by the receiving State in the performance of his functions. He shall enjoy personal inviolability and shall not be liable to any form of arrest or detention.

6. The sending State or the mission may designate diplomatic couriers ad hoc. In such cases the provisions of paragraph 5 of this Article shall also apply, except that the immunities therein mentioned shall cease to apply when such a courier has delivered to the consignee the diplomatic bag in his charge.

7. A diplomatic bag may be entrusted to the captain of a commercial aircraft scheduled to land at an authorized port of entry. He shall be provided with an official document indicating the number of packages constituting the bag but he shall not be considered to be a diplomatic courier. The mission may send one of its members to take possession of the diplomatic bag directly and freely from the captain of the aircraft.

ARTICLE 28

The fees and charges levied by the mission in the course of its official duties shall be exempt from all dues and taxes.

ARTICLE 29

The person of a diplomatic agent shall be inviolable. He shall not be liable to any form of arrest or detention. The receiving State shall treat him with due respect and shall take all appropriate steps to prevent any attack on his person, freedom or dignity.

ARTICLE 30

1. The private residence of a diplomatic agent shall enjoy the same inviolability and protection as the premises of the mission.

2. His papers, correspondence and, except as provided in paragraph 3 of Article 31, his property, shall likewise enjoy inviolability.

ARTICLE 31

1. A diplomatic agent shall enjoy immunity from the criminal jurisdiction of the receiving State. He shall also enjoy immunity from its civil and administrative jurisdiction, except in the case of:

(a) a real action relating to private immovable property situated in the territory of the receiving State, unless he holds it on behalf of the sending State for the purposes of the mission;

(b) an action relating to succession in which the diplomatic agent is involved as executor, administrator, heir or legatee as a private person and not on behalf of the sending State;

(c) an action relating to any professional or commercial activity exercised by the diplomatic agent in the receiving State outside his official functions.

2. A diplomatic agent is not obliged to give evidence as a witness.

3. No measures of execution may be taken in respect of a diplomatic agent except in the cases coming under sub-paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph 1 of this Article, and provided that the measures concerned can be taken without infringing the inviolability of his person or of his residence.

4. The immunity of a diplomatic agent from the jurisdiction of the receiving State does not exempt him from the jurisdiction of the sending State.

ARTICLE 32

1. The immunity from jurisdiction of diplomatic agents and of persons enjoying immunity under Article 37 may be waived by the sending State.

2. Waiver must always be express.

3. The initiation of proceedings by a diplomatic agent or by a person enjoying immunity from jurisdiction under Article 37 shall preclude him from invoking immunity from jurisdiction in respect of any counterclaim directly connected with the principal claim.

4. Waiver of immunity from jurisdiction in respect of civil or administrative proceedings shall not be held to imply waiver of immunity in respect of the execution of the judgment, for which a separate waiver shall be necessary.

ARTICLE 33

1. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 3 of this Article, a diplomatic agent shall with respect to services rendered for the sending State be exempt from social security provisions which may be in force in the receiving State.

2. The exemption provided for in paragraph 1 of this Article shall also apply to private servants who are in the sole employ of a diplomatic agent on condition:

(a) that they are not nationals of or permanently resident in the receiving State; and

(b) that they are covered by the social security provisions which may be in force in the sending State or a third State.

3. A diplomatic agent who employs persons to whom the exemption provided for in paragraph 2 of this Article does not apply shall observe the obligations which the social security provisions of the receiving State impose upon employers.

4. The exemptions provided for in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article shall not preclude voluntary participation in the social security system of the receiving State provided that such participation is permitted by that State.

5. The provisions of this Article shall not affect bilateral or multilateral agreements concerning social security concluded previously and shall not prevent the conclusion of such agreements in the future.

ARTICLE 34

A diplomatic agent shall be exempt from all dues and taxes, personal or real, national, regional or municipal, except:

(a) Indirect taxes of a kind which are normally incorporated in the price of goods or services;

(b) dues and taxes on private immovable property situated in the territory of the receiving State, unless he holds it on behalf of the sending State for the purposes of the mission;

(c) estate, succession or inheritance duties levied by the receiving State, subject to the provisions of paragraph 4 of Article 39;

(d) dues and taxes on private income having its source in the receiving State and capital taxes on investments made in commercial undertakings in the receiving State;

(e) charges levied for specific services rendered;

(f) registration, court or record fees, mortgage dues and stamp duty, with respect to immovable property, subject to the provisions of Article 23.

ARTICLE 35

The receiving State shall exempt diplomatic agents from all personal services, from all public service of any kind whatsoever, and from military obligations such as those connected with requisitioning, military contributions and billeting.

ARTICLE 36

1. The receiving State shall, in accordance with such laws and regulations as it may adopt, permit entry of and grant exemption from all customs duties, taxes, and related charges other than charges for storage, cartage and similar services, on:

(a) articles for the official use of the mission;

(b) articles for the personal use of a diplomatic agent or members of his family forming part of his household, including articles intended for his establishment.

2. The personal baggage of a diplomatic agent shall be exempt from inspection, unless there are serious grounds for presuming that it contains articles not covered by the exemptions mentioned in paragraph 1 of this Article, or articles the import or export of which is prohibited by the law or controlled by the quarantine regulations of the receiving State. Such inspection shall be conducted only in the presence of the diplomatic agent or of his authorized representative.

ARTICLE 37

1. The members of the family of a diplomatic agent forming part of his household shall, if they are not nationals of the receiving State, enjoy the privileges and immunities specified in Articles 29 to 36.

2. Members of the administrative and technical staff of the mission, together with members of their families forming part of their respective households, shall, if they are not nationals of or permanently resident in the receiving State, enjoy the privileges and immunities specified in Articles 29 to 35, except that the immunity from civil and administrative jurisdiction of the receiving State specified in paragraph 1 of Article 31 shall not extend to acts performed outside the course of their duties. They shall also enjoy the privileges specified in Article 36, paragraph 1, in respect of articles imported at the time of first installation.

3. Members of the service staff of the mission who are not nationals of or permanently resident in the receiving State shall enjoy immunity in respect of acts performed in the course of their duties, exemption from dues and taxes on the emoluments they receive by reason of their employment and the exemption contained in Article 33.

4. Private servants of members of the mission shall, if they are not nationals of or permanently resident in the receiving State, be exempt from dues and taxes on the emoluments they receive by reason of their employment. In other respects, they may enjoy privileges and immunities only to the extent admitted by the receiving State. However, the receiving State must exercise its jurisdiction over those persons in such a manner as not to interfere unduly with the performance of the functions of the mission.

ARTICLE 38

1. Except insofar as additional privileges and immunities may be granted by the receiving State, a diplomatic agent who is a national of or permanently resident in that State shall enjoy only immunity from jurisdiction, and inviolability, in respect of official acts performed in the exercise of his functions.

2. Other members of the staff of the mission and private servants who are nationals of or permanently resident in the receiving State shall enjoy privileges and immunities only to the extent admitted by the receiving State. However, the receiving State must exercise its jurisdiction over those persons in such a manner as not to interfere unduly with the performance of the functions of the mission.

ARTICLE 39

1. Every person entitled to privileges and immunities shall enjoy them from the moment he enters the territory of the receiving State on proceeding to take up his post or, if already in its territory, from the moment when his appointment is notified to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs or such other ministry as may be agreed.

2. When the functions of a person enjoying privileges and immunities have come to an end, such privileges and immunities shall normally cease at the moment when he leaves the country, or on expiry of a reasonable period in which to do so, but shall subsist until that time even in case of armed conflict. However, with respect to acts performed by such a person in the exercise of his functions as a member of the mission immunity shall continue to subsist.

3. In case of the death of a member of the mission, the members of his family shall continue to enjoy the privileges and immunities to which they are entitled until the expiry of a reasonable period in which to leave the country.

4. In the event of the death of a member of the mission not a national of or permanently resident in the receiving State or a member of his family forming part of his household, the receiving State shall permit the withdrawal of the movable property of the deceased, with the exception of any property acquired in the country the export of which was prohibited at the time of his death. Estate, succession and inheritance duties shall not be levied on movable property the presence of which in the receiving State was due solely to the presence there of the deceased as a member of the mission or as a member of the family of a member of the mission.

ARTICLE 40

1. If a diplomatic agent passes through or is in the territory of a third State, which has granted him a passport visa if such visa was necessary, while proceeding to take up or to return to his post, or when returning to his own country, the third State shall accord him inviolability and such other immunities as may be required to ensure his transit or return. The same shall apply in the case of any members of his family enjoying privileges or immunities who are accompanying the diplomatic agent, or travelling separately to join him or to return to their country.

2. In circumstances similar to those specified in paragraph 1 of this Article, third States shall not hinder the passage of members of the administrative and technical or service staff of a mission, and of members of their families, through their territories.

3. Third States shall accord to official correspondence and other official communications in transit, including messages in code or cipher, the same freedom and protection as is accorded by the receiving State. They shall accord to diplomatic couriers, who have been granted a passport visa if such visa was necessary, and diplomatic bags in transit the same inviolability and protection as the receiving State is bound to accord.

4. The obligations of third States under paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of this Article shall also apply to the persons mentioned respectively in those paragraphs, and to official communications and diplomatic bags, whose presence in the territory of the third State is due to force majeure.

ARTICLE 41

1. Without prejudice to their privileges and immunities, it is the duty of all persons enjoying such privileges and immunities to respect the laws and regulations of the receiving State. They also have a duty not to interfere in the internal affairs of that State.

2. All official business with the receiving State entrusted to the mission by the sending State shall be conducted with or through the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the receiving State or such other ministry as may be agreed.

3. The premises of the mission must not be used in any manner incompatible with the functions of the mission as laid down in the present Convention or by other rules of general international law or by any special agreements in force between the sending and the receiving State.

ARTICLE 42

A diplomatic agent shall not in the receiving State practise for personal profit any professional or commercial activity.

ARTICLE 43

The function of a diplomatic agent comes to an end, inter alia:

(a) on notification by the sending State to the receiving State that the function of the diplomatic agent has come to an end;

(b) on notification by the receiving State to the sending State that, in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 9, it refuses to recognize the diplomatic agent as a member of the mission.

ARTICLE 44

The receiving State must, even in case of armed conflict, grant facilities in order to enable persons enjoying privileges and immunities, other than nationals of the receiving State, and members of the families of such persons irrespective of their nationality, to leave at the earliest possible moment. It must, in particular, in case of need, place at their disposal the necessary means of transport for themselves and their property.

ARTICLE 45

If diplomatic relations are broken off between two States, or if a mission is permanently or temporarily recalled:

(a) the receiving State must, even in case of armed conflict, respect and protect the premises of the mission, together with its property and archives;

(b) the sending State may entrust the custody of the premises of the mission, together with its property and archives, to a third State acceptable to the receiving State;

(c) the sending State may entrust the protection of its interests and those of its nationals to a third State acceptable to the receiving State.

ARTICLE 46

A sending State may with the prior consent of a receiving State, and at the request of a third State not represented in the receiving State, undertake the temporary protection

of the interests of the third State and of its nationals.

ARTICLE 47

1. In the application of the provisions of the present Convention, the receiving State shall not discriminate as between States.

2. However, discrimination shall not be regarded as taking place:

(a) where the receiving State applies any of the provisions of the present Convention restrictively because of a restrictive application of that provision to its mission in the sending State;

(b) where by custom or agreement States extend to each other more favourable treatment than is required by the provisions of the present Convention.

ARTICLE 48

The present Convention shall be open for signature by all States Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies or Parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and by any other State invited by the General Assembly of the United Nations to become a Party to the Convention, as follows: until 31 October 1961 at the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Austria and subsequently, until 31 March 1962, at the United Nations Headquarters in New York.

ARTICLE 49

The present Convention is subject to ratification. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 50

The present Convention shall remain open for accession by any State belonging to any of the four categories mentioned in Article 48. The instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 51

1. The present Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the date of deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification or accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

2. For each State ratifying or acceding to the Convention after the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification or accession.

ARTICLE 52

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall inform all States belonging to any of the four categories mentioned in Article 48:

(a) of signatures to the present Convention and of the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession, in accordance with Articles 48, 49 and 50;

(b) of the date on which the present Convention will enter into force, in accordance with Article 51.

ARTICLE 53

The original of the present Convention, of which the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall send certified copies thereof to all States belonging to any of the four categories mentioned in Article 48.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Convention.

DONE AT VIENNA, this eighteenth day of April one thousand nine hundred and sixty-one.

For Afghanistan:
For Albania:
S. AÇRÇANI
For Argentina:
C. BOLLINI SHAW
For Australia:
J. PLIMSOLL 30 March 1962
For Austria:
KREISKY
For Belgium:
G. DELCOIGNE Le 23 Octobre 1961
For Bolivia:
For Brazil:
J. DE SOUZA LEÃO
For Bulgaria:
Iv. DASKALOV
Y. GOLÉMANOV
For Burma:
For the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:
S. SHARDYKO
For Cambodia:
For Cameroun:
For Canada:
C. S. A. RITCHIE, February 5th, 1962.
For the Central African Republic:
M. GALLIN-DOUATHE, 28 mars 1962.
For Ceylon:
R. S. S. GUNEWARDENE
For Chad:
For Chile:
LUIS MELO LECAROS
For China:
HU CHING-YU
CHEN TAI-CHU
For Colombia:
M. AGUDELO G.
ANTONIO BAYONA
For the Congo (Brazzaville):
For the Congo (Léopoldville):
J. KAHAMBA
For Costa Rica:
GONZALO ORTIZ, 14 febrero de 1962.
For Cuba:
M. G. INCHAUSTEGUI, 16 de enero de 1962.
For Cyprus:
For Czechoslovakia:
DR. RICHARD JEZEK
For Dahomey:
For Denmark:
H. H. SCHRODER
For the Dominican Republic:
CARLOS SANCHEZ Y SANCHEZ, 30 March 1962.
For Ecuador:
Con. reserva a los parágrafos 2, 3, y 4 del articulo 37.[1]
N. M. PONCE
For El Salvador:
For Ethiopia:
For the Federal Republic of Germany:
WERNER DANKWORT
For the Federation of Malaya:
For Finland:
OTSO WARTIOVAARA, Le 20 octobre 1961.
For France:
ARMAND BERARD, Le 30 mars 1962.
For Gabon:
For Ghana:
E. O. ASAFU-ADJAYE
E. KODJOE DADZIE
For Greece:
With the reservation that the last sentence of paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Convention shall not apply.
DIMITRI S. BITSIOS
29th March 1962.
For Guatemala:
FRANCISCO LINARES ARANDA
For Guinea:
For Haiti:
For the Holy See:
SAC. AGOSTINO CASAROLI
SAC. OTTAVIA DE LIVA
For Honduras:
For Hungary:
USTOR ENDRE
For Iceland:
For India:
For Indonesia:
For Iran:
PROF. DR. A. MATINE-DAFTARY
27 mai 1961.
For Iraq:
With the reservation that paragraph 2 of article 37 shall be applied on the basis of reciprocity.
ADNAN PACHACHI
20 February 1962.
For Ireland:
T. J. HORAN
D. P. WALDRON
For Israel:
JOSEPH LINTON
For Italy:
VITTORIO ZOPPI March 13th 1962.
For the Ivory Coast:
For Japan:
It is understood that the taxes referred to in Article 34(a) include those collected by special collectors under the laws and regulations of Japan provided that they are normally incorporated in the price of goods or services. For example, in the case of the travelling tax, railway, shipping and airline companies are made special collectors of the tax by the Travelling Tax Law. Passengers of railroad trains, vessels and airplanes who are legally liable to pay the tax for their travels within Japan are required to purchase travel tickets normally at a price incorporating the tax without being specifically informed of its amount. Accordingly, taxes collected by special collectors such as the travelling tax have to be considered as the indirect taxes normally incorporated in the price of goods or services referred to in Article 34(a).
KATSUO OKAZAKI 26 March 1962.
For Jordan:
For Kuwait:
For Laos:
For Lebanon:
E. DONATO
For Liberia:
N. BARNES
For Libya:
For Liechtenstein:
HEINRICH PRINZ VON LIECHTENSTEIN
For Luxembourg:
M. STEINMETZ 2 février 1962
For Madagascar:
For Mali:
For Mexico:
CARLOS DARÍO OJEDA
FEDERICO A. MARISCAL
MANUEL CABRERA
For Monaco:
For Morocco:
For Nepal:
For the Netherlands:
For New Zealand:
M. NORRISH 28th March 1926
For Nicaragua:
For the Niger:
For Nigeria:
ALHAJI MUHAMMADU 31st March 1962
For Norway:
EGIL AMLIE
For Pakistan:
ZAFRULLA KHAN March 29, 1962
For Panama:
J. E. LEFEVRE
For Paraguay:
For Peru:
For the Philippines:
ROBERTO REGALA Oct. 20, 1961
For Poland:
HENRYK BIRECKI
MIROSLAW GASIOROWSKI
For Portugal:
For the Republic of Korea:
SOO YOUNG LEE 28 March 1962
For the Republic of Viet-Nam:
For Romania:
DIMITRIU

[1] Translation by the Secretariat: With reservation to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37.

For San Marino:
DR. WILL MÜLLER-FEMBECK 25.X.1961
For Saudi Arabia:
For Senegal:
L. BOISSIER-PALMER
For Somalia:
For Spain:
For the Sudan:
For Sweden:
Z. PRZYBYSZEWSKI WESTRUP
For Switzerland:
PAUL RUEGGER
For Tanganyika:
V. K. KYARUZI 27 February 1962
For Thailand:
O. VANIKKUL 30 octobre 1961
For Togo:
For Tunisia:
For Turkey:
For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:
K. ZABIGAILO
For the Union of South Africa:
B. G. FOURIE 28th March 1962
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
TUNKIN
For the United Arab Republic:
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
PATRICK DEAN December 11, 1961
For the United States of America:
H. FREEMAN MATTHEWS June 29, 1961
WARDE M. CAMERON March 23, 1962
For the Upper Volta:
For Uruguay:
NELSON IRINIZ CASAS
For Venezuela:
RAMÓN CARMONA
avec les réserves en pli accompagné
con las reservas que se inclyyen [1]

En nombre del Gobierno que represento, formulo las siguientes reservas a la Convención de Viena sobre Relaciones e Inmunidades Diplomáticas:

1°) Venezuela no admite, conforme al Decreto Ley de 23 de Mayo de 1.876 articulo 2, la concurrencia en una misma persona del carácter diplomático y consular, por lo cual no puede aceptar el numeral 2° del articulo 3° de la Convención citada.

2°) La legislación venezolana vigente no admite la extensión de privilegios e inmunidades al personal tecnico y administrativo, así como a las personas de servicio, por lo cual no acepta las Disposiciones de los parágrafos 2, 3 y 4 del articulo 37 de la misma Convención.

3°) Conforme a la Constitución de Venezuela, todos los nacionales son iguales ante la ley y ninguno puede gozar de privilegios especiales, por lo cual hago formal reserva del artículo 38 de la Convención.

Viena, 18. abril de 1961

RAMÓN CARMONA,
Representante de la República de Venezuela.

For Yemen:
For Yugoslavia:
Sous la réserve de ratification.
MILAN BARTOS
IAZAR ILIC

I hereby certify that the foregoing text is a true copy of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations adopted by the United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities, held at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, Austria, from 2 March to 14 April 1961, the original of which is deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

For the Secretary-General, The Legal Counsel:
C. A. STAVROPOULUS
United Nations, New York, 20 March 1963.

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON DIPLOMATIC INTERCOURSE AND IMMUNITIES—VIENNA CONVENTION ON DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS—OPTIONAL PROTOCOL CONCERNING THE COMPULSORY SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

The States Parties to the present Protocol and to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, hereinafter referred to as "the Convention," adopted by the United Nations Conference held at Vienna from 2 March to 14 April 1961,

Expressing their wish to resort in all matters concerning them in respect of any dispute arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention to the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, unless some other form of settlement has been agreed upon by the parties within a reasonable period,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention shall lie within the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and may accordingly be brought before the Court by an application made by any party to the dispute being a Party to the present Protocol.

ARTICLE II

The parties may agree, within a period of two months after one party has notified its opinion to the other that a dispute exists, to resort not to the International Court of Justice but to an arbitral tribunal. After the expiry of the said period, either party may bring the dispute before the Court by an application.

ARTICLE III

1. Within the same period of two months, the parties may agree to adopt a conciliation procedure before resorting to the International Court of Justice.

2. The conciliation commission shall make its recommendations within five months after its appointment. If its recommendations are not accepted by the parties to the dispute within two months after they have been delivered, either party may bring the dispute before the Court by an application.

ARTICLE IV

States Parties to the Convention, to the Optional Protocol concerning Acquisition of Nationality, and to the present Protocol may at any time declare that they will extend the provisions of the present Protocol to disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Optional Protocol concerning Acquisition of Nationality. Such declarations shall be notified to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE V

The present Protocol shall be open for signature by all States which may become Parties to the Convention, as follows: until 31 October 1961 at the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Austria and subsequently, until 31 March 1962, at the United Nations Headquarters in New York.

ARTICLE VI

The present Protocol is subject to ratification. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE VII

The present Protocol shall remain open for accession by all States which may become Parties to the Convention. The instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The present Protocol shall enter into force on the same day as the Convention or on the thirtieth day following the date of deposit of the second instrument of ratification or accession to the Protocol with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, whichever day is the later.

2. For each State ratifying or acceding to the present Protocol after its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Article, the Protocol shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification or accession.

ARTICLE IX

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall inform all States which may become Parties to the Convention:

(a) of signatures to the present Protocol and of the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession, in accordance with Articles, V, VI and VII;

(b) of declarations made in accordance with Article IV of the present Protocol;

(c) of the date on which the present Protocol will enter into force, in accordance with Article VIII.

ARTICLE X

The original of the present Protocol, of which the Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall send certified copies thereof to all States referred to in Article V.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Protocol.

DONE AT VIENNA, this eighteenth day of April one thousand nine hundred and sixty-one.

For Afghanistan:
For Albania:
For Argentina:
For Australia:
For Austria:
KREISKY
For Belgium:
G. DELCOIGNE
Le 23 octobre 1961
For Bolivia:
For Brazil:
For Bulgaria:
For Burma:
For the Bylorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:
For Cambodia:
For Cameroun:
For Canada:
For the Central African Republic:
M. GALLIN-DOUATHE
28 mars 1962
For Ceylon:
For Chad:
For Chile:
For China:
HU CHING-YU
CHEN TAI-CHU
For Colombia:
M. AGUDELO G.
ANTONIO BAYONA

---

[1] Translation by the Secretariat:
With the annexed reservations.
On behalf of the Government which I represent, I wish to formulate the following reservations to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations:
(1) Venezuela, under article 2 of the Legislative Decree of 23 May 1876, does not permit the performing of both diplomatic and consular functions by the same person. It cannot, therefore, accept article 3, paragraph 2, of the above-mentioned Convention.
(2) Under present Venezuelan law, privileges and immunities cannot be extended to administrative and technical staff or to service staff; for that reason Venezuela does not accept the provisions of article 37, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, of the same Convention.
(3) Under the Constitution of Venezuela, all Venezuelan nationals are equal before the law and none may enjoy special privileges; for that reason I make a formal reservation to article 38 of the Convention.
Vienna, 18 April 1961
RAMÓN CARMONA,
Representative of the Republic of Venezuela.

For the Congo (Brazzaville):
For the Congo (Léopoldville):
For Costa Rica:
For Cuba:
For Cyprus:
For Czechoslovakia:
For Dahomey:
For Denmark:
H. H. SCHRODER
For the Dominican Republic:
CARLOS SANCHEZ Y SANCHEZ
30 March 1962
For Ecuador:
N. M. PONCE
For El Salvador:
For Ethiopia:
For Federal Republic of Germany:
WERNER DANKWORT
For the Federation of Malaya:
For Finland:
OTSO WARTIOVAARA
Le 20 octobre 1961
For France:
ARMAND BERARD
Le 30 mars 1962
For Gabon:
For Ghana:
E. O. ASAFU-ADJAYE
E. KODJOE DADZIE
For Greece:
For Guatemala:
For Guinea:
For Haiti:
For the Holy See:
For Honduras:
For Hungary:
For Iceland:
For India:
For Indonesia:
For Iran:
Prof. Dr. A. MATINE-DAFTARY
27 mai 1961
For Iraq:
ADNAN PACHACHI
20 February 1962
For Ireland:
T. J. HORAN
D. P. WALDRON
For Israel:
JOSEPH LINTON
ad referendum
For Italy:
VITTORIO ZOPPI
March 13th 1962
For the Ivory Coast:
For Japan:
KATSUO OKAZAKI
March 26, 1962
For Jordan:
For Kuwait:
For Laos:
For Lebanon:
E. DONATO
For Liberia:
For Libya:
For Liechtenstein:
HEINRICH PRINZ VON LIECHTENSTEIN
For Luxembourg:
M. STEINMETZ
2 février 1962
For Madagascar:
For Mali:
For Mexico:
For Monaco:
For Morocco:
For Nepal:
For the Netherlands:
For New Zealand:
M. NORRISH 28th March 1962
For Nicaragua:
For the Niger:
For Nigeria:
For Norway:
EGIL AMILE
For Pakistan:
For Panama:
For Paraguay:
For Peru:
For the Philippines:
ROBERTO REGALA Oct. 20, 1961
For Poland:
For Portugal:
For the Republic of Korea:
SOO YOUNG LEE 30 March 1962
For the Republic of Viet-Nam:
For Romania:
For San Marino:
For Saudi Arabia:
For Senegal:
For Somalia:
For Spain:
For the Sudan:
For Sweden:
Z. PRZYBYSZEWSKI WESTRUP
For Switzerland:
PAUL RUEGGER
For Tanganyika:
V. K. KYARUZI 27 February 1962
For Thailand:
For Togo:
For Tunisia:
For Turkey:
For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:
For the Union of South Africa:
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
For the United Arab Republic:
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
PATRICK DEAN December 11, 1961
For the United States of America:
H. FREEMAN MATTHEWS June 29, 1961
WARDE M. CAMERON March 23, 1962
For the Upper Volta:
For Uruguay:
For Venezuela:
For Yemen:
For Yugoslavia:
Sous la réserve de ratification.
MILAN BARTOS
LAZAR LILIC

I hereby certify that the foregoing text is a true copy of the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes adopted by the United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities, held at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, Austria, from 2 March to 14 April 1961, the original of which is deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

For the Secretary-General, The Legal Counsel:
C. A. Stavropoulos
United Nations, New York, 20 March 1963.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I recommend that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and the optional protocol thereto.

The convention is largely a codification of diplomatic practices as they have developed over the years. It sets forth the rights, privileges, and duties of the members of a diplomatic mission, their families, and private servants. It thus covers a variety of subjects including the functions, size, and location of such missions; diplomatic privileges and immunities; and the obligations of the missions and its members toward the state in which they serve.

This is the first truly comprehensive convention regulating diplomatic relations among sovereign states. The original Congress of Vienna in 1815 was attended only by European states, and the 1928 Conference of American States was attended only by American states. In 1952 the United Nations General Assembly expressed an interest in securing the common observance by all governments of both existing principles of international law and current practice with regard to diplomatic intercourse and immunities. The Assembly asked the International Law Commission to study the subject. The Commission adopted draft articles in 1958, and these articles formed the basis for discussions at the Vienna Conference which was held in the spring of 1961. The convention which was signed at Vienna is what we have before us today.

The provisions of the convention are discussed in detail in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I shall comment on them only briefly today. The convention clarifies the treatment to be accorded to diplomatic missions and the personnel of these missions. The result should be to reduce the possibility of misunderstandings between governments in this field. For the most part, the convention is a codification of principles which governments have observed over the years—in some cases since the Vienna Conference of 1815; in other cases even before that time. Where practice has not been uniform, the convention establishes new rules. One such rule provides that while members of the administrative and technical staff of the mission shall continue to have complete immunity from criminal jurisdiction, immunity from civil jurisdiction will apply only to their official acts. Another new rule is that a diplomatic agent and his family will not have immunity from jurisdiction with respect to certain nonofficial activities such as those of a private, professional or commercial nature.

The convention also states, and this is the first such statement in a legal covenant, that it is the duty of all persons enjoying privileges and immunities to respect the laws and regulations of the receiving state. Let me point out that in general this convention is more restrictive in its provisions regarding diplomatic privileges and immunities than current U.S. practice. Only one group, the members of the families of the administrative and technical staff of a diplomatic mission, will receive immunities to which they are not now entitled; they are presently accorded no immunities. I should also like to emphasize that the convention is limited strictly to the permanent diplomatic missions maintained by foreign governments at the seat of other foreign governments. It does not apply, for example to consular officials, members of trade missions, representatives to international organizations or special envoys.

A word about the optional protocol to the convention. The "Optional Protocol concerning the compulsory settlement of disputes" provides that disputes arising from the interpretation or application of the convention be submitted to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice unless the parties to the convention agree to some other form of settlement. The so-called Connally reservation would not apply, therefore, in cases relating to the application or interpretation of the convention in which the United States might become involved.

In sum, the convention resolves in an orderly fashion many questions regard-

ing the privileges and immunities of diplomatic personnel. The convention is largely a restatement of existing international law but where it changes international law or makes new law, these changes have been on balance of a restrictive rather than broadening nature. Both from the point of view of how the United States wishes its personnel abroad to be treated and from the standpoint of the treatment the United States is willing to accord foreign diplomatic personnel, the provisions of the convention appear to the Committee to be equitable, reasonable, and practical. Sixty-three nations have signed the convention which entered into force on April 24, 1964. Forty of these have already distributed instruments of ratification or accession. I hope that the United States will be the next nation to ratify this convention which the Committee sees as an important contribution to international law and thus to furthering friendly relations among States.

The distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] was chairman of the subcommittee which considered this convention and brought it to the full committee with a unanimous vote. There was no dissent in the committee.

Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the resolution of ratification, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from Executive Report No. 6.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report (Exec. Rept. No. 6) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIENNA CONVENTION ON DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

I. MAIN PURPOSE

The convention, based largely on diplomatic practices as they developed over the years, sets forth the rights, privileges, and duties of all members of a diplomatic mission, of their families and private servants, and the rights and obligations of the state on whose territory they perform their functions. As a partial codification of these practices, it covers a variety of subjects, such as the functions, size and location of missions, diplomatic privileges and immunities—including the treatment of mission premises and archives, freedom of movement, personal privileges and immunities such as immunity from jurisdiction, tax exemptions, and customs privileges—the obligations of a mission and its members toward the state in which they serve, and termination of missions. In general, this convention is more restrictive in its provisions on diplomatic privileges and immunities than current U.S. practices. A detailed description of the convention follows in a later section of the report.

II. BACKGROUND

One of the most ancient and basic tenets of relations between nation states has been the mutual respect accorded each other's envoys. According to Charles Cheney Hyde:

"Long before the Christian era the idea prevailed that the person of an envoy sent by one ruler to another should be inviolable. * * * The Persians in the time of Xerxes were possessed of the same idea, as were also the Greeks. The Roman law gave recognition to it * * *. Upon the murderer of such a person the Salic Law imposed a penalty, and likewise the codes of the Alamanni, the Saxons, the Frisians, and the Lombards."

As early as 1790 the United States began according to the diplomatic representatives of other countries the privileges and immunities then customary. One of the first attempts to set this developing body of customary international law on paper was made at the Congress of Vienna in 1815 which was attended only by European states. However, most of the nations of the world generally followed the Congress of Vienna regulations. In 1928 another attempt was made, this time by the States of the Western Hemisphere, to codify international law in the area of diplomatic relations but the draft convention never entered into force.

Diplomatic intercourse and immunities was selected as a topic suitable for codification by the International Law Commission of the United Nations in 1949 and work on it was begun in 1954. Draft articles were transmitted to member nations in 1957 and on the basis of comments received a revision was drawn up which formed the basis for discussions at the Vienna Conference in 1961, which resulted in this convention. This, then, is the first comprehensive international convention on the subject of diplomatic relations between sovereign states.

III. PROVISIONS OF THE CONVENTION

A. Definitions (art. 1)

Article 1 contains definitions of terms used in the convention such as "head of mission," "members of the mission," "diplomatic agent," "premises of the mission," etc.

B. Diplomatic intercourse in general (arts. 2–20)

Article 2 provides that diplomatic relations and missions are established between States by mutual consent. The main functions of a mission are set forth in article 3: representation, protection of the interests and nationals of the sending state, negotiations, reporting on conditions and developments of the receiving state, promoting friendly relations, and developing economic, cultural, and scientific relations.

The custom of requiring an agreement from the receiving state for acceptance of a head of mission is preserved in article 4; dual accredition is covered in article 5, and article 6 makes possible the accredition of one person as the representative of two or more states.

Articles 7 and 8 concern the appointment of members of the staff of a mission. Generally, the sending state may freely appoint such persons but they should be, in principle, of its nationality. If they are not, the consent of the receiving state must be obtained. In the case of military attachés of any service, a receiving state may require the submission of their names before they will be received. The right of a receiving state to declare any member of a diplomatic mission, including its head, persona non grata or not acceptable is recognized in article 9.

Article 10 concerns notification of arrival and departure of all mission personnel. In article 11 it is stated that the receiving state may require that the size of a mission be kept within limits considered by it to be reasonable and normal. In practice, the United States has not imposed restrictions on the size of foreign missions in Washington, except for a few Eastern European countries. The United States needs flexibility in determining the size of its missions in foreign countries and almost invariably the size of U.S. missions exceed those of foreign missions in the United States. Without prior approval of the receiving state, offices of the mission cannot be opened in a locality different from that of the mission itself (art. 12).

Article 13 defines the time when a head of mission is deemed to have assumed his official role and establishes his precedence in the diplomatic corps. The various classes of heads of missions are described in article 14 and the nature of the mutual agreement necessary to determine those classes is defined in article 15. Articles 16, 17, and 18 concern precedence of heads of mission, precedence of diplomatic staff, and their mode of reception. These articles are patterned on the broad outlines of the Vienna Regulations of 1815.

Article 19 recognizes the position of a chargé d'affaires ad interim, whose name, however, must be officially communicated by the foreign ministry of the sending state to make clear that the chargé is not self-appointed. Article 20 relates to the display by the mission and its head of the national flag or emblem.

C. Diplomatic privileges and immunities (art. 21–40)

1. Mission Premises and Archives

Article 21 obligates the receiving state to facilitate the acquisition, "in accordance with its laws," of premises necessary for a foreign mission or to assist the latter in obtaining accommodations, including for its members, in some other way. The phrase "in accordance with its laws" recognizes the present authority of Congress to enact legislation governing the construction, alteration, repair, and occupancy of premises for chancery purposes as it did in 1964.

Article 22 relates to the inviolability of the premises of diplomatic missions and the duty of the receiving state to protect them from intrusion or damage and disturbances of the peace or impairment of its dignity. The District of Columbia Code now makes it a criminal offense under certain conditions to picket or congregate within 500 feet of a diplomatic mission. The Department of State does not construe article 22 to preclude the exercise of the right of eminent domain for public purposes, if prompt and adequate compensation and assistance in obtaining new quarters is given.

This article also provides that the premises of a mission, furnishings and other property thereon, and the means of transport of a mission shall be immune from search, requisition, attachment, or execution. The committee was assured that this immunity does not preclude the taking of reasonable measures of self-help to deal with emergency situations created by improperly parked embassy cars.

Article 23 provides that the sending state and the head of the mission shall be exempt from taxation in respect of the premises of the mission, whether such premises are owned or leased, but that such exemption does not apply to taxes payable by persons contracting with the sending state or the head of the mission. The hearing brought out the fact that the exemption also does not apply to the owner of premises leased for diplomatic purposes and such lessor remains subject to such taxes. By article 24, the archives and documents of the mission shall be inviolable, as they now are under international practice.

2. Facilitating the Work of the Mission and Freedom of Movement and Communication

Article 25 provides that the "receiving state shall accord full facilities for the performance of the functions of the mission." The Department of State construes this to refer to providing assistance in obtaining licenses, permits, the installation of equipment, or making of repairs when, as in many cases, authorities of the receiving state act as suppliers and/or contractors. It will not, in implementing this article, go beyond the scope of authorizing legislation and appropriations.

The obligation of a receiving state to insure to all members of missions freedom of

movement and travel in its territory is set out in article 26, subject however, to the receiving state's laws and regulations concerning zones, entry into which is prohibited or regulated for reasons of national security. This preserves the right of the United States to impose travel restrictions for reasons of national security. It does not impair the right of the United States to restrict travel of foreign diplomats when that restriction arises from discriminatory treatment in contravention of article 47.

Freedom of communication is the subject of article 27 and it protects the right of free communications by a diplomatic mission, for official purposes, including diplomatic couriers and messages in code or cipher. However, a wireless transmitter may be installed and used only with the consent of the receiving state. This accords with the provisions of the Federal Communications Act of 1934 as amended by Public Law 87–795 in 1962 which authorizes the President, on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to permit foreign governments to construct and operate in Washington radio stations for transmission of messages, provided that substantially reciprocal privileges are accorded the United States abroad.

Article 27 also provides that the official correspondence of the mission shall be inviolable; that the diplomatic bag, visibly marked and containing only diplomatic documents or articles intended for official use, shall not be opened or detained; that the diplomatic courier, officially identified, shall be protected in the performance of his functions and enjoy personal inviolability. Provisions are also made for the status of an ad hoc diplomatic courier and the entrusting of the diplomatic bag to commercial pilots. Official fees and charges levied by a mission shall be exempt from all dues and taxes, according to article 28.

3. Personal Privileges and Immunities of Diplomatic Agents

(a) Immunity from jurisdiction: Article 29 sets forth the personal inviolability of a diplomatic agent and his immunity from any form of arrest or detention. The receiving state shall treat him with due respect and shall take all appropriate steps to prevent any attack on his person, freedom, and dignity. Several U.S. laws already give effect to this provision. (See 22 U.S.C. 252; 22 U.S.C. 2253; 5 U.S.C. 170e–1; and 18 U.S.C. 112.) Article 30 extends the same inviolability to his residence, his papers, and his correspondence except as provided in article 31(3).

Article 31 provides that a diplomatic agent, in the absence of express waiver by his government, shall continue to have complete immunity from the criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state. He shall also enjoy immunity from civil and administrative jurisdiction except in actions relating to (a) private immovable property situated in the territory of the receiving state; (b) acts relating to succession in which he is involved as executor, administrator, heir, or legatee as a private person; and (c) professional or commericial activities exercised by him in the receiving state outside his official functions. These exceptions are new in international law and serve to limit the complete immunity from the civil jurisdiction of the United States presently granted by title 22, United States Code, section 252, to diplomatic agents. However, the complementing legislation (S. 2320) would give the President discretionary authority to extend more favorable treatment than is provided for in the Vienna Convention. Article 31 further exempts a diplomatic agent from the obligation to give evidence as a witness, provides that no measures of execution may be taken against him except in the cases listed above and then only when those measures can be taken without infringing the inviolability of his person or his residence. The agent's immunities from the jurisdiction of the receiving state do not exempt him from the jurisdiction of the sending state.

Article 32 concerns waiver of immunity by the sending state and defines its effect more precisely than has been the case heretofore.

(b) Social security legislation: The social security provision in article 33 is the first international regulation ever adopted in this field. It exempts diplomatic missions or the sending state from complying with local social security legislation for services rendered to the mission. It also exempts from social security obligations private servants who (a) are not nationals or residents of the receiving state, and (b) are covered by social security provisions in force in a sending state or a third state. For persons not covered by these exemptions, diplomatic agents are to observe the social security laws of the receiving state. The article further provides for voluntary participation by exempted persons if such participation is permitted by the receiving state. Existing and future bilateral or multilateral agreements concerning social security moreover are not to be affected by article 33.

Articles 37 and 38 extend the same obligations contained in article 33 with respect to social security laws to members of the administrative and technical staff and the service staff who are not nationals or residents of the receiving state. Nationals and residents of the receiving state are not entitled to the exemptions of article 33. Such Americans are considered to be self-employed under social security legislation.

In sum, these provisions will not require changes in existing U.S. social security legislation but will result in a change in practice in two respects; these provisions will require members of diplomatic missions to pay certain taxes from which they are now exempt and will exempt certain private servants from the present coverage under U.S. law, thus slightly narrowing the group now subject to the old age, survivors, and disability insurance program.

(c) Tax exemptions and customs privileges: Article 34 provides with certain well-defined exceptions, that diplomatic agents shall be exempt from all dues and taxes, personal or real, national, regional, or municipal. The exceptions, upon which there is no exemption, are indirect taxes; taxes on private income having its source in the receiving state and on capital gains on investments; estate taxes; taxes on private immovable property; charges levied for specific services rendered; and registration, court or record fees, mortgage dues, and stamp duties with respect to private immovable property. These tax exemptions are already provided in various sections of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the District of Columbia tax regulations, and laws in Virginia, Maryland, and New York. In fact Revenue Ruling 296 of December 21, 1953, as amended, accords even greater tax exemptions.

Article 35 exempts diplomatic agents from all personal and public services (like jury duty), and military obligations. The customs privileges set forth in article 36 accord with present usage and provide for free entry of articles for the official use of the mission and the personal use of a diplomatic agent or his family. It also provides exemption from baggage inspection but not when there are serious grounds for presuming that the baggage contains articles not intended for personal or family use of the diplomatic agent or that the import or export laws and regulations of the receiving state were being violated. This proviso is new and is a lesser immunity than the total inviolability now given by the United States to diplomatic baggage.

(d) Other persons entitled to privileges and immunities: Article 37, paragraph 1, provides that members of the family forming part of the household of a diplomatic agent, shall, if they are not nationals of the receiving state, enjoy the privileges and immunities specified in articles 29 to 36. Paragraph 2 states that the administrative and technical staff and their families, who are not nationals or permanent residents of the receiving state, shall enjoy the same personal privileges and immunities including complete immunity from criminal jurisdiction as diplomatic agents except that immunity from civil and administrative jurisdiction applies only to acts performed during the course of their duties and customs exemptions only for articles imported at the time of first arrival. Members of the service staff are even more restricted and will enjoy immunity, civil and criminal, from jurisdiction only with respect to official acts, exemption only from income taxes on their salaries, and exemption from local social security provisions. The families of the service staff enjoy no privileges and immunities at all. Finally, with respect to private servants (not nationals or residents of the receiving state) the article accords them exemption only from the income tax. It obliges the receiving state, however, to exercise its jurisdiction over private servants in such a manner as not to interfere unduly with the performance of the functions of the mission.

All of these provisions are considerably more narrow than the immunities now granted by the United States. For instance, the U.S. wife or offspring of a foreign diplomatic agent presently enjoys the immunities of articles 29–36. Also under present practice, the members of the administrative and technical staff and of the service staff and private servants enjoy complete immunity from civil and criminal jurisdiction. Their privileges and immunities will now be much restricted. Only one group will receive immunities to which they are not now entitled, that is the members of the families of the administrative and technical staff which presently are accorded no immunities. Upon enactment of the complementing legislation, it will be possible for the President to extend more favorable treatment to the person to whom article 37 applies.

(e) Nationals and residents of the receiving state: Article 38 provides that a diplomatic agent who is a national of, or permanently resident in, the receiving state shall enjoy immunity from jurisdiction and inviolability only with respect to official acts performed in the exercise of his functions. This is academic insofar as the United States is concerned since it has long been the practice of the United States neither to send nor to recognize as diplomatic officers persons who are nationals or residents of the receiving state. The second paragraph, providing that private servants and other staf members of the mission who are nationals or residents of the receiving state are to be entitled to enjoy privileges and immunities only to the extent admitted by the receiving state, accords generally with the present practice of the United States.

(f) Duration of privileges and immunities: Article 39 provides that every person entitled to diplomatic privileges and immunities shall enjoy them from the moment he enters the territory of the receiving state or, if already in this territory, from the moment his appointment is notified to the appropriate ministry. These immunities normally cease when the individual leaves the country or has had a reasonable time to do so.

(g) Duties of third states: Article 40 provides inviolability and such other immunities as are required for persons going to or coming from their posts through the territory of third states. It does not grant an absolute right of entry or transit; consequently the United States retains control over entry of such persons by means of the visa procedure. This means that the United States is not obliged to allow diplomatic

personnel from countries it does not recognize to transit the United States. The same treatment is also to be accorded diplomatic couriers and official communications and correspondence.

D. Conduct of the missions and its members toward the receiving state (arts. 41 and 42)

Article 41 states for the first time in a legal covenant the duty of all persons enjoying privileges and immunities to respect the laws and regulations of the receiving state. They also have a duty not to interfere in the internal affairs of that state. The committee attaches great importance to this article both from the standpoint of its personnel abroad and from the standpoint of diplomatic personnel in Washington, D.C. Illegal parking, speeding, and other violations by cars bearing diplomatic licenses are frequently the subject of newspaper reports. The committee was assured by Department of State witnesses that the provisions of this article will be helpful in securing better compliance with local laws by members of the diplomatic communities here and abroad.

This article also states the general rule that all official business of the mission is to be conducted with or through the ministry for foreign affairs or such other ministry as may be agreed. As a result of its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign governments, the Committee on Foreign Relations would like to see greater reliance on this principle.

Article 42 provides that "a diplomatic agent shall not in the receiving state practice for personal profit any professional or commercial activity." The Department of State at present makes exceptions to this principle for those engaged in educational and cultural pursuits. It has been the practice of the Department to permit diplomatic agents to accept teaching or similar positions which contribute to the knowledge or culture of the United States particularly since the Department encourages its own Foreign Service personnel to engage in occasional educational or cultural activities abroad. However, the discussion at the Vienna Conference indicated that this article is not intended to prevent a diplomatic agent from pursuing literary or artistic activities or from teaching at educational institutions.

E. End of the function of a diplomatic agent (arts. 43–46)

Article 43 provides that the functions of a diplomatic agent terminate on notification by the sending state that his function has come to an end, or on notification by the receiving state that it refuses to recognize him.

Article 44 speaks of the duty of a receiving state in the event of armed conflict. Article 45 covers situations where diplomatic relations are broken off between states and provides for the protection of the mission, and custody of the mission and protection of interests and nationals by third states, acceptable to the receiving state. Article 46 authorizes a sending state with the approval of the receiving state to undertake the temporary protection of third state interests.

F. Nondiscrimination (art. 47)

Article 47 sets forth a general rule of nondiscrimination as between states in applying the provisions of the convention subject to two qualifications. Discrimination, however, shall not be deemed to be taking place (a) where the receiving state applies any of the provisions of the present convention in a restrictive manner because of like restrictions placed on its mission in the sending state, and (b) where by custom or agreement states extend to each other more favorable treatment than is required by the convention. The first exception will permit the United States to take restrictive action against any state which applies the convention restrictively to U.S. personnel, such as by establishing large zones prohibited to travel. The second exception will permit the United States to grant, subject to enactment of S. 2320, special treatment with respect to certain Federal taxes, and immunity from civil and criminal jurisdiction of the United States on a reciprocal basis.

G. Final articles (arts. 48–53)

These articles (48–53) contain formal provisions such as those regarding signature, ratification, accession, entry into force, and notification. They are similar to others found in various international agreements to which the United States is a party.

H. The optional protocol

The Vienna convention is accompanied by an optional protocol, signed by the United States, concerning the compulsory settlement of disputes. It provides that disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the convention may be brought before the International Court of Justice by any party to the dispute, which is also a party to the protocol, unless some other form of settlement—negotiation, conciliation, or arbitration—has been agreed upon within a reasonable period of time. The so-called Connally reservation, therefore, would not apply in cases in which the United States might become involved relating to application and interpretation of the Vienna convention. The protocol has the effect of eliminating application of the Connally amendment to a narrow group of cases which might arise only out of disputes as to the meaning or application of this particular convention. Similar provisions have been included in at least 31 treaties and 10 other international agreements to which the United States has become a party in recent years. Eighteen nations are parties to the optional protocol to date.

IV. COMMITTEE ACTION

The Vienna convention was signed by the United States on April 18, 1961. It was transmitted to the Senate on May 14, 1963. On May 28, 1965, it was referred to a subcommittee composed of Senators CHURCH, chairman, CLARK, and CARLSON. A public hearing was held on July 6, at which members of the full committee were invited to be present. The Legal Adviser of the Department of State, the Honorable Leonard C. Meeker, made the executive branch presentation and answered questions. Further questions were answered in writing. No one else requested to be heard and the committee knows of no opposition to the convention. The record of the hearing is printed for the use of the Senate but a corrected version of certain pages appears in the appendix.

The committee considered the convention in executive session on August 31, 1965, and decided by voice vote to order the convention reported favorably to the Senate.

The matters of particular interest to the committee are discused in the section that follows.

V. MATTERS OF PARTICULAR INTEREST

A. Departures from present international law and practice

For the most part, the Vienna convention is a codification of principles hitherto observed by governments in their diplomatic relations. For instance, the categories of chiefs of mission and the manner of determining precedence go back to the Congress of Vienna in 1815. Others, such as the inviolability of premises, archives, communications, and the immunity of diplomatic officers go far back into history.

In other areas where practice has not been uniform or established, the convention establishes new rules and these were given particular attention by the committee. The effect of these new rules has been to limit in some places the scope of diplomatic privileges and immunities. For instance, as noted in the discussion of article 31, the exemptions from criminal and civil jurisdiction of diplomatic agents are somewhat narrower, and for administrative and technical staff and service staff (art. 37) they are even narrower yet. These more limited privileges concern tax and customs matters and immunity from local jurisdiction.

Of a broadening nature only are the provisions granting certain privileges and immunities to families of persons forming the administrative and technical staff of a foreign mission.

B. To whom the convention applies

Since there are a great many more foreign official representatives in the United States than those attached to permanent diplomatic missions accredited to the Government of the United States, the committee received assurances that the Vienna convention applied only to the latter group. Members of trade missions and other negotiating groups, representatives to international organizations headquartered in the United States, visiting foreign heads of state or government or other high officials, special envoys, etc. (except insofar as provided for in complementing legislation), are not within the scope of this convention. It is strictly limited to the permanent diplomatic missions maintained by foreign governments at the seat of other foreign governments. The convention does not apply to consular officials. Their privileges and immunities for the most part are governed by bilateral consular conventions between the United States and other countries and are more restricted. To the extent that these conventions contain most-favored-nation clauses these clauses do not apply to the Vienna convention. The United States has signed a Vienna Convention on Consular Relations for which the advice and consent to ratification by the Senate may be sought in the future.

It should be noted, however, that article 15 of the United Nations Headquarters Agreement provides that designated persons forming part of a resident mission to the United Nations (not members of the U.N. Secretariat) shall be entitled in the territory of the United States to the same privileges and immunities, subject to corresponding conditions and obligations, as the United States accords to diplomatic envoys accredited to it. And article 104 of the Charter of the Organization of American States provides that representatives of the Governments on the Council of the Organization, the representatives on the organs of the Council, the personnel of their delegations, as well as the Secretary General and the Assistant Secretary General of the Organization shall enjoy the privileges and immunities necessary for the independent performance of their duties. To the extent that the Vienna convention has narrowed or changed the customary privileges and immunities accorded by the United States to diplomatic missions in the District of Columbia, these will be applied to the persons covered by article 15 of the United Nations Headquarters Agreement and, by reference, to missions to the OAS as well. Altogether, the number of persons enjoying diplomatic status in Washington, D.C., and New York City is about 3,000.

C. Effect on Federal-State relationships

Since the convention is self-executing and becomes the supreme law of the land, the committee questioned the treaty's effect on Federal-State relationships. In only one small area does the treaty affect the powers of the several States of the Union and that is with respect to exemption from taxation of real property no matter where located, as long as it is used for diplomatic purposes. This means that if chanceries or embassies should be established in Virginia or Maryland those States could not collect real property taxes on exempt premises. In actuality,

neither State is presently collecting any such taxes. Except to this extent, the committee was assured that the powers of the Federal Government vis-a-vis the States are not being enlarged in any degree by this treaty.

D. Effect on domestic laws

According to a memorandum from the Department of State, the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations would in and of itself, and without implementing legislation, supersede any Federal, State, or local legislation which does not accord the privileges, immunities, and exemptions required by the convention. The convention will not automatically supersede Federal, State, and local legislation which accords greater privileges and immunities than is required by the convention. At the present time, mission members are considered exempt, in accordance with international practice or on the basis of courtesy and comity, from the requirements of certain legislation which contains no reference to or exemption for foreign diplomatic personnel.

Specific areas in which Federal, State, and local legislation may be affected by the convention with respect to countries parties thereto are:

(1) Diplomatic agents and members of the administrative and technical staff and their families, provided they are not nationals or permanent residents of the United States, will be exempt from direct taxes as provided in articles 36 and 37 and from estate taxes as provided in article 39.

(2) Pursuant to article 33, private servants of diplomatic agents, provided they (a) are not nationals or permanent residents of the United States and (b) are covered by the social security provisions in force in the sending state or a third state, will be exempt from coverage under the present old-age, survivors, and disability program.

(3) Mission members and their families will henceforth not be exempted from Federal and State taxes on income received from private sources within the United States, and will not be exempted from paying the employer's share of social security taxes due with respect to household employees who are covered by such legislation.

(4) The provision in article 23 that the sending state and the head of the mission will be exempt from all dues and taxes, except those in payment for specific services rendered, with respect to the premises of the mission (defined in art. 1(i) as the chancery and the residence of the head of mission) will assure that states grant exemption from their real property taxes even though their laws do not specifically provide for such an exemption.

What the Department of State terms "complementing" legislation has been submitted and is pending before the committee. A report on this legislation (S. 2320) will be submitted to the Senate after full committee consideration. In brief, the bill would (1) provide discretionary statutory authority for according the privileges and immunities specified in the Vienna convention to diplomatic missions and the personnel thereof of states not parties to the Vienna convention; (2) authorize according more favorable treatment to foreign diplomatic missions in the United States and their personnel, depending, inter alia on reciprocal treatment of U.S. diplomatic missions and their personnel in the territory of the sending states concerned; (3) clarify the status in the United States of foreign heads of state and of government and special envoys, and specify the privileges and immunities to which they and members of their official parties shall be entitled during their sojourn; and (4) repeal of Revised Statutes sections 4063–4066 (22 U.S.C. 252–254), relative to definitions of diplomatic personnel and their privileges and immunities, which are inconsistent with the Vienna convention. These sections, touched in somewhat archaic language, now allow the granting of greater privileges and immunities than contained in the Vienna convention.

The Department of State intends to recommend to the President that ratification be withheld until the complementing legislation is enacted.

E. Enforcement and safeguards

The committee was mindful of recurrent violations of the standard of conduct laid down in the Vienna convention such as damage done to American diplomatic premises abroad, unjustified expulsion of American diplomatic personnel, and occasional disregard for domestic laws by foreign diplomatic personnel in the United States. Significant disputes arising from the treaty can, of course, be dealt with by the optional protocol which provides for the reference of disputes on the application and interpretation of the convention to the World Court, if they cannot be settled through negotiations, conciliation, or arbitration. Short of that there are other remedies such as declaring an individual who violates the provisions of the convention a persona non grata, discussing the conduct of mission personnel with a chief of mission, and by engaging in action which is permissible under the terms of the nondiscrimination clause of article 47 which reserves to a State the right to take certain action if it is not securing the kind of treatment to which it is entitled to in another state. Through the visa process, moreover, the United States retains control over who may be admitted to the United States as a member of a mission.

The presence of article 41 in the convention should be useful, stressing as its does the duty to respect the laws and regulations of the receiving state. Members of American diplomatic missions abroad are instructed to follow these meticulously and the committee attaches great importance to this. By the same token, it attaches great importance to like conduct by foreign diplomatic personnel stationed in the United States.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In considering the Vienna convention, its reciprocal nature must constantly be borne in mind. Each party to the treaty both sends and receives diplomatic personnel. This report has stressed the obligations which the United States will assume toward the local diplomatic community. Of greater real importance, of course, are the reciprocal privileges and immunities which U.S. diplomatic personnel will obtain abroad, since the U.S. missions abroad are almost invariably larger than the corresponding ones in Washington, D.C. The convention therefore must be regarded from the standpoint of how the United States wants its personnel abroad treated as well as the treatment the United States is willing to accord foreign personnel in its territory. From both points of view, the committee believes that provisions of the convention are equitable, reasonable, and practical.

There are other positive benefits from becoming a party to the Vienna convention. It specifies exactly what privileges and immunities shall be provided for the members of diplomatic missions and their families. With increasing number of countries and the increasing size of mission staffs the practice of governments in this respect was beginning to vary. The convention resolves, in an orderly fashion, many questions regarding immunity from jurisdiction, customs privileges, and tax exemptions.

As already noted, the convention is largely a restatement of international law. Where it changes international law or makes new law, on balance these changes have been of a restrictive rather than broadening nature.

Prospects for universal application of the convention are good. Sixty-three nations signed it at Vienna and New York; 40 of these have already deposited their instruments of ratification or accession. The convention entered force on April 24, 1964.

The safeguards, to which the committee paid particular attention, are considered adequate. They are certainly no less than those available now, and in some ways they are greater.

The committee concurs in the opinion of the Department of State that "the convention constitutes an important contribution to the progressive development of international law, and should contribute to the development of friendly relations between states."

It urges the Senate to give its advice and consent to ratification of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and the accompanying optional protocol at an early date.

APPENDIX

(Excerpt from hearing before the Subcommittee of the Committeee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 89th Congress, 1st session, on Executive H, 88th Congress, 1st session, the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, together with the Optional Protocol Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, signed at Vienna under date of April 18, 1961)

VIENNA CONVENTION ON DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS, TUESDAY, JULY 6, 1965

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 a.m., in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, Senator FRANK CHURCH presiding.

Present: Senators CHURCH and CLARK.

Also present: Senators SPARKMAN and CASE.

Senator CHURCH. The subcommittee will please come to order.

The subject for the hearing this morning is Executive H of the 88th Congress, 1st session, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, together with an optional protocol on the settlement of disputes under it.

(For text of Vienna convention see p. 40.)

Senator CHURCH. This is the first time a comprehensive international convention on this subject has been before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I hope that members other than the subcommittee members who are interested in this subject will be present today. I understand that several other Senators plan to attend the hearings this morning.

The principal witness from the Department of State is the Honorable Leonard C. Meeker, Legal Adviser of the Department of State.

Mr. Meeker, you are here, are you not? Please come up and be seated.

STATEMENT OF LEONARD C. MEEKER, LEGAL ADVISER, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. MEEKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

* * * * *

Need for expanding world law

I have only one other matter I want to mention to you which is not really relevant to this treaty. I heard a very interesting talk the other day before a group which calls itself Members of Congress for World Peace Through World Law, by Prof. Roger Fisher at Harvard University Law School, in which he suggested the possibility of making a perceptible extension of the field of international law by arranging through diplomatic channels to permit courts to take a wider jurisdiction of judicial controversy than is presently the case, such as matters which were now reserved. For example, if the limousine or the automobile of the American Ambassador to Paris runs over a French citizen, it is my understanding that this becomes

a diplomatic matter rather than a matter for the courts; is that correct?

Mr. MEEKER. Well, it can be if immunity is not waived; yes.

Senator CLARK. I just mention this for your consideration and perhaps later I will come up and talk to you about it. Perhaps we could make a really rather significant contribution to the spread of international law if our State Department took a somewhat less conventional view toward the controversies which could be considered justiciable before the courts of foreign countries rather than insisting on handling them as a diplomatic matter. In this way we might even build up the jurisdiction of the World Court. I make those observations not for any particular comment from you but just to indicate the possibility at a later date we might talk about it.

Mr. MEEKER. I think it is a very interesting suggestion. One of the things we have been interested in is arranging for a very comprehensive, broad coverage plan of insurance for diplomats' cars, both the mission vehicles and the individually owned cars. We have discussed this with the Superintendent of Insurance here in Washington, and with representatives of some associations of insurance companies, and I think it will not be impossible or indeed difficult in the end to work out an entirely satisfactory plan.

We are at the moment trying to gather some further information from misisons here in Washington on which to base our proposals.

Senator CLARK. As you know, in many States, the interest of an insurance company cannot be revealed to the jury. In this situation you are speaking of, would this result—in the event there was disagreement between the plaintiff and the insurance company as to the amount of recovery—in a case getting into court, or would it still have to be handled through diplomatic channels?

Mr. MEEKER. It could go to court and what we would expect would be to have the normal immunity waived for the purposes of the lawsuit.

Senator CLARK. In connection with the insurance there would be an automatic waiver?

Mr. MEEKER. Yes.

Senator CLARK. Professor Fisher's suggestion was a good deal broader than that and I just give you an example which may or may not have any merit. He said for years and years the United States and United Kingdom have been arguing about the status of Christmas Island out in the Pacific. This seemed to him to be a typical kind of a situation that ought to go to the World Court for solution. It is handled in diplomatic channels and pretty far down the line in the line of priority and it would be an action of timidity to give in, in the interests of your own country.

I don't know whether you know that and wonder whether you would comment on it.

Mr. MEEKER. I would only comment that we did 4 years ago make a rather large survey of a number of disputed island territories, especially in the Pacific, to see whether there would be some real purpose to be served by litigating their proper title, ownership, and sovereignty.

We came to the conclusion that the effort would probably not be justified by the results. The amount of work that would have to be done by the other countries and by ourselves would be very large. The amounts of real estate are very small.

Quite frequently, the basis of the U.S. claim is a lot less strong than we might like to see it, and our ultimate conclusion was that we would do better to leave the legal situation alone and to continue to make agreed arrangements from time to time with the other country asserting claims. We have done this very successfully in a very large number of instances, and that approach has appeared to be satisfactory even though, perhaps, not as intellectually satisfying as to have the legal issues finally resolved.

Senator CLARK. Thank you, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the Convention will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, together with the optional protocol concerning the compulsory settlement of disputes, signed at Vienna under date of April 18, 1961 (Executive H, 88th Congress, 1st Session).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 85, nays 0, as follows:

[Ex. No. 260]

YEAS—85

Aiken	Bayh	Byrd, W. Va.
Allott	Bible	Cannon
Bartlett	Boggs	Carlson
Bass	Burdick	Case
Church	Jackson	Nelson
Clark	Javits	Neuberger
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Pastore
Cotton	Kennedy, Mass.	Pearson
Curtis	Kuchel	Pell
Dirksen	Lausche	Prouty
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Proxmire
Dominick	Long, La.	Randolph
Douglas	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Ellender	Mansfield	Robertson
Ervin	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Fannin	McClellan	Smith
Fong	McGovern	Sparkman
Fulbright	McIntyre	Stennis
Gore	McNamara	Symington
Gruening	Metcalf	Talmadge
Harris	Miller	Thurmond
Hart	Mondale	Tower
Hartke	Montoya	Tydings
Hayden	Morse	Williams, Del.
Hickenlooper	Morton	Yarborough
Hill	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Holland	Mundt	Young, Ohio
Hruska	Murphy	
Inouye	Muskie	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson	Jordan, N.C.	Russell, Ga.
Bennett	Kennedy, N.Y.	Scott
Brewster	McGee	Simpson
Byrd, Va.	Monroney	Smathers
Eastland	Russell, S.C.	Williams, N.J.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 85 and the nays are 0. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the ratification of the convention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5688) relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. WHITENER, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. ROUDEBUSH, and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8715) to authorize a contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. GROSS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 3128. An act for the relief of Angelo Iannuzzi;

H.R. 3684. An act for the relief of Maj. Alexander F. Berol, U. S. Army, retired;

H.R. 5989. An act to amend section 27, Merchant Marine Act of 1920, as amended (46 U.S.C. 883);

H.R. 8218. An act for the relief of Walter K. Willis;

H.R. 8351. An act for the relief of Clarence L. Afu and others;

H.R. 8761. An act to provide an increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

H.R. 9854. An act for the relief of A. T. Leary; and

H.J. Res. 504. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON RECEIPT OF APPLICATION FOR LOAN UNDER THE SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an application for a loan by the Hooper Irrigation Co., of Hooper, Utah, for a supplemental loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE BONDING OF GOVERNMENT OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on operations in connection with the bonding of Government officers and employees, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

S. 1013. A bill to clarify the components of, and to assist in the management of, the national debt and the tax structure (Rept. No. 710).

SCENIC DEVELOPMENT AND ROAD BEAUTIFICATION OF THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEMS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 709)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads, from the Committee on Public Works, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 2084) to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Mrs. Marjorie McKenzie Lawson, of the District of Columbia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United States;

Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 20th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

Charles W. Yost, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 20th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

BARRATT O'HARA, U.S. Representative from the State of Illinois, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 20th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, U.S. Representative from the State of New Jersey, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 20th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 20th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

James M. Nabrit, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the 20th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

JAMES ROOSEVELT, U.S. Representative from the State of California, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the 20th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, of Minnesota, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the 20th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

William P. Rogers, of Maryland, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the 20th session of the General Assemly of the United Nations; and

Miss Frances E. Willis, of California, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the 20th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2525. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William G. Allen, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2526. A bill for the relief of Peter Soon Sang Rhee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2527. A bill for the relief of Mary Anilyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 2528. A bill for the relief of Alexander Wyon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 2529. A bill for the relief of Dr. Felix Hurtado Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2530. A bill to effect entry of a minor child to be adopted by U.S. citizens; and

S. 2531. A bill for the relief of Alex Peter and Helene A. Antzoulatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. MONDALE):

S. 2532. A bill to increase educational opportunities thoughout the Nation by providing grants for the construction of elementary and secondary schools and supplemental educational centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 2533. A bill for the relief of Lawrence S. Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. DODD submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) to authorize establishment of Joint Select Committee to Study East-West Trade, which was referred, by unanimous consent, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DODD, which appears under a separate heading.)

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL CENTERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill providing grants for the construction of public elementary and secondary schools and supplemental educational centers.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk until the close of business September 20, in order to permit such Senators as may wish to join me to add their names as cosponsors of the legislation, following which time the bill can be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, the first session of the 89th Congress has been one marked by significant action in the field of educational legislation. Tremendous progress, long overdue, has been made in terms of programmatic support for every level of education from the kindergarten to the graduate centers of our great universities.

When final action has been taken on bills now pending in committee or in conference, we will have redeemed, in almost every part, the pledge given to bring to the floor for action every segment of the education program proposed by President Kennedy, and in addition to that action will have been taken on the further programs and the expanded programs proposed by President Johnson.

The bill I introduce today complements this historic series of measures,

at the elementary and secondary level, by meeting the bricks-and-mortar needs in an important part of our education system.

One does not have to go too far from this Chamber to view schools, still in use, which were constructed before many of the Members here were born. Too many of such schools are still in service in this country, and in every section of this country they constitute a health hazard for the children attending them. They are antiquated structures, and functionally obsolete structures, and inadequate structures for the job which needs to be done.

The bill which I offer to the Senate this morning is already under discussion and review in the House of Representatives. It was introduced in that body as H.R. 9948 on July 20 by a distinguished educational statesman from Kentucky, the Honorable CARL PERKINS. His subcommittee has already initiated hearings upon the measure and the testimony taken in the 9 days of hearings which have been held, according to my understanding, emphasizes the existing need for legislation of this character if we are to attain, even in part, the objectives we seek.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the text of the proposed legislation be printed, together with a short summary of the major provisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 2532) to increase educational opportunities throughout the Nation by providing grants for the construction of elementary and secondary schools and supplemental educational centers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. MONDALE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2532

TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION OF FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT FOR SCHOOLS SERVING CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

SECTION 101. The Act of September 23, 1950, Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by inserting: "TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION IN AREAS AFFECTED BY FEDERAL ACTIVITY" immediately above the heading of section 1, by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears in sections 1 through 10, inclusive (other than where it appears in section 5(c), for the second time in section 5(f), and for the first time in the fourth sentence of section 9), and inserting in lieu thereof "this title", and by adding immediately after section 10 the following new title:

"TITLE II—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION OF FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT FOR SCHOOLS SERVING CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

"Short title

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Elementary and Secondary School Construction Act of 1965'.

"Declaration of policy

"SEC. 202. In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate programs for the construction of facilities for their public elementary and secondary schools, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to construct, reconstruct, renovate, and improve elementary and secondary school facilities (including preschool facilities) so as to meet more effectively the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

"Duration of grants

"SEC. 203. The Commissioner shall, in accordance with the provisions of this title, make payments to State educational agencies for grants to local educational agencies for the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1969.

"Grants—Amount and eligibility

"SEC. 204. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated for making grants under this title for a fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine and shall allot such amount among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective need for such grants. The maximum grant which a local educational agency in Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be eligible to receive shall be determined pursuant to such criteria as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this title.

"(2) In any case in which the Commissioner determines that satisfactory data for that purpose are available, the maximum grant which a local educational agency in a State shall be eligible to receive under this title for any fiscal year shall be an amount equal to one-half of the average per pupil expenditure in that State or in all the States, whichever is the larger, multiplied by the sum of (A) the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the school district of such agency, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)), and (B) the number of children of such ages in such school district of families receiving an annual income in excess of the low-income factor (as established pursuant to subsection (c)) from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act. In any other case, the maximum grant for any local educational agency in a State shall be determined on the basis of the aggregate maximum amount of such grants for all such agencies in the county or counties in which the school district of the particular agency is located, which aggregate maximum amount shall be equal to one-half of such average per pupil expenditure multiplied by the number of children of such ages and families in such county or counties and shall be allocated among those agencies upon such equitable basis as may be determined by the State educational agency in accordance with basic criteria prescribed by the Commissioner. For purposes of this subsection the 'average per pupil expenditure' in a State or in all the States shall be the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made, of all local educational agencies in the State, and in all the States (without regard to the sources of funds from which such expenditures are made), divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such preceding year.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'State' does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(b) A local educational agency shall be eligible for a grant for a fiscal year under this title only if it meets the following requirements with respect to the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (as established pursuant to subsection (c)):

"(1) In any case (except as provided in paragraph (3)) in which the Commissioner determines that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection as to the number of such children of such families are available on a school district basis, the number of such children of such families in the school district of such local educational agency shall be—

"(A) at least one hundred, or

"(B) equal to 3 per centum or more of the total number of all children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in such district,

whichever is less, except that it shall in no case be less than ten.

"(2) In any other case, except as provided in paragraph (3), the number of children of such ages of families with such income in the county which includes such local educational agency's school district shall be one hundred or more.

"(3) In any case in which a county includes a part of the school district of the local educational agency concerned and the Commissioner has not determined that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection are available on a school district basis for all the local educational agencies for all the counties into which the school district of the local educational agency concerned extends, the eligibility requirement with respect to the number of children of such ages of families of such income for such local educational agency shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner for the purposes of this subsection.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the 'low-income factor' shall be $2,000.

"(d) For the purposes of this section, the Commissioner shall determine the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (as established pursuant to subsection (c)) on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce. At any time such data for a county are available in the Department of Commerce, such data shall be used in making calculations under this section. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine the number of children of such ages from families receiving an annual income in excess of the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)) from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act on the basis of the best available data for the period most nearly comparable to those which are used by the Commissioner under the first two sentences of this subsection in making determinations for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b). When requested by the Commissioner, the Secretary of Commerce shall make a special estimate of the number of children of such ages who are from families having an annual income less than the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)) in each county or school district, and the Commissioner is authorized to pay (either in advance or by

way of reimbursement) the Secretary of Commerce the cost of making this special estimate. The Secretary of Commerce shall give consideration to any request of the chief executive of a State for the collection of additional census information.

"Application

"SEC. 205. (a) A local educational agency may receive a grant under this title for any fiscal year only upon application therefor approved by the appropriate State educational agency, upon its determination (consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish under section 206)—

"(1) that, except as provided in subsection (c), payments under this title will be used for projects for the construction of school facilities of the local educational agency which are designed to serve school attendance areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families, including facilities for special projects conducted by the local educational agency in which children from such areas who are enrolled in private elementary or secondary schools, may participate as authorized by section 205 of title II of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended;

"(2) that the local educational agency has provided satisfactory assurance that the control of funds provided under this title, and title to property derived therefrom, shall be in a public agency for the uses and purposes provided in this title, and that a public agency will administer such funds and property;

"(3) that such projects are not inconsistent with overall State plans for the construction of school facilities and that the requirements of section 210 will be complied with on all such projects;

"(4) that the local educational agency will make an annual report and such other reports to the State educational agency, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the State educational agency to perform its duties under this title, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the State educational agency may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The State educational agency shall not finally disapprove in whole or in part any application for funds under this title without first affording the local educational agency submitting the application reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(c) The provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section limiting projects to certain areas shall not be applicable with respect to an application where (1) the local educational agency is eligible for a special incentive grant under section 204 of title II of the act of September 30, 1950, as amended, and (2) the State educational agency determines (A) that there is a need for the facility, and (B) that the facilities for carrying out the provisions of section 205 of title II of the act of September 30, 1950, as amended, are adequate and appropriate.

"Basic criteria

"SEC. 206. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this title, the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria to be applied by State educational agencies under section 205. In addition to other things, such basic criteria shall include the requirement that in approving applications under section 205 priority shall be given to projects which provide for (1) the replacement or restoration of hazardous or unsafe facilities, the consolidation of school facilities where the existing facilities do not provide separate classrooms for each grade, the modernization or replacement of facilities which are antiquated or functionally obsolescent, or the modernization or replacement of facilities to provide innovative facilities or equipment.

"Assurances from States

"SEC. 207. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the program under this title shall submit through its State educational agency to the Commissioner an application, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which provides satisfactory assurance—

"(1) that, except as provided in section 208(b), payments under this title will be used only for projects which have been approved by the State educational agency pursuant to section 205(a) and which meet the requirements of that section, and that such agency will in all other respects comply with the provisions of this title, including the enforcement of any obligations imposed upon a local educational agency under section 205 (a);

"(2) that such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures will be adopted as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this title; and

"(3) that the State educational agency will make to the Commissioner such reports as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title (including such reports as he may require to determine the amounts which the local educational agencies of that State are eligible to receive for any fiscal year), and assurance that such agency will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application which meets the requirements specified in subsection (a), and he shall not finally disapprove an application except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State educational agency.

"Payment

"SEC. 208.(a)(1) The Commissioner shall, subject to the provisions of section 209, from time to time pay to each State, in advance or otherwise, the amount which the local educational agencies of that State are eligible to receive under this title. Such payments shall take into account the extent (if any) to which any previous payment to such State educational agency under this title (whether or not in the same fiscal year) was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to it.

"(2) From the funds paid to it pursuant to paragraph (1) each State educational agency shall distribute to each local educational agency of the State which is not ineligible by reason of section 204(b) and which has submitted an application approved pursuant to section 205(a) the amount for which such application has been approved, except that this amount shall not exceed an amount equal to the maximum amount of the grant as determined for that agency pursuant to section 204.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to pay to each State amounts equal to the amounts expended by it for the proper and efficient performance of its duties under this title, except that the total of such payments in any fiscal year shall not exceed—

"(1) 1 per centum of the total of the amount of the grants paid under this title for that year to the local educational agencies of the State, or

"(2) $75,000, or $25,000 in the case of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, whichever is the greater.

"(c) (1) No payments shall be made under this title for any fiscal year to a State which has taken into consideration payments under this title in determining the eligibility of any local education agency in that State for State aid, or the amount of that aid, with respect to the free public education of children during that year or the preceding fiscal year.

"(2) No payments shall be made under this title to any local educational agency for any fiscal year unless the State educational agency finds that the combined fiscal effort (as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner) of that agency and the State with respect to the provision of free public education by that agency for the preceding fiscal year was at least equal to such combined effort for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

"Adjustments where necessitated by appropriations

"SEC. 209. If the sums appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, for making the payments provided in this title are not sufficient to pay in full the total amounts which all local and State educational agencies are eligible to receive under this title for such year, such amounts shall be reduced ratably. In case additional funds become available for making payments under this title for that year, such reduced amounts shall be increased on the same basis that they were reduced.

"Labor standards

"SEC. 210. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors on all construction projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a-276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 265c)."

Technical and conforming amendments

SEC. 102. (a) The Act of September 23, 1950, Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended—

(1) by inserting before section 11 the following title heading: "TITLE III—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS", and

(2) by redesignating sections 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, as sections 301, 302, 303, 304, and 305, respectively.

(b) The section of such Act redesignated as section 302 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) No funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act shall be used for the purpose of religious worship or instruction or for the construction of facilities as a place of worship or religious instruction."

(c) Subsection (c) of the section of such Act redesignated as section 303 is amended by inserting "title I of" immediately before "this Act" both times it appears.

Definitions

SEC. 103. (a) The section of the Act of September 23, 1950, Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, redesignated as section 305 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(17) The term 'current expenditures' means expenditures for free public education to the extent that such expenditures are made from current revenues, except that such terms does not include any such expenditure for the acquisition of land, the erection of facilities, interest, or debt service.

"(18) The term 'county' means those divisions of a State utilized by the Secretary of Commerce in compiling and reporting data regarding counties."

(b) Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by inserting before the period at

the end thereof the following: ", except that such term does not include any education provided beyond grade 12".

Extension of Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress

SEC. 104. (a) The first sentence of section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out "1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "1969".

(b) Subsection (b) of the section of such Act redesignated as section 304 is amended by striking out "1966" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1969".

(c) Paragraph (15) of the section of such Act redesignated as section 305 is amended by striking out "1963–1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "1966–1967".

TITLE II—CONSTRUCTION OF SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS

SEC. 201. (a) Section 301(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "four" and inserting in lieu thereof "five".

(b) Section 301(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title for purposes other than construction, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. For the purpose of making grants under this title for construction of supplementary educational centers, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500,000,000 for the purpose of making grants under this title."

The summary presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS UNDER TITLE I

Title I of the bill would distribute funds to local public educational agencies on the basis of a formula similar to the formula contained in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89–10, with the modification that each school district would be entitled to receive 50 percent of the average per pupil expenditure in the State or 50 percent of the average per pupil expenditure of all the States whichever expenditure figure is higher, for each child coming from a low-income family.

USES OF FUNDS UNDER TITLE I

A local educational agency could use funds granted pursuant to this title for the construction of school facilities of the local educational agency which are designed to serve school attendance areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families including facilities for special projects conducted by the local educational agency in which children from such areas who are enrolled in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools may participate as authorized by title I of Public Law 89–10.

The Commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education is required to establish basic criteria to be applied by the State educational agency in approving applications by local public educational agencies for the use of funds under title I of the bill. Such basic criteria shall include priorities given to projects which provide for (1) the replacement or restoration of hazardous or unsafe facilities; (2) the consolidation of school facilities; (3) the modernization or replacement of facilities which are antiquated or functionally obsolescent; and (4) the modernization or replacement of facilities to provide innovative facilities or equipment.

OTHER USES OF FUNDS UNDER TITLE I

In those school districts where a maximum effort is being made by the local public educational agency to provide broadened educational opportunities for children in school attendance areas where there are concentrations of educationally deprived children, the local public educational agency could use construction grants provided by title I for the construction of any needed school facility in the district. Such maximum effort must be evidenced by (1) the local educational agency is eligible for special incentive grants under section 204 of title I of Public Law 89–10; (2) the facilities in the school district for carrying out the provisions of section 205 of Public Law 89–10 relating to education programs for educationally deprived children, are adequate and appropriate.

These determinations are to be made by the State educational agency under broad criteria prescribed by the Commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education. The State educational agency also makes the determination with respect to the need for the construction of a facility other than one to carry out the program authorized by section 205 of Public Law 89–10 in the event that the local educational agency qualifies for this special use of funds granted pursuant to title I of the bill.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION UNDER TITLE II

Title II of the bill would amend section 301 of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 by adding additional authorizations for the purpose of constructing facilities to house programs authorized by title III of such act. Authorization for construction grants for this purpose would be as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year:	Amount of grant
1967	250
1968	400
1969	500
1970	500
1971	500

In addition, additional authorization for regular program activities authorized by title III of Public Law 89–10 are provided as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year:	Amount of grant
1967	150
1968	200
1969	250
1970	300

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The language under title I of the bill would become a permanent title II of Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress, title I of which, upon the enactment would deal with school construction in areas affected by Federal activities and title II would deal with school construction in areas where there are concentrations of educationally deprived children.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in introducing this bill at this time, I am aware that many feel that the days of the 1st session of the 89th Congress are numbered and that hearings on a measure such as this might not take place immediately. However, I also note from press reports that a contrary point of view has been stated and that there is a possibility that the Senate may still be in session for some period of time. I can assure the Senate that when the bill is referred to the committee and referred to the Subcommittee on Education, I shall try to accommodate my schedule, and I hope the schedules of my colleagues on the subcommittee can be similarly accommodated, to permit us to take the bill under consideration in open hearings, and it is for this purpose that I issue an open invitation to all those having a concern with this legislation to review it with care in the course of preparing such testimony, either written or oral, as they may care to give for our guidance. I shall at a later date, upon receipt of the legislation in the subcommittee, be prepared to make further announcement regarding time and place of the hearings.

To close, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks excerpts from the remarks of the chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, at the opening of his hearings on the companion measure, H.R. 9948.

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

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN CARL D. PERKINS AT THE HEARINGS OF THE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION CONCERNING THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1965, H.R. 9948

The 89th Congress has made a great stride forward in placing a floor under educational opportunities throughout the Nation. This has been accomplished by the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Public Law 89–10, which recognizes a national need for improved educational programs at the elementary and secondary level, in those school districts in which there are concentrations of children coming from extremely low income families.

The funds provided under that act for such programs, however, while envisioning a wide variety of special educational programs and a strengthening of existing educational programs to serve the special needs of such children, are inadequate to enable the construction of new classroom and other educational facilities in the school attendance areas in which these programs will operate. Of course in some instances, the construction of facilities is authorized by title I of Public Law 89–10, as well as under title III. However, situations are limited in which the urgent needs of educationally deprived children will give any priority to the construction of facilities which are nevertheless urgently needed. In some respects I have the feeling that we may have placed the cart before the horse in authorizing funds for programs before providing funds to adequately house such programs.

Many of our school facilities today are themselves stark examples of poverty and it is difficult for the best education programs to meet the needs of disadvantaged children in overcoming poverty in a setting of poverty. If a real breakthrough is to be achieved in providing educational opportunities in the poorest areas of our Nation, it is essential that school facilities be up to date, safe, healthy, modern, and thoroughly conducive to impressing upon the students the importance with which the Nation regards the educational process and academic achievement. It is little wonder to me that our dropout rates are high in low-income areas when we have placed so little value on the educational process as to house this most important activity so poorly.

SELECT JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last week I submitted an amendment to the omnibus farm bill, to strike the so-called Mondale amendment and substitute in its place a proposal to establish a Select Joint Committee To Study East-West Trade.

The deletion of the Mondale amendment was only a part of the purpose of my amendment and although the Mondale amendment has been taken out of the bill, I intend to pursue my objective of obtaining Senate approval of my select joint committee proposal.

I feel that the question of East-West trade is one of the most important problems before us today.

It is also one of the most controversial.

The President has set up a special committee to report on the question; and it has also been the subject of fragmentary testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee. But there has not yet been any truly definitive study of this complex and many-faceted problem.

No matter how Senators may feel about East-West trade, no matter whether they are disposed to favor more restrictive or less restrictive policies, I think all of them will agree that we would be in a better position to make up our minds if the pros and cons were examined exhaustively in hearings before the kind of joint committee I now propose.

For this reason, I am submitting today, as a Senate concurrent resolution, the substantive part of my amendment which calls for the establishment of a Select Joint Committee To Study East-West Trade, with instructions to report to Congress and the President by February 1, 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that my resolution be left at the desk until the close of business tomorrow night, so that Senators who wish to do so may join with me as cosponsors.

I ask that my proposal be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Commerce Committee for consideration. I hope that in the Foreign Relations Committee this resolution may be considered as part of the hearings to be held starting this Friday on the subject of the shipment of surplus commodities on American bottoms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and when reported by that committee, will be referred to the Committee on Commerce; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 59

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Select Joint Committee of Congress to Study East-West Trade (hereinafter referred to as The Select Committee), to consist of a total of Twenty-Four members, 2 majority members and 1 minority member each from the House Agriculture Committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the House Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, the Senate Commerce Committee, the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to be chosen by the respective committees.

SEC. 2. The Select Committee shall report its findings and make recommendations to Congress and to the President on or before February 1, 1966, after hearings, studies and consideration of the whole range of East-West trade, to include:

(a) the historical background and development of trade between the Free World and Communist or Communist-dominated countries;

(b) the present state of trade relations between the Free World and Communist or Communist-dominated countries; and

(c) the possible advantages and disadvantages to the United States and other Free World countries of expanded trade with Communist or Communist-dominated countries.

SEC. 3. The Select Committee shall pay particular attention to the various devices which have been suggested to encourage greater trade between the United States and the Communist or Communist-dominated countries, including but not limited to:

(a) the waiving of restrictions, limitations, or conditions connected with the sale through normal commercial channels of agricultural commodities;

(b) the guarantee by agencies of the Federal Government of credit arrangements, worked out through normal commercial channels; and

(c) the development of a modified list of strategic goods, intended to make our policy more consistent with those of other Free World nations.

SEC. 4. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 5. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-ninth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 6. The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

SEC. 7. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

SEC. 8. The Select Committee shall expire once it has made its report of findings and recommendations, in any event not later than February 1, 1966.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 448

Mr. FANNIN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 449

Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. COTTON) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 10871) making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREEMENT CONCERNING AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS WITH CANADA—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 450

Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 9042) to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

SCENIC DEVELOPMENT AND ROAD BEAUTIFICATION OF THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEMS—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NOS. 451 AND 452

Mr. COOPER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2084) to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. DODD, and Mr. CANNON be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2482) to prohibit obstruction of performance of duty by the Armed Forces by obstruction of the transportation of personnel or property thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senator HARRIS, Senator RIBICOFF, and Senator MONTOYA be added to the list of cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 85, the measure I introduced proposing a constitutional amendment relating to equal rights of men and women, and that their names be listed among the sponsors

at the next printing of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] be added to the sponsors of S. 2411 at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Bernard J. Brown, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. attorney, middle district of Pennsylvania, term of 4 years—reappointment.

Beverly W. Perkins, of Nevada, to be U.S. marshal, district of Nevada, term of 4 years—reappointment.

John G. Chernenko, of West Virginia, to be U.S. marshal, northern district of West Virginia, term of 4 years—reappointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, September 21, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Testimony delivered before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, on August 27, 1965, relating to the Government Employees Salary Comparability Act.

EFFECTS OF LAWLESSNESS ON YOUTH

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a very perceptive editorial, written by James O. Duncan, editor of the Capital Baptist, discussing various aspects of lawlessness in this country and its effect on our youth.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, from the September 26, 1963, issue of the Capital Baptist, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

ONE OF THE SIDE EFFECTS

A growing number of people, both white and Negro, are becoming concerned about one of the byproducts of efforts of Negroes to achieve social justice and freedom. Thousands of children, of both races, are being taught, by precept and example, that the end justified the means, that laws may be broken and disrespect may be shown to officials whose duty it is to enforce them, if it suits the purposes of the lawbreakers. Countless teenagers have been encouraged—even by their mothers and fathers—to look with contempt upon laws which inhibit them, and to earn status by disobeying the police.

Will these youth ever unlearn what they have learned during these days of crisis? Will attitudes toward laws and law enforcement officers change? Are we in the years just ahead going to have more juvenile delinquents than ever before?

The church and the home have a major task before them today, to give proper guidance to our youth.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have also in my hand, an article written by Mr. Raymond Moley, entitled "The Bracero Blunder." This is a clear and concise editorial on what many of us have been trying to awaken the Senate to for many years, particularly the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY].

I ask unanimous consent that the article, from the issue of Newsweek of July 19, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE BRACERO BLUNDER

(By Raymond Moley)

LOS ANGELES.—The scarcity of farmworkers is a hotter subject in California this summer than the weather in the Imperial Valley. This crisis in agriculture, California's largest industry, was caused by the termination of the bracero program on January 1. The program was adopted in 1951 as a means of regulating the movement of Mexican farmworkers, braceros, into the United States in the summer and fall. Under the plan, administered by the U.S. Department of Labor and validated by the Governments of the United States and Mexico, large numbers of such workers were admitted for a period of 6 to 12 weeks, were paid wages equal to those of Americans and were required to return after the harvest to their homes below the border. Most of the same workers returned year after year to the same employers. It was mutually profitable.

The pressure for the termination of the bracero program came from the AFL–CIO, largely because of its desire to unionize farmworkers. Liberals in Congress supported the termination of the program because of their deluded belief that it would reduce unemployment in the large industrial centers. Union labor has not been able to supply workers necessary to the harvest. And no unemployed worker now enjoying Government benefits is willing to migrate to another State for a temporary job.

HEADACHE FOR HOUSEWIVES

The impact upon California agriculture has been most severe. Many millions have been lost because of unharvested, rotting produce. And the flow of money into the State from exports to the East and abroad has been drastically curtailed.

As a result of this debacle, housewives elsewhere in the Nation have been confronted with rising prices for the many products imported from California and other States in the Southwest. In New York one purchaser of a head of lettuce after hearing the price asked that it be gift wrapped. This rise in prices will continue as the various crops ripen on into September and October. And after that, the prices of canned goods will rise during the winter.

As the crops ripened this spring, the Department of Labor attempted to supply the need for workers by recruiting high school students in the States west of the Mississippi into what are called A teams. Indians were bestirred from their abodes to the east and north and transported to the fields. But the high school boys—athletes back home—found the work too hard and the sun too hot, and the teams melted away. College students, who a few months ago were "standing up for their rights," found stooping over in the fields to earn a few dollars quite another matter. Of 300 Indians recruited in the Dakotas, who were flown in at a cost of $6,400 to Salinas growers, all but 20 vanished within a few days.

THE HUMAN SIDE

The cream of the comedy is a notice that the war-on-poverty program is spending $106,000 in Oxnard to educate and train 12 community advisers and leaders to train seasonal workers. According to the person doing the organizing, there isn't any teaching material ready, but that will be developed in time. It will take more uplifters to develop techniques. If workers were available, growers could easily enough tell them what to do.

A lasting loss to California is the trend of large growers to lease lands in Mexico and develop them along with Mexicans under more tolerable conditions in a country which has no Secretary Wirtz to "help" with their problems. California can ill afford this strain on its economy at this time because in several communities I have visited there are signs of declining business.

There is a human element in the termination of the bracero program. While the bleeding hearts in the Washington regime are spending billions to help the poor in Egypt, India, and elsewhere abroad, and while there is much talk about the Alliance for Progress, the Federal Government has visited a cruel hardship on the people of our nearest neighbor to the south. The termination of the bracero program has hacked away the livelihood of tens of thousands of Mexican workers, for this visit to the north had come to be their way of life. Their feelings can well be imagined.

AMENDMENT OF BONDING PROVISIONS OF LABOR MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959 AND THE WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if my colleagues will allow me briefly, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 681, H.R. 5883.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5883) to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 5883) to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 698), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act was signed into law September 14, 1959. The purpose of this act was to provide certain safeguards for the rights and interests of employees and the public generally as they relate to the activities of labor organizations, employers, labor relations consultants, and their officers and representatives. Under title V of the act, "Safeguards for Labor Organizations," a provision in section 502(a) requires the bonding of every officer, agent, shop steward, or other representative or employee of any union (other than a union whose property and annual financial receipts do not exceed $5,000) or any trust in which a labor union is interested, who handles funds or other property for the faithful discharge of his duties. Section 502(a) also provides that the surety company shall be a corporate surety which holds a grant of authority from the Secretary of the Treasury as an acceptable surety on Federal bonds.

A. Bond

With regard to the language "faithful discharge of his duties," former Secretary of Labor Mitchell said in his first annual report of the administration of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act:

"Although many facets of section 502(a) were susceptible to differing interpretations, neither the act nor the legislative history provides specific guidance or direction. For terms like "faithful discharge," where legal meaning was sought there was a paucity of case precedence on the subject."

Secretary of Labor Wirtz in his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor said:

"The bill will substitute an honesty bond for the faithful discharge bond now required of union officials and employees who handle union funds.

"Very briefly, the original legislation provided for a faithful discharge bond, but nobody was clear about what it meant, so premium prices went up. This would be changed by the bill to allow an honesty bond in place of the faithful discharge bond."

In further explanation of the Department of Labor's position with regard to the bonding requirements under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, Secretary Wirtz in a letter to Senator MCNAMARA, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, dated July 1, 1965, said:

"Union officials are presently held to the general standard of fiduciaries. Section 501 (a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act spells out that standard of responsibility and section 501(b) provides an appropriate civil remedy for any breach of that obligation.

"It has been the position of the Department of Labor since the passage of the act that the bond required by section 502 need not cover all violations of section 501(a). Shortly after the enactment of the act, the then Secretary of Labor promulgated an interpretative bulletin which states in part: 'The bonding requirement in section 502(a) relates only to duties of the specified personnel in connection with their handling of funds or other property to which this section refers. It does not have reference to the special duties imposed upon representatives of labor organizations by virtue of the positions of trust which they occupy, which are dealt with in section 501(a), and for which civil remedies for breach of the duties are provided in section 501(b).'

"The honesty bond which would be required by H.R. 5883 is the same type of bond which has been used by corporations, banks, and other financial institutions and has proven effective and adequate. It is the same kind of bond which is required under the Welfare Pension Plans Disclosure Act."

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in reporting H.R. 5883 without amendment, approves the following language in Report No. 182 of the House Committee on Education and Labor:

"The legislative history of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act as amended in 1962, which is similar to the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act in nature but applicable to the much more affluent welfare and pension funds, indicates that Congress intended to correct many of the basic defects of section 502(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act in the writing of section 13, the bonding provision of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. The American Surety Association, in a letter to the Secretary of Labor dated March 21, 1963, outlined the basic changes which resulted as follows:

" 'The adoption of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments of 1962 change the situation radically so far as welfare and pension plans are concerned by eliminating the multiple penalty requirement, the separate bond requirement, and the faithful discharge of duty requirement with the result that welfare and pension plans may now be covered under an aggregate penalty form of bond on an honesty basis only and more than one insured may be included in a single bond under circumstances prescribed in the regulations of the Secretary of Labor.

" 'These changes in requirements will result in substantial reduction of premium because the cost of multiple penalty coverage is a 12-percent increase over the cost of aggregate penalty coverage, elimination of the faithful discharge coverage eliminates the 25-percent surcharge, and coverage on more than one welfare or pension plan in a single bond eliminated the basic charge which is necessarily involved when separate bonds are issued to several insureds.'

"The committee is convinced that there is no reason to continue any distinction between the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with regard to their bonding provisions, particularly in light of the testimony of the great additional cost to the unions under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act provisions.

"The U.S. Treasury list for surety companies was originally established for the purpose of providing reputable guarantors for specific performance of Government contracts.

"A bond from a corporate surety is required under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act. Under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act the Secretary of Labor may issue an exemption from that act's provisions that only bonding companies holding a grant of authority from the U.S. Treasury Department may issue the required bond. However, the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act gives the Secretary no such authority with regard to the bonding provisions of that act.

"The committee must take note that there are 231 bonding companies on the Treasury list, but that not all these companies are either able (because of their size) or want to write the type of bond required under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act.

"The bill proposes the substitution of a fraud or dishonesty bond for the presently required faithful discharge bond. The question had been raised as to whether or not the proposed substitution would dilute the protections afforded to union funds, and whether or not the fraud or dishonesty bond would adequately cover the violations of section 501(a) of the act.

"Solicitor of Labor Charles Donahue, in a letter to Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, chairman of the General Subcommittee on Labor, presented the well-considered views of the Labor Department favoring the bill and the proposed substitution of bonds. He states that it is and has been the position of the Department that the bond required by section 502(a) need not cover all violations of section 501(a). This position is expressed in an interpretative bulletin promulgated by then Secretary of Labor Mitchell shortly after the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act was enacted which states in part:

" 'The bonding requirement in section 502(a) relates only to duties of the specified personnel in connection with their handling of funds or other property to which this section refers. It does not have reference to the special duties imposed upon representatives of labor organizations by virtue of the position of trust which they occupy, which are dealt with in section 501(a), and for which civil remedies for breach of the duties are provided in section 501(b). The fact that the bonding requirement is limited to personnel who handle funds or other property indicates the correctness of these conclusions. They find further support in the differences between sections 501(a) and 502(a) of the act which sufficiently indicate that the scope of the two sections is not coextensive.'

"The committee endorses the soundness of that interpretation.

"The bond which is substituted is the same type of bond which is required under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, as amended. Clearly, the individual union member has as great if not a greater interest and stake in the union's welfare and pension plan funds, and in their honest administration, as in any other funds of his union. The committee can see no reason why officers and other representatives of labor organizations who handle funds other than those of welfare and pension plans should be bonded in a manner any different from those who handle such funds. Indeed, in terms of the gross amounts, the welfare and pension plan funds are much greater than any of the accumulated union funds. There has been no testimony suggesting that the fraud or dishonesty bond provided under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act has failed to protect those funds and, as indicated earlier, there is no reason to think that such a bond will not protect equally well any funds other than welfare and pension plan funds. Further, the committee is concerned with the 25-percent surcharge for faithful performance bonds which extra charge fails to secure any defined increase in protection. Such a frittering away of union funds is a shameful waste of the assets which the act seeks to protect.

"B. Surety companies authorized to issue bonds

"Under rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 13(e) of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, as amended, the Secretary may approve bonding arrangements other than those with a surety company 'which is an acceptable surety on Federal bonds under authority granted by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the act of July 30, 1947 (6 U.S.C. 6–13).'

"Accepting the formula of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, the proposed legislation gives the Secretary of Labor the authority to exempt labor organizations from placing the bond required under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act through a surety company holding a grant of authority from the Treasury Department,

when in his opinion, such labor organization 'has made other bonding arrangements which would provide the protection required.' Experience under the similar provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, which were enacted in 1962, reveals that the Secretary has used this discretionary power most carefully and cautiously, thereby assuring to the union funds involved the utmost protection. He has granted an exemption to those labor organizations which make arrangements with the underwriters at Lloyd's, London, contingent on certain conditions which must be first met by Lloyd's. (See CFR secs. 465.17 and 465.18.)

"The proposed legislation also provides that such other bonding arrangements under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act must be at a cost which is comparable or less than that of securing the requisite bond from a surety company holding a grant of authority from the Treasury Department.

"It is not the intention of the committee, in giving this discretionary power to the Secretary, to sanction self-insurance on the part of labor organizations. Since the Secretary has recognized that the language of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act does not give him authority to recognize self-insurance as offering adequate protection to the union funds affected by that act, the committee is assured that self-insurance shall not be recognized as adequate protection under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act.

"However, it is the intention of the committee that both foreign and domestic surety companies, other than those holding a grant of authority from the Treasury Department, shall be eligible, upon prior consent of the Secretary of Labor, to issue the bonds required by the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act.

"C. Reporting

"Following the basic concept of the reporting and disclosure requirements of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, the legislation proposes that each surety company which issues any bond required by either act shall file with the Secretary a report describing its bond experience under each such act. These reports shall be in such form and detail as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation, but shall include information as to the premiums received, total claims paid, amounts recovered by way of subrogation, administrative and legal expenses. By giving the Secretary discretion as to what information shall be required in these reports the committee feels that both the public interest and the policy of the acts can best be served."

SCENIC DEVELOPMENT AND ROAD BEAUTIFICATION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2084.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2084) to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

PENALTIES FOR HANDLING AND COLLECTION OF DISHONORED CHECKS OR MONEY ORDERS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives on the bill (S. 1317) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks or money orders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1317) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks or money orders, which were, on page 1, line 7, strike out "or money order"; on page 1, line 9, strike out "or money order"; on page 2, line 4, strike out "or money orders"; on page 2, line 7, strike out "or money order"; and to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks."

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF PART II OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE RELATING TO DIVORCE, LEGAL SEPARATION, AND ANNULMENT OF MARRIAGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 948, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment numbered 1 of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 948) entitled "An Act to amend part II of the District of Columbia Code relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia."

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to aforesaid bill.

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to aforesaid bill.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the action by the Senate in receding to its amendment No. 3 is technical and more fully explanatory in nature, and does not alter that portion of the bill amending section 16–904(b) of the District of Columbia Code, providing that a judgment of legal separation from bed and board may be enlarged into a judgment of divorce from the bond of marriage upon application of the innocent party, a copy of which shall be duly served upon the adverse party, after the separation, which is intended to mean the legal separation, of the parties has been continued for 1 year next before the making of the application.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from the Senate amendments numbered two and three.

The motion was agreed to.

DESIGNATION OF FRANCIS CASE MEMORIAL BRIDGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 5) designating the bridge crossing the Washington Channel near the intersection of the extension of 13th and G Streets Southwest the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge," which were, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the bridge crossing the Washington Channel of the Potomac River on Interstate Route 95, approximately one hundred yards downstream from the outlet gate of the Tidal Basin, near the intersection of the extension of Thirteenth and G Streets Southwest, shall be known and designated as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge". Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States or of the District of Columbia in which such bridge is referred to shall be held to refer to such bridge as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge".

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall place on the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge" plaques of suitable and appropriate design.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit copies of this resolution to the wife of the late Senator Francis Case, Myrle Case; his daughter, Jane Case Williams; and his granddaughters, Catherine and Julia.

And to insert the following preamble:

Whereas the Congress and the citizens of the District of Columbia are sorely saddened by the tragic and untimely passing of one of the District's most dedicated and resourceful friends, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Francis Case; and

Whereas during his long and distinguished career in the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate, Francis Case was known and respected for his courage and untiring devotion to duty, and was loved for his sincerity, modesty, and understanding; and

Whereas he attained enviable stature and esteem for his constant cooperation, his wise counsel, and his broad comprehension of planning and development in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas Francis Case was an architect of the twenty-third amendment to the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote for electors for President and Vice President; and

Whereas during his years of service Francis Case sponsored many measures for improvements in the District of Columbia and served as chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia in 1953 and 1954; and

Whereas, through diligent study of past, present, and future District of Columbia needs, Francis Case gained a thorough grasp of District activities and helped fashion firm policies that will guide the District for decades; and

Whereas, after having served on the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia through the years 1951 to 1954, Francis Case returned voluntarily to the committee in 1959 and 1960 to serve again the people of the District despite his increased responsibilities in the United States Senate; and

Whereas his able and dedicated service as a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works contributed immeasurably to the development and improvement of the highway transportation system in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas it was through this remarkable dedication to duty that Francis Case helped

bring about major District of Columbia expansion of highway and bridge construction, through the enactment of the District of Columbia public works program in 1954, that is a lasting monument to his service: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the amendments of the House are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

CASE MEMORIAL BRIDGE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I wish to thank my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Senate District Committee, Mr. BIBLE, for his prompt and patient handling of Senate Joint Resolution 5, which has now required his attention a half dozen times since I first introduced it in 1963.

Likewise, I want to thank my associates in the South Dakota congressional delegation, Senator KARL MUNDT, Congressman BEN REIFEL, and Congressman BERRY, for assisting in putting this resolution through the Congress, as well as my old associate, Congressman JOHN McMILLAN, of South Carolina, who has cleared it through the House District Committee.

The late Senator Francis Case, of South Dakota, whom this resolution honors by naming the Washington Channel Bridge for him, was a constructive and diligent Senator, who performed his duties as a U.S. Senator and as chairman of the District Committee with great zeal and statesmanship.

Senator Case sponsored many measures for improvements in the District of Columbia and served as chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia in 1953 and 1954. He joined the committee originally in 1951, and returned to it voluntarily in 1959 and 1960, despite his increased responsibilities in the Senate.

One of the Senator's greatest contributions to the District of Columbia was his support and leadership for enactment of the District of Columbia public works program of 1954, bringing about a major expansion of highway and bridge construction. He paralleled this work for the District with his efforts as a member of the Senate Public Works Committee to bring about the enactment of the Federal Aid to Highways Act of 1962, which actually made possible the bridge across Washington Channel, located on Interstate Route 95 as it enters the city of Washington.

Francis Case was a constructive exponent of economic development throughout the Nation. In addition to highways, he was a leading advocate of the inland waterway system and of our western reclamation program. He was an untiring student of the measures which were before his committees, devoted to his duty, sincere and modest about the contributions he made to District, regional, State, and national advancement.

Naming the Washington Channel bridge in honor of his memory is peculiarly appropriate, as his widow has pointed out to me, because the bridge links the city to which he contributed so much with the Interstate Highway System.

SPRUCE KNOB-SENECA ROCKS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, WEST VIRGINIA

The PRESIDING OFFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives the bill (S. 7) to provide for the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in order to provide for the public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment thereof by the people of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in the State of West Virginia.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the "Secretary") shall—

(1) designate as soon as practicable after this Act takes effect the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area within and adjacent to, and as a part of, the Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia, not to exceed in the aggregate one hundred thousand acres comprised of the area including Spruce Knob, Smoke Hole, and Seneca Rock, and lying primarily in the drainage of the South Branch of the Potomac River, the boundaries of which shall be those shown on the map entitled "Proposed Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area", dated March 1965, which is on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; and

(2) publish notice of the designation in the Federal Register, together with a map showing the boundaries of the recreation area.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall acquire by purchase with donated or appropriated funds, by gift, exchange, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, or otherwise, such lands, waters, or interests therein within the boundaries of the recreation area as he determines to be needed or desirable for the purposes of this Act. For the purposes of section 6 of the Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 897, 903), the boundaries of the Monongahela National Forest, as designated by the Secretary pursuant to section 2 of this Act, shall be treated as if they were the boundaries of that forest on January 1, 1965. Lands, waters, or interests therein owned by the State of West Virginia or any political subdivision of that State may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within the boundaries of the recreation area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in implementing the purposes of this Act.

(c) In exercising his authority to acquire lands by exchange the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property within the recreation area and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property in the State of West Virginia under his jurisdiction.

(d) The portion of the moneys paid to the State of West Virginia under the provisions of section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 500), for expenditure for the benefit of Pendleton and Grant Counties, West Virginia, may be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of such counties for public schools, public roads, or other public purposes.

SEC. 4. (a) After the Secretary acquires an acreage within the area designated pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 2 of this Act that is in his opinion efficiently administrable to carry out the purposes of this Act, he shall institute an accelerated program of development of facilities for outdoor recreation. Said facilities shall be so devised to take advantage of the topography and geographical location of the lands in relation to the growing recreation needs of the people of the United States.

(b) The Secretary may cooperate with all Federal and State authorities and agencies that have programs which will hasten completion of the recreation area and render services which will aid him in evaluating and effectuating the establishment of adequate summer and winter outdoor recreation facilities.

SEC. 5. The administration, protection, and development of the recreation area shall be by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to national forests, in such manner as in his judgment will best provide for (1) public outdoor recreation benefits; (2) conservation of scenic, scientific, historic, and other values contributing to public enjoyment; and (3) such management, utilization, and disposal of natural resources as in his judgment will promote, or is compatible with, and does not significantly impair the purposes for which the recreation area is established.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws. The Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment, and shall issue regulations after consultation with the Department of Natural Resources of the State of West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, S. 7 passed the Senate earlier this year. Recently, it passed the House of Representatives with two minor amendments. These amendments were suggested by the public officials of Grant and Pendleton Counties in West Virginia, the two counties in which the national recreation area would be established. Specifically, the amendments deal with the acreage and with the disposition of national forest revenues in the two counties involved.

The amendments had the approval of the U.S. Forest Service. This being the case, I have cleared the matter with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and also with the ranking minority member on that committee, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I have also cleared it with the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader.

Therefore, in order that the Senate may not have to have a conference with the House of Representatives, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

THE IMMIGRATION BILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, one of the major issues yet to come before the Senate, before adjournment this year, is the proposed revision of the U.S. immigration laws. The subject of immigration has appeared on most of the lists of "must" legislation I have seen in recent weeks. The President has made several statements stressing its importance.

The national origins concept, which underlies the present system, was first proposed on April 11, 1924, and was based on the national origins of the inhabitants of the United States according to the 1920 census, exclusive of, first, natives of independent countries of the Western Hemisphere, second, persons of Asian ancestry, third, descendants of African immigrants, and fourth, descendants of American aborigines. The proposal was voted down in the House of Representatives, but it was inserted in the Senate and retained in conference. The Senate and House agreed to the conference report, and the bill, as amended, became law on May 26, 1924. The original objective of the 1924 act was to maintain the ethnic composition of the American people, on the premise that some nations are far closer to the United States in culture, customs, standards of living, respect for law, and experience in self-government. The act was denounced by some people as racially biased, statistically incorrect, and a clumsy instrument of selection based on discrimination against nations.

In 1952, the Immigration and Nationality Act was passed, this legislation being a codification of a multitude of laws governing immigration and naturalization in the United States. The immigration quotas provided therein were, in general, patterned after the national origins system, contained in the Immigration Act of 1924, in that the number of quota immigrants entering the United States during any one year was limited and a distribution of the annual quota among the various quota areas was provided. The national origins provision was the subject of debate in both Houses of the Congress. President Truman vetoed the bill but, notwithstanding his strong opposition, the President's veto was overridden by the Congress and the Immigration and Naturalization Act became law.

I have only two objections to the present system. One is that it applies no limitation on immigration from South America and other Western Hemisphere countries and, theoretically, any number of persons could emigrate to the United States from the Western Hemisphere countries immediately. This weakness has not had too great an impact upon our country up to the present moment, largely because South American countries have been absorbing their own population increase very well. Yet, the day is not far off, when the population explosion in Latin American countries will exert great pressures upon those people to emigrate to the United States. It will be my intention, therefore, to support a limitation on the number of immigrants from Western Hemisphere countries, but I fear that such a limitation, if it is retained in the Senate bill, may be scrapped in the subsequent conference with the House of Representatives. My other objection is that under the present system, certain countries, such as Italy and Greece, for example, whose peoples do assimilate readily and easily into the American society, have been disadvantaged.

Notwithstanding the two objections I have iterated, I think the basic national origins quota system should be retained. I realize that it has been nullified to a great extent by amendments and special refugee laws and other legislation in the form of private bills. The system has been castigated and vilified by those who declare that it discriminates against other nations, but, on the whole, I consider it to be a just and wise system. Relatively larger quotas, of course, are assigned to such countries as England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, France, and Scandinavia, but this is because the basic population of our country is made up largely of stocks which originated from those countries, and the reasoning back of the present system is that additional population from those countries would be more easily and readily assimilated into the American population. Naturally, those immigrants can best be absorbed into our modern population whose backgrounds and cultures are similar. It is indubitably clear that if the majority of Americans had sprung, not from Western, central, and southern Europe, but from central Africa or southern Asia, we would today have a vastly different country. Unquestionably, there are fine human beings in all parts of the world, but people do differ widely in their social habits, their levels of ambition, their mechanical aptitudes, their inherited ability and intelligence, their moral traditions, and their capacities for maintaining stable governments.

The advocates of this legislation state that the increase in immigration brought about by its passage will be miniscule and will amount to only a few additional thousand persons annually, but I fear that the practical result will be otherwise. In my judgment, it is completely unrealistic for us to be considering legislation that is going to permanently increase our immigration to any degree whatsoever. I grant that the immigrants who have come to this country have made a magnificent contribution to our development. Anyone who attempts to articulate this contribution is doomed to understatement because, certainly, this Nation was put together by immigrants and would not exist if they had not come here.

It is true also that immigrants have continued to play an important role in our Nation's development. But that role has been and is dwindling in importance. Most of us are descendants of immigrants, but this is no longer a nation that needs immigration as it once did. Indeed, the problems we will face in the years ahead will be those of a surplus population rather than needed population. In this respect we are like most other nations of the world. But, unlike other nations, we have not yet learned how to give primary consideration to immigration as it will affect us internally, without developing a guilty conscience. We have yet to make the philosophical transition from an immigrant-seeking nation, which we were until fairly recently, to one whose population has developed to the capabilities of our present resources.

But why, Mr. President, should the United States be the only advanced nation in the world today to develop a guilt complex concerning its immigration policies, when it is already far more liberal than other countries in this respect, and in view of the fact that other advanced nations are selective in dealing with immigrants and without apology?

Every other country that is attractive to immigrants practices selectivity and without apology. For example, Trinidad is an island country that gained its independence from Great Britain a few years ago. Yet, under a new British law, immigration from Trinidad is closely restricted. Australia has no quota at all. It simply excludes anyone of non-European ancestry. I am told that the Japanese Government discourages immigration from many countries. I am also informed that Israel has a policy—as it has every right to have—based on religion. Why should the United States, therefore, not reflect careful selectivity and be more restrictive in the formulation of its immigration policies?

Our first responsibility in matters of immigration, at a time when automation is on the rise and the population explosion is giving cause for concern, is to the people of the United States and not to the entire population of the world.

The advocates of change assure us that under the proposed legislation it will be easier for people of special skills to come into the country and help the U.S. economy. Yet, under the new legislation, there would be an increase in quotas for such countries, as Trinidad, Jamaica, Tanzia, Malawi, Yemen, and Nepal, and I would imagine that persons with special skills needed in the United States might be very hard to find in those countries. Moreover, under existing law, skilled aliens are granted first preference status which entitles them to monopolize the first 50 percent of a country's quota. Yet, we continue to hear general platitudes about attracting skilled workers.

A collateral question that arises is whether we really want or need to permanently attract skilled workers away from other countries. This policy seems at odds with our other efforts to help these countries improve their economic conditions. It seems to me that these countries need the services of their talented and trained people more than we do.

I think it is rather inconsistent on our part, Mr. President, to permit an increase in immigration—which is sure to be the effect of a more lenient immigration statute—at a time when we are becoming more and more aware of the population problems we are faced with

in the world and in this country. These problems are bound to increase in dimension in the years ahead. The continent with the highest birth rate in the world today is South America. Yet, under our present immigration laws, unlimited immigration is allowed to natives of Central and South American countries. It is time we were looking to this aspect of our immigration policy with a view to applying restrictions rather than trying to rectify discriminations against Asian and African countries that exist in our quota system. As I said earlier, I intend to support the application of a limitation on immigration from Western Hemispheric countries, but any change in our present immigration laws should be largely limited to just this aspect and should not encompass such a wholesale revision as that with which we are about to be faced.

Sooner or later, it seems to me, we are going to have to recognize the realities of this situation and to admit to ourselves that our first responsibility in matters of immigration is to the people of the United States and not to the entire population of the world. If we think that we are going to be able to alleviate the problems of expanding population of other countries of the world by permitting increased immigration into this country we have some more hard thinking to do on the subject. It would be completely unrealistic for us to attempt to do this when the current annual net increase in world population is 70 million people, or more than one-third of the present population of the United States. The plain fact is that the United States is not hurting for population or jobseekers. Our population is now between 190 and 200 million people, and our current birth rate is far in excess of our death rate.

The problems we face due to expanding population may not presently be as serious as those faced by other countries of the world. Our agricultural and other productive capacities have not yet been put to the test. But we are now experiencing a number of troubles which are directly or indirectly attributable to our increasing population. These include pollution of our rivers and streams, and the air we breathe in our great metropolitan areas; the first serious water shortages in the northeastern part of the country; progressive extinction of wildlife; and ever-increasing welfare costs as the nonproductive segments of our population continue to expand. A good deal of the legislation we have enacted in recent years has been directed toward finding solutions to these problems. Liberalizing our immigration policies cannot help but compound such problems.

In my opinion, revising our immigration laws by removing the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions will add to the many social problems that now confront us across the Nation. What effect will all the "new seed" immigrants that will be allowed to enter under the bill have upon these social crises? I doubt that they will add stability to our population in meeting these problems.

Moreover, the crime rate is increasing alarmingly in our urban centers. The great bulk of immigrants in recent years have settled in these metropolitan areas. I would not claim that, generally speaking, immigrants as a class are especially prone to criminal conduct, but I should think that their increased migration into the cities would add to the problems that are already there.

Another point raised by those who would have us scrap the national origins quota system is that a new system of selection will be devised which will be in the national interest. In other words, they would have us believe that our foreign policy will be ineffective and hampered if we retain the national origins quota system. This is pure drivel. Why have other advanced nations not felt it in the interest of their own foreign policies to let down their immigration bars? The plain fact is that there will always be cries of rage from people who would like to get into this country and cannot. One can live more comfortably on relief in a New York tenement than under the most advantageous conditions existing in most of the areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

We are also told that the proposed new immigration legislation is needed to reunite families. But the Congress of the United States has always been sympathetic to requests for entry of separated families. As to Italians, Lebanese, and other immigrants who wish to unite with their families already here, I have personally introduced legislation many times to reunite husbands and their wives, and parents and their children, and I shall continue to do so as the necessity arises. I believe that this system is workable and should be continued.

But, Mr. President, if we scuttle the national origins quota system, we will have many years and many reasons to regret it. I do not claim that the existing national origins quota system is perfect, but it has provided a reasonably effective means of controlling immigration, and where it has not worked, we have enacted special legislation to alleviate special problems as they have arisen.

The national interest must come first. Sentimental slogans have been all too adroitly exploited, and the time is at hand when we must resist the pressures for sharply increased immigration of persons with cultures, customs, and concepts of government altogether at variance with those of the basic American stocks. We must not throw open the gates to areas whose peoples would be undeniably more difficult for our population to assimilate and convert into patriotic Americans. The alien inflow to America from potential waiting lists of applicants from Jamaica, Trinidad, Tobago, Indonesia, India, Nigeria, and so forth, can profoundly affect the character of the American population, and, in the long run, can critically influence our concepts of government.

In my capacity as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I review, with other members of the committee, budgetary requirements for operations of various Federal departments and agencies. I feel it expedient that we consider the necessity of funding administrative costs arising from processing and admitting the increased number of immigrants which will certainly result from the enactment of the proposed legislation.

I ask also where the medical specialists are coming from, both here and abroad, to efficiently screen the state of physical and/or mental health of various immigrant applicants who are anticipated as being admissible under the changed wording of the areas of this bill dealing with physical and/or mental health and past history of mental illness? Any person who has ever reviewed court testimony by experts in the field of mental problems, mental health, mental capability to judge moral or legal responsibility, mental capacity for safe driving, and related problems, will well wonder what Pandora's box we may be opening.

I am advised that the term "mentally retarded" will be substituted for the term "feebleminded" in the exclusion of aliens who are feebleminded to conform to current American usage as in the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act of 1963—Public Law 88–164—and the Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963—Public Law 88–156. This may be a simple change in nomenclature, Mr. President, but its implications can be very significant. In the United States today, there are approximately 5 million persons in the largest group of mentally retarded, who, I am told, cannot usually be distinguished from the remainder of the population until they have difficulty in learning school subjects. To quote from President Kennedy's Panel on Mental Retardation in 1962:

> Without special attention, they often become the problem members of our society, capable only of a marginal productive role. They are the workers who are the most frequently displaced by the economic adjustments in our competitive society. However, given timely supervision, guidance and training early enough in life, many will be capable of complete assimilation into our society.

It is readily apparent, Mr. President, that under the proposed alteration in verbiage, we will facilitate the immigration of persons into our country who, to quote the 1962 panel, "often become the problem members of our society, capable only of a marginal productive role."

Of course, we are told that developments in the field of mental health are such that, with careful supervision, those mentally retarded persons admitted under the new immigration concept will be capable of assimilation into our society. The advocates of the proposed legislation assure us that the services necessary for the retarded immigrant child or adult will be provided without his becoming a public charge. But, Mr. President, I fear that the assurances of proper safeguards will not work out in actual practice as they are envisioned to do so in theory. It seems to me that we are making a serious mistake if we enact legislation which will result in adding to our already increasing burden of costs and care in the field of mental health, those immigrants who have histories of some form of mental illness. We must not overlook the fact that each young immigrant afflicted with some form of mental illness or retardation is a

potential parent of children who may inherit the same mental defects.

With reference to physical health, Mr. President, anyone who has traveled very broadly throughout the world can certainly find himself, or herself, wondering whether the very vocal advocates of an open door to the promise of America truly realize what the destruction of our present national origins quota system and the elimination of the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions may involve. As one example, Japan with its teeming millions, has so polluted its coastal waters that infectious hepatitis is indigenous to that area to such an extent that persons are warned against swimming in the waters, from drinking the water, from eating the seafood until it has been completely treated with heat, or otherwise, to destroy bacteria. And still the disease spreads. Recent newspaper photographs showed beaches in Japan, during a late summer hot spell, literally covered with human beings for miles of shoreline. The intense overpopulation has so increased the dangers of spreads of infections that it is not an uncommon sight to walk down Japanese streets, to ride street cars, to travel in trains, and see numbers of Japanese wearing gauze surgical masks as a primary means of reducing the dangers of epidemics.

I am not critical of the Japanese, nor of the Indians, for their overpopulation problem. I am truly sympathetic with them. But, even more important, I am concerned with the fact that these nations are now at a point where we in the United States are heading—and one only has to pick up our census reports and prognostications to learn this.

There are, of course, persons who sincerely believe that, because there has been some stabilization of applications for admissions to the United States, over the past several years, under our national origins quotas, there will be but a minute increase in applications for immigration into the United States, as a result of these proposed amendments.

However, the facts of our present immigration laws, and the policies under which they operate, are well known throughout the world and have for decades served as deterrents to many potential immigrants in their efforts to enter the United States.

The passage of the proposed legislation will remove these deterrents, and, in view of the fact that many northern European nations, under the present system, have unused quotas, I fear that the practical results of the new legislation will be a considerably increased immigration, in addition to the many serious concomitant problems, some of which I have discussed.

We take justifiable pride in the heritage of the American melting pot, but, unless the national origins quota system is maintained and unless limitations are placed on immigration from Western Hemispheric countries, the melting pot will no longer melt, and eventually ours will become a conglomerate, characterless society.

I believe deeply that we owe future generations the simple service of preserving the American heritage with its traditional social and political customs, its culture, and its national characteristics. Our national immigration policy must be an immigration policy that is in the national interest, and it must aim to establish the proper relationships between immigration and employment as well as between immigration and stable government.

Every 7½ seconds the clock in the U.S. Department of Commerce building in Washington records a new birth. Every 17 seconds one person dies in the United States. A foreign national enters the country every 90 seconds, and an immigrant leaves every 23 minutes. This all adds up to a net gain, I am told, of one every 12 seconds, which means a net annual increase of about 2.6 million. It is time that we awaken ourselves to the fact that future generations have no one to look to but ourselves for the preservation of the Nation, of liberty, freedom, and opportunity, and a republican form of government. Therefore, I intend to cast my vote, when the moment comes, against the proposal to scrap the national origins quota system because the proposed legislation will permit a greater inflow of immigrants from Asian and African countries and because our own problems of chronic and persistent unemployment and underemployment, housing, job retraining needs, growing welfare caseloads, crime, and juvenile delinquency are so great that we should not be considering any liberalization of the immigration laws.

I recognize that this is a very delicate issue and that the position I have taken will not be popular with some people, particularly those who misunderstand my reasons therefor. Nonetheless, I feel it my duty to vote against the proposed legislation, in my judgment, it not being in the best interests of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article entitled "The Situation as U.S. Population Nears 200 Million," published in the Washington Sunday Star of September 5, 1965.

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

THE SITUATION AS U.S. POPULATION NEARS 200 MILLION

Anyone contemplating a big celebration for the day when the U.S. population reaches 200 million should start planning fairly soon. According to the Population Reference Bureau, there are only about 21 months to go.

The 195 million mark was reached this month. At the present rate of growth the next 5 million needed to top 200 million would be added about May 1967.

Currently, the population is growing by about 7,200 a day, requiring some 700 days to accumulate a 5 million increase. The first census in 1790 enumerated 3.9 million persons. For two decades thereafter the Nation's growth averaged only about 450 persons a day, requiring 30 years to add 5 million. The birth rate around 1790 was more than twice as high as it is now. However, today's larger population base of 195 million can roll up a 5 million increase much faster than a base of 3.9 million.

Once a country's population passes the 100 million mark, even a moderate fertility rate produces a sizable numerical increase. India's population, for example, is increasing by 5 million every 150 days. If India suddenly cut both her birth rate and death rate in half, making them roughly equal to the U.S. rate (21.2 births and 9.4 deaths per 1,000 population), her population would still increase at well over 5 million a year. This is what comes of having a population of nearly half a billion. If population growth in the United States continues at the present rate, in just over 60 years this Nation will have as many people as India has today.

Japan, to take another example, has cut her birth rate to among the lowest in the world, 17.2. With a population just under 100 million, Japan will still realize a 5 million increase in 5½ years. In Canada, on the other hand, where the population is less than 20 million, it would take over 10 years at the current rate of growth to reach a total of 25 million.

U.S. RATE DECLINED

Around 1800, when the U.S. birth rate was over 50, the annual population increase was about 165,000. Today, with a moderate birth rate of 21.2, the increase is over 2.6 million each year.

The uncertainty of the family size preferences of upcoming parents makes the future of U.S. population growth difficult to predict. During the post-World War II baby boom, the U.S. birth rate reached 26.6 in 1947—the highest since 1921. Although the rate has declined somewhat in recent years, the population gain for the intercensal decade (1950–60) was an unprecedented 28 million—almost identical to the 28.5 million increase for the 20-year period, 1930–50.

While the birth rate has gone down since 1957 and shows no signs of leveling off, the rising tide of young women just entering the high-fertility age group, 20–29, is expected to make an impression on the total fertility of the Nation.

"The 195-million mark in August may become a turning point in U.S. population growth," according to Robert C. Cook, president of the Population Reference Bureau.

"In view of the very large fertility potential which now confronts us, the decades immediately ahead must be viewed as crucial ones," said Cook. "Even with a leveling off of the birth rate, we will be adding nearly 3 million a year to our population. If present trends continue, we will reach a growth level of 5 million a year during the last decade of the century." The highest projection of the Bureau of the Census, based on a return to the high-fertility rates of the postwar years, shows the U.S. population increasing by 7.5 million per year between 2000 and 2010.

DEPENDENT AGE GROUPS

At present, American parents of a newborn baby can expect their child to live past the age of 70. In 1900, life expectancy at birth was less than 50 years. The population aged 65 and over has increased by almost 500 percent since 1900, from 3 million to nearly 18 million. The number of children under 19 has risen from 34 million in 1900 to 77 million today.

The median age of the population is now 28.5 years and could drop to 25 years if U.S. fertility reverts to the postwar pattern. Thus, over half the population is in the dependent age groups of under 19 and over 65.

"Urban concentration is adding to the problems created by this socially demanding age structure," Cook said. "Over 70 percent of all Americans live in cities. Already we are nationally distraught by the perplexing problems of urban congestion, water shortage, juvenile crime, chronic deficiency in educational facilities, and inadequate care of the aged.

"Those who think growth to 195 million Americans should be celebrated with noisemakers and paper hats might well prepare

their children to celebrate the 400-million mark with padlocked personal water bottles and oxygen masks."

SCENIC DEVELOPMENT AND ROAD BEAUTIFICATION OF THE FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY SYSTEMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2084) to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, today the majority leader announced that tomorrow the Senate would begin the consideration of S. 2084, known as the highway beautification bill. I serve on the Committee on Public Works and voted to report the bill to the Senate.

In committee, I offered several amendments to the bill. Some were adopted, and I hope they will be maintained by the Senate. Other amendments that I offered were rejected and I expect to offer them on the floor of the Senate.

I strongly supported the first bill considered by Congress with respect to the beautification of highways. That was a bill that was introduced in the administration of President Eisenhower and provided for the control of advertising on the Interstate Highway System. The bill was strongly contested, but was passed by Congress.

In 1961 and again in 1963 I joined the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] in introducing bills to extend that act. Against strong opposition, our bills were approved by Congress.

The bill that will be considered tomorrow differs from the bill which was enacted in 1958 providing for the control of advertising on the Interstate Highway System. S. 2084, in title 1, would provide for Federal control of signs and billboards located in areas adjacent to both the interstate and primary highway systems within 660 feet of the nearest edge of the highway.

Title 2 provides for the screening or removal of junkyards located in areas within 1,000 feet of the nearest edge of the right-of-way.

Title 3 provides for the landscaping and the scenic enhancement of all Federal-aid highways.

The bill introduced on behalf of the administration provided that the cost of the program, with the exception of title 3, was to be borne by the Federal Government and the States from general appropriations in the same proportion as is now applicable to the construction of the two systems; that is, 90 percent by the Federal Government and 10 percent by the States with respect to the Interstate System, and 50 percent by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the States with respect to the primary system.

The full cost of title 3 for the landscaping and scenic enhancement of all Federal-aid roads would be borne wholly by the Federal Government.

The amounts authorized to be appropriated in the bill would be, for the Federal Government, $160 million for fiscal year 1966, $160 million for fiscal year 1967; and $40 million by the States in fiscal year 1966, and $40 million by the States in fiscal year 1967, or a total Federal cost of $320 million. This was admitted to be merely an estimate; the total cost of the entire program is speculative.

The bill would require that the States, through their legislatures, accept this program, if it should be enacted by Congress, by January 1, 1968. If the States did not accept the program, then all Federal funds, including matching funds, either for the Interstate Highway System, the primary system, the secondary system, or the urban system, would be denied the States, and these funds could be reapportioned among the complying States. I point this out because, worthy as the objectives of the bill are, the program is essentially mandatory upon the States. It requires them to accept the plan and also requires their legislatures to appropriate the money to pay the States' part of the program.

In committee, I offered several amendments. As I said, some of them were adopted. Today I wish to submit two amendments. The first amendment that I send to the desk would provide that the Federal Government pay the entire cost of the program. In the subcommittee, my amendment was adopted; but in the full committee, the action of the subcommittee was reversed. I should like to state briefly the reasons which led me to offer the amendment, and which will lead me to offer it tomorrow in the Senate.

First, this is a national program. It is so announced in the bill. It has been proclaimed by the President—and I think correctly so—that it is national in its scope. I think it should be considered as a national bill with the full cost to be paid by the Federal Government.

My second reason is that I believe this is the first bill of its type, that has been introduced in Congress, at least during during my stay here. Dozens of Federal-aid programs are actually in existence. They are voluntary programs in the sense that the State must accept them generally. The reasons for aceptance are strong, the States do accept them, and their legislatures provide the funds for the States share of the cost.

However, I do not consider this bill to be based on voluntary compliance—that is, one which the States can accept voluntarily.

It is declared that this is a national program; that the beautification of the highways is essential; and that the program should be accepted by Congress and then by the States. It may be argued that it is a voluntary program so far as the States are concerned, because the State legislatures must act to accept it. But I point out that the penalty—the denial of all highway funds to a State—does not give the States a chance to make voluntary decisions. It is, in effect, coercive, because no State could refuse to accept the program, and no State legislature could refuse to appropriate the money to pay its share of the cost; otherwise, the State would lose its entire apportionment for the construction of all Federal and State roads within its jurisdiction.

The chief reason that I believe the full cost should be paid by the Federal Government is the unusual character of the pending bill and the precedent that it could set if Congress were to declare that a program—perhaps one not as worthy as this—is essential to the national interest, and then, after enactment, require the States, pursuant to penalty, to accept the program and to appropriate money to pay for what in actuality is a Federal program. I believe we would be establishing an unusual precedent.

With all the dozens of Federal aid programs, I do not know of any other program in which a State is compelled to accept the program and to appropriate money for its share because of the penalty that would be imposed upon the State.

It might be said that we represent the States and that, therefore, we are adopting this program for the States. However, we cannot place ourselves in the position of substituting for State legislatures. I do not believe, as a matter of precedent, that we should impose upon the States this tremendous penalty which, in effect, would force them to accept this program.

I shall offer my amendment again tomorrow to require the Federal Government to pay the full cost of this program. I offered in the subcommittee another amendment which would extend the time for the removal of advertising and the screening of junkyards from 1970 to 1972.

I have noted in some articles that this has been termed an amendment to postpone the effective date of the highway beautification program. Of course, if one had read the bill, he would know that conclusion is not correct. The effective date for controls of advertising and the screening of junkyards remains the same—January 1, 1968. When the States act—and they are compelled to act under this bill on or before that date—this program of control would go into effect immediately.

My amendment would simply extend the time for the removal of the advertising and the screening of the junkyards for 2 years. I believe that we would have certain advantages by so doing. First, it would actually only extend the time only 2 years because if a legislature acts in 1966, as it could, 6 years would be provided for the removal of advertising or for the screening of junkyards. If a legislature were to act in 1967, there would be 5 years.

If this cost were to be placed in part upon the States—and the cost is speculative—it would simply give the States an additional 2 years in which to distribute the cost of the burden.

If my amendment should be agreed to, thus placing the entire cost on the Federal Government, we would give the Federal Government 2 years in which to distribute the cost of the entire program.

Considering the state of the deficit of the Federal Government and the state of the budgets of many States, I should think that this would be helpful to both State and Federal Governments.

Another reason for offering my amendment is that it has been stated by members of our staff—and it has been confirmed by representatives of the Department of Commerce—that a great deal of this type of outdoor advertising is based on a 5-year lease.

If my amendment should be agreed to, an additional number of contracts would expire and which would reduce the total final cost of the program.

I offered a third amendment in committee. It was rejected both in the subcommittee and in the full committee. However, I shall offer it again.

This amendment would provide that the same standards be maintained which were accepted by Congress when the Interstate Highway System was enacted. The bill before us is much less restrictive in its standards than the standards Congress adopted for the Interstate Highway System.

There may be some reason—and I understand that there are reasons—for making the requirements less stringent upon the primary system. The primary system has been in the course of development since 1921. It comprises approximately 225,000 miles of road, running through thousands of communities, in which the advertising, thus far, at least, has not been prohibited by any act of the Federal Government. It has been subject only to the zoning powers and the police powers of the State. These controls upon the primary system, taking into account its mileage and the passage of the roads through thousands of communities, and the establishment of advertising as a legitimate business should be less restrictive. However, I see no reason for the open end provision in this bill applying to the Interstate Highway System. I believe that it should be made clear that, under this bill, the States—and of course they act through their municipalities—can zone additional commercial areas along the interstate system.

With respect to the Interstate Highway System, this would mean that along this 41,000 miles of road, running mostly through open country, bypassing towns and cities, additional areas could be opened up for outdoor signs and billboards.

I believe that the Interstate Highway System should be at least kept as clear of advertising and junkyards as it is today under the existing law. However, this bill is less restrictive.

Mr. President, two amendments which I offered were accepted and incorporated in the bill. I hope that they will be agreed to in the Senate. One amendment was to give assistance to the traveling public on interstate highways. As one knows who travels the Interstate Highway System, there are directional signs, but they are of a general nature. Usually they indicate that fuel, food, and lodging, are available at the nearest town.

My amendment provides with respect to the Interstate System the Secretary, in consultation with the States, could designate an area at an appropriate distance from an interchange, and, in that area, signs could be established according to standards fixed by the Secretary to give specific information to the traveling public, such as the location of hospitals, motels, hotels, restaurants, and service stations. This is particularly important when we considered the fact that the traveling public uses to great extent credit card facilities.

This amendment was adopted by the full committee.

I had one other amendment which was accepted, and which I hope will be agreed to in the Senate. The bill which was introduced on behalf of the administration would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe standards for on-premise signs; that is, signs on an owner's premises of advertising the business or activity that he conducts on his own property.

Take, for example, the situation of a town or city traversed by a segment of the primary system, having a drugstore, a motel or a hotel, or any other business enterprise, owned and operated by an individual, who had erected signs to advertise his own business. The bill as introduced would have authorized the Secretary to prescribe standards for those signs, to require the owner to take down his signs and replace them at his own cost with signs conforming to the Secretary's standards.

When I brought that provision to the attention of the committee members, I am happy to say that they approved my amendment to remove this authority. I understand that this amendment is also acceptable to the administration.

Another question deserves the consideration of the Senate. Title II, providing that compensation to owners of junkyards shall be paid, also provides that the first $1,500 of cost should be paid by the owners. While this would reduce the cost to the Federal Government and the States, I doubt that such a provision would be sustained in the courts. The elements of "just compensation" have been determined by the courts in innumerable cases. I do not believe the courts would hold that $1,500 could be deducted from "just compensation." This should be removed from the bill.

I have filed individual views with the report, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the individual views of Mr. COOPER were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR JOHN SHERMAN COOPER TO S. 2084

I supported the objectives of S. 2084 and voted in the Public Works Committee to report it to the Senate. Nevertheless, I intend to offer amendments to the bill, as I did in committee, and one purpose of my individual views is to explain the reasons which I consider support the adoption of the amendments.

The bill before us, S. 2084, in its title I, provides for Federal control of advertising, displays, and devices in areas adjacent to the interstate and primary highway systems within 660 feet of the nearest edge of the right-of-way; title II provides for the screening or removal of junkyards in such areas within 1,000 feet of the nearest edge of the right-of-way; title III provides for landscaping and scenic enhancement of all Federal-aid highways. The cost of the first two programs is to be borne by the Federal Government and the States from general appropriations in the same proportion now applicable to the construction of the two systems—that is, 90 percent by the Federal Government and 10 percent by the States with respect to the Interstate System, and 50 percent by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the States with respect to the primary system. The full cost of the title III program is to be borne by the Federal Government. The amounts authorized to be appropriated for the three titles are, respectively: $20 million, $20 million, and $120 million through fiscal 1966; and $20 million, $20 million, and $120 million through fiscal 1967, a total cost to the Federal Government of $320 million, and to the States of $80 million for the next 2 fiscal years. It is admitted that the authorizations are estimates and that the total cost for the entire program is speculative.

It should be emphasized that S. 2084 differs in two important respects from Public Law 85–767 enacted by the Congress in 1958, and amended in 1959. Public Law 85–767 applied to the control of advertising only on the Interstate Highway System, comprising approximately 41,000 miles, while S. 2084 extends controls to the primary system, which includes the urban system of highways, and comprises approximately 224,000 miles. The second major difference, and one of great importance, is that Public Law 85–767, which expired on July 1, 1965, was a voluntary program which required the legislative consent of the States, while S. 2084, although requiring legislative action by the States by January 1, 1968, is essentially mandatory upon the States. This is its effect, for upon failure to adopt the Federal plan, all funds apportioned to the State for the Interstate Highway System, the primary system and the secondary system, would be withheld and, at such time as fixed by the Secretary of Commerce, would be reapportioned to States complying with S. 2084. As I shall point out later, this is an unusual and coercive condition which I do not believe is applied to the States under any other Federal-aid program.

I supported Public Law 85–767, the first road beautification bill, one proposed by President Eisenhower. In 1961, and again in 1963, I joined with Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER in introducing bills to extend the provisions of the act for additional 2-year periods, and they were adopted against strong opposition. Twenty-five States, including my State of Kentucky, voluntarily accepted Public Law 85–767 by legislative action. These States have exercised the advertising controls required by the act, either by providing compensation to the advertising businesses and property owners affected, or without compensation under their police powers.

COMPENSATION

S. 2084, as reported, provides for compensation to sign owners and property owners where advertising is required to be removed, and for compensation to junkyard owners and property owners where screening or removal is required. The original bill proposed by the administration authorized the use of the States' police powers to effect removal of advertising and screening of junkyards, without requiring compensation. I introduced in the Senate an amendment requiring just compensation. I support the committee amendment requiring just compensation, although the committee language differs from the language of my amendment. The acceptance by the committee of the principle of just compensation evidently took into account the situation existing on the primary system, which has been developing since 1921. It passes through thousands of cities and communities

throughout the United States. Advertising on the primary system has been accepted throughout the years as a legitimate business, and as useful to the traveling public, and has not been heretofore prohibited except through the zoning powers of the States. It is proper and just that the taking of the property rights of the sign owners and land owners should be accompanied by compensation.

COST

The principle of compensation having been agreed to by the committee, the question arose—who should pay compensation? As I have noted, the bill introduced on behalf of the administration provided that with respect to titles I and II, the cost should be allocated between the Federal Government and the States, 90–10 percent with respect to the Interstate System and 50–50 percent with respect to the primary system. This requirement presumably follows the analogy of the division of cost for the construction of the two systems.

I introduced in the committee an amendment providing that the full cost of the title I and title II programs be paid by the Federal Government. My amendment was adopted in the subcommittee, but the full committee reversed the decision of the subcommittee. I shall offer my amendment on the Senate floor and for the following reasons:

1. The program to be completed within a limited period is a national program of beautification reflecting a national policy which the bill declares. Although it is a program of worthy objectives, with which I agree, it is not a program which has been proposed or voluntarily accepted by the States.

2. The existing Federal-State programs for the apportionment of the cost of construction of the Federal-aid system between the Federal Government and the States is not a true analogy with respect to the beautification program intended by S. 2084. Residents of States have a direct interest in the construction of the interstate and primary systems, more specifically in the primary system, as they are needed to serve the local economy, and the traveling public in the actual use of the roads. The States propose the initiation of construction of segments of the primary systems, basically because of State and local needs, paying 50 percent of the cost, and receiving aid from the Federal Government. But the choice of initiating a particular segment of the primary system and providing appropriations for its share of the cost, rests with the State. The Interstate System has been established to join the States and their principal cities in the interest of interstate communication and defense and, as the payment of 90 percent of its cost by the Federal Government indicates, it is a national rather than a local system of roads.

The esthetic values of beautification, and they are important and should be achieved, do not directly affect the economic use of the highways. Title III of the bill, which provides for landscaping and scenic enhancement of all Federal-aid highways, as part of the national beautification program, recognizes this fact. It specifies that the entire cost shall be borne by the Federal Government. In reality, all three titles represent integral parts of one program and one national policy.

3. The division of cost between the States and Federal Government with respect to the construction of the Federal-aid highway system is measured by accepted factors, largely determined by mileage, such as the cost of rights-of-way and construction. The cost of beautification under titles I and II bears no relation to these known factors, but instead will be determined by the number and investment cost of signs and billboards and of junkyards. The expenditure for some States will be proportionately much larger than others, dependent upon the volume of existing advertising, and the number and size of the junkyards.

4. A principle and a precedent are involved in requiring the States to pay a proportionate share of the costs of titles I and II. It is that the Federal Government, through the Congress, can require mandatorily that the States take legislative action to appropriate funds for a program declared national and essential by the Congress. It may be argued that the States will accept the program voluntarily by legislative action. But the fact is that the provision requiring the cutoff of all Federal-aid funds for the construction of necessary interstate and primary roads is an instrument of such coercive strength that no State could refuse to appropriate its share of the cost required by the committee bill.

This is illustrated by the following table from Senate Report No. 1162, accompanying H.R. 10503, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1964, showing the approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds to be made for fiscal year 1967:

Approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds, fiscal year 1967

[Thousands of dollars]

State	A–B–C, pursuant to H.R. 10503				Interstate[1] (2,900,000)	Total (3,900,000)
	Primary (450,000)	Secondary (300,000)	Urban (250,000)	Subtotal (1,000,000)		
Alabama	8,536	6,522	3,361	18,419	59,673	78,092
Alaska	24,019	16,119	164	40,302		40,302
Arizona	6,509	4,220	1,869	12,598	40,505	53,103
Arkansas	6,404	5,098	1,362	12,864	30,193	43,057
California	22,693	10,486	27,062	60,241	275,823	336,064
Colorado	7,405	4,802	2,545	14,752	38,249	53,001
Connecticut	3,338	1,833	3,937	9,108	40,734	49,842
Delaware	2,216	1,478	574	4,268	10,740	15,008
Florida	8,217	5,089	7,030	20,336	59,844	80,180
Georgia	11,439	8,598	4,051	24,088	53,159	77,247
Hawaii	2,216	1,478	928	4,622	22,652	27,274
Idaho	4,948	3,551	528	9,027	13,540	22,567
Illinois	16,805	9,213	16,053	42,071	150,480	192,551
Indiana	10,043	7,267	5,610	22,920	71,441	94,361
Iowa	10,058	7,493	2,672	20,223	36,506	56,729
Kansas	9,937	6,942	2,453	19,332	22,366	41,698
Kentucky	7,250	6,155	2,496	15,901	58,844	74,745
Louisiana	6,671	4,799	3,913	15,383	83,324	98,707
Maine	3,307	2,511	848	6,666	13,626	20,292
Maryland	4,459	2,798	4,521	11,778	52,845	64,623
Massachusetts	5,682	2,520	8,627	16,829	61,815	78,614
Michigan	13,836	8,689	11,337	33,862	112,403	146,265
Minnesota	11,217	7,908	4,098	23,223	74,612	97,835
Mississippi	7,056	5,911	1,468	14,435	35,050	49,485
Missouri	11,865	8,122	5,555	25,542	73,782	99,324
Montana	8,144	5,651	572	14,367	26,994	41,361
Nebraska	8,031	5,724	1,442	15,197	16,853	32,050
Nevada	5,113	3,400	377	8,890	14,539	23,439
New Hampshire	2,216	1,478	661	4,355	12,940	17,295
New Jersey	6,341	2,201	10,742	19,284	75,211	94,495
New Mexico	6,824	4,605	1,209	12,638	28,794	41,432
New York	20,217	8,806	28,794	57,817	136,683	194,500
North Carolina	10,412	9,320	3,279	23,011	23,594	46,605
North Dakota	5,633	4,130	439	10,202	12,740	22,942
Ohio	15,653	9,768	14,128	39,549	196,870	236,419
Oklahoma	8,893	6,191	2,758	17,842	34,707	52,549
Oregon	6,797	4,753	2,089	13,639	50,103	63,742
Pennsylvania	16,278	10,434	15,911	42,623	129,028	171,651
Rhode Island	2,216	1,478	1,503	5,197	10,626	15,823
South Carolina	5,691	4,970	1,790	12,451	24,909	37,360
South Dakota	6,165	4,465	455	11,085	18,939	30,024
Tennessee	8,847	6,966	3,561	19,374	72,698	92,072
Texas	26,909	16,998	13,894	57,801	130,513	188,314
Utah	4,846	3,143	1,304	9,293	41,762	51,055
Vermont	2,216	1,478	268	3,962	19,909	23,871
Virginia	8,829	6,846	4,334	20,009	87,666	107,675
Washington	7,072	4,780	3,740	15,592	60,129	75,721
West Virginia	4,446	3,979	1,316	9,741	43,419	53,160
Wisconsin	9,863	6,962	4,837	21,662	25,509	47,171
Wyoming	5,040	3,429	295	8,764	27,679	36,443
District of Columbia	2,216	1,478	1,569	5,263	41,476	46,739
Puerto Rico	2,216	2,465	1,921	6,602		6,602

[1] Based upon the total cost estimate. These will be revised by the 1965 cost estimate now being prepared for submission to the Congress in January 1965.

Dozens of Federal-State aid plans have been enacted by the Congress. These plans are based upon agreement between the Federal Government and the States. I do not know of any Federal-aid program, in existence or proposed, with the exception of this bill, which requires States to take legislative action and make appropriations under penalty of losing Federal-aid available under another program.

A very basic question is involved in this requirement of S. 2080. Should the Federal Government, by the imposition of penalties, require a State to appropriate funds to support a program, worthy as it may be, determined by the executive branch and the Congress to be a matter of national interest? This precedent, if established, could be applied in the future to programs less worthy, if the Congress so determined. It may be argued that Members of the Congress, as representatives of the States, are acting for the States, but I know of no authority we have to substitute ourselves for State legislatures, and require mandatorily State appropriations for national programs, established by the Congress.

For these reasons, I believe that the Federal Government should pay the entire cost. The program is national in scope and for the benefit of all of the traveling public throughout the United States.

EXTENSION OF TIME

The full committee rejected an amendment which I offered to extend the time for the removal of advertising and the screening of junkyards from 1970 to 1972 which had been previously considered and adopted by the Subcommittee. As this amendment has been characterized incorrectly as one to delay control, I point out its correct purposes. The amendment would not change the basic provision that States, in order to receive

Federal-aid funds, must institute mandatory controls by January 1968. At that time the program would become effective in all States complying. My amendment would extend from 1970 to 1972, the time for the removal of prohibited advertising, and the time for the removal or screening of junkyards.

Whether the States are to bear a proportionate part of the cost, or all is to be borne by the Federal Government, the cost would be distributed over a 4-year period rather than a 2- or 3-year period as provided by the committee bill. Taking into account the state of the Federal budget and many State budgets, my amendment would lessen their burden. Second, as a larger number of outdoor sign owners and property owners would complete their contracts by 1972 than by 1970 (I am informed by the committee staff that the usual term is 5 years), the cost of the program would be reduced. Third, the short-time extension would allow the private industry affected a more reasonable time to adapt their operations, particularly upon the primary system, and I believe this is fair.

MAINTAINING INTERSTATE SYSTEM STANDARDS

S. 2084 is less restrictive upon advertising and junkyards on the Interstate System than Public Law 85–767. For this reason, I offered in committee an amendment which proposed that the standards adopted by the Congress under Public Law 85–767 be maintained with respect to the zoning of areas adjacent to the Interstate System.

In my view, Congress should maintain the Interstate System free from additional commercial signs and billboards. S. 2084 is less restrictive than Public Law 85–767, as it would enable the States to zone additional areas along the Interstate Highway System on which commercial signs and billboards may be erected.

I believe it important that we recall the basic distinction between the Interstate System and the primary system. The Interstate System was authorized by the Congress in 1956 to provide for the national transportation and defense needs of the country. Its 41,000 miles bypass cities and traverse, for the most part, open and sparsely populated areas which had not been used for advertising purposes. The primary system, on the other hand, has been in course of development since 1921. Its 224,000 miles, including the urban system, pass through thousands of towns and cities and industrial and commercial areas where outdoor advertising has been long established.

Section 131(b) of Public Law 85–767 and section 131(a) exempt certain segments of the Interstate System from the control provisions of section 131(a). The exempted areas include the following:

1. Segments of the Interstate System constructed on rights-of-way acquired prior to July 1, 1956.

2. Segments of the Interstate System which "traverse commercial or industrial zones within the presently existing boundaries of incorporated municipalities wherein the use of real property adjacent to the Interstate System is subject to municipal regulation or control."

3. Segments "which traverse other areas where the land use, as of the date of the approval of this act, is clearly established by State law as industrial commercial."

The pending bill broadens the exemption by including the following:

1. Areas "zoned industrial or commercial under authority of State law."

2. Areas unzoned but "used for industrial or commercial activities, as determined in accordance with provisions established by the legislatures of the several States, which shall be consistent with the purposes of this act."

Under Public Law 85–767 the exemption for commercial or industrial zoning on the Interstate System is limited to areas subject to municipal regulation or control within the municipality's boundaries then existing at the time of the effective date of the act, viz, 1958, and to those areas clearly established by State law as industrial or commercial as of 1958. Although the committee bill removes the exemption with respect to those segments of the system constructed on rights-of-way acquired prior to July 1, 1956, nevertheless the old law is more restrictive: first, in limiting the areas eligible to be zoned industrial and commerical and, secondly, in establishing a cutoff date of 1958 with respect to future zoning. Without a cutoff date the committee bill would authorize future zoning of additional areas adjacent to the Interstate System upon which outdoor advertising may be displayed.

Let it be remembered that State legislatures will not zone specific areas on Interstate roads. Municipalities, counties, and townships, authorized by the State legislatures, will exercise the power to establish additional commercial and industrial zones, exempt from the controls of S. 2084. This open-end authority should not be permitted with respect to the Interstate System.

I offered in committee amendments which were adopted, and which I hope will be maintained.

DIRECTIONAL SIGNS ON THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

In place of the present system of permitting only signs on the Interstate System indicating "fuel, food, and lodging," the committee adopted my amendment to require the Secretary, in consultation with the States, to "provide for an area at an appropriate distance from an interchange on the Interstate System on which signs, displays, and devices giving specific information in the interest of the traveling public may be erected and maintained." To avoid possible abuse, these signs will conform to national standards promulgated by the Secretary. Establishments such as motels, hotels, service stations, restaurants, and hospitals in communities bypassed by the Interstate System would be afforded an opportunity to have their services notified to the traveling public under appropriate standards.

ON-PREMISE SIGNS

The committee agreed to an amendment I introduced, striking the section empowering the Secretary to set national standards concerning number, size and lighting of on-premise advertising—that is, advertising by the owner on his property concerning his business activities conducted on his property. Under the original bill the Secretary was authorized to prescribe the types of signs which commercial and business establishments, located along the primary system, could display on their property advertising their products and services. In cases where the property owner's signs did not conform with the Secretary's standards, the property owner could be required to remove, at his expense, such signs and, where replaced, by signs meeting the Secretary's standards. The States have power to exercise such authority, and such controls, by zoning or other methods under their police powers. I do not consider it proper that the Federal Government be given authority to prescribe to property owners the manner in which they may advertise legitimate business activities conducted by them on their own property.

Mr. COOPER. To close, I say again that I have always supported the principle of the beautification of our highways. I have introduced bills to that effect, and they have been passed against very strong opposition. But I have noted what I believe to be undesirable effects in the bill before the Senate. I proposed corrective amendments in committee, and those which were not accepted I shall offer again on the floor of the Senate, unless, prior to the time when the Senate considers and takes action upon this bill, the administration itself takes action to remove some of the provisions of the bill which I do not deem proper.

I do not wish to extend my remarks further, but to point out again the very unusual character of the bill. I doubt if any bill has ever been passed which allowed the Federal Government to prescribe a program for the whole Nation, essential and worthy though it might be, and then fix a penalty on the States so that their legislatures would be required in effect to appropriate money for the payment of the costs assigned the States by the Federal Government.

NOMINATION OF DAVID W. BRESS, TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, recently President Johnson sent to the Senate the nomination of David W. Bress to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

In today's Des Moines Register, there is an article by the distinguished reporter Mr. Clark Mollenhoff of the Register's Washington Bureau, which brings out that Mr. Bress was the lawyer of record for the Serv U Corp. from October of 1963 until last December. This is the corporation which was controlled by Bobby Baker, and it was involved in litigation with one of Mr. Baker's former associates. The case was apparently settled without going to trial last December.

What is important to note, however, is that Mr. Baker is involved in grand jury proceedings here in the District of Columbia, and any prosecution which might grow out of these proceedings would be under the jurisdiction of the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

In such an event, Mr. Bress and his staff would be placed in a most difficult position. Actions involved in the subject of a prosecution could have arisen at the time he was representing Mr. Baker's Serv U Corp. These actions might involve the corporation. This could well involve a conflict of interest. Other members of Mr. Bress' staff would, as his employees, and subject to his control, be deprived of that freedom from suspicion which must exist in the public mind if confidence in our system of justice is to be preserved.

Also, if Mr. Bress should take office prior to the conclusion of the grand jury proceedings, a foundation for suspicion in the public mind would be laid if these proceedings do not result in an indictment, or in an indictment for a less serious violation of law than some members of the public might think proper.

Under the circumstances, it would seem to me that action on this nomination should be held up pending grand jury action and any prosecution which might arise out of the grand jury's deliberations. I would hope that this could be done so that Mr. Bress when he takes office, will do so under the very best of circumstances.

DEAN RUSK: L.B.J.'S "JUST-A-MINUTE MAN"

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in an article in last Sunday's New York Times, Max Frankel has brilliantly discussed the Secretary of State Dean Rusk. The article is happily titled "The President's Just-a-Minute Man." And this quality of a loyal but extraordinarily competent and remarkably informed Secretary of State who has the character to disagree with the President when he is convinced he should—this rarely appreciated quality of Mr. Rusk is well documented by Mr. Frankel.

Mr. President this article helped me greatly to understand the contribution Mr. Rusk makes to our foreign policy, how he recognizes that the President—not the Secretary of State must really run America's foreign policy program. It explains how the strong and able Secretary of Defense fully understands that his Department must be subordinate in a real sense to the State Department in military as well as foreign policy. And it shows how and why Dean Rusk has worked so well with the Congress as well as the Pentagon and the President.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S "JUST-A-MINUTE MAN"

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON.—Ironically but characteristically, Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State, became the subject of lively controversy here this summer not because of anything he did or decided but simply because of what he is—a decent, dignified, dogged, self-effacing, circumspect and dispassionate manager of the international diplomacy of the United States.

Typically, this personalized controversy pained him deeply, but typically, too, it seemed to buttress his standing in the Government, particularly with Lyndon B. Johnson. For the first time in 5 years public men were moved to take a position on Dean Rusk and they rallied to his side. Incidentally, therefore, the brief flurry of attention provided a focus for appraisal of a man whose bland exterior has defied penetration even by some of his closest associates.

The Washington ruckus that Rusk had for so long eluded was triggered by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.'s public recollection that President Kennedy had planned to find a new Secretary of State after the 1964 election and had really wished he could do so even sooner. That single piece of gossip from the former President's aide, a historian, gave wing to the rest of his magazine memoir, a polemic against the timidity and sluggishness of American diplomats and a portrait of Rusk as their honorable and talented, but insufficient, leader.

Actually, there was nothing novel about Schlesinger's catalogue of credits and complaints, except his ability to attribute many of them to Mr. Kennedy, who had appointed and, despite his evident doubt, retained Rusk as the leading member of his Cabinet.

No one who has known Rusk has failed to like him or to respect his mastery of the technical details of innumerable foreign-affairs problems, his gift for concise and persuasive exposition, his extraordinary diligence, his patient yet skillful deportment as a negotiator, his remarkably happy relations with the Congress and the Pentagon—two traditional citadels of hostility toward a Secretary of State—and his inherent courtesy, gentility and durability.

But neither could anyone long in Washington have failed to encounter, now here, now there, the harsher judgments that Schlesinger collected, namely that Rusk was unsuited for command, that he rarely had strong views and rarely argued a position with adequate force, that he was reluctant to decide and wholly unwilling to confide in his subordinates, that his thoughts tended to be conventional and his assertions pedestrian, and that his instincts for service instead of self-assertion had made him all his life the ideal Chief of Staff, the perfect No. 2 man.

This slapdash list of virtues and deficiencies, though contradictory in some important respects, is widely accepted here as a fair evaluation of Dean Rusk. Much of the furor about the Schlesinger article dealt with the value and propriety of citing a dead President's random judgments of an important official now serving another administration. But the endless waves of Washington gossip had rolled over Dean Rusk many times before, questioning his influence and estimating his net worth and thus creating the impression that no one here would be surprised either by his dismissal tomorrow morning or his survival through one or even two Johnson terms, longer than any predecessor.

Rusk's studied reticence and political pallor have made many of the complaints appear credible, especially since he has had to labor in the shadows of first a dynamic President and now an overbearing one. Neither President, however, was easily persuaded to exchange Rusk's experience and demonstrated value for the more flamboyant but unpredictable talents of another man. And both Presidents did their best to protect the Secretary from the gossip that he himself has scrupulously ignored.

"The things that man puts up with," President Johnson remarked recently. "The way they talk about him, even in his own Department. I said to him the other day, 'Dean, I hope the next time they'll say something about your wife or daughter. I want to see you get mad, just once.' And he just sits there and laughs.

"He's kind, maybe too kind. Decent. He's got the compassion of a preacher.

"He's got courage. A Georgia cracker. When you're going in with the marines he's the kind you want at your side * * *.

"And he's also the man, like Sam Rayburn used to say, whom you look to, when you're all set on something, to speak up calm and say, 'Now, just a minute.' He's the just-a-minute-man around here, not feisty like McNamara and Bundy."

"Besides," the President continued, without a smile, "even if I did want to get rid of him, my wife wouldn't let me. She loves that man like her daddy. He's No. 1 in the Cabinet, not only in protocol, but in the heart of his President."

Dean Rusk has sat serenely through the public arguments, as he has through much private though more substantial debate. He countered Schlesinger with the simple remark that no President, colleague or foreigner would ever find Dean Rusk betraying a confidential comment (but also by deciding, after much hesitation, that he would record his views and have his say—for history).

Rusk is forever mindful of the fact that he is a poor boy off a tenant farm in Georgia, become the 54th Secretary of State of the United States, that he is the creature and the agent of a Presidency that he reveres and the representative of a nation whose ideals of law and order, charity and civility he not only upholds publicly but worships privately. The Secretary of State of the United States simply does not get mad or rattled, and he does not argue, least of all for himself.

"Dean is almost egoistic about denying the ego," says a colleague.

"The course of wisdom," Dean Rusk has said, "lies in reducing the impact which accidents of personality have upon the relations among nations. * * * National interests reach far beyond the idiosyncrasies of holders of public office. * * * One of the purposes of diplomacy, including its elaborate formality and high style, is to exclude from great affairs of state the many irrelevancies which spring from human frailty."

As he makes this point, at times defensively, at times didactically, Rusk probably has in mind the accidents that placed him atop the State Department, midst the desks and chairs of illustrious predecessors like Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and John Quincy Adams and midst the portraits of commanding Secretaries who raised him through the bureaucracy and into the American establishment, George Marshall, Dean Acheson, and John Foster Dulles.

Much of his conduct in office is self-consciously patterned after General Marshall's, especially the aloofness from subordinates, the dignified silence toward critics, the fierce loyalty to the President, the impatience with academic distinctions between military and political sides of a problem, and, always, the self-control. Much of Rusk's careful and successful coordination with the Congress and the Defense Department is obviously a reaction to the disastrous experiences of Dean Acheson with both. And much of his fear of "making policy by phrase" and flamboyant rhetoric is clearly a reaction to John Foster Dulles' troublesome penchant for slogans such as "massive retaliation," "brinkmanship," "rollback," and the like.

Yet, like all men, Rusk has probably defined his job to himself by stressing the qualities that come most easily to him. "Rusty" Rusk at Boys' High in Atlanta was no rugcutter. He was a lanky, freckled lad remembered for his inquisitiveness and maturity and his determination to reach Davidson College in North Carolina, "the poor man's Princeton" that his father had attended, and then Oxford, by the only financial route possible, as a Rhodes scholar. He did.

Even at the age of 29, sobriety must have been written all over the face of Prof. Dean Rusk at Mills, a girls' college in Oakland, Calif., for they made him dean of faculty. And then came that charming, revealing effort to serve decorum by reviving his given name, David D. Rusk. It failed because "Dean Dean" was just too tempting for most of the students, including the former Virginia Foisie, of Seattle, who became Mrs. Rusk after a discreet campus courtship.

Not derring-do but dutiful, intelligent, and diligent staff work with Gen. Joseph Stillwell's international command in Burma made him Colonel Rusk in World War II. And then, after 6 years of sub-Cabinet assignments in the Defense and State Departments, he seemed to fit comfortably into the prudent mold of the Rockefeller Foundation, where he dispensed cautious charity as President Rusk.

"Only small things ever irritate Dean," Mrs. Rusk has observed, "petty annoyances, say, like taking a shortcut that turns out to be the longest way around." Even then, however, it takes a trained eye to detect impatience in the quickening puffs on the chain of Chesterfields or in the surest sign of all, a sudden silence.

The stolid record and reticent manner are complemented by a mild appearance. Rusk stands 6 feet 1 inch, tall without towering; he weighs 195 pounds, sturdy but not stately. (He was, he says, "the last of the midget centers" in college basketball.) The figure is cut down by the suit—loose, large, and square—and by the round and open face and bald brow. (With an apron, they were saying, when he joined the Kennedy team, he could pass for your friendly neighborhood bartender.)

His deportment is courtly, his tone is even, his accent is lightly Georgian, his grammar is often conditional ("I would think that the answer to that would probably be "No"). The eyes are deep and wary until they grasp the circumstance or the purpose of an inquiry, but a thin smile is always poised. With a rebuke, the smile grows broader; with a jest, crinkles fan from eye to temple and the shoulders heave first up, then down.

Unseen, and therefore often unnoticed, is the sturdy backbone. In the defense of national interest as he perceives it, Rusk is, quite simply, tough. There is an ever-present readiness to contemplate the necessity of supporting diplomatic objectives with military power; there is a stern expectation that foreign governments and leaders will be accountable for their words and deeds, and there is a fierce endurance of tedious repetition and negotiation to protect sound positions against the widespread passion for novelty.

It is Rusk's veiled strength that most impresses the handful of men who deal with him regularly, up close. Invariably, they begin a description of him with the remark that "he's a lot tougher than he looks, you know." Probably it is because his appearance and self-control have so often been mistaken for vacillation and infirmity that Rusk has an abiding fear that his country's inherent decency, indulgent democracy and desire for peace will be mistaken for docility and weakness and invite the kind of attack that will draw it into war. That thought has preoccupied him in every major crisis.

No single incident, however, can gage the range of Rusk's wisdom or the temper of his toughness. Hardly any single foreign affairs crisis, policy, decision or achievement of the past 5 years bears the personal imprint of the Secretary of State. No major public utterance by him marks a turn in the Nation's diplomacy. No office of the Department of State, not even his own, has been shaped in his image.

Understanding the American Secretary of State, therefore, requires a sense of Cherokee County, Ga., where Dean Rusk ran about in flour-sack underwear under the constant admonition of his father—a Presbyterian preacher diverted to farmer and mail carrier—to be morally firm and to excel.

It requires a sense of the pride and feeling of privilege with which Dean Rusk wore the uniform of an ROTC cadet, from high school on; of the youthful debater defending the League of Nations in isolationist America, and the Rhodes scholar studying ways of achieving peace and finding his formula in the Oxonian norms of international law and order and trust among honorable men. It requires an awareness of how Dean Rusk came within 3 days of joining the Regular Army after World War II, aiming to become General Rusk, until his idol, General Marshall, called him to the State Department.

It requires a sense of this Spartan man of 56 being tied by phone and radio to the alarms of a thermonuclear world, even while catching snatches of a Yankee game from a pocket transistor in his official Cadillac or while hiking occasionally across a suburban golf course.

And it requires a sense of nuclear-age diplomacy, which politicians understandably find fluffy. Politicians play in a world of climax-by-election and by norms of compromise and conciliation derived from a common, national law. Diplomats, in contrast, are forever trying to cope with societies that they never really understand and to influence governments almost always beyond their control.

The politician yearns for quick results and public acclaim. The diplomat usually wants to smother conflict in calculated confusion and yearns for privacy and anonymity until subtle and gradual accommodations are achieved.

That is why the State Department, even at its best, has been inside, as outside, a shapeless hulk. Six thousand persons, of a worldwide diplomatic force of 24,000, labor in its antiseptic offices in uncertain coordination, processing a daily flow of 3,000 messages and many more homegrown papers in Kafkaesque pursuit not of climactic decisions but of attitudes and ideas that might impress or influence foreign friends and foes.

Ideally, it is the Secretary of State's task to try to control that process as well as the Nation's more active programs of foreign aid and propaganda, in collaboration or competition with the Departments of Defense, Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce, a dozen entrenched intelligence services, scores of congressional committees and hundreds of private pressure groups. It is the Secretary's job to be the President's principal foreign policy adviser and deviser, the Nation's chief negotiator, the diplomatic world's most-prized host and visitor and, on the crucial issues of peace and war, the administrator's foremost expositor.

Few men, if any, can bear this load without concentrating on some parts of the job at the expense of other parts. That has been especially evident since World War II propelled the United States toward relations with 110 countries (and conflict with a handful of others that it does not formally recognize), and since the political and military importance of those relations and conflicts have made most postwar Presidents wish to be, quite literally, their own Secretaries of State.

Rusk came to the job fully aware of its absurdly great dimensions. His temperament, and the circumstances of his appointment have governed his selection of preferred duties. Only two Secretaries before him and only one President before his own, he told himself, had had to navigate in a nuclear world without a nuclear weapons monopoly, a world in which every major crisis implied the risk of disaster and in which the lines between domestic and foreign affairs, between peace and war and between victory and defeat had become dismayingly blurred. In such murky seas he could be the navigator, but never the captain.

He came unknown to President Kennedy and to the public, with no independent political standing, ambition or—most important, perhaps—opposition. He was recommended by Dean Acheson and Robert A. Lovett, activists who remembered him for adroit and forceful management of Far East policies at the start of the Korean war. Clearly, however, he was hired back from the Rockefeller Foundation because he posed no personality challenge to the eager young President.

Kennedy in 1960 wanted no rival at State; his political obligations to such well-established figures as former Governors Stevenson, Harriman, Bowles, and Williams were paid off with lesser foreign policy posts in the Department. Only then, after a half-hour get-acquainted meeting and a glance through something Dean Rusk had written 8 months earlier, Kennedy made his choice.

The impressive article that Rusk had published in the quarterly magazine, Foreign Affairs, made this central point: "While Mr. Truman's remark, 'The President makes foreign policy,' is not the whole story, it serves very well if one wishes to deal with the matter in five words." To the surprise of many and the dismay of some, Rusk meant it, all five words of it.

He believed then and still believes that the President makes, manages and alters policy, pronounces it and leads in legislating it. He believes that the Secretary of State can be the President's principal assistant and chief adviser and foreman in directing the more routine business with other governments, with a duty, however, not only to defer to the President but to expose him to significant differences of opinion and to help him to select from among possible alternatives.

Circumstances and temperament thus led Rusk to choose for himself a clearly subordinate and collegial role to be limited and shaped not only by the President but by his fellow counselors and, to some extent, by events.

It was a painful role at the start. The young men of the New Frontier in the White House, the Defense Department and even the Justice Department under the President's brother, Attorney General ROBERT F. KENNEDY, ran wildly through Rusk's preserve, trying to get the country moving with ideas, innovations, initiatives, while Rusk was settling into office with a warning to the Foreign Service that "an idea is not a policy" and that "the transformation of an idea into a policy is frequently an exhausting and frustrating process." That transformation, and not innovation, was his main concern.

"The pilot of a jet aircraft has a checklist of many dozens of questions which he must answer satisfactorily before he takes off his plane on a flight," he remarked in discussing policy machinery. "Would it not be interesting and revealing if we had a checklist of questions which we should answer systematically before we take off on a policy?"

Rusk came opposed to the then universal but spasmodic yearning for summit meetings. He came determined to cut down even the travels of the Secretary of State. He brought doubts and suspicions about some of his predecessors' hastily constructed military alliances around the world. He arrived with a strong bias for professional and quiet diplomacy, and an apparent desire to work slowly, events and the President permitting, to develop a respectful new relationship with the Soviet Union, a constructive partnership with Western Europe, a hardheaded but not moralistic approach to the uncommitted nations and, with time, possibly even the beginnings of a relationship with Communist China.

Yet within a few months Rusk found himself rushing around the world as frequently as John Foster Dulles while his President rushed off to an ill-considered summit conference with Nikita Khrushchev. The diplomatic tinkering that Rusk had hoped for in dealings with both Western and Eastern Europe became impossible and the faint efforts to evolve a new Far Eastern position, beginning with the recognition of Outer Mongolia, were shot out from under him by more aggressive politicians.

The checklist theory of diplomacy had really been destroyed by the disastrous adventure of the Bay of Pigs invasion, which Rusk, against his better judgment and along with most other Kennedy aides, had failed to question. On the night of the Cuba crash he showed one side of his steadfast character when he asserted of President Kennedy, with rare passion, "What matters now is this man. We have to save this man."

But Kennedy sought to save himself by multiplying the channels of advice and information, a technique that conferred no special status even on the Secretary of State. Rusk found himself competing with better known and more socially attuned and more outspoken men. His weapons were patience, a restrained pride, expertise, and an impressive ability to impress the wise and foolish alike among foreign diplomats and Members of Congress.

He might never have gained his balance on the New Frontier if not for the Berlin crisis, which rapidly became Kennedy's most hazardous foreign problem and was an almost perfect outlet for Rusk's diplomatic temperament. Along with others, the Secretary urged the appropriate demonstration of force that he believes to be an essential overture to all big-power diplomacy.

But he then took personal charge of a heroic though not then appreciated exercise in tedium—"to talk the inflammation out of the problem," as he put it. For months, he juggled the same old tired arguments with the Russians until even Andrei Gromyko took to joking about their broken-record dialog. Yet Rusk refused to yield to the pressure for new ideas and persisted in the effort "to turn this thing over to my successor exactly as I inherited it."

Other men continued to capture the headlines and the President's ear on European policy and the Alliance for Progress, the Congo, Laos, Vietnam, and Indonesia, even nuclear testing and other Soviet problems. Moreover, Rusk shrank from essentially economic problems, with which he felt insecure, as well as from much administration, and he never displayed the politician's desire or instinct for seizing personal or bureaucratic advantage from events.

He sat almost silently through the tempest of the hawk-and-dove debate in the week of the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, waiting until nearly the moment of decision to draft a personal advisory memorandum for the President urging what by then had become a consensus view, a partial blockade. Critics complain about Rusk's aloofness from the tense argument and even friends believe that by this reserve he misjudged the wishes of the President, but he believed that his responsibility was a shade deeper than that of his colleagues, that he should not embrace a policy until all the experts had spoken and that his penultimate judgment had to be delivered only to Mr. Kennedy.

Rusk's relationship with Kennedy, most of their associates agree, was never easy. Differences in age and upbringing seemed to hold them apart; this the Secretary recognized without ever faltering in his devotion. In a moving memorial tribute last spring, he groped hard for the right phrases and decided finally to describe Kennedy as an "extraordinary and incandescent man" who "shall be forever young."

Yet he was not only kept but valued. The same combination of traits that prevented him from uttering sweeping ideological formulas and engaging in flamboyant tactics evoked in him a wholesome suspicion of all dogmatic views and a rational moment-to-moment desire to define a foreign affairs problem in terms of the national interest and capacity.

He did not let faiths like communism or neutralism blind him to the opportunities for traditional diplomacy nor did he let his personal distaste for the Sukarnos of this world overcome his calculation that the United States should cling to the last sliver of influence it can wield through aid or flattery, cajolery, and courtesy.

Some say that his pragmatism and rationality do not altogether reach across the Pacific, that the bitter experiences of the Korean war made Rusk something of a zealot in his dread of Communist China. The evidence suggests that Rusk has been no more successful than most Americans in understanding the many Asian nationalisms, but in Asia, as elsewhere, he has no taste for ideological or missionary wars. He seems to favor a pattern of action and diplomacy that will reproduce the imperfect stability of Europe, a condition in which nations "will leave their neighbors alone"—a phrase he has used so often that he draws laughter where he means to speak in dead earnest.

Where diplomacy can function or where the stakes strike him as negligible, as in Laos, Rusk has been shrewd and flexible in promoting accommodation. Where the stakes remind him of Korea and diplomacy seems barred, as in Vietnam, he has never hesitated to aline himself with the hawks.

At such moments he has been impatient of the demand that he represent the "diplomatic" or less belligerent side of an issue. He insists that there is no "State Department position" until he takes a position, and in his view there can be no diplomacy where the Nation's desire to live in peace is mistaken for weakness.

The net value of Rusk's service, beliefs, temperament, and professional skill can be gaged only by the President he serves, the only man to whom he will account. His best performances, colleagues testify, come in tense but private diplomatic exchanges in which he will make his points with perfect control, in just the right order and balance, with a courtesy and forcefulness that are rarely found in such combination, and his most valuable advice, they say, amounts to a large dose of prudence in the exercise of force, as in the consideration of targets for bombing in North Vietnam.

"When we were going to take out those PT boats that hit our ships in Tonkin last summer," President Johnson remembers, "it was Dean Rusk who said: 'Now, just a minute—one of those bases is oh-so-close to the Chinese and if one of our planes gets over there and they don't understand what we're trying to do, then what?' Oh, he wanted to get them all right, because they hit our ships. But then he asked how many boats they had in all and Bob (McNamara) says 47 and he asked how many at that target up there and Bob says 13 and Dean Rusk finally said: 'I'm for getting 34, just as hard as we can, and forgetting about those 13,' and that's what we did."

To the end, President Kennedy probably found it difficult to decide whether Rusk's traits were the ones he wanted most in a Secretary of State. How President Johnson will decide the same question remains to be seen. But for Rusk, the change in Presidents clearly meant a change to an older, more comfortable shoe.

Though no closer, really, in temperament, Johnson and Rusk are close in age, social origin, and political coloration. "I'm a liberal in the South and a conservative in the North," the Secretary has said. And he has been from the beginning more consistently prominent among those who influence Mr. Johnson.

For one thing, the Congress counts for much more in the tactics of the Johnson administration and Rusk has always been strong on Capitol Hill. He can sit there, broaden the Georgia accent a bit and slacken the grammar some and sound fresh and candid even in what he has uttered a hundred times. The most stubborn Members have come to trust him not because he is artful but because he combines real knowledge with an elemental (one Cabinet colleague said "primitive") patriotism.

Moreover, the Secretary of State, as such, counts for more now because foreigners, as a group, count for much less at the White House these days. Mr. Johnson has not sought Mr. Kennedy's rapport with the leaders of other lands, but he knows and values their responsiveness to Rusk's civility.

Also, under President Johnson, the lines of responsibility run more clearly through the Cabinet members. Though Rusk is only one of a triumvirate of senior foreign policy advisers—with Robert McNamara and McGeorge Bundy—and must occasionally share the President's confidence with new appointees like Thomas Mann, the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, and Arthur Goldberg, the Ambassador to the United Nations, he sees the President as much as anyone, often three times a day, and has been left much more firmly in command of the resources of his Department.

Rusk has not visibly altered his methods of command, and the Department's sluggishness and frequent divisions into contending forces remain the source of many complaints in the Government. He is described as decisive, but only as issues percolate to the top. He has widened his circle of confidants to include especially his Deputy, George Ball, whose friendship and intellectual range he values despite frequent disagreements, but that circle still does not extend very far down.

As a departmental commander, Rusk is often held up as the very opposite of the self-assured and forceful Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara. Yet one of the more remarkable and probably valuable Washington developments has been their harmonious relationship. It is fashionable here to hunt for evidence of conflict between them and their Departments, yet it is the unanimous testimony of many officials who should know—and of some who wish it were different—that there is no such conflict.

In part this is due to McNamara's conviction that the Armed Forces must never be more than a tool of foreign policy. At least as much, however, it is due to Rusk's personal esteem for those who wear the Nation's uniform. Like George Marshall, Rusk does not like to discuss a problem in military terms lest it become a military problem. But, as a colleague has observed: "He not only values the difficulty of a military problem and of the terrain of military action, he appreciates the fact that the military men are stuck with that problem and terrain—maybe more than the Secretary of Defense."

When the administration ran afoul of world opinion for the use of nonpoisonous gas in Vietnam, Rusk quickly urged an end of gas operations. He would not, however, publicly commit the administration to permanent abstinence because, it is said, he simply cannot bring himself to tie the hands of the American soldiers whom he is daily asking to risk their lives.

Rusk's greater comfort in the Johnson administration has not prevented some difficult moments. The new President's gait and gallop took some getting used to.

Mr. Johnson, too, threatened an early rush for meetings at the summit. Then, with an anxious eye on his old friends in the Senate, the President personally directed the protracted semantic haggling with Panama about a new Canal Zone treaty, an exercise in which Rusk sensed unnecessary rigidity on both sides. Most difficult of all was the President's hasty and controversial contention that Communists had seized control of the Dominican rebellion and his broad vow to intervene against communism anywhere in the Americas—assertions that Rusk did not prevent but worked hard later to defuse.

Under Johnson as under Kennedy, the Secretary's forbearance has been phenomenal. He had no sooner issued his most persuasive arguments against a pause in the bombing of North Vietnam than the administration decided to pause. He had no sooner denied that Americans faced combat in South Vietnam than they were ordered into combat. He tolerated campaigns by his subordinates to force a nuclear navy upon the European allies and a showdown over dues payment at the United Nations, campaigns that clearly exceeded his wishes in their force. He left it to the President's staff to devise important proposals for the economic development of Vietnam and to formulate the President's public offer of "unconditional discussions" to end the war, not because he opposed them but probably because he misgaged the mood at the White House.

Fundamentally, therefore, Rusk's conduct in office has not changed since the Kennedy years and he has remarked, with obvious approval, that Kennedy and Johnson were fundamentally alike in that they were "more interested in what is required of us in a particular situation than in the long-range broad, philosophical aspects of a situation."

Rusk lacks the time even more than the interest for contemplation of the deeper forces at work in the world. But he is not without a vision. He speaks of it often, though some dismiss it as simple. Man-

kind's great contest, he believes, is quite simply between the "forces of consent" and the "forces of coercion." And the United States great hope in leading the first of these forces, he thinks, is the fact that the desire for freedom is "deeply rooted in human nature" everywhere. The Nation's great contribution, he insists, is restraint, even in the years of its greatest power, and its appealing yearning for simple law and order.

For this, Rusk labors to the point of exhaustion, in the interests, as he sees them, of people everywhere, yet without really touching people anywhere. He is articulate, but rarely eloquent. He has a gift for pithy phrase, but mistrusts it deeply.

Washington will not soon forget Rusk's comment, as he awoke the night after Moscow was challenged to pull its missiles out of Cuba: "Well, we're still here." Or, on learning that Soviet missile-bearing ships had turned in their tracks at sea: "We're eyeball to eyeball and I think the other fellow just blinked." Or when baited in a Senate committee to confess that communism profits from civil rights demonstrations: "If I were denied what our Negro citizens are denied, I would demonstrate." And when challenged to concede the complexity of the southeast Asia tangle, that Ruskian refrain: "The issue is simple, if everyone will just learn to leave his neighbors alone."

He mistrusts what he calls "making policy by phrase" not only because a glib word may hamper him, the 54th Secretary of State, but perhaps also the 55th and the 65th. Not fame, not phrase, not flamboyance, not even power—what satisfaction, then does he find in his burden?

"I would say it's kind of Calvinistic," he replies.

THE EXPERIENCE OF THE PLAINS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, those of us who come from the American West are proud of the fact that our great region helped shape the man who now serves as President of all the American people.

Tom Wicker, the distinguished Washington Bureau chief of the New York Times, has written one of the best analytical pieces to appear on President Johnson. As Mr. Wicker notes:

Just as Lyndon Johnson can be seen as the symbolic man of that first great drawing-together of the sections, it must be understood that he also is the product of those other strains and conditions that made the West different and more than an extension of things eastern. * * * But that experience, expressed in Lyndon Johnson, can become an exhilarating and dynamic new part of the whole American experience. Here, on the edge of the Plains, it is easier to sense the possibility than in that East of other standards, other ways.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Wicker's article from the New York Times printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AUSTIN: THE EXPERIENCE OF THE PLAINS

(By Tom Wicker)

AUSTIN, TEX., July 10.—This is a city near the eastern shoreline of the Great Plains—those endless rolling plains of the American interior that Josiah Gregg called the "grand prairie ocean." Along this shoreline the westward migration, stunned by the immensity and loneliness and aridity of the land-sea ahead, halted for nearly a half century.

Then bold and acquisitive men began again to push westward, virtually into the unknown, in their prairie schooners and on horseback. The world they found on the plains was as new and hazardous as that beyond the other shore on which the Pilgrims and the Cavaliers had landed more than two centuries earlier. And the life and society they built for themselves was different from that of the forests and cities behind them—breeding a new and different kind of man in a land of survival and innovation.

UNDERSTANDING FOR EASTERNERS

This is important for men bred in the East and the great cities to comprehend in the age of Lyndon Johnson. For he is a man of the plains and the dust and the endless horizons and, while he also is President of the United States, he is no more separable from the life and society and environment of the West than was the cowboy—that enduring and romantic symbol of man's emergence upon the Plains.

When easterners, Walter Prescott Webb wrote, became aware of the cowboys and the cattle barons and the peace officers and the bad men and the buffalo hunters who were surviving and innovating on the distant plains, "when the easterner came in contact with this man of the West, whose vision had been enlarged by a distant and monotonous horizon, whose custom it was to live and work on horseback, and who carried at his side the power of life and death over his adversaries (the six shooter), the easterner was at once impressed with the feeling that he had found something new in human beings."

But there were other sides of the West that were not so romantic. It was a lawless place because the old laws of the East and the forces and the cities did not fit the conditions of life on the Plains. It was a radical place in its politics, Webb wrote because of its necessary "effort at adjustment through political action to new conditions, a searching for the solution of problems where the old formulas fail and the new ones are unknown."

Finally, it was a land of suffering and toil and danger and loneliness, "far from markets, burned by drought, beaten by hail, withered by hot winds, frozen by blizzards, eaten out by the grasshoppers, exploited by capitalists and cozened by politicians."

Therefore, Webb pointed out, "the key to an understanding of the history of the West must be sought in a comparative study of what was in the East and what came to be in the West. The salient truth, the essential truth, is that the West cannot be understood as a mere extension of things eastern."

THE TRUTH ABOUT JOHNSON

It cannot be said often enough that "the salient truth, the essential truth" about Lyndon Johnson is that he cannot be considered "a mere extension of things eastern" either. Webb even points out that before the great cattle migrations on the Great Plains, northerners moving westward had remained essentially in the North and southerners moving westward had kept essentially to the South; it was in the West that northerners and southerners at last began to mingle, to encounter problems as common and like in North Dakota as in the Panhandle of Texas.

Just as Lyndon Johnson can be seen as the symbolic man of that first great drawing-together of the sections, it must be understood that he also is the product of those other strains and conditions that made the West different and more than an "extension of things eastern."

The outsized visions (of a Great Society, for instance), the commanding, horseback manner, the faith in power (God made men large and small, they used to say out here, but Colonel Colt could make them all equal), the willingness to confront new and demanding conditions with innovation and boldness, the inborn sense of a land "burned by drought, withered by hot winds" and of men struggling and surviving and conquering, the limitless confidence in man's ability to solve his problems (by action, by power, by energy, by cooperation—in short, by government as it is conceived today), all these meet in Lyndon Johnson, product of the western experience, the Plains experience.

QUALITIES OUT OF PROPORTION

And if in some men, even the President of the United States, these qualities can be magnified out of proportion by pride and power and the ancient bitterness of the West toward those who exploited and cozened it, if the commanding man can become domineering and the unconventional garb, speech, and manner of the harsh and radical West become grating, these things are part of the western experience, too, and inseparable from it.

But that experience, expressed in Lyndon Johnson, can become an exhilarating and dynamic new part of the whole American experience. Here, on the edge of the Plains, it is easier to sense the possibility than in that East of other standards, other ways.

SMUT AND THE MAILS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, my colleague from Nebraska, Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM, has for many years led the fight to protect our society from obscene and pornographic material which has been circulating through the mails in ever-increasing quantities.

While a number of laws directed to this problem have been enacted, the evidence indicates that we are losing the battle. Each Member of the Congress can attest to this, because it is documented by the increasing number of complaints from outraged constituents. With this in mind, Congressman CUNNINGHAM introduced a bill in the 88th Congress which would have enabled the recipient to put a stop to unsolicited mailings of pornographic material. The bill, H.R. 319, was passed by the House last year by a vote of 325 to 19. Unfortunately, it came to the Senate too late in the session to allow action on it.

This bill met the problem of obscenity in the mails in a responsible and direct manner. It would have allowed the recipient of such mail to inform the Postmaster General that he had received "morally offensive" matter in the mail and request that his name be removed from the sender's mailing list. If the sender failed to honor this request, the recipient could then file a statement with the Postmaster General noting this fact. Following this the Postmaster General could request the Attorney General to apply for a court order directing compliance with the order to refrain from sending any further matter.

Substantially the same bill, H.R. 980 was reintroduced in this Congress and was passed by the House on April 5 by a vote of 360 to 21. Several improvements were made in the bill. The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee concisely summarized them as follows:

The differences are that H.R. 980 characterizes the mail matter as "obsecene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile" rather than "morally offensive." Second, H.R. 980 makes provision for barring subsequent mailing of "additional such mail" to the objecting recipient rather than barring all mail.

Third, H.R. 980 affords an opportunity to a sender to have an "appropriate hearing" before request is made of the Attorney General to apply for a court order directing compliance with the Postmaster General's notice directing the sender to refrain from sending mail to the complainant.

The opponents of this legislation claim that it makes everyone a censor, that it tends to infringe on the constitutional rights of freedom of speech, and due process. This is essentially the position taken by the Post Office Department and by the Department of Justice.

There is no legitimate basis for the claim of censorship. The restriction under this legislation would result from the request of a single postal patron and would apply only to him. It would result in no restriction whatever on the right of the public to have access to the material involved. There is no provision in the bill which authorizes the Government or anyone else to pass upon what other people should or should not read or write or circulate.

The provision in the bill providing for an appropriate hearing before the Postmaster General if requested and the requirement for action by the court in contempt proceedings before the mailer is subject to any penalty appear to provide the requisite due process for those who would run afoul of this legislation.

On many pieces of legislation the Congress must look to the balancing of competing rights. Here the question is balancing the right of privacy of the addressee with the right of the distributor of freedom of speech or the right to distribute the mail matter to the particular addressee. H.R. 980 does achieve an effective and equitable balance.

It is time that the American public has protection from unwanted filth sent through the mails. It is my hope that there will be early and favorable action on this important legislation, first by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to which this bill has been referred, and then by the Senate itself.

AUTOMOBILE TIRE SAFETY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the president of the Kankakee Federal Savings & Loan Association at Kankakee, Ill., Mr. James G. Schneider, has sent me an excellent article on automobile tire safety which was published in the association's monthly report for August 1965.

This article reviews some of the disclosures on automobile tires which have been made recently. For instance, it quotes from an article in Motor Trend magazine to the effect that many station wagons have seriously overloaded tires, even when they are carrying only normal loads.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TIME TO RETIRE?

We fail to be impressed with the auto makers' claims that "you cannot get a better tire than an original equipment tire" (Wall Street Journal, Aug. 13, 1965, p. 1, col. 6). It reminds us too much of the story about the reporter who just before blastoff asked the astronaut what worried him most about the coming flight. "Oh," he replied, "the fact that everything in the capsule was supplied by the lowest bidder."

The temptation to cut down on costs (and possibly quality, too) by purchasing tires that are just a little bit cheaper can mean a whopping sum to Detroit. Try figuring it with a reduction of just a dollar a tire, and then multiply that by 5 tires per car and 8 million cars and you wind up with a $40 million annual saving for the auto companies.

This is one of the reasons there seems to be a good deal of merit in the proposal by Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, to have the Government set mandatory safety standards for tires on new cars, and for replacement tires, too. No doubt many of the motorists who have had unsatisfactory experiences with original equipment tires are in favor of the Senator's idea.

Right now, the law of the jungle seems to be the only thing governing retail tire sales. The average motorist doesn't have the faintest idea as to what constitutes a good tire or a good tire value. All the talk about 2-ply, 4-ply, 6-ply and then "2-ply rated 4-ply" only adds to the confusion stirred up by the nylon-rayon argument and the so-called 1-cent sales, the vacation tire sales, 24-month guarantees, etc.

And it's sometimes impossible to get any satisfaction from those fabulous guarantees. Take the example of one of our acquaintances who had a fast flat while driving his heavily loaded station wagon on a turnpike. He immediately pulled over to the shoulder and coasted to a stop. When he got out to examine the tire the last of the air was leaving it. After removing the tire he found that the inner lining had separated from the body. When he applied to the local dealer of the company which had supplied the original equipment tire he was told: "Sorry, we can't make any kind of an adjustment—this tire has been run flat." Guess you're supposed to stop instantly when you're traveling 65 m.p.h.

As illustrated by that example, much of the controversy now centers on the question of whether auto manufacturers are providing adequate tires on station wagons. For several years "Consumers Reports" has called attention to the dangers of overloaded tires. Just a year ago after field testing 10 leading station wagons Motor Trend magazine in an article entitled "The World of Wagons" (July 1964, p. 22, et seq.) flatly stated: "The maximum tire load rating (as established by the Tire & Rim Association) seldom exceeds the actual curb weight of the car (wagon) by enough margin to make it realistic for our use. In a few cases, the curb weight of the wagon was already greater than its tires' load rating—even without a driver aboard." The tests were conducted with simulated six-passenger loads of 920 pounds (driver and observer weighed a total of 320 pounds and four 150-pound sandbags were carried in the back) and Motor Trend claimed that each wagon carried an "overload of from 400 to 1,100 pounds."

The article flatly stated that "the manufacturers aren't equipping their wagons with tires that have an adequate load rating. The wagon owner who does carry a load, even a so-called normal one, is in most instances badly overloading his tires. As a tire's load increases over its maximum rating, it runs at greatly increased temperatures, and its mileage life decreases rapidly. In some instances, the higher temperatures can cause tread separation or a dangerous blowout. All manufacturers offer larger, higher capacity tires as options. We feel they should be standard."

Until some kind of mandatory standards are enacted, about the only thing the average motorist can do is get on good terms with a reputable tire salesman, and hope (1) that he knows his business and (2) that he'll give you a decent deal. Go sic 'em, Senator NELSON.

SOME QUESTIONABLE RULINGS BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, in recent weeks I have called the attention of the Senate to numerous questionable rulings by the National Labor Relations Board which have disturbed many observers of labor-management relations in our country.

The pattern and weight of these decisions amount to a strange distortion of the labor law as enacted by the Congress. Another example of this has been pointed out forcefully by the Wall Street Journal in an editorial on September 13.

The editorial describes what happened to a union member who sought an election to determine if a majority of the workers in his plant wanted to continue their union affiliation. In dismissing his complaint, the NLRB displayed total lack of concern for the individual union member by holding that unions must be able to penalize members who file such petitions.

This has a direct bearing, Mr. President, on a legislative matter which will soon be brought to the floor of the Senate. In that regard, the Phoenix Gazette of September 9 has commented editorially that repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act cannot be justified on any grounds other than payment of a political debt.

In order that these two timely editorials may have the wider distribution they deserve, I ask unanimous consent to have them appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette, Sept. 9, 1965]

IN ALL ITS SHABBINESS

Whether one agrees with the basic philosophies expounded, or not, the trademark of the Johnson legislative program which has, so far, been stampeded into enactment is a strong—virtually maudlin—appeal to the emotions.

It has been, for all intents and purposes, foolproof and the fruits of the program grow in profusion around us already—the skeletal framework of a monolithic bureaucracy devoted to the elimination of every real and imagined ill to which man is heir. The fact that so much of it is slanted to the lowest common denominator, substitutes froth for solid effort and equates busyness with achievement is beside the point. All of it centers on goals with an almost overwhelming emotional appeal and makes it possible for a pliant Congress to rationalize its pliancy as being essential to the building of a truly great Great Society.

But, with Senate consideration this week of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, the mask is missing. Here, in all of its ugly nakedness, is a key platform of the Great Society that cannot be prettied up and sold as a compassionate, heart-rending effort to solve some persistent evil in the economy. Here is a crude payoff on an old political debt to organized labor. Period.

Let the Senators who feel they must vote for repeal of 14(b) to avoid the wrath of the

President—and the labor leaders—go right ahead and do so.

But let us hear from them no pious flap later about the overwhelming need for it "to save the workingman."

Let them merely stand on their record of having voted to impose compulsory unionism on their constituents.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 13, 1965]

MISPLACED CONCERN

Plainly there is something wrong when a citizen who happens to be a member of a labor union can be penalized for asking an election at the plant where he works to find out whether a majority of his fellow employes want the union to continue to represent them. It's even worse when his penalty is upheld by a Federal agency which is supposed to protect him against abuses of union power.

If an employee is forbidden to use the legal avenue making possible the ouster of a union a majority of workers no longer wants, then he may be doomed to belong to the union as long as it exists. That would seem to be the case where the union shop, requiring union membership as a condition of employment, prevails. Of course he can try to find other work. Either way, it is not much of a choice, as a member of an AFL–CIO Steelworkers local employed at a steel plant in California has discovered.

This employee filed a petition, as he legally was entitled to do, with the National Labor Relations Board asking an election to determine whether a majority of workers at the plant wished to continue their union membership. Affronted by this challenge to its position, the union suspended the petitioner's membership and, for good measure, fined him $500, the fine later being withdrawn.

In turn the employee appealed to the NLRB, charging that his union was interfering with his right to file a decertification petition. The NLRB dismissed his complaint, on the ground that since such petitions are of serious "union concern," the unions must be able to protect themselves by penalizing employees who file them.

To be sure, any move to decertify a union as the workers' bargaining agency is of "union concern"—especially when to date about two-thirds of all decertification elections have been lost by the challenged unions. But in its eagerness to protect unions against collapse the NLRB shows an almost incredible lack of concern for the welfare of the individual member and for his right to determine whether or not the union in fact represents a majority voice.

By coincidence, Congress now seems close to repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, a move that would invalidate State right-to-work laws that protect employees against compulsory unionism. The NLRB's sanction of union coercion should, at the very least, persuade the lawmakers to take another look at what they are asked to endorse.

THE VICE PRESIDENT'S FAITH IN AMERICAN YOUTH

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, at a time when America's youth are frequently under sharp criticism, it is refreshing to read of the faith which our Vice President, HUBERT HUMPHREY, has in our young men and women.

The Vice President has set forth this faith in an inspiring article, which appears in the September 5, 1965, issue of Parade magazine.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH TODAY'S YOUTH—SOME RIOT; OTHERS DO GOOD DEEDS—THE VICE PRESIDENT LOOKS AT OUR CONTROVERSIAL YOUNGER GENERATION

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Young Americans give their lives for freedom in South Vietnam, while other young Americans demonstrate against our involvement there. Some young people rip apart seaside resorts, others work night and day to repair the flood-ravaged dikes of the Middle West. Our universities turn out the brightest, best-educated graduates in history, but at the same time we face a problem of school dropouts.

Which is the true picture of the younger generation? Are more and more young people finding their release in rioting, protests and crime? Or is the trend upward toward honor and achievement? Will they send America into decline, or will they build a greater, more dynamic nation?

I believe the latter is true, and I can back up my belief with facts and personal experience. This is no reason for complacency. For we cannot allow even a fraction of our youth to squander themselves while we, who like to boast that we are older and wiser, stand by lamenting.

My interest in youth is by no means academic. As the father of four children (three still in school), I am concerned at the increase in juvenile crime not only in the slums, where there is the goad of dismal poverty, but among children who have never known want, children who should know better.

Like any other father of my generation, I have my share of skepticism about Beatle mops and dances like the swim, the frug, and the watusi. But then I find myself asking: Was there ever a young generation that didn't have crazes, and was there ever an old one that approved of them? What of the flappers of the Roaring Twenties, many of them now sedate grandmothers? What of the grandfathers who once sported Rudolph Valentino sideburns and those wide trousers known as Oxford bags? What about the Black Bottom and the Charleston? But we grew out of them.

I do not condone the excesses of youth. I don't mean the fads; I mean the rioting, violence, and crime that cause us worry in our society. But again, I must ask how much we, the older generation, are responsible for the startling increase in juvenile lawlessness?

The war broke up families and reduced parental discipline. Then came the postwar years of the "fast buck" with an inevitable eroding of morality and family responsibility. Children were left to bring themselves up while their parents made up for lost time.

Now we are in a period of unprecedented prosperity, and I cannot help feeling that prosperity is a more severe test of character than adversity. Hard times, as I remember from my own youth, bring families together. In good times, it is all too easy to drift apart. Though the young people today enjoy luxuries never known to their parents, they are also exposed to pressures and frustrations their parents never encountered.

MORE PEOPLE THAN JOBS

Our youth are quite conscious they live in a world that has the capacity to destroy itself and that the detonators are in the hands of the older generation. They are also conscious of the fact that, in our affluent society, there are more people of their age than there are jobs to go around. The number of workers 18 and 19 years old is expected to increase by half a million this year—twice the increase of last year. Before 1970, more than 3 million young people will swell the labor force each year.

Those without training and skills will face a bleak future. The unemployment rate for the young already is more than three times as high as for older workers. We are past the time when a living, even a humble one, can be made without anything but willing hands.

Our country does not owe anybody a living, but it does owe its youth at least the opportunity to work. Government and private industry are now alert to this problem, and we are doing everything we can to help these young people. There are youth opportunity centers, the poverty program, the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the community action programs.

Of course, youth must be willing to work, and most of them are. I have spoken to thousands of young people at Job Corps camps and other training centers. Many come from broken homes; many are barely able to read and write. Almost all have been bitterly disappointed in their short lives. Yet most are determined to pick up their second chance, acquire new skills and face the world with hope.

Even more impressive are the thousands of young Americans who have an acute conscience about their own generation and want to help the less fortunate. They are intelligent, courageous, well-informed young people, willing to work long hours for little or no pay to correct what they feel is injustice.

Some of the student protests, picketing, marches, sit-ins have caused dismay among us older folk. Frankly, I have shared it because some of the issues, in my view, have been false. But I must admit that America today might be a better place if the people of my generation had shown the same awareness. Fiery speeches and angry placards on the campus are to my mind far less dangerous to the Nation's future than the silence that stifles new ideas. Age in itself is no guarantee of wisdom. In a world changing as rapidly as ours, there can be as many old fools as young fools. Young Americans who get into trouble, who kick against the established order, are often the most alert.

Who of our older generation has not been a rebel? I have been one, and so has our President. Lyndon Johnson was a school dropout who left his native Texas to work with his hands in the fields of California. But he returned to enter college and begin his career as a teacher in a Mexican-American public school. His former students still remember him as a man who gave them knowledge and encouragement to face a world that all too often seemed stacked against them.

Lyndon Johnson held his first Presidential appointment at 27, his first political office at 29. He has said: "No one knows better than I the fires that burn in the hearts of young men who yearn for the chance to do better what they see their elders doing not well * * * or not doing at all."

FAMOUS BEATNIKS

Today's young people—as students, as citizens, yes, even as demonstrators—are showing that they, too, want to do better. Of course, we have our beatniks. There have been beatniks in every age. Some of them are now listed among the world's leading artists, writers and musicians. Gauguin was a beatnik. So were Van Gogh and Edgar Allan Poe.

But I am less concerned with the eccentricities of genius, which can flower in the most unlikely soil, than I am with the mass of our young people today. I don't find them a "beat" generation at all, and I have met them by the thousands across this great country.

Our young people are a healthy and wholesome generation, less hypocritical, more frank than we were at their age. They speak more openly about sex, religion, politics, and other subjects that used to be taboo. In the age of computers, satellites, and almost instant communications, they are also more intelligent and competent. For this is the age of excellence.

Not long ago, I visited the nuclear aircraft carrier *Enterprise* and was amazed to find boys under 20 manning consoles of multimillion-dollar radar equipment. They were responsible for the safety of American pilots and million-dollar aircraft miles away at sea. At Loring Air Force Base, I talked with a grease-stained enlisted man whom I found working under a jet plane. "I understand you are pretty good," I said, "at keeping these planes in tiptop shape."

"No, Mr. Vice President," the GI replied. "We're not pretty good. We're the best." His commanding officer, Brig. Gen. Frank Elliott, completely agreed. "I have been in the Air Force a long time," he said. "This crop of youngsters is the best yet. They are more responsive and responsible."

No fewer than one-quarter of the members of our armed services are under 20. Our generals and admirals agree they are the finest young fighting men this country has ever produced, as tough as their fathers of World War II and Korea, more alert and adaptable and so more fit to use the complex weapons of the space age.

If I had to give the younger generation a label, I would call them, as the President has, Volunteer Generation. I may not always agree with the causes they serve, but I must always admire the spirit with which they fight. It could shame some of us older people who pride ourselves on being concerned citizens.

HOW FAR?

For example, a poll in a national news magazine asked American students how far they would go—beyond mere talk—to support a cause in which they believed. Some 93 percent said they would sign a petition; 72 percent had already done so. Some 87 percent said they would contribute money; 58 percent had already done so. An amazing 43 percent were even ready to go to jail.

More than 10,000 young volunteers are now serving in the Peace Corps. Another 3,000 have already returned after tours of duty. But most significant, more than 100,000 have asked to take part in this bold and idealistic experiment. When VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America—the domestic Peace Corps) was launched, more than 3,000 inquiries were received from young people on the first day of business.

When Parade's own editor, Jess Gorkin, had the inspired idea to ask the young people of America to "Work a Day for J.F.K.," the response was staggering. They went out by the thousands to mow lawns, clean cars, run errands, sell cookies and lemonade so they could donate their earnings to the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library. There was no compulsion such as is brought by the Commissars in a Communist society. It was merely a suggestion in one magazine for young people to accept or reject.

All it takes to rouse today's young people is motivation. They need to know that their contribution has a purpose. I grew up when it was important to help the family. It was important that we dug vegetables out of the sand and stored them in the root cellar. It was important that we earned money to help feed the family. Now in our prosperous suburbs, it is no longer important for young people to contribute to the livelihood. They are inclined to look upon the daily chores as merely an exercise in discipline.

I have complete faith in our young generation. Whenever I am weary or worried, I seek out young people. Many times, I have walked out of a meeting, depressed and discouraged, looking for some teenagers. I have found them to be a tonic; they rekindle my spirit and sharpen my wits. I am able to go back refreshed and revitalized.

We parents expect the young to learn from us and from their teachers. But this holds good only if we are prepared to learn from the young—to probe their problems and to admit, as history has proven time and again, that the "follies" of today can be the truths of tomorrow.

WE MAY WIN THE WAR BUT LOSE THE PEOPLE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, James Reston of the New York Times writes in the Sunday magazine section of the Times some refreshing and persuasive observations on the Vietnamese war which he has been observing at first hand in South Vietnam.

Among other things Mr. Reston says that the mood and attitude of American officials in Vietnam is quite different than the mood and attitude in this country. For instance, in Vietnam the view is that talk of negotiations now may be very harmful to us in Vietnam. It can be interpreted as a sign of weakness, as a reason for the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese to hold out longer, press harder, feel more confidence in their eventual victory. Reston also reports a reassuring observation about the competence and ability of our forces in Vietnam, and how well our forces have established a military defense that will not be defeated militarily.

At the same time, Reston also observes that we could lose. In all probability the loss would not be a military loss but a loss resulting from our losing the support of the people. On the economic front, the social, psychological front we are in grave, serious danger. This relatively unreported front is where we must continue to fight and win.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Reston "We May Win the War But Lose the People," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WE MAY WIN THE WAR BUT LOSE THE PEOPLE

(By James Reston)

SAIGON.—The face of the war is not the same in Saigon as in Washington. It may look the same, like the face of a clock in different time zones, but it is noon in Washington when it is midnight in Saigon.

Time and distance make a difference. The mood of American officials here is not at all the same as the mood of their colleagues in Washington. They worry about different things, but on the whole the Americans here worry less and are more optimistic about the future than when they left the Potomac.

This may be because they are under fire. Bombs have a way of making people pay attention to the urgencies of the present, but there are other more tangible reasons.

First, the performance of the American military forces here is impressive. They have demonstrated already that they can cross half the world with their bulldozers, their engineering skills, their air and naval power; and establish bases quickly under tropical conditions in the face of a well-trained and ingenious foe. They hold limited points in a limited area mainly on the seacoast, but at least they have removed the fear that the American command might be overrun before it could be securely established.

"The trained American," General Eisenhower wrote in 1948, "possesses qualities that are almost unique. Because of his initiative and resourcefulness, his adaptability to change, and his readiness to resort to the expedient, he becomes, when he has attained a proficiency in all the normal techniques of battle, a most formidable soldier." There has been a lot of evidence to support this conclusion—at least enough to give the American community here a sense of confidence that the short-term problem of the war can be met.

Second, there is a growing feeling in Saigon that the Vietcong cannot organize large enough units in the face of constant harassment from the air to win a major victory over regimental sized units of the American forces. And even if they did manage to get together a large enough force to risk it, the armed helicopter can now bring reinforcements to the battle much faster than the enemy can.

Even the French observers here, who are not given to wild exaggeration of America's capabilies, are impressed by this new mobile power of the armed helicopter. They point to it as one of the major advantages the Americans have over the French Army when it was dealing with the same problem.

Third, the Vietcong are showing some signs of feeling pressure under fire. They have been conscripting 16-year-olds and 17-year-olds and sending them far from home in spite of promises to the contrary, and often with insufficient training. They have been increasing their exactions from the peasants, often taking as much as two-thirds of the rice crop. Also, unlike their disciplined actions of the past when they sought to win over the civilian population, some of their units have recently engaged in brutalities designed to terrorize the civil populations, and in some areas their actions have amounted to little more than a form of armed banditry.

Finally, as the United States has stabilized the military situation and gone over to the initiative in the air, it has begun to get more cooperation and intelligence from the people.

The authority of the white man may be gone in Asia, but respect for power has not. In fact, respect for power is evident in every traffic jam at every corner in Saigon.

The Vietnamese have an almost hierarchical system of power in these streets, and everybody pushes his power to the last millimeter. The pedestrian—even the dainty female pedestrian, tiptoeing around the puddles in her ankle-length pantaloons, has to give way to the bicycle, while the bicycle defers at the very last critical instant to the scooter, and the scooter to the little blue-and-yellow Renault taxi, and the taxi to the jeep, and the jeep to the truck.

These local factors undoubtedly contribute to the short-term optimism here. Other local factors also give Americans in this capital a way of looking at the war that is somewhat different from Washington's.

The military strategy, for example, affects the thinking here about a negotiated settlement. Defensively, this strategy is to hunt the Vietcong from the air. Offensively, the purpose is to drive the Vietcong into the forests and deny them time to rest and replenish their supplies in the hamlets.

American diplomats here, unlike their colleagues in Washington, are counting, not on bringing the enemy to a big splashy peace or truce conference, but on forcing the Vietcong gradually to fade away or reduce their actions to manageable proportions, so that the job of pacifying South Vietnam and establishing a stable responsible government can make some progress. Meanwhile, General Westmoreland is working on a plan to encourage the defection of Vietcong troops by

promising them safe conduct back to their native hamlets. But nobody here is talking about negotiations in order to placate public opinion in the United States.

It is opinion in Vietnam that officials here are worrying about. I have not found a single official, either in the American community in Saigon or the diplomatic community here, who thought the constant appeals for negotiations out of Washington were helpful. Most of them were for a negotiated settlement in the end, but felt this was a function of private diplomacy and insisted that the way to avoid negotiations was to keep talking about them publicly.

The best judgment here seems to be that it will take a year—some of our experts think two—to produce a sharp decrease in Vietcong raids. This raises a central question about American strategy. For while the short-run outlook here seems fairly good, the long-run prospect is quite different and much more complicated. Officials here are constantly coming up against the question: Will the Vietcong crack under the steady American bombardment and the power of the helicopters, or will the social and political structure of South Vietnam crack first?

The war has already produced more than half a million refugees. Feeding and housing them alone is an immense problem that is not being done with any sense of pity, or even decency, and the air war is just beginning.

By the end of this year, American air power will have doubled at the very least—a fact that raises two prospects, neither of them very pleasant. The first is that in order to attack the Vietcong, who terrorize and hide in the villages, the bombers will have to hurt the civil population in the villages even more. The second is that the Russians will put more and more antiaircraft weapons into this country and thus increase the casualties among American airmen and planes.

Incidentally, this problem illustrates another difference between American officials in Saigon and American officials in Washington. In Washington, officials are being very solicitous and understanding of the Russians. They are saying it is hard for the Russians to watch a Communist ally in North Vietnam being overwhelmed by American bombers, and, therefore, that we must expect Moscow to provide some defense against our air attacks.

In Saigon, however, American officials feel that the Russians are not only trying to help the Communists here, but are using this war as a testing ground for new weapons, as the Communists and the Nazis did in the Spanish Civil War in the 1930's.

Accordingly, while Washington talks about the possibility of Chinese intervention in the ground war, American officials here are even more concerned about the reality of Russian surface-to-air missiles, Russian fighters and Russian light bombers in the air war. Thus, the longer range prospect is not so good here. It raises several basic questions:

How will American opinion react to mounting casualties among our own fighter-bomber crews? And how will American opinion react if U.S. air attacks produce more and more casualties, not only among Communist Vietcong guerrillas, but among South Vietnamese civilians?

The dilemma is increasingly clear. On the one hand, there is almost no disagreement in Saigon, even among the French, that without the introduction of American bombers this war would probably have been lost already. But with the introduction of American air power, especially as used indiscriminately by the South Vietnamese forces, the danger of losing the people in the long run, even while winning the military war in the short run, is very real.

Two things may modify this U.S. problem of hurting our friends or potential friends in order to hurt, our enemies. The first is that a great many of the air raids are not in densely populated areas. And the second is that the Vietnamese are a stoical people, who have suffered so much under the Mandarins, the French, the Japanese, and their own leaders in Saigon—which most Vietnamese regard as a remote and hostile center of authority and corruption—that they will probably endure punishment longer than anybody from the West might think possible.

Part of the reason for pessimism about the future beyond the immediate crisis is that South Vietnam does not really have a government that governs, or even an army that fights, in our sense of these terms. It is true that the Vietnamese have taken most of the casualties in the past year, but most of their 500,000-man army is either on defense or on reserve.

Premier Ky is very frank about it. He conceded the other day that his troops had been shelling and bombing the Vietcong because it was easier and safer for them to do so rather than go into the night and fight them on the ground. He concluded that his problem was to win the people by revolutionary programs while trying to win the war, but it is not at all clear that he will have the support of his military associates—and competitors—for such a policy.

In short, our generals here can deal, and are dealing for the moment, with the immediate military problems. And they are dealing with them rather better than their associates in Washington thought likely.

But behind the tactical and strategic military questions of the moment lie the occult immensities of the past—and these are not so easy either for the Americans in Saigon or for those in Washington. We do not really know how to deal effectively with a Government like this one. What Lord Curzon called the trail of the serpent lies over the curious collection of military sovereigns here. It is, Curzon said, "the vicious incubus of officialdom, paramount, selfish, domineering, and corrupt. Distrust of private enterprise is rooted in the mind trained up to believe that the Government is everything and the individual nothing."

He defined the oriental mind as meaning: "In character, a general indifference to truth and respect for successful wile; in deportment, dignity; in society, the rigid maintenance of the family union; in government, the mute acquiescence of the governed; in administration and justice, the open corruption of administrators and judges, and in everyday life, a statuesque and inexhaustible patience, which attaches no value to time, and wages unappeasable warfare against hurry."

Asia is moving, and the observations of the English aristocracy about this part of the world at the end of the Victorian era may not now be exact. But the fact is that our officials here in Saigon have run into a great deal of evidence that much of this is still true.

The Americans in Saigon have discovered that they can influence the course of the war, but the Americans in Washington have to deal with longer perspectives and are not at all sure that what they can influence they can control. Maybe this is what explains the greater optimism of American officials in Saigon: They have seen the power of America to influence the military situation. But they cannot control it without the support of the South Vietnamese Government and people, and so far they are not assured of either.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY ON KING TURKEY DAY AT WORTHINGTON, MINN.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on this last Saturday, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY made a speech in Worthington, Minn., that is worthy of our very close and detailed attention. He made the point so well that in the United States our true task is to create a state and environment of equal opportunity where every man will have an equal chance to do something for himself and his fellowman. And he rightly emphasized that our fellowman lives not only in Worthington, Minn., not only in the United States, but in the entire expanse of this world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY ON TURKEY DAY, WORTHINGTON, MINN., SEPTEMBER 11, 1965

Thank you, Governor Rolvaag. I'm not surprised to see both you and Senator MONDALE here today. King Turkey Day has always been a time when we politicians descend on Worthington.

I remember my first visit to Turkey Day. I literally descended on Worthington—in a light plane, and in bad weather. There were a few anxious moments, but we made it.

That was in 1948. I was mayor of Minneapolis and running as hard as I could for a seat in the U.S. Senate. Bad weather or not, I was coming to Turkey Day. I might add that my opponent, Joe Ball, didn't make it that Turkey Day. And he didn't make it that November either.

Since then, I've been to nearly a dozen King Turkey Days in Worthington. But none of them is as sharp in my memory as my first one.

When I came here in 1948, as a candidate for high public office, I did not talk about the turkey industry, or about Minnesota, or even about agriculture. I talked about the Marshall plan.

The Marshall plan was something important happening in 1948.

There were people then—and there are people today—saying that Worthington was not the place to talk about war and peace, about the great challenges facing Western man, about the moving tides of history.

But I said then—as I do today—that this is exactly the place.

For, in this nuclear age, Worthington is as close to Moscow, or to Cairo, or to Santiago, as my boyhood home was to Minneapolis. In fact, as I think about it, Minneapolis was even more distant to us then than those other places are today.

The time is past in this world—and we all know it—when what happens someplace else has nothing to do with us.

The Marshall plan had something to do with us in 1948. It revived Western Europe and helped make us secure from a very real and present danger. Korea had something to do with us. So did Hungary. So did Cuba.

So today do India and Pakistan and Vietnam. No one knows this better than the families in Worthington, and there are several of them, who have sons in Vietnam today. And, might I add, so today do Watts, Calif., and Harlem, N.Y., have something to do with us.

No man, no country can live in isolation.

There was a time when we thought we could. Some of us can still remember it first hand.

We had prosperity in this country. And we decided to keep that pot of gold all for ourselves.

We wouldn't share with anybody.

We closed our immigration. We said: "We just don't want anymore of those foreigners, thank you."

We closed our trade. We said: "We don't want to do business with people abroad."

We closed our eyes and our minds to terrible things happening in the rest of the world—aggression, persecution, international bullying.

And it wasn't long 'til we closed our banks, and we closed our businesses, and our farms, and we opened up breadlines. We found ourselves in world depression and, then, Pearl Harbor.

When people turn selfishly inward, it's not a turn for the better. We do injustice to ourselves. And we lessen all men for what is less in us.

Today, in 1965, as Vice President of the United States, it is my privilege to return to Worthington to talk again about things that are important.

There are things being done in this Nation, and by this Nation, that are worth some of our time.

We Americans face great burdens ahead.

That is why we are building the great resources—both material and human resources—of this country to meet long, hard tasks at home and in the world.

We are trying to create an environment in this country where every single citizen will have the equal chance to do something for himself and for his fellow man. We seek to create a true state of opportunity.

There is no equal chance for the young man or woman, for the family, imprisoned in the ghettos and slums of urban America.

There is no equal chance for the American denied a life of choice because his skin is black, or because he has the wrong last name.

There is no equal opportunity for the school dropout—a boy or girl without skill—in a society which increasingly demands education and skill.

That is why we today are making great national investments to improve education, to defeat poverty, to remake our cities, to lift rural areas left behind, to give men and women their full constitutional rights.

The Job Corps camp is not a make-work project. It is nothing less than an effort to help young men learn how to make a living—to help them become taxpayers and not taxeaters.

Federal aid to education is not a means of exerting Federal control over towns and school districts, teachers and students. It is a way to bring better education to children living in places without enough money to pay for that education.

Yes, we are making basic, long-term investments in America and its people.

Our country is rich and prosperous. We can afford it. We can afford a strong national defense. We can afford billions of dollars to put a man on the moon and we can afford to help put a man on his feet right here on earth. Yes, today we help our neighbor. It is good economics. It is also right.

The author, Thomas Wolfe, wrote it a generation ago. Today we work for it:

"To every man his chance, to every man regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this * * * is the promise of America."

And where will this strong and free America stand in the world?

Will we, as before, turn inward to keep what we have? Will we let the rest of the world go its own way—even if that way leads to disaster?

We must not and we will not.

We will not close the doors of our rich city until the less fortunate of the world are driven to storm its walls.

We will not stand idly by while the totalitarians and the takers of the world work their will by force on those unable to alone defend themselves.

And, we will not—living under the shadow of a great nuclear cloud—give up our search for a world of peace.

For peace is like a great cathedral. Each generation adds something to it. It requires the plan of a master architect. It requires the labors of many.

We will build peace with foreign aid. We will build peace with food for peace, with the Peace Corps, with technical assistance, with the Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

We will build peace with exchanges of people. We will build peace in the United Nations and in other international organizations. We will build peace at the conference table.

We will stand firm against those who would break or abuse the peace.

We will bend all our efforts so that our own great and terrible national military power need never be used.

Yes, we have things to talk about in 1965, just as we did in 1948.

We have the things that all men have in common: Our hopes for a freer and better life, for a chance to build something better for our children, for a world living in peace and in justice.

Let us work for the fulfillment of those hopes.

THE PTA UNDER ATTACK

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in auditoriums and across living room tables, a subtle war is being fought over how America's schools should be run. The weapons include innuendo, parliamentary maneuver and sometimes—violence.

This is a story told in the current issue of Look magazine in an article entitled, "The Plot to Take Over the PTA." It is the story of how an organization which has been working for good schools under local control is being undermined and its numbers reduced by a "takeover" plot of national proportions.

All those concerned about our schools will want to read this article. I would like to call it to the attention of the Senate by asking unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From Look magazine, Sept. 7, 1965]

THE PLOT TO TAKE OVER THE PTA

(By Ernest Dunbar)

"We have to live with these people day in and day out, in all of our clubs and our schools and our children. Until you're in the middle of it, you don't realize what it entails."

The speaker was a housewife in Wheaton, Ill., a Chicago suburb. She was troubled, thinking back over incidents that seemed somehow like a bad dream and yet were part of a reality that had forced its way in upon her tranquil, tree-shaded world. The battlelines of an ugly, unheralded war began at her doorstep, and the opposing troops were neighbors, acquaintances, and onetime friends.

Who are "these people?" They are other American—superpatriots, self-appointed Paul Reveres, confused mothers, bewildered businessmen, professional "anti-Communists." Their stated goal: to rid America's schools of alleged Communist influences. Their intended vehicle: the local parent-teachers' association.

Would the Wheaton housewife talk to a Look reporter? Hesitantly, she agreed. What she had to say mirrored the anguish, the turmoil and strife that are becoming distressingly familiar in many school PTA's across these United States.

Her PTA had come under the domination of ultraconservative members of the community, and they had invited a traveling lecturer on anticommunism to address them in the high school auditorium. His talk shocked the mild mannered suburbanite. According to the speaker, most Federal officials in Washington do not believe in God or the Constitution, and are under the influence of a foreign Communist power; the State Department and the U.S. Supreme Court are being directed by the same Communist conspiracy; the news media of the country are dominated by Communists, and the United Nations exists solely for subverting the United States and other nations, and dragging them into one world government.

"I couldn't believe my ears," the housewife says. "What's worse was that everybody was sitting there nodding in agreement. There was almost no objection to anything this man said," she recalls. Later, during the discussion period, when she questioned the accuracy of some of the lecturer's statements, "there were people glaring at me and muttering, and frankly, I felt afraid."

Late one evening, 2 weeks after this incident, two men tried to force their way into her home while her husband was out of town. They said they had come to have it out with her because of her opposition to the conservative direction taken by the local PTA unit. The men left only after she threatened to call for help.

Last winter, in St. Augustine, Fla., before an important meeting of a high school PTA, the chairman of the local (white) Citizens Council, a segregationist organization, took his PTA membership card to a printer and had 500 counterfeit cards made in order to pack the meeting with his non-PTA supporters. Not only did another council member ask the PTA president to sign the bogus membership cards (the request was rejected), but the printing bill for the fake cards was sent to PTA.

At Portland, Oreg., Wilson High earlier this year, the PTA scheduled a series of speakers on civil rights to coincide with a study project being conducted by the school's students. One of the talks was given by J. Belton Hamilton, a Negro assistant attorney general of Oregon. The committee of parents that had arranged the meeting reported numerous phone calls were received which labeled the speaker, the principal, and the PTA president as Communist and put unusual pressure on us to have a speaker representing their special interests. The report said that those responsible for the pressures "have taken their action in the name of patriotism and Americanism."

Last year, in Upper Saddle River, N.J., a well-to-do New York City suburb, businessman Jerry Schlossberg, vice president of the Edith Bogert School PTA, was selected by a nomination committee to become president. In that PTA, the vice president usually succeeds the outgoing president. Then things took an untraditional turn. Schlossberg says a telephone campaign spread the word around town that he, Schlossberg, a member of a local fair-housing group, was going to bring some Negro families into the all-white community. Three days before the election, a meeting was held in the home of Mrs. Ordeen Knight, Schlossberg's nomination was withdrawn and a substitute slate headed by Mrs. Knight put up. Some board members later asserted that Schlossberg lacked the "temperament" for the job.

After the election of Mrs. Knight as president of the Bogert School PTA, a local newspaper revealed that both she and the new vice president were members of the extremist John Birch Society.

In North Hollywood, Calif., PTA members at the Victory Boulevard Elementary School prepared to put on their third annual skit to raise money for school activities. Fifty parents and the school principal, Francis Williams, were to take part in the program, which they had been rehearsing for 3 months. Shortly before the play was to open, one Victory Boulevard School parent objected to a show that spoofed George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and other historical figures. News of the objection appeared in the press, and the principal began receiving telephone calls from people who were not in PTA and had no children in the school. One caller warned him that the show must be canceled "if you want to see daylight tomorrow."

Williams submitted the script to the two most conservative members of the Los Angeles City Board of Education, who did not oppose his going ahead with the show. After the first of four scheduled performances of the "Victory Boulevard Follies," a powerful bomb was set off in the restaurant owned by Konrad Schloss, one of the authors of the controversial skit. School authorities, fearing for the safety of the children, canceled the remaining three performances. The $500 that the parents had hoped to raise for the school fund was lost.

What's happening in the PTA? In airy kitchens, high school auditoriums, over living room tables and on sun-swept patios across the Nation, a shadowy but frequently vicious war is being fought. The stakes are the minds of American schoolchildren.

The antagonists are housewives, principals, teachers, physicians, school board members, and veterans leaders. They range from do-gooders, standpatters, middle-of-the-roaders, to the lunatic fringe. The weapons are parliamentary procedure, delay, disruption. Sometimes, they include innuendo, character assassination, racial or religious bigotry, harassment, threats, and—violence.

No community is immune. Some of the participants are unaware of the true nature of the fight, and many are equally unaware that the same kind of fight is going on at the same moment in dozens of other communities around the country. Ordinary housewives have suddenly had to become experts on extremist tactics and literature because what they had thought was going to be a pleasant tour of duty as a PTA officer has instead plunged them into a dirty, underground war in which reputations have been destroyed overnight and school systems commandeered by kooks.

The assault on the PTA has come from a number of rightwing organizations, but the most persistent campaign—and the most difficult to combat—is being waged by the secretive John Birch Society. Officials of the National Congress of Parent and Teacher Associations believe their troubles can be traced to this much-quoted directive from founder Robert Welch to Birch members, contained in the society's September 1960 Bulletin: "Join your local PTA at the beginning of this school year, get your conservative friends to do likewise, and go to work to take it over. You will run into real battles, against determined leftists who have had everything their way. But it is time we went on the offensive, to make such groups the instrument of conservative purpose, with the same vigor and determination that the 'liberals' have used [to] the opposite aims. When you and your friends get your local PTA group straightened out, move up the ladder as soon as you can to exert a wider influence."

The Birchers have been busy doing just that in the years since, and although they have not "straightened out" the PTA yet, that 68-year-old organization has been dealt some damaging blows. In 1964, for the first time since the depression, the PTA lost members—138,592, to be exact. In the year ending March 1965, the association lost an additional 201,295 members. Current membership totals 11,791,431, compared with the association's 1963 all-time high of 12,131,318. Since the school population has been expanding during this same period, the drop in PTA membership is even more significant.

Some of the losses are attributed to the consolidation of school districts, which also has the result of consolidating PTA's. But the PTA officials believe it is the extremist campaign, not school consolidation, that is mainly responsible for the membership drop.

The PTA is no stranger to conflict. What many a parent has come to think of as a combined Kaffeeklatsch and Tuesday-night debating society was actually founded in 1897 by a group of determined women, concerned with improving the environment of America's school age children. In the years since then, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers and its local PTA units have fought successfully for a long list of programs affecting children—from the establishment of hot lunches in schools in 1912 to the National Defense and Education Act of 1958. They have backed free kindergartens in public schools, the tightening of child labor laws (in 1910, 1 child in 6 was a child laborer), the creation of the U.S. Children's Bureau, higher salaries and standards for teachers, dental clinics and special courts for juvenile offenders, to name a few.

The impressive record amassed by the PTA came after battles with legislators in State capitals and Washington, wrangles with industrial bigwigs, and the bruising of many a politician's ego.

Today, there are 46,000 PTA units in the United States and in affiliated American schools abroad. Husbands have joined the ranks, and today, the membership is one-third male.

But the gains of the past are taken for granted. Ironically, PTA's active support of progressive legislation and policies is now the lightning rod that draws the ire of many of its opponents. The association's endorsement of Federal aid to education and equal-opportunity legislation, for example, has infuriated many of its more conservative members and led some of its units to withdraw.

In a number of communities, conservatives have worked hard to gain dominant positions in local PTA units and then successfully urged the members to drop their link with the State and National organizations. To spur the withdrawal movement, PTA's opponents have worked steadily, spreading half-truths and misinformation about the organization. Last fall in St. Augustine, where the PTA was under attack not only by the Birchers but by the Ku Klux Klan and the Citizens Council as well, a local physician, Dr. George Hopkins, addressed the R. B. Hunt Elementary School PTA. In his speech, Hopkins accused the national PTA of supporting or promoting: "a Federal Board of Education * * * legal invasion of personal privacy through sociological and psychological testing of minors, unlimited endorsement of the U.N. in the following categories: (a) the destruction of our constitutional Republic through one-world government; (b) the surrender of our military forces to U.N. control; (c) the favorable indoctrination of our children in socialism through the Communist-dominated UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization)." Hopkins also told the group that the national organization had been charged with defending textbooks sympathetic to communism.

After the Hopkins speech, the R. B. Hunt School parents voted to withdraw from the national PTA and form an unaffiliated PTO, Parent Teachers Organization. (Dr. Hopkins' wife had been president of the PTA unit at a local junior high school when it, too, voted to withdraw from the PTA in 1963.)

Hopkins and another physician, Dr. Hardgrove S. Norris, whose office adjoins that of Hopkins, had previously tried to get the St. Augustine High School PTA unit to withdraw from the national body, but failed to win the necessary two-thirds vote. Dr. Norris has been listed on the Committee of Endorsers of the Birch Society.

To illustrate the intertwining of the anti-PTA forces, Norris is also active in the ultra-conservative Florida Coalition of Patriotic Societies, another group active in the attack on the PTA. The FCPS, in a resolution earlier this year, asserted that "we want it fully understood that the Florida Coalition of Patriotic Societies does not in any way imply that the PTA has any Communist sympathies, but we believe that the PTA is being used by our enemies without its knowledge * * *."

The catalog of accusations against the PTA hurled by Hopkins occurs repeatedly in rightwing assaults on the organization around the country. The targets—Federal aid to education, "psychological testing" in the schools, the United Nations, UNESCO and "world government"—are pounded at by waves of rightwing literature, widespread radio broadcasts, and a traveling stable of "anti-Communist" lecturers.

Mrs. Bertha Cohoon, a housewife who is president of the St. Johns County (St. Augustine) Council of PTAs, has called Dr. Hopkins' statements "fallacious." The attacks on PTA, she says, are being made by the same groups who have been attacking educators and educational groups for years. "Posing as superpatriotic organizations and using the battle cry of 'Communist,' they have, in my opinion, misused our constitutional rights of freedom of speech and the press. They use fine, sincere Americans to spread the hate and fear, in what they believe to be good Americanism. We have lost two fine ministers from our community. Neighbor is looking at neighbor, saying to themselves, 'Is he—or isn't he?' "

On at least one occasion, says Mr. Cohoon, a local unit was simply stampeded out of the national PTA. "Without any prior notice or discussion, one person recommended that the unit get out of the State and county PTA. Most of those present didn't even know what they were voting for. After the vote, the meeting was immediately adjourned, and everybody was flabbergasted.

"My phone rang all night. I've been in the PTA for 15 years, and when something comes up, people automatically call me, thinking 'Bertha has the answer.' But Bertha doesn't always have the answer—I wish I did. They were out. People said they wanted to do something, but they tend to let things go, and they never did," she says.

Bertha Cohoon, like other PTA leaders across the country, is convinced that the move to establish PTOs is calculated to do away with the PTA. "I'm willing to let them start a PTO in any school that has a PTA, and then let's see which one is most effective," she says. "But they don't want that—they want to destroy the PTA."

Apathy and small attendance at meetings are frequently the biggest boons to PTA's opponents. In Hardin, Tex., a PTA with 137 members held a meeting, and only 18 people showed up. Fourteen voted to disband, four abstained, and Hardin lost its PTA. At North High School in Phoenix, Ariz., PTA members rejected the policies of the National PTA by a vote of 19–11 among its 296 possible voting members. (In a later vote, 150 alarmed parents voted against the anti-PTA faction, and pro-PTAers regained leadership of the unit.)

As the war in the PTAs grows hotter, the parliamentary skirmishing becomes more involved. In some PTA meetings, attempts are made to prolong discussion, frequently by the persistent injection of irrelevant issues, so that weary parents will depart in disgust and an important vote can be taken

in their absence. Another gambit is to pack a nominating committee with ultraconservatives, who, in turn, nominate their slate for control of a unit.

In some of the PTA battles, a strategy has emerged. Extremists nominate a few of their number for important posts, and suddenly alarmed moderates rush in and nominate a host of their candidates. In the voting, the moderates' votes are spread among a number of candidates, while the extremists concentrate their votes on their few men. Result: The extremists win.

The tactic of making a sudden motion for withdrawal is one that has frequently been used in PTA units where rightwingers, counting on the usual apathy and small attendance, have sought control. A mother in an Arizona PTA with a membership of 800 describes a meeting she attended last year. There were only 50 parents present. "Right out of the clear blue sky, somebody makes a motion to withdraw," she exclaims. "Fifty members is our quorum, there were 50 members there. A vote was taken by show of hands, the withdrawal motion was defeated. Then someone proposed the motion be reconsidered at the next meeting. She had voted against the motion, and it was out of order for one who voted against it to propose a reconsideration; it was done anyhow. This time, I worked to get people to come. We got 200 at the next meeting. The withdrawal motion was defeated again."

The PTA has been under particularly heavy attack in Arizona. PTA membership there has dropped from 84,714 in 1963 to 69,410 in 1965. A woman who moved to Phoenix from the East 4 years ago says: "At my first PTA meeting, I knew something was wrong. It was like no other PTA meeting I'd ever gone to. The program was not about the kids, it was all about patriotism, 'Americanism.'"

Other Arizona women complain of being pressured to adopt the conservative view. "If you are for Federal aid to education, UNESCO or the UN, you're a 'Communist.' There's no gray area, it's all black and white." Says another who had spoken up for Federal aid: "My telephone would ring. A male voice would say: 'When the Communists take over the schools, you are going to be very happy.'"

Mrs. Walter Hafley, wife of a Tucson druggist and ex-president of the Arizona Congress of Parents and Teachers, feels the Birchers are definitely the leaders of the anti-PTA drive in her State. She cites the 1962 State PTA convention as an example of the lengths to which the opposition will go. "We were flooded with people who did not have membership cards and were not affiliated with our units. It was a planned attack. It was at this convention that a vote was taken which reversed our previous stand and put us on record as being opposed to Federal aid to education."

But that position has now been reversed again. "In order to deal with them," says Mrs. Hafley, "I had to get their material and read it. I know what their aims and objectives are. They pick up one statement from one area and parrot it over and over. The best way to throw them is to ask questions. They don't know the answer because all they know is the question. When you ask them, 'Why do you think this will work better?' they are stymied. I've spent 2 years studying them—that's why my garden has gone to pot. I've bought more John Birch material than the Birchers themselves."

The most articulate critic of the Arizona PTA says he's no Bircher. George P. Lasley, vice president of KRUX, a Phoenix radio station, has broadcast frequent editorials blasting the organization for being involved in controversial legislation and for supporting the United Nations and its agencies. "If people knew exactly what they were being asked to support when they joined the organization, I would have no quarrel with it—but they don't know."

The critics of PTA are by no means all Birchers or members of other extremist groups. Many voice dissatisfaction with the organization, which suggests that one of PTA's biggest problems is communication—getting its principles and internal workings fully understood by its rank-and-file members.

The most frequently heard complaints about PTA are:

Too much of the local members' dues goes to the national and State PTA organizations, from which local units get few services.

PTA involves itself in political issues, contrary to its rules.

PTA is dominated from the top—by the national leaders—and local units are powerless to make their voices heard.

The national PTA endorses controversial organizations (the U.N., UNESCO, etc.) or policies (integration, Federal aid) to which many of its members are opposed.

Parents joining PTA are unaware of the policies they are endorsing, policies they are committed to support.

Yet a close examination of PTA does not bear out the charges.

The dues of each of the 46,000 local units are set by the unit itself, and the parent organization, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, receives the same sum from each unit, 5 cents per member per year, with which it helps maintain a headquarters staff in Chicago and finances its national activities, including the monthly publication, the PTA magazine. State and local units apportion the rest of the dues between themselves.

PTA has been involved in political activity since its founding, say the association's officials, when politics affect children's welfare. The PTA has a national legislative program, which, under PTA's bylaws, must be approved by at least 31 of the association's 52 congresses, and the organization suggests that each unit have a legislative committee. Although PTA's bylaws prohibit it from endorsing or opposing political candidates, the association's handbook encourages members to work for laws that promote its goals.

The charge that the PTA is dominated from the top does not square with the organization's makeup. Delegates from local units elect the officials of the district and State PTA congresses. The national convention elects the national officers. The national PTA is governed by a 91-member board of managers consisting of the State presidents, the national officers and the chairmen of the standing committees. Its policies come from the national convention.

Though it is true that some of the stands taken by the association have been controversial, controversy, like beauty, is frequently in the eye of the beholder. At their May national convention, PTA members voted approval of a resolution supporting Federal, State, and community action to ensure "all citizens full and equal opportunities for the exercise of their civic rights and responsibilities." While this PTA stand may displease some of its members, it is considered mild by others. The important thing is that the members, through elected delegates, had a chance to vote on it. Democracy cannot guarantee more.

Do parents join PTA without knowing what they are pledging to support? Are they unaware that they are simultaneously becoming members of the State and national PTA? The last question is easiest to answer. The card issued to every member tells him that he is now a member of the State and National bodies.

It is possible that new members may not know about all the policies and programs of the organization. As any congressman or school principal can testify, the PTA has a lot of interests. But its aims and activities are spelled out in a 272-page manual for members, and the national PTA uses part of that 5-cent contribution to turn out an avalanche of pamphlets describing its work.

If some of the criticism of PTA stems from legitimate disagreement over some of its activities, it is becoming increasingly apparent that a combined effort is being made by Birchers and other extremist groups to control or destroy the organization.

A big weapon in the plot against the PTA is a nationally distributed booklet called "Parents Are Puppets of the PTA." This tract asserts that the PTA "promotes world government by support of the United Nations," assails it for backing mental health programs ("the aim of the mental health movement is unmistakable: nonconformists are in actual peril of being adjudged insane") and fluoridation ("Does PTA Promote Poisoning Public Water Supplies?").

"Parents Are Puppets of the PTA" bears the imprint, "Tarrant County Public Affairs Forum," of Fort Worth, Tex., and lists a local post office box, but inquiries to the chamber of commerce and the better business bureau revealed that neither knew more about the organization than that. The "Forum" remains cloaked in the anonymity given to renters of post office boxes, while it spews out anti-PTA diatribes.

False and inflammatory literature is only one of the tools used by the extremists. PTA leaders across the Nation report a continuing effort by opponents to disrupt meetings by harassment of speakers, concerted coughing and moving of chairs. Mrs. Jennelle Moorhead, president of the national PTA, says, "I first became alarmed in 1962 when we held our convention in Iowa. A national newsmagazine called me to say they had been tipped that there would be a riot on the floor. 'What are you going to do to cause a riot?' they asked me."

Mrs. Moorhead and other prominent PTA officials do not believe the attacks, the attempts at disruption, the intimidation of speakers are coincidental. "Take the letters we get, for example," she says. "The same vocabulary is used, whether it comes from the east, north, west or south. The letters all read alike. Someone is giving the orders, and I wish I knew who it was. I can tell when the line changes—it's like the shifting of gears—if they've been attacking us on UNESCO, all of a sudden they'll change and begin attacking something else."

The PTA now knows it is in a fight. The national organization has issued a pamphlet on extremism and advises its members on ways to combat it. But the battle is growing bigger than PTA. The extremist drive has begun to shift toward school boards. The Birchers and others have realized that school boards pick school superintendents who, in turn, pick teachers, books, and establish curriculums. Since few people turn out for school board elections, they are ripe pickings for a determined undercover campaign by a small group of zealots.

Joseph Stocker, public-relations director of the Arizona Education Association, warned the convention of the National Education Association recently: "Extremists of the right may be expected to continue their thrust at the public schools with the object, plainly and simply, of controlling the curriculum and brainwashing children. They will seek these ends through election to school boards, control of PTA's and censorship of the content of education, in libraries and in classrooms. They will seek to elude identification as extremists by putting forth candidates for school boards and PTA offices who have not been members of the Birch Society or of other extremist groups.

But he concluded, "in recent elections where extremists have run under extremist labels, or with the open support of extremist organizations, they have been soundly defeated in a very large majority of instances.

The American people, when fully informed, simply won't buy extremist doctrine and extremist candidates."

While not every hard-pressed member of the PTA would concur with Joe Stocker's optimism, most would agree that things are humming at the PTA meetings these days. Housewives are boning up on the Birch Society Blue Book and pouring over Robert's Rules of Order. The "takeover" plot has not been stopped, but at least most PTAers are beginning to know what the battle's all about.

FOOD AND POLITICS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, an article in the August 16 issue of NAM Reports, points out some of the political pressures from various sources, with various conflicting objectives, which are being focused on our food production and distribution system.

This article serves to remind us that more and better food for a constantly declining share of the family budget is now being provided by America's food industry. Furthermore, it counsels that care and caution be exercised in consideration of any new legislative or other measures which would tend to impair the progress that can be achieved by its own innovations and competitive activities.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

[From NAM Reports, Aug. 16, 1965]

FOOD AND POLITICS—HOW GOVERMENT FOCUSES CONFLICTING PRESSURES

Food is the basic industry of the United States, and it would be incredible if the world's largest government remained aloof from the production, processing, and marketing of what we eat. It does not.

Food came before governments, but the moment governments appeared upon the scene food became one of their primary concerns. Men's first fights were over food; order-keeping, the first duty of government, required the adjustment of such disputes. Men still fight over food, and the background of the trouble in Vietnam is that one of Asia's richest rice producing areas is coveted by the Communists.

However, today's relationship between America's $84 billion food industry and its $100 billion Government is more intricate than earlier involvements, because within the Government are many agencies directly concerned with food, but with totally conflicting purposes.

In the White House, for example, is a Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, dedicated to making food available at minimum cost to the eater. Some blocks away in the Agriculture Department men and women on the same Federal payroll fight to wrest more money from the eater for the benefit of the farmer.

Caught between such political pressures so focused by government are the hundreds of food processors and retailers whose margins of profit are slim in good times and tend to disappear entirely under a variety of circumstances. Fierce competition, both in buying raw materials and in selling finished products is one reason for the low-profit margins. Shifting consumer preferences, seasonal use of costly plants and equipment, the whims of weather and the fluctuations of supply are among the others.

Yet, no one could call the tremendous food industry as a whole a "sick industry." It employs more than a million and a half workers, provides an astonishing variety of food in ample quantities at reasonable prices to 192 million people and has revolutionized eating habits with its innovations.

Newest governmental factors on the food industry's horizon are the Food Marketing Commission, the President's Committee on Consumer Affairs and the food stamp program. But many of the older agencies dealing with the food industry are taking new approaches and considering still others.

A few Federal programs are designed to benefit the food industry, although an individual company may in some cases be damaged by them. These include:

Interior, State, Agriculture, and Commerce Departments' several programs to improve commercial supplies of fish.

Agriculture Department research into new varieties and processes.

Area Redevelopment and Small Business Administration loans for new and expanded processing plants (which may help you if you get them, and provide new competition for you it someone else does).

But by far the larger part of Federal activities relating to the food industry are for the benefits of others—labor, farmer, consumer, foreign nations. The interest of these groups often conflict.

In the creation of the Food Marketing Commission it is implicit that more Federal activity in the food industry will be forthcoming, but not for the industry's benefit. The Commission has been engaged in a series of hearings, at which its members solemnly have undertaken to put into the record a most detailed description of how our food is grown, processed, and sold. Patiently, it is eliciting from growers, processors, and retailers the most minute details of their operations. Recently, it has suggested it may resort to subpenas.

One of the purposes set down for the creation of the Commission was to determine what kind of food marketing system would suit the Nation's needs in the years ahead. This clearly indicates the possibility—even probability—that the Federal Government expects to make the ultimate decisions.

The Commission ultimately will write a report and recommendations. Its data will be used but actual legislation is likely to originate with the executive branch and may bear little resemblance to the Commission's ideas. These are factors that probably will influence the kind of legislation Congress will be asked to pass:

The basic necessities are food, clothing, and housing. For some years, Government programs in housing have been based on the idea that a family should have the housing adequate for its needs for whatever it is able to pay (public housing, and now rent supplement). Now we have a food stamp program based on the idea that a family should have the food it needs for what it is able to pay. As has happened in housing, this could be extended into the middle income brackets.

Important elements in the Government believe that the present variety offered the consumer is wasteful, that choices based on brand names are confusing, that convenience features do not justify their costs. The pressures for grade labeling and standardized packaging could grow.

The Commission is intrigued by a recent upturn in the retailer markup after a long period of decline. Members have publicly expressed an interest in allocating "fair shares" of the consumer dollar, and are musing about whether these increases are justified. (They have occurred in a period of unionization of store personnel, expansion of customer facilities such as parking lots and a shift in product lines carried, including some which like frozen foods require more expensive storage and display facilities.)

Despite the appearance of a single Commission to study the whole food industry, it appears unlikely that a single code will be drawn up to govern the industry. The reason lies in the Government's embodiment of conflicting political interests. A single code could not be written until these interests were reconciled by the Government—an unlikely eventuality. It can be expected that any new law will overlay the old ones, leaving the food industry's executives saddled with the problem of compliance at minimum price increases regardless of cost increases that may be entailed.

Continuing will be the importance of such factors as:

Extension of the minimum wage for farm labor, and encouragement and assistance to unions which seek to organize farm labor.

The attempt to capture farm employment for unemployed Americans, wiping out the importation of seasonal labor from elsewhere in the hemisphere.

Price support programs supplemented by marketing agreements to keep raw material prices high, coupled with the new farm bill approach (the so-called bread tax idea) designed to limit Federal spending for farm programs by engineering mandatory price increases on foods to the growers.

Federal purchases for the Armed Forces, school lunch programs, and food for peace, whose timing affect the market. (During the recent abrupt rise in beef prices, more than 10 million pounds of beef was shipped abroad under Public Law 480.)

Federal sale of commodities which force down prices persuasively just before farmers are asked to vote on a crop control program.

Diplomatic decisions on food importations and prices. The Government has decreed that consumers will pay more than a free market price for coffee and sugar, for instance, as a form of indirect foreign aid. It has encouraged importation of some foreign food products, such as Polish hams, in the hope of easing cold war pressures.

These lists far from exhaust the Federal activities bearing upon food production and marketing. One important element in the picture is antitrust action.

The Federal Trade Commission is interested in price discrimination, and "cost justification" concepts are still wending their way through the courts.

Mergers often are attacked by FTC or the Justice Department, and the definitions of markets and market shares are a wilderness yet unpenetrated. In Beatrice Foods, the FTC, in addition to ordering divestiture of some units of one of the larger corporations in the field, issued some warnings which appear to indicate that a dairy firm now in the multi-hundred-million-dollar bracket will be in the clear as long as it does not make acquisitions, or hasn't recently made some, but that a newer growth company may be approaching danger of prosecution when it hits a $50-million volume. This bemuses lawyers, who wonder if the FTC means to preserve the present larger companies from new major competition.

In *Amalgamated Meat Cutters* v. *Jewel Tea*, union immunity to antitrust prosecution was reestablished in a way that seems to place many aspects of food marketing within the control of union leaders.

Reciprocal trading, a common practice for obvious reasons among many food manufacturers with many product lines, was attacked successfully in Consolidated Foods.

Conflicting decisions in Borden and Universal-Rundle place in doubt pricing of brand name products and private label products of similar grade and quality.

Now in Washington, official thinking has turned to the economists' textbook term of

monopsony—the market power of a few buyers in a field with many sellers. Theoretically, these are covered by the Sherman Act, but there could be new legislation.

The gist of the antitrust activity and thinking tends to attack food industry practices which achieve economies that can be passed on to consumers, while elsewhere the pressure is on to assure low prices and to reduce prices at retail.

Senator LONG has asserted that the Food and Drug Administration has come to take a dim view of the utility of diet foods, health foods, and diet supplement activities, and it appears that if he is right there could be more harassment along this line.

In addition to all the governmental problems uniquely its own, the food industry shares the problems of industry in general.

The food industry has been successful in keeping prices down largely through increasing productivity. The Commission heard testimony on one product line, for example, in which raw material increased in price by 80 percent, wages increased 100 percent, and price increased only 20 percent.

But while Washington rejoices when prices fail to rise, it officially wrings its hands when the labor content of products is reduced, reducing employment. While the investment credit and liberalized depreciation rules were intended to encourage new plant and modernization, the very efficiencies thus brought about are deemed to call for counter-measures—such as federalized and liberalized unemployment compensation systems, higher premium overtime, shorter workweeks and even—perhaps—a mandatory guaranteed annual wage.

At present, the food industry is exempt from some wage-hour regulations because of its seasonal peaks, but the pressure in Washington always is on to remove such exceptions, however sensible.

The food industry, like others, is believed by many in Government capable of "absorbing" large increased costs out of present small profits. Mathematics is one of Washington's fuzzier subjects.

Emerging on the left side of Washington official thought is a doctrine growing out of the war on poverty that earnings should not have to be spent on necessities—such as food and housing—but should be discretionary income, so much of them as are not removed by taxes. In other words, a citizen should not have to pay for what he needs, but only for his wants above his needs.

A larger body in the Capital would concur in this only to the extent that it believes each citizen should have what he needs and pay as much as he is able.

So far, the food stamp plan, now spreading over the Nation, is a device to make this possible at the taxpayers' expense. Experience has shown, however, that the Government seldom pays the full price of things for long, but seeks preferred treatment on prices. Just as the consumer is now asked to bear part of the cost of the farm program in bread prices, some observers feel, the food industry will someday be asked to bear part of the cost of the food stamp plan, perhaps through discounts on food sold under them.

The NAM, through its marketing and other committees, is monitoring the currents affecting the food industry in Washington, and has participated in a number of actions in support of the industry. Today it is exploring new ways to persuade Washington to allow the food industry to continue to compete to develop new products, better values and higher standards without artificial or arbitrary restraints which blunt the edge of the consumer's best weapon—the ability of manufacturers to compete for the hand of the consumer.

There are many agencies representing many points of view in Washington. Industry must represent its own.

MILWAUKEE'S PORT SETS RECORDS FOR GROWTH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the brightest chapters in recent Wisconsin economic history has been the steady and sharp, I might say, sensational growth of Milwaukee's world trade.

There are many reasons for this. Of course, the big reason is the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway. But many lake ports might have taken advantage of this and did not. Milwaukee did.

Milwaukee is blessed with Harry Brockel, a port director of top caliber. He has done a great job.

The whole Milwaukee community has enthusiastically supported its port. Business leaders have aggressively and imaginatively exploited it.

The port has been physically improved. Recently Congress gave the green light for Milwaukee harbor dredging. Milwaukeeans expected the dredging to take 4 years. It took 4 months.

The dredging will permit fully loaded ocean ships with 28-foot drafts to be accommodated at all municipal docks in 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent article in the New York Times on this new "Miracle of Milwaukee" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MILWAUKEE'S PORT SETS RECORD; LOOKS TO EUROPE FOR BUSINESS

MILWAUKEE, September 11.—In 2 weeks Milwaukee Port Director Harry C. Brockel will start a European trade mission armed with figures showing Milwaukee to be one of the busiest ports on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The trip will come at an especially impressive period in the port's history. Mr. Brockel believes that overseas trade flowing this year will set a "smashing new record." Through the end of August seaway trade already was up 28 percent over the same period last year.

Besides this, Mr. Brockel will be able to boast of physical improvements at the port. A Federal program to dredge channels is nearing completion about 4 months after it began. Local officials thought it would take 4 years.

AVOIDS GUIDING SHIPS

The dredging will permit fully loaded ocean ships with 28-foot drafts to be accommodated at all municipal docks in 1966. Until now partly loaded deep-draft ocean ships had to be guided through water only 21 feet deep in many places.

Also the city is preparing to build its fourth general cargo terminal, at a cost of $750,000. The Milwaukee Common Council is expected to authorize design plans next week. The 50,000 square foot terminal will help relieve frequently overcrowded conditions at the port.

"There is tremendous pressure for us to build this terminal," Mr. Brockel said. "Sometimes our terminals are so chocked it's difficult to keep the aisles open."

Another factor spurring use of the port is the new fats-an-oils terminal that was recently placed in operation. It is expected to handle 100,000 tons of cargo annually.

The terminal helped raise the city's reputation as one of the most diversified ports on the seaway. On the basis of cargo flowing through it, Milwaukee ranks fourth among 27 ports on the U.S. side of the seaway. Ahead of it are Duluth-Superior, which has a huge grain shipment, Chicago and Toledo.

This year, Mr. Brockel said, Milwaukee should handle about 800,000 tons of cargo, compared to 685,000 tons during the record year of 1961. For the first time, the number of ocean sailings should go over 500. A record of 439 was set last year.

Tonnage through August totaled 500,228, compared to 390,147 in the same period last year. Notable increases were shown in bulk grain shipments, up 69 percent; and heavy-lift cargo and steel, up 251 percent.

The port has suffered somewhat, Mr. Brockel said, because Government shipments of powdered milk had dropped sharply and iron and steel scrap shipments had been reduced to nothing because that business is dormant.

"But we are making great strides as a mercantile port and this is where there is the most competition," he added. "European countries are making increasing use of Great Lakes ports for high-grade cargo—machinery, tools, wines, ceramics, and manufactured goods. This is the cargo that takes men and machinery to move and what brings money into a port."

CHICAGO A RIVAL

In order to get this trade Milwaukee has had to compete with other seaway ports, especially the sprawling one in Chicago, and also overcome skepticism from its own common council.

The $7,500 authorization for the European trip was made by the council only after months of debate and an accusation by Brockel that the council was imposing "the most restrictive form of shackles on the port's operations."

He has called for an expanded promotion for the port, noting that "New York spends more on promotion than we do for our entire operation."

Mr. Brockel will visit 11 western European countries on his trip, attempting to convince them, he said, of the importance of the Great Lakes ports.

"The problem of the Midwest," he said, "is to blow away the last vestiges of provincialism."

THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH ON PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, although a liberal newspaper, has never hesitated to express its disagreements with President Johnson's policies. Therefore, the highly favorable editorial which appeared in the Post-Dispatch, after a recent Presidential press conference, assumes special significance. This editorial correctly concluded:

Altogether, this was one of the President's most successful press conferences. He is very much the man in charge, and he is moving steadily in a number of right directions. The country has every reason to grant him the confidence he inspires.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE MAN IN CHARGE

President Johnson made a good deal of news at his press conference Wednesday, none of it more important than the general impression he conveyed of a confident, masterful Executive who is on top of his job in all respects. He looks well and obviously feels well. The legislative record his administration is compiling continues to add up impressively. He is moving with care and skill to cope with the race relations crisis. He has completed forming a new United Nations staff with "a passion for peace." He ex-

pressed the national interest in a noninflationary steel wage settlement. Above all, he aroused hopes that the road to peace in Vietnam may yet open up.

VIETNAM

The President left no doubt that his Cabinet's renewed emphasis on negotiation for a peace settlement based on the 1954 Geneva accords is part of a calculated effort to bring Hanoi to the conference table. There will be no letup of the military pressure, but the limited character of his military objective was again made clear. It is to stabilize the fighting so that a negotiated political settlement can finally end the fighting. He is right in saying that the country is united behind this goal. If North Vietnam and the Vietcong can be convinced of this, then a prudent assessment of their own interests should suggest that negotiating fair terms for an ultimate end of all foreign intervention offers much more than expansion of a hopeless war.

WAR POLITICS

With smooth finesse Mr. Johnson isolated the House Republicans' feeble white paper which sought to draw a party line on Vietnam. He needed only to hint at the high-level Republicans who back his leadership and generously to grant a few others the right of dissent. The GOP dissenters are, of course, trying to reconcile the irreconcilable, they disclaim responsibility for our commitment in Vietnam but have nothing to offer except an irresponsible expansion of the war. In accepting limited objectives and a political settlement instead, the President unquestionably has the country with him. Yet he is on warning that, if he fails to obtain peace, the Republicans will not hesitate to charge him with "Johnson's war."

UNITED NATIONS

The appointment of James Roosevelt as U.S. representative on the U.N. Economic and Social Council, the post once held by his mother, aptly symbolizes the President's concern for development of impoverished lands through U.N. action. In southeast Asia, only peace is needed to unleash a surge of energy directed against the real enemies of the people there—hunger and ill-used resources.

STEEL

By strongly supporting his economic advisers' guidelines for wage and price stability in the steel negotiations, Mr. Johnson served notice that he intends to use his powers to restrain inflationary forces before they get out of hand. His determination is all the more welcome in view of new wage contracts in the west coast construction industry which bend, if they do not break, the guidelines. Similar action in steel could set off a chain reaction throughout the economy. The President laudably makes it clear that he wants the guidelines to apply also to salary increases for Federal workers.

LEGISLATION

Mr. Johnson continues to exert his seemingly effortless mastery of an unprecedented legislative program. He urges House leaders to force the District of Columbia home rule bill out of a committee pigeonhole by discharge petition. He warns against crippling of his immigration bill, which promises a long-overdue revision of the obnoxious national origins basis for quotas. He still wants repeal of the Taft-Hartley license for State right-to-work laws. He notes with satisfaction a fine pace of Negro voter registration under the Civil Rights Act. And he holds out a carrot to Congress with a promise that, if it will do all its work this year, he won't ask so much next year.

Altogether, this was one of the President's most successful press conferences. He is very much the man in charge, and he is moving steadily in a number of right directions. The country has every reason to grant him the confidence he inspires.

WASHINGTON WORLD CONFERENCE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am most pleased that the Senate last Friday adopted the concurrent resolution expressing the support of the Congress for the World Conference on World Peace Through Law which opens today in Washington, D.C. As the principal Senate sponsor of the measure, I was gratified that congressional approval was speedily obtained.

Yesterday's Washington Post carried a fine editorial on the meaning and significance of this important Conference. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "The Quest for World Law," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE QUEST FOR WORLD LAW

Washington today becomes the focal point of the world-law movement. Four continental conferences in recent years led to the Conference on World Peace Through Law in Athens 2 years ago, and now some 2,500 judges and lawyers from 110 countries have assembled here for the similar purpose of extending the boundaries of international justice. They will talk in lofty terms of replacing violence with law, but most of their time will be spent on the vital business of improving courts, extending research, bridging legal gaps, and analyzing the so-called treatymaking explosion.

These lawyers and judges are practical men. They have no expectation of substituting world law for diplomacy and military force in the present context of international relations. What they seek is a speedup in the natural evolution of international law and judicial institutions. One of the problems they will tackle here will be the unification of some aspects of commercial law and the promotion of arbitration arrangements so that business may be more easily transacted across international lines. Another important question for discussion will be the extension of law to the no man's land of outer space.

To the pessimists who see no hope for a lawful world the sponsors of this movement reply that 80 percent of all the treaties known to man have been drafted in the last 20 years. Treaties are the primary staple of international law. Not all of them are constructive in purpose, but the mere proliferation of treaties suggests a widespread desire for orderly international relations. Treaties have multiplied faster than the means of interpreting and enforcing them, and this problem too will get much attention from the Conference.

We are especially hopeful that the Conference will be able to show how the World Court can be made more effective. This is one area in which the United States, with its crippling restriction as to the jurisdiction of the Court, is sadly out of harmony with the growing demand for law in the settlement of international disputes. By simply embracing the principle of judicial settlement of all legal disputes that may be properly carried to the World Court, the United States could make an enormous contribution to the new world law that every statesman likes to talk about.

THE EXTRAORDINARY POWERS OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET NARRATED IN AMERICAN LEGION MAGAZINE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am sure that many of my colleagues have felt the frustration when we as a legislative branch of the Government have been seriously handicapped by action of the Bureau of the Budget which we found unsound govermentally.

In the August 1965 issue of the American Legion magazine, a fine article is printed entitled "The Extraordinary Powers of the Bureau of the Budget," written by Deane and David Heller. Although the American Legion magazine often prints articles of exceptional quality and interest, I believe this article on the Bureau of the Budget should be read by everyone who is interested in the preservation of the legislative function of Congress. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that this article which begins on page 8 of this August issue of the American Legion magazine be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE EXTRAORDINARY POWERS OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

(How a superbureau in Washington manipulates the laws, censors witnesses before Congress, and dictates to departments and agencies by the exercise of powers never set forth in the American Constitution.)

(By Deane and David Heller)

Does America have an invisible government within the Government? Is there a Government agency so powerful that it can—and does—overrule, frustrate, or emasculate an act of Congress when it decides, on its own or in a huddle with the President's aids, that Congress has acted unwisely? Is there a Federal agency so powerful that it can, in the words of a leading U.S. Senator, terrorize other agencies of the Government?

Is it possible that a superpowerful agency of unelected officials can instruct Cabinet officers testifying before Congress? Can this agency black out unfavorable information and censor the opinions of Government officials who disagree? Can it kill or cripple a Government program legally enacted by Congress?

Let's take a look at some words of Lyndon Baines Johnson about the Bureau of the Budget, an agency of unelected officials which exercises amazing powers, whether it legally possesses them or not.

In 1958, a furious war raged in Congress over the refusal of the Budget Bureau to spend money authorized by Congress for dams, national defense, missions, space research, and a wide variety of other purposes. Lyndon Johnson, then Senate majority leader, rose from his seat in the front row of the Senate Chamber. The dark-suited Senator, standing tall like a Texas Ranger out to draw a rifle bead on the bad guys, took out after the Bureau of the Budget.

Lyndon Johnson's quarrel with the Bureau of the Budget had a long and fascinating history.

Seven months earlier, on August 30, 1957, he had written a hot letter to the then Budget Director, Dr. Percival Brundage:

"I am deeply concerned about the practice of the Bureau of the Budget of controlling, through the apportionment procedure, the expenditure of funds appropriated by Congress," the future President wrote.

His letter had noted that the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee had heard 1,132 witnesses in 40 lengthy sessions that brought forth a bill on civil construction to offset growing unemployment. The bill passed the Senate with only one dissenting vote.

"This bill thus may be conservatively said to represent the will of Congress," the Texas

Senator wrote acidly. "Yet, a letter over your signature suggests that a portion of the funds appropriated by Congress for construction projects by the Corps of Engineers will be placed in budgetary reserve by the Bureau of the Budget." The Senate majority leader then asked "by what authority" the Budget Director derived such powers "by which such action, overriding the will of Congress" was taken.

On another occasion, Mr. Johnson had complained that the Budget Bureau was a "czar."

Now Lyndon Johnson's angry words of March 11, 1958, made on the Senate floor, turned to the matter of a dam in Oregon (the John Day Dam) for which Congress had voted funds and the President had signed an authorization.

"The President, by the exercise of his own judgment and discretion could have vetoed it (the dam)," Johnson said. "But instead he chose to approve it. He permitted a budget official who had responsibility to no one, who was an appointee of the Executive, to impound the funds and vitiate the will of the Congress and the Executive."

Johnson then struck at the growing habit of the Budget Bureau to present an "approved" list of projects to Congress on a "take it or leave it" basis.

"I do not intend to let the Budget Director pick out, pick out and pick out and finally tell us: 'If you will knuckle under and get down on your knees and take exactly what I tell you, I will let you have a bill. If you do not, I will send you a veto.'"

Lyndon Johnson's next words stated the case for the constitutional power of Congress to exercise the legislative power of the Nation:

"When I have passed judgment on a bill and have voted for it, the simple fact that someone in the Bureau of the Budget objects to it will not change my conviction and make me turn tail and abandon the position I took when I voted for the bill originally."

How revealing of the inner workings of power in Washington, where—the average layman may think—Congress passes laws and the administration carries them out.

For decades, the obscure Bureau of the Budget, a 500-man agency housed in the Executive Office Building near the White House, has stirred up fierce controversy, fear, and anger inside Washington. Lyndon Johnson's words denouncing it were, in fact, courageous. The Budget Bureau has teeth and claws. It can fight back—hard. Money—or the control of money—equals power. Even a majority leader of the U.S. Senate might find it prudent not to tangle with this little-known agency—far and away the most powerful in the Nation's Capital. Of all the heads of bureaus, the Budget Director is the only one the President can appoint without approval in the Congress.

The Budget Bureau can kill virtually any bill introduced in the Congress with seven words: "Not in accordance with the President's program." In this it wields the political power of the President with Congress. It can (and often has) overruled Congress by refusing to expend funds voted by Congress for Federal programs. In the past, these have included funds for veterans medical care; housing; urban renewal; atomic submarines; the army reserves; research and development for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force; public works projects; missile and atomic energy plants; water and power projects; hospitals—and scores of other things.

This may be an eye opener. If you've ever thought about the Bureau of the Budget at all (most people haven't), a mental picture may come to mind of a group of dedicated bookkeepers toting up long columns of figures in red ink in their ledger books. But you couldn't be more wrong. The Budget boys are the fellows with muscle in Washington. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget carries far more weight than some members of the Cabinet. And it isn't just anybody who can overrule an Act of Congress. On the law books, that authority is supposed to be reserved for the Supreme Court in open trial.

It isn't easy to get a top administrator in the executive branch to talk about its secrecy-shrouded operations. But listen to this (from a man who wishes to remain anonymous, but who formerly held a top Government administrative post):

"There's little that any administrator can do when the Budget Bureau interferes in the details of his work. It's a tough thing. Every administrator serves at the pleasure of the President. If he doesn't like it, he can only get out.

"It is a serious problem for Congress, whose lawmaking power is often usurped by the control of the purse strings. Congress passes an appropriation for a certain thing to be done. Then the administrator who'd do the job is denied the funds by the Budget Bureau and he is not allowed to tell the public or Congress the facts. Congressmen tell the people back home that the matter has been taken care of but nothing happens and nobody on the outside can understand it. I once had a confrontation with the Budget Director of my time on his arbitrary rulings affecting the policy of my agency. In exasperation he said to me: 'Listen. The Budget Bureau can do anything it pleases.'"

The National Education Association has been waging a war with the Defense Department over the condition of its overseas schools. Congress passed a law (Public Law 86–91) to put the oversea schools for children of servicemen on a par with better U.S. schools. The Defense Department did not bring the schools up to par, and pays its teachers about $2,000 less than the standard set by Congress. In the face of protest from educators, it simply repeated over and over that it didn't have the money. But the Defense Department had not asked Congress for the money needed to carry out its law.

The American Legion took up the cudgels for the NEA in this fight last fall, and in an editorial advised it that perhaps the villain was elsewhere. "Defense can't ask for more money than Budget OK's and if Budget is the pinchpenny, Defense isn't allowed to say so, under rules that keep the facts behind our budgeting a secret to the extent the Budget Bureau desires."

The Legion has had long experience with the Budget Bureau's policymaking, its vitiating of law, and its sense of values and thinking. For two decades, career men in the Budget Bureau have interfered in the operation of veterans legislation and have sought to impose policies of their own, antagonistic to those established by Congress, while Budget Directors, Presidents and Congresses have come and gone.

Several examples in the field of veterans affairs are enlightening.

Several years ago, President Kennedy authorized 2,000 nursing care beds for the Veterans' Administration, and Congress enacted a law calling for 2,000 more. The House Veterans Affairs Committee, in drafting the law, specifically called for the nursing care beds in addition to the VA's hospital beds. The Budget Bureau fought this law bitterly before it was passed. Today, it is forcing the VA to reduce its hospital bed facilities by 4,000 beds instead of adding the nursing care beds to the total VA bed space. At this writing, only 550 of the nursing beds have been put in operation. Meanwhile, the VA is reported to be planning to run the nursing programs eventually on money saved by closing VA hospitals.

The Budget Bureau is generally opposed to both veterans hospitalization and the bulk of the Public Health Service hospital services. In spite of the laws creating them and providing their services it would like to reduce them and put them both in one hospital system. Congress has rejected every proposal either to cut them down or combine them. Nothing daunted, the Bureau of the Budget has been proceeding toward both objectives on its own. In January, under Budget Bureau pressure, both the VA and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare announced closings of VA and Public Health Service hospitals, respectively. At the same time they announced an "agreement" under which the VA, which was created by law to care for eligible war veterans, would accept such PHS patients as merchant mariners and commercial fishermen in VA hospitals. This has naturally created a storm, especially as the VA hospital system had, in March, a waiting list of more than 17,000 eligible veteran patients before closing 6 VA hospitals and before taking in PHS patients. When the Comptroller General issued an opinion that aspects of the PHS agreement are illegal, the Budget Bureau's hospital spokesman told a congressional committee that he doubted the opinion was binding, though the Government Operations Manual sets forth that by law the opinions of the Comptroller General are binding on the executive. This one issue presently has the Budget Bureau and Congress heading on a collision course with respect to the legality of Budget Bureau activities.

A competent reporter who has been on the Washington scene for more than two decades notes that it is almost impossible to find who makes decisions like this. The Budget Bureau refers to them as "decisions arrived at by the President," while the actual architects are "faceless and nameless."

How the Budget Bureau thinks about veterans was revealed in House testimony on a pension bill last year. A VA spokesman said that the Budget Bureau was not only opposed to the bill but was opposed to publicizing it because "this would cause a large number of new veterans to apply." We will see more about the Budget Bureau's work in making it hard for veterans to receive benefits already awarded them by law.

At its May 5–6 meeting this year, the executive committee of the American Legion unanimously approved a resolution urging President Johnson to curb the power of the Bureau of the Budget, charging, among other things, that the Bureau is establishing national policy on its own, thereby usurping the power of Congress. The Legion took this dire action following the latest attack upon veterans' benefits by the Budget Bureau.

On January 13, 1965, the VA, without warning, announced its intention to close 11 hospitals, 4 veterans' homes, and 16 regional offices where veterans' claims are received, processed, and awarded or denied. The national commander of the American Legion, Donald E. Johnson, immediately protested, calling it "shocking" that Members of Congress, who are supposed to set veterans' policy, were not consulted. Commander Johnson charged that the announced closings were not the considered judgment of the VA, but were forced upon it by the Bureau of the Budget. John J. Corcoran, director of the Legion's National Rehabilitation Commission, charged "the Veterans' Administration has lost control of its medical program to the Bureau of the Budget." On March 4, 1965, the Assistant Director for Legislative Reference of the Bureau of the Budget admitted to the Legion's Rehabilitation Conference that the Budget Bureau "did press the VA to close hospitals."

Out in the field, citizens' committees looked at some facts. Thus a special committee of experienced North Dakota veterans' service officers, representing volunteer groups, investigated the VA's justification of the proposed consolidation of the Fargo

VA regional office with the one in St. Paul, Minn., 200 miles away.

The VA had made two basic claims, never mentioning Budget Bureau pressure. It said (1) that $139,740 would be saved, chiefly in salaries paid at Fargo; (2) North Dakota veterans could easily process their claims by mail to St. Paul, because experience showed nearly all of the claims handled at Fargo were being handled by mail already.

The North Dakota committee found that it would cost more to move than to stay in Fargo; that the savings estimate was based chiefly on salary eliminations at Fargo; that it was almost double the actual salary elimination; and that it did not deduct from savings the new costs that would be assumed in St. Paul.

Far worse, the VA's report on handling claims by mail turned out to be a pathetically transparent attempt to justify the unjustifiable. In attempting to minimize the impairment of services by withdrawing from Fargo, the VA claimed that only 2.3 percent of its service in Fargo in 1964 had been made by personal contact with veterans, while 97.7 percent had been by mail—which could, of course, simply continue at St. Paul at no inconvenience to anyone.

The VA reported 270,483 mail contacts at Fargo in 1964 and only 6,506 personal contacts with veterans.

The North Dakota committee reported that the figures were outrageously false. Only 19,500 of the pieces of mail reported had anything to do with service contacts with veterans. The rest (more than 261,000) were just mail received—junk mail, ads, bills, inter-VA mail, personal mail of employees and patients—anything with a canceled postage stamp.

And personal contacts with veterans, instead of being 6,506 were 40,008. They came not to 2.3 percent of the total contacts with veterans, but more than 66 percent.

Similar committees in other parts of the country reported the same discrepancies with respect to justifications of VA closings in their areas.

This incredible situation concerning public responsibility is not like the usually meticulous Veterans' Administration. It is like the wriggling of a Government agency under orders from the Bureau of the Budget to cut back its operation with a tough command to make the cutback look good.

On the surface it looks like insanity for the Budget Bureau to force the VA to close offices when the reputed savings are only myth. But it makes sinister sense when you recall the Budget Bureau's desire not to have veterans claim what has already been awarded them by Congress. Intensive studies by both the VA and the House Committee on Veterans Affairs have revealed that veterans who have been eligible for millions of dollars of vets benefits didn't claim them because they did not understand the law in spite of VA mail in governmentese explaining it to them. In this light, the hanky-panky unveiled at Fargo (only one of 16 regional offices that were proposed to be closed) to force more veterans to use the mail suggests that the Budget Bureau sees the real savings to lie in unclaimed benefits if services to veterans are withdrawn hundreds of miles.

The outcry at this sort of thing resulted in President Johnson taking the matter out of the hands of the VA and the Budget Bureau and referring the VA closings to a special Presidential committee. On June 9, the closing order was rescinded for Fargo and seven other regional offices, for two of the soldiers homes and five of the hospitals. This was clearly a compromise of a situation in which his own Budget Bureau had embarrassed the President. Six hospitals, caring for 11,500 patients; eight regional offices, and two soldiers homes remained on the list to be closed unless Congress should specifically legislate their continuance, as it has sometimes done in the past. To a number of bills already proposed to prevent further arbitrary closings at the whim of the Budget Bureau, the House Veterans Affairs Committee promptly added another (H.R. 202) to restrict either the closing or adding of VA hospitals and homes in the future without approval of the committee. So much for a sampling of the Budget Bureau's operation in veterans affairs.

Fear is one of the weapons by which the Bureau of the Budget enforces its dominance "It is common knowledge," former Senator Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, once remarked, "that most Government agencies are scared green of the Budget Bureau."

The gagging of high Government officials in testimony before Congress goes right to the heart of the American system of representative government. It is a form of controlled ignorance of the people's representatives.

Nor is this confined to verbal testimony. The Budget Bureau controls the content of letters sent by agencies to Congress and of letters sent by independent agencies to the President. It censors the mail in both of these channels by demanding that whatever such agency heads write must be submitted to them for approval, disapproval or alteration. The Congress seeks a written appraisal on virtually every bill before it, from the agency that the bill would come under. But if any agency head has a different opinion from that of the Budget Bureau, it is out of the letter before a congressional committee sees it.

The Member of Congress who, over a period of many years, has been the Budget Bureau's most persistent critic on Capitol Hill is Representative DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania. FLOOD has referred to the Budget Bureau as a menace to the general welfare and has, along with numerous other Members of Congress, often introduced bills to abolish it in its present form.

FLOOD was the author of a stinging attack on the Bureau when he charged in 1959 that it had made groveling, heelclicking, faceless wonders of the Department of Defense witnesses before the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees of Congress. "No wonder Gen. James Gavin, Gen. Matthew Ridgway and other civilian and military leaders in the Department of Defense will not stomach this regimentation," FLOOD said angrily on the House floor.

Representative FLOOD created a sensation when he read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a confidential memorandum (obtained by means not publicly stated) addressed to the then Secretary of Defense, Neil McElroy, by the then Budget Director, Maurice H. Stans. It reads very much like the orders of a tough top sergeant passing down the word to the troops:

"It is expected," Stans wrote to the Secretary of Defense, "that witnesses (before congressional committees) will carefully avoid volunteering views differing from the budget, either on the record or off the record. While direct questions at hearings must be answered frankly, it is expected that a witness who feels that he must set forth a personal view inconsistent with the President's budget will point out that the President's judgment on the matter was reached from his overall perspective as head of the Government and in the light of overriding national policy. The witness should make it clear that his personal comments are not a request for additional funds.

"Please see that a reminder of this reaches all officials and employees who participate in hearings on appropriations and on legislation directly related to budget proposals."

Not everyone was gagged, but they didn't have their way either. The Congressional Quarterly published the names of numerous able Americans who had quit the Government service in rebellion against the invisible Budget Bureau rather than support policies to which they were opposed, with gags in their mouths. At the same time the Quarterly listed a host of charges that had been made against the Bureau.

Adm. Hyman Rickover said it had withheld "funds to design nuclear power plants to keep submarines under water indefinitely." The outspoken father of our nuclear subs declared, "They should either release the funds or cancel the project."

The head of the National Bureau of Standards charged that the Budget Bureau had held up funds for missile research. The Army Research Director said that weapons development was lagging because too many budget experts were trying to run the Army research program. Representative CHET HOLIFIELD said there'd been a clear substitution of the judgment of the Budget Bureau for Atomic Energy Commission experts at the Hanford, Wash., plutonium project. Senator CLINTON ANDERSON said the Budget Bureau had slowed rocket development by impounding $9.1 million appropriated for Project Rover, and that it had drafted the President's space agency bill and given interested agencies only 24 hours' notice before submitting it to Congress. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD said that the Bureau had frozen $22 million of $32 million appropriated for the National Guard.

To the Stans letter, Representative FLOOD commented acidly:

"The Bureau of the Budget is a Frankenstein insofar as the legislative processes of Congress are concerned. It proposes and discloses as this group of glorified clerks directs. The Budget Bureau is making policy on the minute, on the hour, on the day. It is torturing beyond all reason what Congress meant when it created the Bureau."

Such intimate glimpses into the inner exercise of power by the Bureau of the Budget do not come to light often. You do not see television programs or magazine articles on the Budget Bureau—and the only newspaper comments you are likely to see are brief, routine announcements such as that of the recent replacement of Budget Director Kermit Gordon by Charles L. Schultze, a 40-year-old Maryland University economics professor.

The late Senator Thomas Hennings, of Missouri, counted by many as the most scholarly constitutional lawyer to sit in Congress for decades, was upset about the Budget Bureau's muzzling of witnesses before congressional committees:

"Congress," Senator Hennings said, "ought to have access to opinions and facts from Government officials to carry out its own serious responsibilities to the people." He read to his fellow Senators a short, sharply pointed editorial from the Columbia Missourian re: the Budget Bureau's gagging of witnesses:

"Budget Bureau spokesmen denied that this (the Stans letter) was intended as a gag on prospective witnesses. But if it was not this, what was it?

"It is the duty of Congress to make appropriations, and in carrying out this duty, it should have all possible sources of information. The most natural sources of information are Government officials. Congressmen must try to find out whether or not their requests are justified."

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, now the majority leader, has questioned the constitutionality of the powers exercised by the Budget Bureau.

"Congress," he said frankly, "faces a constitutional problem which we will have to meet some day if we do not want to see our (lawmaking) power steadily eroded and our constitutional position as a coequal branch of the Government reduced still further."

The constitutional problem still has not been faced.

The Bureau was established in 1921 after a dozen years of hassle on Capitol Hill. But it did not become really controversial until the late 1930's, when Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed to reorganize it, vastly enlarge its powers, and put it in the Executive Office of the President.

Republican Members of Congress bounced up and down off the Capitol Dome at the very thought of that. Capitol Hill resounded with anguished cries that Roosevelt wanted to become a dictator. Enough Democrats joined in opposing the move so that it was defeated in Congress. An angry F.D.R. from the little White House in Warm Springs, Ga., wrote his famous "Dear John" open letter in which he denied that he possessed the talent or inclination to become a dictator.

Finally, F.D.R. got his way. The bill passed. On September 9, 1939, Reorganization Plan No. 1 for 1939 made the Budget Bureau a part of the President's staff.

With the recasting of the Bureau as a private arm of the President, its Director beyond congressional confirmation, the Bureau became a storm center and has been one ever since.

What went wrong?

Both the Congress, and President, and all the agencies, badly need a budget bureau to estimate how much income the Government may have from any and all revenue sources, and how much the various old programs and new programs entertained by the Congress, the President, and the agencies will cost. Such a bureau is also needed to suggest ways and means of doing the most with the least money. Nobody has ever objected to this, the primary function of the Budget Bureau. And it is an enormous and responsible job.

But all of this is an advisory and coordinating job.

The power to see to it that the laws that are enacted are, or are not, carried out, does not go with an advisory job.

The power to alter the details of the work of other agencies so as to alter the effect of the law does not go with it.

The power to censor the agencies of Government so that they may tell Congress only what the Budget Bureau permits them to does not go with it. Any agency should be permitted to tell the Congress anything it wants to, and the Budget Bureau should then be permitted to testify that it disagrees with such agency, so that Congress can have the facts on both sides.

We have seen that the Budget Bureau is not above telling Congress what laws it should and should not pass, not as mere testimony, but with threats of getting a Presidential veto in some cases, or simply declining to spend the money (or permitting it to be requested) to carry out a law that may be enacted by Congress over the Bureau's objection.

Because the Bureau was made an arm of the President himself, it easily looks upon itself as the President speaking. Unlike Presidents, the career staff of the Bureau doesn't stand for election every 4 years. Presidents of both parties and Budget Directors come and go while the career staff stays on. It stays on under Republican and Democratic Presidents, giving orders to and making decisions for Republican and Democratic Cabinet Departments and lesser agencies under secretaries who come and go, and wielding the political power of succeeding Presidents in Congress.

This is heady medicine indeed—a temptation to an exercise of power which the Constitution sought to avoid above all else. It makes of the Budget Bureau a disembodied, unelected, permanent super President of the United States. The same men spoke for Truman and Eisenhower and Kennedy who are speaking for Lyndon Johnson today. Had Barry Goldwater been elected they would have been speaking for him. Presidents themselves shrink in stature beside this silent, secretive organ of continuing power. Small wonder that the Budget Bureau is seen by many as the invisible Government of the United States. Small wonder that Lyndon Johnson, as majority leader of the Senate, cried out "by what authority?" and got no answer.

The Budget Bureau is needed—back in its former position as a potent advisor whose estimates and counsel on income and expenditures should be heard with respect. But it should be divested of all powers—actual and sub rosa—to be the enforcer of its own policies in both the executive and legislative branches of a Government that is supposed to be representative of the people. By making the Budget Bureau an arm of the President, too much power was delegated to a continuing group of men who are not politically answerable to the people of a Republic. President Johnson will have no power to speak for his successor as President, but the career men in the Budget Bureau who now speak for him will speak for the next President, and the next, and the next.

"The Bureau of the Budget has usurped the constitutional powers of Congress for decades," declares Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas. "The Budget Bureau has gone far beyond its proper and constitutional place in Government by the arbitrary exercise of powers not properly granted to the Executive. I would be in favor of abolishing it as it now exists and replacing it with another agency to coordinate rather than to command.

"It's really dangerous," says YARBOROUGH. "It's not safe for the country. The Founding Fathers: Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and the others who framed our Government, set up a Constitution of checks and balances. The Founding Fathers learned from the experience of centuries that the average man would fare better with a diffusion of power in Government.

"If, under the guise of being economical, the Budget Bureau refuses to spend money appropriated by Congress to carry out the laws enacted by Congress, the balance of constitutional powers is destroyed. And that is precisely what has happened over the past several decades.

"Congress must some day face up to the problem by abolishing the Bureau of the Budget and setting up something else in its stead. It is the duty of the Congress to have the nerve and the drive and the energy to go back and recapture its constitutional powers. Some day it will."

HUMAN SUFFERING IN SOUTH VIETNAM EMPHASIZES THE IMPORTANCE OF INCREASING MEDICAL AID

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, our military effort in Vietnam seems to be slowly but steadily improving.

And yet we may lose the peace. We may lose the support of the people of South Vietnam simply because their suffering has become unbearable.

Last Sunday Dr. Howard Rusk, the eminent New York Times medical correspondent, reported the heartbreaking story of sickness and death in Vietnam.

He also described in detail the pathetic lack of doctors, of hospitals, and medicines. These are shortages we are working desperately to solve. It is vital that we do even better—in fact far better in the future—if we are to win the hearts and minds of these long-suffering people, and that is the key to genuine victory in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Dr. Rusk, "Refugee in Vietnam," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REFUGEE CRISIS IN VIETNAM—CONSTANT SHIFTING OF HOMELESS MAKES DIFFICULT JOB ALMOST INSURMOUNTABLE

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

SAIGON.—Only by seeing can one believe the extent and depth of human suffering in Vietnam.

The complexities of relieving suffering in this war-ravaged nation are incredible. They would be insurmountable were it not for the programs already established by the U.S. forces, both military and civilian, international voluntary agencies and other groups from the free world.

Of the 15 million people in Vietnam, 600,000 or 1 in 15 are refugees. This is the second time in the brief history of the Republic of Vietnam that the uprooting of lives has reached enormous proportions.

In 1954 and 1955, following the partition of Vietnam, almost 1 million refugees left the Communist north because of political and religious beliefs. Only 140,000, primarily elements of Ho Chi Minh's army, moved from the south to Communist North Vietnam.

The situation today, however, is completely different from 10 years ago. At that time there was a clear line of demarcation between the forces of communism and democracy.

LAND OF ISOLATION

Now South Vietnam resembles a large lake dotted with numerous islands. The "water" portion is the Vietcong and the "islands" the secure and semisecure territory of the Vietnamese. As the tide of battle fluctuates, these islands increase or decrease in size.

When the islands decrease the rural population seeks refuge in the secure territories and, as a result, the refugee population swells. As the government and U.S. forces counterattack and regain territory the refugees return to their farms and hamlets.

When the United States and Vietnam marines began a combined air and amphibious offensive in the coastal lowlands at Cape Batangan, about 340 miles northeast of here recently, the refugee population of nearby secure areas increased rapidly. Leaflets are dropped in advance of an attack to warn the civilian population to seek safety.

The current influx of refugees results from the increased Vietcong terrorism and confiscatory taxation, and increased Vietnam and U.S. military operations.

Refugees are almost 100-percent women, children, and older men. Practically all of the country's men of working age are in its armed forces. Primarily farmers, the refugees have no other skills and are dependent upon the government and the U.S. Agency for International Development.

In theory, the government provides each adult refugee with seven piasters a day (about 5 cents) and three piasters a day for a child. With the rising prices, resulting from shortages of commodities, it has become increasingly necessary for the United States to provide the refugees with supplementary food. Distribution of food, which comes from U.S. surplus stocks, presents an extraordinarily difficult logistical problem because the secure areas are isolated.

RAIL TRANSPORT OUT

There is no rail transport because the Vietcong have destroyed all railway bridges. When wood and other supplies become depleted, the government has to deploy thousands of its troops to clear a highway through Vietcong territory and then has to keep it open for the long truck convoys. In many

areas, the only communication with the outside world for months has been by airlift.

Food and its delivery is the No. 1 problem for Vietnam's refugees and its provincial population. The second major problem is health. Vietnam has about 900 physicians, most of whom are in the military service. In one secure area, which last week had a population of about 300,000 persons, there are only 4 physicians, all of whom are in the military service and must meet the civilian health needs on a part-time basis.

Tuberculosis is highly prevalent, as are skin infections, intestinal parasites, trachoma, and other diseases of the eyes, typhoid, and leprosy. A remarkably good job has been done by Vietnamese and United States health workers in controlling serious epidemics among the refugees by inoculations against smallpox, cholera, plague, and typhoid.

In vast areas of the country the only health services are medicines distributed by U.S. military teams. These are not special medical units but regular forces, all of whom carry medicines to distribute to the civilian population, especially refugees.

Added to the health problems of an uprooted population are the ravages of conflict. This writer saw the effects of the war on a visit to Mytho, a provincial capital in the lush Mekong Delta. Mytho is 30 minutes from here by helicopter over Vietcong territory. There had been heavy fighting the night before in the area. Refugees were just beginning to struggle in with their wounded.

The most touching of all was a frantic mother with a 3-year-old child, a large portion of whose face had been destroyed by Vietcong land mines. She had walked 11 kilometers (nearly 7 miles) through Vietcong territory to find help for her child.

Other casualties included amputees and a 12-year-old boy with hundreds of skin wounds, who was blinded by a Vietcong land mine.

COULD BE REHABILITATED

There was an outstanding team of Philippine surgeons in the provincial hospital, which, like many hospitals in Vietnam, had two patients in most of its beds. There are numerous Philippine and other free world groups working in health activities among the Vietnamese civilian population.

Particularly distressing to this writer was the problem of the paraplegic veterans. Most of them have been collected at one center, which is a 2-hour drive from Saigon through Vietcong territory. The authorities, having had no experience in the modern management of paraplegia and no personnel trained to meet the complicated problems of this condition, are helpless.

These men are excellent candidates for rehabilitation, but unless they receive outside help quickly they are doomed.

Vietnam is a political struggle with violent military overtones. It is a Vietnamese war, which must be won by the Vietnamese with our support. It is a war that can be lost in Saigon, but can only be won in the countryside. It is a war with hundreds of pressing needs in the fields of health, education, and welfare.

The solutions to these problems have political as well as humanitarian implications. The Vietnamese peasant wants security, food, social justice, and a better life for his children than he has had. He has a great yearning for education for his children. He will cast his lot with the political system under which he thinks his chances are best for the achievement of his aspirations.

Failure of the United States and the free world to provide sufficient help to the Republic of Vietnam to make these aspirations a reality could result in our winning the war but losing the peace.

RICHARD NIXON IS OFF BASE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, by making inflammatory statements during his recent trip to the Far East, Richard Nixon has done a distinct disservice to our Government's goal of a peaceful settlement in southeast Asia. Some of the Nation's most responsible newspapers, including the New York Times on September 8, and the Lewiston Morning Tribune on August 29, have condemned Mr. Nixon's statements. As Bill Hall noted in the Lewiston Morning Tribune:

Former Vice President Richard Nixon, currently on a tour of the Far East, is taking astounding liberties in announcing what this Nation's policies should be and will be in the Vietnamese war. He is showing no regard for the fact he is a distinguished former high official in the U.S. Government, and that many in the Far East may take his words for more than the idle comments of another American tourist.

I ask unanimous consent to have these two excellent editorials printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Sept 8, 1965]

NIXON OFF BASE

Richard M. Nixon's 16-day tour of Asia, described as a "private business trip," has been accompanied by public statements at every stop calling for "victory" in Vietnam and denouncing proposals for peace negotiations. In a Saigon news conference, the former Vice President said the Republican Party would make a campaign issue out of Vietnam in 1966 and 1968 if President Johnson ended the war there by compromise.

The propriety of carrying an American political debate abroad, doubtful in any circumstances, is even more questionable when controversial statements concerning a war situation are emitted from a platform in the war zone itself. But the issue raised by Mr. Nixon's remarks—which oppose a settlement based on concessions by both sides—is far more important than the unfortunate location he chose for the purpose.

The idea that unconditional surrender can be imposed on North Vietnam is an illusion that most Americans long since have abandoned. President Johnson has recognized that military victory is impossible for either side. He has accompanied military pressure with proposals that offer North Vietnam a way out of the present impasse.

The effect of the President's proposals on the nonalined countries—and on Moscow and Hanoi—seems to have Communist China worried. Peiping in recent weeks has felt it necessary to urge Hanoi to fight on. But the Chinese leaders are evidently unable to offer any more solid encouragement than the will-o'-the-wisp hope that other "liberation wars" in Asia, Africa, and Latin America ultimately will help the Vietnamese Communists defeat the United States.

In these circumstances, Mr. Nixon's remarks can only be tragically harmful, encouraging an unrealistic intransigence just at the moment when a vital debate seems to be going on within the Communist world.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Aug. 29, 1965]

WE READ YOU—LOUD AND MISTAKEN

Secretary of State Dean Rusk proclaimed knowingly Friday that he is keeping his "antenna * * * very much alert" for peace signals from the Communists. If he had tuned to another frequency Saturday he would have heard, not a peace overture, but a symphony in saber rattling. And it came not from Hanoi, Peiping, or Moscow war rooms. The transmitter was a former Vice President of the United States.

Former Vice President Richard Nixon, currently on a tour of the Far East, is taking astounding liberties in announcing what this Nation's policies should be and will be in the Vietnamese war. He is showing no regard for the fact he is a distinguished former high official in the U.S. Government, and that many in the Far East may take his words for more than the idle comments of another American tourist.

Stopping in Japan, Nixon told the residents of Tokyo that the Communists "have slapped us in the face with a wet fish" after each U.S. peace offer, and that Communists misinterpret a willingness to negotiate "as a sign of weakness." Constant talk of negotiation has actually prolonged the war, he said.

And at Taipei, Formosa, Nixon declared that the Communists know the Republic of China will attack the mainland if they intervene in Vietnam. He said not only that the Communists know that, but, in the event of such intervention, "there would certainly be justification for the Chinese Nationalists to counterattack the Chinese Communists."

In one busy day, a former Vice President of the United States has announced to the world that the search for peace in Vietnam is a sign of weakness, and he has given his blessing in advance to a Nationalist Chinese attack on mainland China.

The Communists may know that the Nationalists will attack the mainland if they intervene in Vietnam, but one wonders if the President of the United States knows it.

Perhaps that is a possibility being considered by the Johnson administration in the event of Red Chinese intervention, but that is a decision to be made when the time comes by the Commander in Chief, the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is not a course to be proclaimed as fact by an itinerant American politician.

It is one of the blessings of U.S. citizenship that any American can become an expert on foreign policy and tell the President and the world what we should do in Vietnam. But no one, and especially a man of such stature that he might be believed by many abroad, has the right to announce whether we will or will not invite the Formosan Chinese to apply counterpressure against the mainland.

Even when Nixon only discusses what the United States should do, rather than what it will do, his declaration is incompatible coming from a man who once sought to become Commander in Chief himself. To suggest that attempts at peacemaking are wrong because they will be misinterpreted as signs of weakness is preposterous.

There would seem to be a faint possibility that they might be interpreted as signs of peaceful intent.

Right or wrong, the U.S. policy in South Vietnam should by now be crystal clear to the Red Chinese, the North Vietnamese. the Russians, our allies, the American people, and even former Vice Presidents. Johnson, Rusk and practically every member of the Cabinet has stated on countless occasions that the American and Vietnamese forces will maintain the pressure on the Vietcong and North Vietnam making it clear that there is no weakness of resolve of military force.

At the same time, it has been explained time and time again, we remain ready to talk peace whenever the Vietcong, the North Vietnamese, the United Nations or anyone else is ready to talk peace. Meanwhile, American forces engage the Vietcong, and American bombers pound the north. It's a strange way to demonstrate weakness.

It is easy to understand the President's frequent exasperation over his foreign policy critics. No matter what he does, he is wrong. If he prosecutes the war too vigorously, he is wrong for not seeking more avenues to peace. If he offers to negotiate, he is showing signs of weakness.

In the meantime, however, the President continues to put the weight of action behind the words of policy. The pressure on the Vietcong is being increased, and the attempts to find a peaceful solution are becoming ever more intensive. American troops continue to be sent to Vietnam in ever-increasing numbers, and Rusk reports he is under orders to seek out every possible road to peace. There are, in fact, dozens of attempts now underway through Moscow, through the United Nations and through a flock of other third parties.

And through it all, Rusk keeps his antennae alert. Hopefully, he soon will pick up more than the static transmitted from Tokyo and Taipei Saturday.

THE VOLUNTARY FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it would be difficult to overstate the importance of continuing the national feed grain program through the next 4 years.

The feed grain program is a tremendous success. Over two-thirds of all the farmers in the United States have feed grain bases, growing one or more of the three grains primarily used for livestock and poultry feeding, corn, barley, and sorghum grains.

Corn and the other feed grains are used for human consumption, for the feeding of dairy cows, for the feeding and fattening of beef cattle, hogs, chickens, and turkeys, for cash export, and for many industrial uses. Feed grains either accounted for or had a direct bearing on over $3 of every $5 received by all American farmers in 1964.

It should be continued because it has proved to be a success and because the trend of success can be continued.

Also, it should be continued because the alternative would be extremely bad for farmers and bad for the Nation.

First, let us look at the success story.

During the past 4 years, it has chalked up these achievements:

First. It has increased producer income. Producers have realized $3 billion more for their crops than would have been possible under pre-1961 programs. In Minnesota alone, continuation of this program will mean an additional $21 million in farm income next year, increasing feed grains returns to $534 million.

Second. It has reduced the surplus. This fall the combined carryover of feed grains will be down more than 1 billion bushels from the 3.2 billion bushel peak in 1960.

The program has also saved money for the taxpayer in the long run. For example, in 1960, CCC stocks of feed grains, stored at the taxpayers' expense totaled some 85 million tons. The 1961–64 programs reduced that amount from 85 million tons to 56 million tons, at a substantial saving to the Government. USDA experts say that had this program not been law, stocks would otherwise have continued to increase to 125 million tons, costing the American taxpayer increased storage and handling and transportation costs.

Third. It has cut Government costs. Government outlays, though large under the program, ultimately would have been more than $2 billion greater under the pre-1961 program.

The cost to the Government per harvested acre has been, for example, for feed grains only $11 per acre, as compared to $34 per acre for cotton, $41 for wheat, and $101 for rice. On a per farm basis, the results are even more revealing. Feed grains, per farm, cost the Government an average of $436 per farm, while cotton went to $626 per farm, wheat $1,109, and rice slightly under $12,400.

But in any way that costs can be analyzed, it is the most efficient, the most economical, and the most beneficial to the farmer of any of the other major commodity programs.

Fourth. It has promoted foreign sales. Feed grain exports have expanded rapidly in recent years and are a major dollar earner without need of Government export payments.

Fifth. It has brought stability into grain markets and the livestock industry. The pressure of climbing surpluses and lower prices under pre-1961 programs would have extended through the entire agricultural economy with particularly serious implications for the multibillion dollar livestock and poultry industry.

The alternative to an effective feed grain program is disaster. Without a feed grain program, the acreage of feed grains would go up around 30 to 35 million acres the first year. Farmers would inevitably produce an extra 40 to 50 million tons of feed grains that we cannot use now. This extra feed grain would mean millions of extra hogs or billions of pounds of additional beef.

Mr. President, the majority of the Senate committee reviewed the facts that I have just mentioned concerning the success of this program, and I think it is fair to state the consensus was that this is the first truly successful feed grain program that we have ever had in the history of farm legislation and farm programs.

Time after time I have heard farmers from my own State of Minnesota, sometimes even those who were not participants in the feed grain program, say that this is the best program they have ever had made available to them. They appreciate most of all that it has helped bring about stability in livestock supplies and in livestock prices. For many producers, this is why we have a feed grain program—to promote stability with reasonable supplies in the livestock economy.

Minnesota's feed grain crop is crucial to the health of our agricultural sector, for although as a cash crop it accounts for only 13.6 percent of Minnesota marketing receipts, it is grown on 85 percent of our farms, and is fed on farms to cattle, hogs, calves, poultry, and dairy cows, which together account for almost 70 percent of Minnesota's marketing receipts.

And Minnesota's farmers participate in the Government programs. 71 percent of our farmers signed up, compared to the nationwide average of 36 percent, and the loss of that program would mean to those farmers an immediate drop in income in excess of $45 million. It can readily be seen what such a loss would do to the State of Minnesota. And this would be true for many other States having a high participation rate in the voluntary feed grains program.

I am not talking about the large commercial farmer. Studies of Minnesota reveal that in our 42 principal feed grain counties, an average of 80 percent of the payments made by the Government went to cooperating producers with a base acreage of 200 acres or less. In some of those counties, this figure goes as high as 96 or 97 percent.

Basically, the feed grain program included in the omnibus farm bill now before the Senate is a continuation of the successful program we now have. Production needs to be compared with utilization to provide any meaningful measure of the program's success. Total stocks have been cut about 30 million tons during the first 4 years of the program. It is clear, therefore, that the program has been successful in reducing production substantially below the level of utilization. In contrast, during the 1950's, increases in utilization were more than offset by increases in production.

But the committee recognized that as productivity goes up, the basic price relationships of these grains must be reviewed. We recognize that in the last 6 years corn yields have increased nearly 33 percent—from 54.5 bushels per acre in 1960 to an estimated 72.4 bushels per acre in 1965. About the same percentage increase occurred in the preceding 6 years. We are advised this increase in productivity—in yields—is likely to continue in the foreseeable future—certainly in the 4 years covered by this new bill—and we must, therefore, recognize that the price support rate must take into account the changes in technology and productivity that are occurring. We have done that, Mr. President, by providing the authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to modify the components of total support available to the cooperator. We have provided that total support must be in the range of 65 to 90 percent of parity. Under present conditions, this would be $1.03 to $1.42 per bushel for corn.

In the bill, as well as in the report, the committee has indicated that the Secretary of Agriculture should take into account these changes in determining the levels of the loan and, therefore, the level of the price support payment. I believe I am accurate in stating that a majority of the members of the committee do not mean in any way to force the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the basic loan level in a manner which would be disruptive to the livestock economy. There were suggestions presented in the committee that this be done by statute so as to drop 1 nickel per year for each of the 4 years involved with the feed grain program. This was not accepted by the majority of the committee. Instead, we preferred to give the authority

to the Secretary of Agriculture to take into account—and I quote from H.R. 9811 now pending before the Senate, on page 78, line 10: "taking into account increases in yields, but"—and now I emphasize, Mr. President: "but so as not to disrupt the feed grain and livestock economy."

Also, I believe I am correct in stating that a majority of the committee—being interested in maintaining farm income of cooperators—wanted to be sure that any reduction in the loan rate would not be accompanied by a reduction in total support paid to the participating feed grain farmer. We look for improvement, not diminishment, of feed grain farmer income.

In summary, the majority of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry are saying to the Secretary and administrators of this program: "We recognize that rapid changes are taking place, we recognize that there may need to be modifications in the mix of price support loan and price support payments in order to get the best results of the feed grain program in the years ahead, but in making your decisions we want it clear that you shall take into consideration the effects of any new loan levels on supplies, and therefore, returns to producers involved in feed grain and livestock production.

We do not intend that the Secretary of Agriculture should reduce, for example, the loan level to 85 or 90 cents, since to do so may well be disastrous to the feed grain farmer and to the livestock farmer.

The committee also included authority to sharply change the feed grain program from the way it has operated in the last 4 years if changing conditions should indicate the need. Subtitle B provides for all of the incentives for participation to be directed toward land diversion payments, with no price support payments available to cooperators. As part of our consideration of this amendment we asked the Department of Agriculture to analyze this approach and to give us the benefits of their analysis. In brief, the Department technicians advised the committee that to obtain an equal amount of diversion, the approach provided in subtitle B would require diversion payment rates at between 70 and 90 percent of the loan, times the projected yield. This compares to the 20- and 50-percent payments which have been used in recent years.

Furthermore, the Department indicates that the approach embodied in subtitle B would not be used in the immediate future. They indicated no objection to having the authority included so that it might be used in some future years—such as 1968 or 1969—if circumstances were such that this approach would obtain the desired results at minimum cost while maintaining farm income and providing stability in the livestock economy. On the basis of that analysis and counsel from the Department, this provision was included in the feed grain title.

This is in line with our effort to provide the executive branch with a full kit of program tools to carry out the purposes of the Congress. We recognize that conditions change and that program methods must be adapted in order to assure continuing good results.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me point out again that two-thirds of all the farms in the Nation produce feed grains and that most farms are users of feed grains in the production of meat, milk, and eggs. Hence, in dealing with the feed grain program, we are dealing with the livelihood of millions of farm families, the business interests of the meat, dairy, and poultry and egg industries, and a major share of the food supply of the Nation. This is a tremendous responsibility. In this bill, it is being handled responsibly.

RICKOVER'S ADDITIONAL 2 YEARS SERVICE GOOD NEWS FOR AMERICA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the decision by President Johnson to keep Adm. Hyman Rickover on duty for 2 years beyond his compulsory retirement next year is mighty welcome. The President's action represents a rare exception and it should. It makes sense for our military officials to be relatively young, alert, at the peak of their mental powers. At the same time, when the rare genius with the imagination of a Rickover comes along and when he is as highly expert as Admiral Rickover is in a field of immense importance—the nuclear powered submarine in Rickover's case—we should use his rare talent as long and as well as we can.

I ask unanimous consent that an article in the New York Times reporting the President's decision with regard to Admiral Rickover be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JOHNSON EXTENDS RICKOVER'S ACTIVE DUTY 2 YEARS—CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT HELPS TO BAR FORCED RETIREMENT—APPEAL BY SENATOR ANDERSON IS ACCEPTED BY PRESIDENT

(By Jon W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, September 10.—President Johnson has ordered a 2-year extension of active duty for Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, thus once again preventing the controversial developer of the atomic submarine from being forced into retirement.

Without the Presidential intervention, Admiral Rickover, who will be 66 years old in January, would have been forced to retire from active duty early next year.

Once again the admiral's congressional supporters, who repeatedly in the last 8 years have saved him from forced retirement by the Navy, rallied to his defense.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, a senior Democrat on the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Emergy, was understood to have sent a letter to the President urging the retention of Admiral Rickover—a suggestion promptly accepted by Mr. Johnson.

CONTINUITY IS SOUGHT

The point being made by the Congressmen—and by Admiral Rickover in testimony repeatedly before congressional committees—is that in highly technological enterprises it is becoming increasingly important to have continuity of leadership.

In contrast with the rapid turnover in most other military development projects, Admiral Rickover has remained in essentially one job since he first started developing an atomic reactor for a submarine 18 years ago.

It is to this continuity that Admiral Rickover attributes the success and relatively low cost of his expanding program. Slightly more than $1 billion has been spent in research and development in the nuclear reactor program—less than has been spent in the development of some major missiles.

Out of the Rickover program has come a still expanding nuclear fleet as well as the basic reactor technology for the present generation of atomic powerplants.

There are presently 30 Polaris and 22 atomic attack submarines in operation, as well as 3 atomic-powered surface ships. Under construction or authorized are 11 additional Polaris submarines, 35 attack submarines, and 2 more surface ships.

In the face of repeated pressure from the Navy to force him into retirement, Admiral Rickover has made no secret of his desire to remain on active duty "as long as I am able and both I and others feel I can do a useful job."

For successful development and safe operation of the nuclear fleet, he has emphasized that it was "mandatory" that there be a permanent organization. He has expressed fears that the Navy would dismember this group upon his retirement because "it does not fit into the neat pattern of Navy organization."

Aside from his length of duty, dating back to his commissioning as an ensign in 1922, Admiral Rickover is unusual in the Navy for his two-hat assignment in two organizations. He serves as director of naval reactors in the Atomic Energy Commission and director of nuclear propulsion in the Navy's Bureau of Ships.

Admiral Rickover faced retirement from his post nearly 2 years ago when he reached the Navy's compulsory retirement age of 66. But then, under a little used provision of naval regulations, the Navy agreed to recall Admiral Rickover to active duty for 2 years upon his retirement. This tour will now be extended until January 1968 under the new Presidential directive.

With the exception of Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, who remains on active duty by virtue of his five-star rank, Admiral Rickover now has the longest active duty service of any officer in the Navy. Although he suffered a serious heart attack 4 years ago, he still maintains his rigorous 6- and 7-day-a-week pace.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ORVILLE FREEMAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, it is most appropriate at this time to be able to recognize some of the achievements of a man who has "the most unpopular job in Washington." The Senate has focused its attention on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 for several days now. The man who is charged with the responsibility of carrying out the programs contained in this legislation, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, has done a remarkable job in contending with some of the most worrisome problems in the field of government. An editorial in the Nashville Tennessean, in discussing the remarkable accomplishments of the Secretary, recently stated that:

Mr. Freeman has demonstrated that he is a man who exercises power with judicious care. He is devoted to the task of raising rural income to a level comparable with that of other sectors of the American economy. He deserves all the help he can get.

I heartily concur in these thoughts and commend this editorial to the reading of all the Members of this body. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial reprinted in the RECORD.

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

AGRICULTURE SECRETARY DESERVES MUCH CREDIT

Dramatic changes, unless their impact is unfavorable, have a way of creeping up on Americans, virtually unnoticed.

Just past the middle of 1965, the long deplored stockpiles of surplus farm products have melted down to at least a respectable minimum. And it has happened in a manner that attracted almost no notice. Cotton storage is the only major exception.

Almost while nobody was looking a problem, long considered an impossibility to solve, has become manageable. Typical of what has happened is the reduced carryover of feed grains down from 85 million tons in 1961 to 55 million tons today. A bumper feed grain crop this year, 20 million tons up from 1964, can only increase slightly the margin of safety in existing reserves.

For a nation which assumes as a part of its responsibility the easing of hunger around the globe, the grain elevators may be down too low.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, who has the most unpopular job in Washington, is the man responsible for this achievement.

He succeeded in office Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, who spent his 8 years denouncing the surpluses as sinful but doing nothing to reduce them. Mr. Freeman was still a newcomer on his job when circumstances beyond his control cornered him behind the political eight ball of the Billie Sol Estes case.

While the Estes case haunted him, the Secretary entered quietly upon his tremendous task of whittling the stockpiles and restoring the American farmer to a position in the economic yardsticks approaching parity. Most of the time Mr. Freeman had to tread a maze of contradictory laws to achieve these goals.

The surplus problem has not disappeared, but it has been greatly reduced. As one reward Mr. Freeman deserves a sympathetic understanding and support for his farm legislation now pending before the U.S. Senate. The bill is not the final answer to the continuing farm problem, but it is the best thing available until a new assessment can be made of the long-range future of farming. It is hoped a congressional committee now making a full study of farm and food prices will be able to come up with some new ideas on how to solve today's farm problems.

Charges by opponents, that the proposed legislation now before the Senate gives to the Secretary of Agriculture the broadest discretionary powers in both production controls and incentive payments ever given a man in his office, are true. This is not necessarily an end.

Mr. Freeman has demonstrated that he is a man who exercises power with judicious care. He is devoted to the task of raising rural income to a level comparable with that of other sectors of the American economy. He deserves all the help he can get.

CANADA'S WHEAT BOOM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, Canada, and especially Canadian wheat farmers, are enjoying an era of prosperity.

The Canadian wheat crop this year is 27 percent above last year, and 60 percent above the 10-year average.

The crop is not giving the nation any surplus problems. On the contrary, Canada's problem is one of transport—getting the wheat transported from the prairie Provinces and loaded aboard ships for delivery abroad.

I am delighted to see Canadian wheat farmers prospering. I am disappointed only that U.S. wheat farmers, who have had to cut acreage time after time to avoid surpluses, are not sharing in the sales to Russia which have made the Canadian prosperity possible. They could have done so, and some of the 60-percent expansion in Canadian wheat production could have occurred in the United States, except for the self-defeating, ill-advised requirement which the United States imposes on cash wheat sales to the Soviet countries that 50 percent of our wheat must move in American ships. This results in costs which make our wheat producers unable to produce for this large market.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to put three brief articles on the situation in Canada in the RECORD. Two are from the Winnipeg Tribune, reporting the size of the wheat crop and the problem of transporting their wheat to ships—a problem that it would be novel if not pleasant to have in this country. The third is from our own Journal of Commerce and reports the impact of the Russian wheat sales on the Canadian economy and her balance-of-trade problem.

I repeat, Mr. President, that I am delighted that the Canadians have done so well, but would be even happier if our Nation had shared a little in the trade which has proved such a bonanza for our northern neighbors.

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

[From the Winnipeg (Canada) Tribune, Sept. 4, 1965]

PARKER SEEKS TEMPORARY HALT TO TRAIN

Movement of grain to terminal positions is behind schedule and Canada will not be able to fulfill her export commitments unless immediate action is taken, W. J. Parker, president of Manitoba Pool Elevators, said today.

Speaking for 30,000 Manitoba farmers who deliver grain to pool elevators throughout the province, Mr. Parker said rail movement of grain from country to terminal elevators must be speeded up if the farmer is going to be able to deliver the required amount of grain to satisfy export contracts.

"We have only 3 or 3½ months until the close of navigation of the Great Lakes, and we must move quickly."

Referring to a plan by the Canadian Pacific Railway to discontinue operating the Dominion, Mr. Parker said the Manitoba Pool Elevators favors temporary removal of the passenger train.

There is an apparent serious shortage of diesel units in the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Parker said.

"We would support the Canadian Pacific Railway in a temporary suspension of the Dominion for a period of at least 3 months, thereby clearing 24 or 25 diesel units for freight, and I would urge the Federal Government to immediately release the railway from its obligation in this period.

HOLD HEARINGS

"In the meantime, the board of transport commissioners could hold hearings and bring forth their findings on the original application of the railway for the abandonment of the Dominion."

The interest of the nation in this regard is clear, Mr. Parker said. It is unthinkable Canada should miss an export grain target because of delay or failure to take the needed action.

"Our future trade relations with the Russians and the Chinese are at stake, and the buoyant effects on the economy of heavy grain exports are already known from past experience."

Mr. Parker pointed out that passenger traffic has other alternatives—automobile, bus and air travel. But there is no other way to get grain to terminal positions than by pulling a string of box cars with a diesel engine.

Therefore, he said, grain definitely must be given priority over passenger traffic, and the government should immediately give the Canadian Pacific Railway a temporary suspension in the operation of the Dominion.

[From the Winnipeg (Canada) Tribune, Sept. 4, 1965]

BUREAU PREDICTS RECORDS

OTTAWA.—The Bureau of Statistics Friday estimated 1965 wheat production at a record 759,804,000 bushels, beating the old high of 723,400,000 bushels in 1963. Many other crop records also were forecast.

The predicted wheat yield per acre of 26.9 bushels would also be a record by a paper-thin margin. The current record is 26.8 set in 1952.

Estimated prairie wheat yield of 743 million bushels is 29 percent ahead of last year's crop of 578 million and also well ahead of the 1963 record production of 703 million.

Rapeseed production forecast is for a record 28 million bushels, more than double the old high of 13.2 million set last year. Rapeseed yield of 19.5 bushels an acre would also be a record, surpassing the 1951 figure of 18.5.

Forecast flaxseed output of 29.1 million bushels would be the second largest crop on record. Last year's was 20.3 million.

Estimated yields per acre of oats, barley, and rye surpassed the old highs. Predicted production of every grain exceeded last year's output. Mixed grain production of 74.4 million bushels would be a record as would the yield per acre of 49.4.

HARVEST JUST STARTED

The crop estimates by the Federal agency were based on an August 15 survey when the prairie harvest had just started. The Bureau report warned that the estimates would hold good only if satisfactory weather conditions prevailed for the remainder of the growing and harvest season.

Bad weather and heavy rains in some areas last month halted harvest operations. The current need is for warm, dry harvest weather.

The total predicted wheat crop would be 27 percent larger than the 1964 bumper crop of 600.4 million bushels, and 60 percent above the 10-year average (1954–63) of 475.1 million.

The all-Canada wheat yield of 26.9 bushels an acre is well ahead of the 20.2 yield last year and the 19.5 yield of the 10-year average. Spring wheat formed the bulk of the crop with a predicted output of 746.6 million bushels yielding 26.7 bushels an acre.

Prairie wheat production of 743 million bushels is 64 percent ahead of the 10-year average yield of 453.3 million. Manitoba production is set at 86 million, compared to 85 million last year. Saskatchewan is 476 million compared to 348 million and Alberta

is 181 million compared to 140 million last year.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Aug. 31, 1965]

CANADA ECONOMY GETS BOOST FROM WHEAT SALE

For the second time in 24 months, says the current Monthly Review of the Bank of Nova Scotia, a huge wheat sale to the Soviet Union has happily occurred when Canada's balance of international payments was moving in an unfavorable direction. The Russian purchase will serve to sustain growth in exports. It will also give an indirect boost to the tempo of domestic activity.

The volume of gross national product for 1965 as a whole, the Review suggests, should now appreciably exceed the 5 percent increase officially forecast at the beginning of the year. Coming on top of last year's 6½-percent growth this would be more than enough to keep the economy on the annual growth target projected for the period 1963–70 by the Economic Council of Canada.

STRONGEST INFLUENCE

The strongest influence in the current picture is provided by capital investment projects. The pace of capital expenditures has accelerated sharply over the past 4 years; following an upward revision in the mid-year forecast they are now expected to rise 19 percent in 1965. Consumer demands so far this year have also shown a strong underlying trend. While the rise in consumer expenditures has been broadly based, the biggest element of growth has been car sales which for the 1965 model year could show a rise of as much as 14 percent over the previous year.

On the external front, the Review says that the less favorable trend in exports which developed in late 1964 following completion of the large wheat sale to Russia continued into 1965, exports in the first half showing a year-over-year gain of only 2 percent as against a rise of 22 percent in the comparable period of 1964. With exports less buoyant and imports continuing to grow under the pressure of strong domestic demands, Canada's international transactions on current account have since the last quarter of 1964 shown a considerably larger deficit.

The strong demands in domestic markets have also found expression in some upward movement in prices and costs. Wage demands which have been strengthening as a result of shortages of skilled or specialized workers in important sectors of the economy hold out the danger of further pressure on costs, particularly if the boost to activity now in prospect generates a renewed spurt in employment. These pressures, both actual and in prospect, have induced a gradually rising note of caution in official policies. While the money supply has continued to expand at a fast pace to meet unusually strong loan demands interest rates have been moving upwards for several months now and this trend could continue until it becomes apparent that the strain on resources is easing.

The concomitant to domestic pressures—a worsening trade balance—has now been forestalled by the wheat sale to Russia, while the U.S. market has strengthened as a result of stepped-up commitments in Vietnam. In some other countries export prospects are still clouded by economic difficulties. In the year ahead, however, the Review points out, Canada now has good prospects for sustaining strong and viable economic growth, though increasing efforts will be needed to hold costs in line if the country's longer-term competitive position is to be maintained.

ABOVE AND BEYOND THE CALL

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, only too infrequently do we see a clear and decisive victory of justice over injustice, right over wrong, and light over darkness.

Last week, one of these rare victories occurred, and I wish to pay the highest tribute to the three men who made the victory possible after a ceaseless struggle of more than 10 years.

Two of these men are public servants, well known for their many struggles for the public good. They are the President of the United States and the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. I am certain that both of these gentlemen would join me in calling attention to and especially paying tribute to the third who is much less well known outside the Senate. I refer to Mr. Howard Shuman, Senator DOUGLAS' extremely able administrative assistant. Without Mr. Shuman's idealism and dogged persistence, the victory could never have been won.

You may wonder of what victory I speak.

It is not the kind of victory that receives worldwide attention, but it is the kind that should receive wide attention here in the Congress. It is the kind of victory from which we can take comfort that our system of government has certain hidden strengths which serve it well.

The victory concerns the granting of a Presidential pardon to a marine sergeant named Carl H. Buck who was cashiered out of the Marine Corps more than 10 years ago. He was accused of stealing chevrons. Through the years, he maintained his innocence. And, due primarily to the dogged determination of Mr. Shuman, new evidence was discovered which proved his innocence.

I know that President Johnson, Senator DOUGLAS, and Sergeant Buck will join me in congratulating Mr. Shuman on the happy results of his long struggle.

SENATOR SPARKMAN ACHIEVES BREAKTHROUGH IN BEEF EXPORTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the expansion of our exports has never been more crucial to our economic well-being than it is at the present time. Thanks to the excess of exports over imports, which is now running at an annual rate of over $6 billion a year, this Nation is permitted the luxury of heavy private overseas investments, substantial foreign aid, and extensive military establishments in Europe and the Far East. Were it not for the steady and substantial margin provided by our export trade, the dollar would indeed be in serious difficulty.

Under these circumstances, it is most regrettable that so many people are still lulled by the old, mistaken notion that because our exports represent a small fraction of the total goods and services produced in this Nation, they are not important.

As a matter of fact, exports are very important to many sectors of the economy. Agricultural commodities presently make up one-fourth of U.S. exports, and such sales are responsible for 16 percent of farm income. It is the export market that provides an outlet for 75 percent of our wheat production, 66 percent of our rice, and more than half of our dried peas.

Unfortunately, there are other agricultural commodities which we produce with great efficiency that are still barred from foreign markets. Of these poultry is a notorious example.

In a reversion to protectionism the Common Market has raised tariffs so as to virtually exclude American poultry from that market.

Another is beef. This country produces 40 percent of the world's beef; yet, up to this year, only a fraction of 1 percent of our production went overseas, in spite of its universally recognized superiority. When we consider that 25 percent of the annual income of American farmers derives from beef and cattle, the large aspect of this problem becomes apparent. As our representatives prepare for the Kennedy round trade negotiations in Geneva later this month, they will do well to keep in mind the great prospective importance of beef cattle in our exports.

We are all indebted to my distinguished colleague, Senator SPARKMAN, not only for focusing attention on the prospective importance of the beef and cattle exports, but also for far-sighted and steadfast efforts to increase them.

Through our mutual association on the Joint Economic Committee, I have been privileged to share Senator SPARKMAN's concern about the role of discriminatory freight rates in keeping down U.S. exports. For 2 years, he and I have been working to bring to light the adverse effects of ocean freight rate discrimination on our foreign trade. Unwarranted differentials as between incoming and outgoing rates deprive our business enterprises of millions and millions of dollars in possible sales each year.

Senator SPARKMAN was quick to explore the implications of this situation for beef exports. Through his efforts on the Small Business Committee, of which he is chairman, he has succeeded already in reducing ocean freight rates by 25 percent on most categories of beef and beef products sold to Western Europe. Largely as a result of this accomplishment, American exports of beef and veal for the first quarter of 1965 were double those of the preceding year, and live cattle exports were almost 70 percent above last year's first quarter.

But keep in mind that this is only the first quarter. Like John Paul Jones, our Alabama colleague has just begun to fight. Already, he has made us all aware of how vast a potential for the U.S. farmer exists in the field of beef exports.

The fact that the people of Alabama are prime beneficiaries of his efforts in no way detracts from the gratitude that the rest of the Nation owes Senator

SPARKMAN. It is the South, in particular, that stands to gain tremendously from such a development. It is there that we find livestock growing rapidly in economic importance, and experts look to it as a source of great expansion in Alabama and the adjoining States, with attendant development and enrichment of the area. But other parts of the country will also benefit from increased beef exports—a fact that we in Illinois are very much aware of. We are grateful to Senator SPARKMAN for his achievements and urge him to continue his valiant efforts on behalf of the U.S. farmer.

UNITED STATES RESTRAINT ON CHINA NOT APPRECIATED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, too few Members of Congress and the public fully realize the role this country is playing as a restraining influence for peace and freedom from Communist domination in this world. It is true that the world is suffering a highly dangerous clash between India and Pakistan. In Vietnam we are engaged in war ourselves.

And yet as James Reston wrote Sunday in the New York Times that without American power used as a restraining influence—and now I quote:

Vietnam and probably the rest of southeast Asia would probably have been taken over by China already and without the threat of U.S. intervention in the Indian-Pakistan conflict China would be sorely tempted to intervene in that war in order to expand its influence if not control over the whole Indian subcontinent.

Reston calls the United States the greatest influence for restraint and sanity—if not for peace—in the present world situation.

I ask unanimous consent that an article in Sunday's New York Times entitled "Washington: The United States and Asia," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON: THE UNITED STATES AND ASIA

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, September 11.—The world at the moment seems even more perverse than usual. It is blazing hot in Washington when it is supposed to be cool. India, which invented nonviolence, is at war. Berlin, the flash-point of Europe, is calm, and the imperious New York Yankees are in sixth place in the American League. It is all a little odd. The Communists are vilifying one another like Eastern and Midwestern Republicans. The Western allies are staggering, blundering and squabbling like schoolboys. Asia is using the techniques of the West to destroy the dwindling influence of the West, and for the moment a tornado of angry voices dominates the Asian majority of the human race.

All this noisy disorder of little men in big jobs sends a shudder through the rest of the world, and suggests a vast and irreparable breakdown of organized society.

WORDS AND ACTIONS

Yet bad as it all looks and sounds—and is—two qualifications probably ought to be made. There is still a great difference between the words and the actions of all these bawling patriots, and there is less military power involved in their dangerous adventures than the headlines seem to suggest.

The Vietcong, for example, are carrying on their war against half a million South Vietnamese and over 100,000 Americans in southeast Asia with about 10 tons of supplies a day from North Vietnam. This amounts to little more than four 2-ton trucks full of arms and ammunition every 24 hours, and gives some idea of how much trouble can be caused with a little gunpowder, and how hard it is to stop such a trickle of supplies in so large a peninsula.

THE INDIAN CONFLICT

India and Pakistan have more power, but certainly not enough to wage serious war for a long time over the vast subcontinent of India. They do have the capacity and apparently the irresponsibility to risk the slaughter of a religious war among their peoples, but they are both short of oil and ammunition, and this may limit the consequences of their action.

This is an awkward and disturbing period, but nations no longer resort to total war because of the murder of archdukes. They still talk as if they would bring down the world if they don't get what they demand on Monday morning, but on the whole they do not seem to take their own threats quite as seriously as the headline writers for whom their threats are obviously intended.

The world is naturally horrified by the outbreak of yet another war—this last one between peoples who have lectured the human race on the virtues of philosophy and passive resistance—but even the moral monsters of the world outside the Indian subcontinent seem to have learned to put some limits on the use of military power since the advent of nuclear weapons.

What is surprising in this immense struggle for influence over the unredistributed areas left over from the last World War is not that so much power is being used to control these borderlands of the Communist empire, but that so much power is being held back in the fighting.

The United States may not be prevailing in Vietnam, but it is limiting its war power and limiting its war aims; and China is retaliating mainly with words.

Even Sukarno in Indonesia is not acting as viciously as he is talking, and it can be taken for granted that this comparative restraint is not due to any moral scruples on his part.

AMERICA'S POWER

At least one reason for this is that American power is a restraining influence—from Berlin to India, Pakistan, Vietnam, Korea, and China.

Despite all Washington's mistakes of the past in dealing with the postwar redistribution of power and influence in Asia, the influence and power of the United States in that part of the world is still considerable.

Without it Vietnam and probably the rest of southeast Asia would probably have been taken over by China already, and without the threat of United States intervention in the Indian-Pakistani conflict, China would be sorely tempted to intervene in that war in order to expand its influence if not control over the whole Indian subcontinent.

China may still do so. It is too early to tell. People hope vaguely and fear precisely, and for the moment they are fearing a great many alarming things. But other factors are at work for restraint and sanity if not for peace, and the greatest of these is the power of the United States.

DAVID BRODER ON THE NEW POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the recent selection of Larry O'Brien as Postmaster General was correctly hailed as yet another success in President Johnson's brilliant series of appointments to high Federal office. One of the best articles written about this appointment was that by David Broder which appeared in the New York Times on September 5. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

O'BRIEN AS HEAD OF POST OFFICE CAN WIELD VAST POLITICAL POWER

(By David Broder)

WASHINGTON, September 4.—"The immense patronage of the Post Office Department is justly a subject of jealousy. If wielded with a view to acquire or retain political power, it is far more dangerous than that of all the other departments, not even excepting the Treasury. The postmasters are usually intelligent and active and, if disposed, are able to bring an influence to bear that may determine, in the divided state of parties, the fate of the most important elections."

This warning against possible abuses by the Jacksonian Democrats then in power was voiced in 1834 by the Whig minority of the House Post Office Committee at a time when the Post Office Department was about one-twentieth its present size.

This week, to direct the activities of 34,000 postmasters and some 600,000 employees, President Johnson named as Postmaster General the most successful Democratic political organizer of the 1960's, Lawrence Francis O'Brien.

It was a tribute to Larry O'Brien's personal popularity that the Republicans on the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee Wednesday joined their Democratic colleagues in unanimously recommending Mr. O'Brien to the Senate (which quickly confirmed him by voice vote), knowing full well with what skills he would employ the power they had placed in his hands.

The marriage of politics and postal affairs is almost as old as the country. The Postmaster General is a Cabinet member; he has patronage to dispense; the job provides excuse for travel and intimate connection with the affairs of thousands of communities. All that makes the post a politician's dream. Since Theodore Roosevelt named Republican National Committee chairman George B. Cortelyou as Postmaster General in 1905, the post has more often than not been filled by a politician: Will Hays, Frank Walker, Robert Hanagan, Arthur Summerfield and, of course the man with whom Mr. O'Brien was being compared this week, Jim Farley.

Like Mr. Farley in his prime, Mr. O'Brien is a gabby, indefatigable Irish Catholic politician, with a host of acquaintances whose names he can recall and a delight in doing favors for them. A native of Springfield, Mass., the 48-year-old Mr. O'Brien has been immersed in politics up to his crew-cut red hair his whole adult life.

He ran John F. Kennedy's first campaign for the Senate and every Kennedy campaign thereafter. When Mr. Kennedy became President, Mr. O'Brien became his top lobbyist, a job he did not like but which he filled more fully than any predecessor in the post. He was with John Kennedy the day the President was shot. He helped bear his body off the Air Force 1 at the end of the flight back to Washington.

But he did not join the exodus of other Kennedy aides from Lyndon Johnson's White House that winter. He stayed and helped the new President complete the legislative work that had been begun and he worked to elect President Johnson last fall with all the skill, if not all the joy, that he would have extended on behalf of President Ken-

nedy. Despite his weariness in his job as special assistant for congressional relations, he even agreed to serve through this session as legislative strategist for the Great Society bills. But he planned to leave this fall, for business or Massachusetts politics.

And then, late last week, the President called him and offered him another option. At his Texas ranch last Sunday Mr. Johnson named Mr. O'Brien as his new Postmaster General, succeeding John A. Gronouski, who was named Ambassador to Poland.

The O'Brien appointment was hailed widely as another brilliant Presidential stroke, preserving in the employ of the administration one of its prime political resources. Tom Wicker, chief Washington correspondent of the New York Times, wrote that the new Postmaster General was "in the finest tradition. * * * He knows nothing whatever about delivering the mail, but he * * * has shown two Presidents that he knows how to deliver the goods."

That he will use his knowledge in this new job was made clear by Mr. Johnson. Mr. O'Brien, he said "will continue to be a very strong right arm to the President."

CONTEMPT FOR LAW AND ORDER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on August 23, I delivered a Senate floor speech on "Contempt for Law and Order." My speech dealt with the Los Angeles, Chicago, Springfield, and Morganfield race riots, and, in the course of my remarks, I deplored willful violations of law committed in the name of civil rights, and I called attention to the growing disrespect for law and order which street demonstrations and acts of so-called civil disobedience have helped to foster.

Considerable editorial comment subsequently appeared in various West Virginia newspapers. In this regard, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials from the Wheeling News Register of August 24; the Wheeling Intelligencer of August 25; the Williamson Daily News of August 26; the Huntington Advertiser of August 26; the Parkersburg News of August 28; the Bluefield Sunset News Observer of August 30; and the Romney Hampshire Review of September 1.

I also ask unanimous consent to include an editorial by David Lawrence from the September 6 issue of U.S. News & World Report.

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

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News Register, Aug. 24, 1965]

SENATOR BYRD SPEAKS OUT

U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia again has shown he is not afraid to speak out on the controversial issues troubling our Nation.

In his speech Monday before the Senate, Senator BYRD debunked the theory that poverty ignited and incited the recent racial riots in Los Angeles, Chicago and two other American cities.

Senator BYRD's concern extends beyond the riot-torn cities, however.

"Not to be overlooked," he declared, "are the willful disobeying of court orders, the numerous sit-ins, wade-ins and other violations of law which have become the order of the day."

The Senator points out that "ragtag beatniks, agitators and professional troublemakers" have subjected and exposed the American public to every conceivable kind of inconvenience.

In the innocuous name of civil disobedience, Senator BYRD asserts, these individuals have sprawled in the streets, blocked traffic, formed human walls in front of business establishments, swarmed over public property, staging noisy sit-ins and demonstrations.

Senator BYRD is concerned that few citizens have denounced these actions because of a fear—the fear of being branded a bigot.

This newspaper shares of the Senator's concern.

Until Americans, by the thousands and millions, denounce this widespread flouting of the law, it will continue.

There will be more deaths.

There will be more destruction.

"Laws are made to be obeyed by all of the people all of the time," Senator BYRD told his colleagues.

Respect for the law, he added, "is the basis for orderly government."

We wholeheartedly agree with the Senator that law-abiding citizens, regardless of race, must rally around the police who are called upon to enforce the law and guarantee the rights of the individual by protecting him against molestation and loss of personal property.

"Too often," Senator BYRD says, "police play a thankless role in difficult and dangerous situations. All too often the charge of police brutality is made by individuals and groups when they have resisted arrest and have openly incited the use of force."

The law-abiding citizen has no need to fear police brutality, the Senator adds.

We have seen the enactment of the most sweeping civil rights legislation in the Nation's history.

But the riots and racial strife continue.

We have seen the U.S. Supreme Court render decisions highly favorable to the cause of human rights.

But the riots and racial strife continue.

The majority of the people—not the mobs in the streets—must prevail if our democracy is to survive.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer, Aug. 25, 1965]

ON TARGET: BYRD HELPS PUT WANT IN TRUE PERSPECTIVE AS RIOT MOTIVATION

West Virginia's ROBERT C. BYRD, who has gone down the line on most of the Great Society projects aimed at helping those classified as impoverished, is showing signs of disenchantment.

Although an enthusiastic supporter of the administration's 1965 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act as well as the Appalachian project, Senator BYRD is finding the war on poverty a little hard to swallow in the light of recent developments.

During last week's debate on the poverty war's new money bill, the West Virginia representative voiced grave misgivings. He went along with the bill doubling the appropriation—the price tag is $1.65 billion in the Senate bill—because the President considers the legislation "important within the framework of his economic security planning for the better interests of our Nation." But he voiced in doing so his concern over some of the things reportedly going on in various parts of the country, "including particularly, charges of political favoritism."

And now Senator BYRD has said something that has badly needed saying in the place where he chose to give it voice—the Senate of the United States.

In a bristling speech on the floor of the Chamber Senator BYRD rejected the popular notion that economic deprivation and the denial of civil rights are the root cause of street rioting, and told his associates that "those who disgrace our Nation by violent disobedience and willful flouting of the law must be dealt with severely," whether they be "black or white, whether in the South, North, East, or West."

Particularly to the point, we thought, was Senator BYRD's reminder that with the enjoyment of civil rights goes the responsibility of obedience to the law that alone makes their exercise possible, and this word of advice to those who are, this newspaper believes, chiefly responsible for the disorder:

"Militant civil rights groups should stop blaming the white power structure for all of the ills that are visited upon the Negro community. Negroes must themselves take the lead in doing something constructive for themselves, and they can do this by waging war upon the evils of illegitimacy as one important beginning."

It would prove more effective if men like Senator BYRD implemented their disapproval of the trend of events by refusing to appropriate money for projects that cater to the notion that the world owes everybody a comfortable living and it is the duty of the Federal Government to see to it that it is forthcoming, and for laws which encourage the belief that minority groups are entitled, not to equality with their neighbors, but to preferential treatment. But it is at least a helpful sign when a few men in high places of public responsibility display the political courage necessary to stand up and testify that the policy of catering to the so-called disadvantaged has been carried to dangerous extremes.

[From the Williamson (W. Va.) Daily News, Aug. 26, 1965]

SENATOR ROBERT BYRD SPEAKS OUT

Poverty and alleged police brutality are not the causes of the recent racial riots "but only the scapegoats for the senseless outbreaks of violence and destruction."

U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD made this declaration in a speech delivered in the Senate Chamber in which the lawmaker from West Virginia demonstrated that he is not afraid to speak out on controversial issues troubling the Nation.

Senator BYRD said that "overworked expressions" such as heat, frustration, poverty, exclusion from the main stream of society, police brutality, etc., are being used to explain why the riots took place in Los Angeles, Chicago, Springfield, and Morganfield, Ky.

"While none of these factors can be ignored, I cannot believe they are the sole, or perhaps, the major cause of the Los Angeles insurrection," the Senator said.

The West Virginia solon pointed out that he represents "a State which has had more than its share of poverty in the past. Conditions are better now and much of the State is prospering. But I have seen the days when thousands of Negroes, and whites alike, in the Appalachian lived in conditions of squalor, deprivation and ill health.

"Despite this mass depression, malnutrition and misery," he continued, "the people never resorted to burning, looting, assaulting and destroying. There were no welfare programs, no antipoverty programs, no Federal aid as we know it. But there was no disorder and there was a wholesome respect for law. Negroes and whites got along well in the community.

"This is not to say that laws were never broken. They were. But those who violated the laws were punished and the sociologists, the psychiatrists, the judges and politicians were not expected to find excuses for their crimes."

Senator BYRD's concern extends beyond the riot-torn cities, however.

"Not to be overlooked," he declared, "are the willful disobedience of court orders, the numerous sit-ins, wade-ins and other violations of law which have become the order of the day."

The Senator points out that "ragtag beatniks, agitators and professional troublemakers" have subjected and exposed the American public to every conceivable kind of inconvenience. In the innocuous name of "civil disobedience," Senator BYRD asserts, these individuals have sprawled in the streets, blocked traffic, formed human walls in front of business establishments, swarmed over both private and public property, staging noisy sit-ins and demonstrations. And few people have dared to voice an objection for fear of being labeled "bigot."

This newspaper shares the Senator's concern.

Until Americans, by the thousands and millions, denounce this widespread flouting of the laws, it will continue.

There will be more deaths. There will be more destruction.

"Laws are made to be obeyed by all of the people all of the time," Senator BYRD told his colleagues. "Respect for the law is the basis for orderly government."

This newspaper wholeheartedly agrees with the Senator that law-abiding citizens, regardless of race, must rally around the police who are called upon to enforce the law and guarantee the rights of the individual by protecting him against molestation and loss of personal property. Too often, Senator BYRD says, police "play a thankless role in difficult and dangerous situations. All too often the charge of police brutality is made by individuals and groups when they have resisted arrest and have openly incited the use of force."

The law-abiding citizen has no need to fear police brutality, the Senator adds.

We have seen the enactment of the most sweeping civil rights legislation in the Nation's history.

But the riots and racial strife continue.

We have seen the U.S. Supreme Court render decisions highly favorable to the cause of human rights.

But the riots and racial strife continue.

Senator BYRD has wisely warned "let no man or group or race of men err in the belief that the law can best be administered by taking it into one's own hands" for "the law that protects the wealth of the most powerful, protects also the earnings of the most humble; and the law which would confiscate the property of one would, in the end, take the earnings of the other."

Disobedience to law and acts of violence by a few can hurt the just cause of many. The majority of the people—not the mobs in the streets—must prevail if our democracy is to survive.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser, Aug. 26, 1965]

CONTEMPT FOR LAW AND ORDER

In a thoughtful and long-deliberated speech to the U.S. Senate Monday, West Virginia's Senator ROBERT C. BYRD joined the growing number of public officials who have voiced their dismay at the recent outburst of racial rioting and the obvious breakdown in the rule of law and order and civic pride in many parts of the country under the guise of righting civil wrongs.

The Senator makes the point in his speech that "it is an obvious fact that there has been a violent breach of two cardinal principles of our American society—the respect for law and order, and the recourse to orderly process of law to seek redress of wrongs."

The contempt for law and order—and that was the title of Senator BYRD's speech—cannot continue if America is to continue strong. Those who are clamoring in the streets, calling on people to disobey what they arbitrarily consider "bad" laws and to obey only those laws which they consider "good" laws—in other words, that it is morally right to resort to disobedience whenever a citizen's conscience tells him that a law is unjust—can only bring chaos and anarchy.

Senator BYRD puts it sharply in his speech:

"Laws are made to be obeyed by all of the people all of the time. Respect for the law is the basis for orderly government and law-abiding and peace-loving citizens, regardless of race, need to rally around the police, who, too often, play a thankless role in riotous and difficult and dangerous situations. Of course there have been instances of police brutality, and there can be no excuse for the use of undue force by a policeman. But, all too often, the charge of police brutality is made by persons and groups when they have resisted arrest and have openly invited the use of force. The law-abiding citizen has no need to fear police brutality."

What needs to be done will take hard work and understanding by every member of the community of men. It cannot be done by reformers or "civil rights" groups or militant approach. It is the white man's job as much as the Negro's.

In his list of things that must be done, the Senator suggested that:

1. Those who cherish equal rights under the law should be taught to assume equal responsibility before the law.

2. Every effort should be made to stamp out illiteracy, with education the cornerstone for amicable race relations.

3. The opportunity for employment on the basis of merit, education, training, experience, industry, and character must be given.

4. Family planning is imperative.

5. The Nation cannot continue to close its eyes to the problem of illegitimacy.

6. No amount of government paternalism can take the place of drive and ambition, when it comes to developing the substantial and upright citizen.

These are simple things, but their implementation has confounded our Nation for many years. It is good that more and more citizens are beginning to be concerned about them.

[From the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News, Aug. 28, 1965]

TRUE PERSPECTIVE IN RIOT MOTIVATION

West Virginia's ROBERT C. BYRD, who has gone down the line on most of the Great Society projects aimed at helping those classified as impoverished, is showing signs of disenchantment.

Although an enthusiastic supporter of the administration's 1965 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, as well as the Appalachian project, Senator BYRD is finding the war on poverty a little hard to swallow in the light of recent developments.

During last week's debate on the poverty war's new money bill, the West Virginia representative voiced grave misgivings. He went along with the bill doubling the appropriation—the price tax is $1.65 billion in the Senate bill—because the President considers the legislation "important within the framework of his economic security planning for the better interests of our Nation." But he voiced in doing so his concern over some of the things reportedly going on in various parts of the country, "including, particularly, charges of political favoritism."

And now Senator BYRD has said something that has badly needed saying in the place where he chose to give it voice—the Senate of the United States.

In a bristling speech on the floor of the Chamber Senator BYRD rejected the popular notion that economic deprivation and the denial of civil rights are the root cause of street rioting, and told his associates that "those who disgrace our Nation by violent disobedience and willful flouting of the law must be dealt with severely," whether they be "black or white, whether in the South, North, East, or West."

Particularly to the point, we thought, was Senator BYRD's reminder that with the enjoyment of civil rights goes the responsibility of obedience to the law that alone makes their exercise possible, and this word of advice to those who are, this newspaper believes, chiefly responsible for the disorder:

"Militant civil rights groups should stop blaming the white power structure for all of the ills that are visited upon the Negro community. Negroes must themselves take the lead in doing something constructive for themselves, and they can do this by waging war upon the evils of illegitimacy as one important beginning."

It would prove more effective if men like Senator BYRD implemented their disapproval of the trend of events by refusing to appropriate money for projects that cater to the notion that the world owes everybody a comfortable living and it is the duty of the Federal Government to see to it that it is forthcoming, and for laws which encourage the belief that minority groups are entitled, not to equality with their neighbors, but to preferential treatment. But it is at least a helpful sign when a few men in high places of public responsibility display the political courage necessary to stand up and testify that the policy of catering to the so-called disadvantaged has been carried to dangerous extremes.

[From the Bluefield (W. Va.) Sunset News-Observer, Aug. 30, 1965]

THINGS THAT NEEDED SAYING

West Virginia's Senator BYRD made some telling points in a Senate speech last week on the race riots in Los Angeles and other cities.

Much has been made of the Negroes' poor economic condition, he said, which it is contended prompted them to loot, destroy, and kill. But said Senator BYRD:

"I have seen the days when thousands, Negroes and whites alike, lived in the coalfields of Appalachia in conditions of squalor, deprivation, and ill health which could scarcely be equalled in the slums of Chicago or the ghettos of Los Angeles * * * yet these people never resorted to burning, looting, assaulting, and destroying."

If poverty were the root cause of crime and violence, he said, there would have been continual chaos and revolution in the depressed coal camps of West Virginia and other States.

Those who violate the law in these areas, he said are punished, and "psychiatrists, sociologists, politicians, and judges are not expected to find excuses for crime."

Commenting on so-called civil disobedience, he said:

The American public has been subjected and exposed to every conceivable kind of inconvenience by hordes of ragtag beatniks, agitators, and professional troublemakers who insist upon lying down in the streets, blocking traffic, swarming over private property, staging noisy sit-ins and demonstrations, all in the innocuous name of "civil disobedience."

Few, he said, have dared to voice an objection to these disorders for fear of being labeled "bigot."

Whatever the causes for these and other mob actions in American communities, he said, "it is obvious there has been a violent breach of * * * respect for law and order and the recourse to orderly processes to seek redress of wrongs."

"Those who cherish equal rights under the law," he said, "should be taught to assume equal responsibility before the law"—and that is the crux of the matter.

It is indeed ironic, as he pointed out, at the very time when the greatest gains for civil rights have been made, that some have shown the greatest irresponsibility.

He underlined this point by recalling that one of the arguments advanced for passage of civil rights measures has been "to get the demonstrators off the streets."

"Let no man or group or race err in the belief that the law can best be administered by taking it into one's own hands," he said. "For the law that protects the most powerful * * * protects also the * * * most humble."

BYRD, a stanch churchman himself, raised the question of whether such things as the Los Angeles riots have not stemmed in part from the statements of some church leaders that it is appropriate, even desirable, to obey only those laws with which one agrees—that it is morally right to resort to disobedience whenever a citizen's "conscience" tells him a law is "unjust."

It is "shocking," he said, and we agree, that some church leaders have endorsed such a program. The law-abiding citizen, he correctly pointed out, has no reason to fear "police brutality."

As for constructive measures, BYRD points to the immediate necessity for this country to "stamp out illiteracy."

Rather than "integration for integration's sake," he said, education to equip the disadvantaged to hold jobs that will enable them to take their place in society is the urgent need.

This effort must be pushed hard, he said, together with an effort to reduce the excessive birth rate and illegitimacy among uneducated, low-income Negroes. Unemployment can never be wiped out, he said, as long as illiteracy flourishes and the birth rate soars.

We think these things needed saying.

[From the Romney (W. Va.) Hampshire Review, Sept. 1, 1965]

RIOT CAUSES

Talks by news commentators, newspaper columns, editorials and reports of a number of Government commissions have been full of explanations for the recent riots in Los Angeles and Chicago as well as those of last summer in Rochester and New York. Practically all of them use the terms that have become slogans of the civil rights movement and that have been worn thin by constant repetition by the liberals. Practically none of them have talked about the cause in the sense of why they happen.

To be sure, the slogans are based on fact. No one denies that we have a poverty problem in the Nation and the additional fact that the nonwhite population suffers more poverty proportionally. There is also basis for the term "second-class citizen" as applied to some of our ethnic groups and our society is full of inequalities.

The point is, however, as Senator ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia pointed out in a recent speech in the United States Senate, these things have existed in this country for a very long time and have been the cause of riots in only the rarest of instances. Although the past few years have seen the passage of more civil rights legislation than we have had in the past, this legislation has been the culmination of an effort that has been going on for decades to improve the lot of our more unfortunate citizens.

The explanation of why these riots have broken out and the reason why more of them can be expected to occur at any time and in almost any place in the country lies in the fact that they have been encouraged. Sometimes this encouragement was given deliberately and sometimes inadvertently by well-meaning people, but it was encouragement to lawlessness all the same. The leaders of the Negro organizations, NAACP, SCLC, SNCC, CORE and the rest, have repeatedly advocated what they call "civil disobedience." This is far more than a demonstration or a march on some city for the purpose of calling attention to some real or fancied wrong, this is a form of anarchy. This attitude has been bolstered by some churchmen who have preached the doctrine of resisting any law that the individual or group doesn't like.

When they add to this the approval and sometimes the encouragement of the Government, the chance of riots is greatly increased. Dr. Martin Luther King, during a recent visit to Washington, threatened disturbances and the same old civil disobedience if Congress did not immediately pass the desired home rule legislation for the District of Columbia. Approval and encouragment came from the White House itself in the President's recent statement in which he repeated Dr. King's warning in a statement designed to pressure Congress into swift approval of this legislation.

Certainly, if Dr. King can threaten to turn his followers loose on the Nation's Capital and the President approves this threat by adopting and using it, why should anyone who feels he has a grievance, or feels that his wants are being denied, restrain himself from taking violent physical action against all authority and against all restrictions. Here is the cause of the riots and here is the reason that they can and will break out again. The pattern is set and has received what amounts to official approval: Make your demand and accompany it with a threat of civil disobedience, then if your demands are not met on your timetable, demonstrate, and if that doesn't get immediate results, riot. You will be excused by one of the old slogans, or the liberals will invent a new one for you.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 6, 1965]

THE RIGHT TO LOOT?

(By David Lawrence)

There seems to be a new civil right—the right of the have-nots to take whatever they want from the haves. It is supposed to justify, if not to sanction, the wrecking and burning of private property, the theft of goods from stores, and the assaulting of white persons as well as Negroes. All this is a corollary of "demonstrations" which nowadays lead to rioting and violence.

We hear spoken frequently in this connection the word "revolution." Various ministers of the gospel tell assembled crowds approvingly that what's happening today is "just like the Boston Tea Party." The inference is that the right of insurrection is being exercised, and hence is to be regarded as no more than "freedom of petition" or "freedom of assembly."

James Farmer, National Director of the Congress of Racial Equality, one of the prominent Negro organizations, said in a news conference at Los Angeles on August 25:

"This was more of a revolt than a riot. This was not a striking out with blind fury. The revolt had eyes. It picked its targets. And those targets were symbols of exploitation."

Mr. Farmer, who made a tour of the devastated business district, said that the stores hit were with few exceptions white-owned, and often had shoddy goods and comparatively high prices.

Will Federal power now be used under the "interstate commerce clause" of the Constitution to prosecute certain persons for "discriminatory" acts in failing to respect the property rights of white people? These severe interruptions of business certainly "affected commerce." Losses due to looting amounted to millions of dollars.

Does all this perhaps come under the right to loot or the right of "revolution?" Is this the result of the extremism in the crusade for equal rights? The Wall Street Journal, in an editorial, says:

"Among the more interesting comments on the tragic riots in Los Angeles was Senator ROBERT KENNEDY's remark that 'there is no point in telling Negroes to obey the law' when many of them have reason to feel that 'the law is the enemy.'

"And a man who has served as Attorney General, above all people, ought to know that the overriding role of the law is to protect society in order to protect the individual.

"What Senator KENNEDY should be reminding the Negro people is that, if our far larger society is to survive in freedom, it must live under a framework of law."

There may be some precedent for Senator KENNEDY's remark that "the law is the enemy." For this has been the attitude of many a minority group which has sought at gatherings and demonstrations to portray the constituted authority as hostile to their aims and purposes.

But does this give anyone the right to revolt, the right to loot, the right to carry on riots and demonstrations in which persons of all races are killed or injured? Senator ROBERT C. BYRD of West Vigirnia, Democrat, said recently in a speech to the Senate:

"It is known that fanatic Black Muslims have agitated and contributed to mob violence in American cities. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has warned that there has been a rising degree of undesirable infiltration of some civil rights groups.

"I desire to ask, as do other concerned Americans, whether the actions in Los Angeles, in Chicago, in Springfield, in Morganfield, and wherever violence of this nature may occur in the future, may be said to be a logical outgrowth, in part, of the leadership of certain clergymen who have stated a belief that it is appropriate, and even desirable, to disobey what they arbitrarily consider to be bad laws and to obey only those laws which they label good laws—in other words, that it is morally right to resort to disobedience whenever a citizen's 'conscience' tells him that a law is unjust.

"As Supreme Court Justice Frankfurter once said: 'If a man can be allowed to determine for himself what is law, every man can. That means first, chaos; then, tyranny.' It is shocking that some church leaders have endorsed such a program."

The American people have witnessed heretofore an extensive use of hundreds of agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and of Federal troops in States of the South. But somehow there has been no such manifestation of authority with respect to the riots in California, in which 37 persons were killed, hundreds were wounded, and an enormous property damage was inflicted. To be sure, commissions have been appointed to study the sociological factors and to consider more Federal aid. But what about prosecuting the instigators of the revolution?

Has the Federal Government itself begun to discriminate now in choosing the States whose citizens are to be protected? Is the right to loot in certain areas to be affirmed by passive acquiescence?

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), in accordance with the previous order, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 15, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 14 (legislative day of September 13), 1965:

U.S. ATTORNEY

Hosea M. Ray, of Mississippi, to be U.S. Attorney for the northern district of Mississippi for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Edward C. Sweeney, of Illinois, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 5 years expiring August 9, 1970.

IN THE NAVY

Lt. Cmdr. Charles Conrad, Jr., U.S. Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Navy in accordance with article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 14 (legislative day of September 13), 1965:

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 9th session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Henry DeWolf Smyth, of New Jersey, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 9th session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

John Gorham Palfrey, of New York, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 9th session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

James T. Ramey, of Illinois, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 9th session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Verne B. Lewis, of Maryland, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 9th session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Kenneth Holum, of South Dakota, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 9th session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter to the people of the Seventh District of Alabama for May 27, 1965:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(From Congressman JIM MARTIN)

JOB OPPORTUNITIES NEEDED

Regardless of the good intentions of those who demand that the South immediately solve the problems facing its concentrated Negro population, the basic problem will remain until we have improved education and made more job opportunity. Employment for unskilled and uneducated whites and Negroes is the fundamental need. The right to vote means little to a man who cannot find a job by which he cannot support himself and his family.

With the heavy concentration of Negroes in many southern counties, it is not possible to create in those local areas the job opportunities needed. The so-called civil rights leaders, who shed crocodile tears over the plight of the Negroes, are not concerned with jobs for them. This is apparent in the efforts of Martin Luther King and other agitators to discourage industry from locating or expanding in Alabama and other Southern States—even though their boycott hurts most the very people they claim to want to help.

LETTER TO BISHOP LORD

Several months ago I wrote a letter to Bishop John Wesley Lord of the Methodist Church, pointing out the problem and the inability of the South to provide job opportunities without assistance. I suggested to the good bishop that the churches of America take the lead in promoting a plan to give those Negroes who would like to relocate in a section of the country where they could find jobs, an opportunity to do so. In my letter, I pointed out that if each church congregation in the Nation would open their arms and hearts to one, two or more good Negro families, making them welcome in their communities, help to educate them and find jobs for them, within 5 or 10 years at the most, the race problem would disappear.

Unfortunately, Bishop Lord never answered my letter. I received a form letter from him in which he presented arguments justifying his joining the Selma demonstration, but he made no mention of my letter or its contents. Perhaps he did not read it, although I did write him a second letter calling attention to the first, and this one he ignored completely.

There are many good people in the United States who are deeply concerned about the plight of the Negro in the South, but they are opposed to assuming any responsibility in their own communities. This was shown in a recent Gallup poll in which northern whites opposed relocation of Negroes from the South. Fifty-two percent of those questioned in the North opposed having Negroes move into their neighborhoods. Even of the 33 percent in the North who favored relocation, one-third opposed having them move in as neighbors.

This is the kind of hypocrisy prevailing among many northerners on the race issue. This prevents the only workable solution—giving Negroes equal job opportunity and educational opportunity in every State and section of this Nation. Until the Northern States, many of them with less than 1 percent Negro population, are willing to accept the colored as neighbors and friends as we do in the South, agitators will continue to flourish, and our country will be weakened by the hatred that has been generated against the Southern States for more than 100 years. I am trying to change this attitude by contacting national magazines, as well as civic and religious leaders, to urge them to at least consider lending their efforts toward taking concrete and effective action in helping impoverished southern Negroes to enjoy to the fullest the American dream in every section of this great land.

ANTIDUMPING BILL

On May 26, I introduced an amendment to the Anti-Dumping Act to plug loopholes in present laws which permit foreign manufacturers to injure American industry by dumping their goods on American markets at low prices. This practice hurts business, industry and, most of all, American workers. This bill to correct the situation is supported by a number of Members of Congress in both House and Senate and in both political parties. The bill is now pending before the Ways and Means Committee, and I am hopeful we can get action on it in this present session.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

There will be a determined effort in this Congress to give the District of Columbia home rule. Lyndon Johnson is urging it, and all the liberals, who control this Congress, are behind the effort. The next month will be devoted to citywide observances to push for turning the Federal City over to locally elected politicians. As the pressure for home rule is applied, it is interesting to study recent population figures. Twenty-five years ago 28.4 percent of the people in Washington were colored, 71.6 percent white. Today 58.2 percent are Negro. Among youngsters under 20, more than 70 percent are colored. There are 183,000 fewer whites in the District today than there were 15 years ago. Crime in the District has jumped upward by 83 percent in the last 7 years, with 87 percent of all major crimes committed by Negroes. Ten thousand Negroes are on relief. Of the 4,529 illegitimate babies born in the District in 1963, 4,145 were Negro—one-fourth of all the births in Washington.

THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PARTIES

The basic difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties was shown in a recent questionnaire sent by a California Congressman. These were some results:

On unseating the duly elected Mississippi delegation in the House at the demand of the Mississippi Freedom Party, 50 percent of the Democrats answering the questionnaire agreed; 55 percent of the Republicans answering opposed.

On a complete test ban of nuclear weapons to enable the United States to maintain its lead over the Communists, 46 percent of the Democrats favored it, while 61 percent of the Republicans were against such a ban.

Fifty-eight percent of the Democrats were in favor of liberalizing our immigration laws, while 46 percent of the Republicans were opposed to letting down the bars.

Montana Jurist Author of Nation's Pioneer Pension Plan for Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARNOLD OLSEN
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, Judge Lester H. Loble of Helena, whose judicial work in the field of juvenile delinquency has achieved nationwide