

Y4
Ag 8/1
H 67/
961

1010

Ag 8/1
H 67/961
7/74

HOG CHOLERA ERADICATION

GOVERNMENT
Storage

HEARINGS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND FEED GRAINS OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION
ON
H.R. 7176, H.R. 7177, H.R. 7694, H.R. 7702,
and S. 1908

JULY 26 AND 27, 1961

Serial M

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1961

73701



1/8 AY
1/8 8A.
1/8 H
1/8 100

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HAROLD D. COOLEY, North Carolina, *Chairman*
W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Vice Chairman*

GEORGE GRANT, Alabama
E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas
JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi
CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma
WATKINS M. ABBETT, Virginia
CLARK W. THOMPSON, Texas
PAUL C. JONES, Missouri
HARLAN HAGEN, California
LESTER R. JOHNSON, Wisconsin
ROSS BASS, Tennessee
W. PAT JENNINGS, Virginia
D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, Florida
MERWIN COAD, Iowa
J. FLOYD BREEDING, Kansas
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky
HAROLD B. McSWEEN, Louisiana
DANIEL K. INOUE, Hawaii
RALPH R. HARDING, Idaho

CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa
PAUL B. DAGUE, Pennsylvania
PAGE BELCHER, Oklahoma
CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE, Maine
CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
DON L. SHORT, North Dakota
CATHERINE MAY, Washington
DELBERT L. LATTA, Ohio
RALPH HARVEY, Indiana
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas
RALPH F. BEERMANN, Nebraska
BEN REIFEL, South Dakota

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

A. FERNÓS-ISERN, Puerto Rico

MRS. CHRISTINE S. GALLAGHER, *Clerk*
HYDE H. MURRAY, *Assistant Clerk*
JOHN J. HEIMBURGER, *Counsel*
FRANCIS M. LEMAY, *Staff Consultant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND FEED GRAINS

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Chairman*

PAUL C. JONES, Missouri
W. PAT JENNINGS, Virginia
D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, Florida
MERWIN COAD, Iowa
J. FLOYD BREEDING, Kansas
RALPH R. HARDING, Idaho

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
DON L. SHORT, North Dakota
CATHERINE MAY, Washington
DELBERT L. LATTA, Ohio
RALPH HARVEY, Indiana



CONTENTS

	Page
H.R. 7176, a bill to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program.....	1
S. 1908, a bill to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program.....	2
Statement of—	
Aaberg, Herman C., assistant director, Commodity Division, the American Farm Bureau Federation; accompanied by J. B. Thayn, assistant legislative director.....	54
Battles, Roy, assistant to the master, the National Grange.....	50
Blitch, Hon. Iris Faircloth, a Representative in Congress from the State of Georgia.....	63
Campbell, Phil, commissioner of agriculture, State of Georgia.....	60
Davies, Aled P., vice president, American Meat Institute.....	40
Doup, George, president, the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.....	56
Greene, Charles S., president, the Gregory Laboratory, White Hall, Ill.....	14
Johnson, LaVerne, president, National Swine Growers Council.....	15
Johnson, Reuben, the National Farmers Union.....	59
Kessler, Sherman O., chairman, Indiana Hog Cholera Eradication Committee, New Ross, Ind.....	17
Killick, John A., executive secretary, the National Independent Meat Packers Association.....	64
Kingman, Dr. H. E., Jr., executive secretary, American Veterinarian Association; accompanied by Dr. J. A. Henderson, Iowa; Dr. Harry Geyer, Columbus, Ohio; and Dr. Howard W. Dunne, Pennsylvania State University.....	3
Livestock Conservation, Inc.....	5
McClane, T. K., Jr., executive vice president, Florida Farm Bureau.....	58
O'Connell, Richard T., legislative counsel, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.....	45
Pepper, Charles, president, Delaware Swine Producers Association.....	26
Prough, Marion, president, and George Lechliden, secretary, Maryland Swine Producers Association, Inc.....	25
Steddom, Marion, president, Iowa Hog Cholera Eradication Committee, and past president, Iowa Swine Producers Association.....	12
Van Houweling, C. D., Assistant Administrator, Agricultural Research Service; accompanied by F. J. Mulhern, Associate Director, ADE, ARS; and S. P. Lejko, assistant to Administrator, ARS, U.S. Department of Agriculture.....	31
Communications submitted to the subcommittee:	
Brauer, George, chairman, Illinois Swine Herd Improvement Association, letter of June 9, 1961.....	62
Bausch, J. W., Washington representative, Armour & Co., letter of July 28, 1961.....	59
Campbell, Phil, commissioner of agriculture, State of Georgia, letter of July 24, 1961.....	60
Carp, Fred, president, Kansas Swine Improvement Association, letter and telegram of July 25, 1961.....	64, 65
Conner, Boyle, commissioner of agriculture, State of Florida, letter of July 25, 1961.....	25
Dastrup, R. Harvey, executive director, Livestock Conservation, Inc., letter of July 24, 1961.....	60
Dwyer, Joe, director, Department of Agriculture, State of Washington, letter of May 15, 1961.....	25
Freeman, Hon. Orville L., Secretary of Agriculture, letter of July 26, 1961.....	34

Communications submitted to the subcommittee—Continued

Killick, John A., executive secretary, National Independent Meat Packers Association, letter of August 7, 1961-----	Page 63
Liljenquist, L. Blaine, president and general manager, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., letter of August 1, 1961-----	68
Paul, George L., and James M. Barclay, House of Representatives, State of Iowa, letter of August 3, 1961-----	66
Phillips, Rutherford T., executive director, the American Humane Association, letter of June 2, 1961-----	62
Wilson, P. O., secretary-general manager, National Live Stock Producers Association, letter of July 24, 1961-----	61

HOG CHOLERA ERADICATION

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 1961

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND FEED GRAINS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10:05 a.m., pursuant to notice, in room 1310, New House Office Building, Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Jennings, Matthews, Breeding, Harding, Hoeven, Short, Mrs. May, and Harvey.

Also present: Representatives Grant, Findley, and Beermann.

Christine S. Gallagher, clerk.

Mr. POAGE. The subcommittee will come to order.

We have before us this morning several bills, H.R. 7694 by Mr. Matthews, H.R. 7177 by Mr. Harvey, H.R. 7176 by Mr. Grant, H.R. 7702 by Mrs. Blitch, and S. 1908. These will be made a part of the record at this point.

(H.R. 7694, H.R. 7177, H.R. 7176, H.R. 7702, and S. 1908 are as follows:)

[H.R. 7176, 87th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To provide for a national hog cholera eradication program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to safeguard the health of the swine herds of the Nation, to prevent the spread of hog cholera, to decrease substantially the estimated \$50,000,000 annual loss from hog cholera, to expand export markets for pork and pork products now restricted on account of hog cholera, and to otherwise protect the public interest, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed (1) to initiate a national hog cholera eradication program in cooperation with the several States under the provisions of section II of the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (21 U.S.C. 114a), and related legislation, and (2) to prohibit or restrict, pursuant to the authority vested in him under the provisions of section 2 of the Act of February 2, 1903, as amended (21 U.S.C. 111), the interstate movement of virulent hog cholera virus or other hog cholera virus to the extent he determines necessary in order to effectuate such eradication program.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to establish an advisory committee composed of (1) eleven members selected from representatives of the swine and related industries, State and local government agencies, professional and scientific groups, and the general public, and (2) one member selected from the officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture who shall serve as chairman of the committee. The committee shall meet at the call of the Secretary.

(b) It shall be the function of the committee to advise the Secretary with respect to the initiation of the national hog cholera eradication program referred to in the first section of this Act, and with respect to the development of plans and procedures for carrying out such program.

(c) Committee members other than the chairman shall not be deemed to be employees of the United States and shall not be entitled to compensation, but

the Secretary is authorized to pay their travel and subsistence expenses (or per diem in lieu thereof), in connection with their attendance at meetings of the committee.

(H.R. 7176 was introduced by Mr. Grant. Three other identical bills were introduced as follows: H.R. 7177 by Mr. Harvey of Indiana; H.R. 7702 by Mrs. Blicht; and H.R. 7694 by Mr. Matthews.)

[S. 1908, 87th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To provide for a national hog cholera eradication program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to safeguard the health of the swineherds of the Nation, to prevent the spread of hog cholera, to decrease substantially the estimated \$50,000,000 annual loss from hog cholera, to expand export markets for pork and pork products now restricted on account of hog cholera, and to otherwise protect the public interest, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed (1) to initiate a national hog cholera eradication program in cooperation with the several States under the provisions of section 11 of the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (21 U.S.C. 114a), and related legislation, and (2) to prohibit or restrict, pursuant to the authority vested in him under the provisions of section 2 of the Act of February 2, 1903, as amended (21 U.S.C. 111), the interstate movement of virulent hog cholera virus or other hog cholera virus to the extent he determines necessary in order to effectuate such eradication program.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to establish an advisory committee composed of (1) eleven members selected from representatives of the swine and related industries, State and local government agencies, professional and scientific groups, and the general public, and (2) one member selected from the officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture who shall serve as chairman of the Committee. The Committee shall meet at the call of the Secretary.

(b) It shall be the function of the Committee to advise the Secretary with respect to the initiation of the national hog cholera eradication program referred to in the first section of this Act, and with respect to the development of plans and procedures for carrying out such program.

(c) Committee members other than the chairman shall not be deemed to be employees of the United States and shall not be entitled to compensation, but the Secretary is authorized to pay their travel and subsistence expenses (or per diem in lieu thereof) in connection with their attendance at meetings of the Committee.

Mr. POAGE. I know a number of members have constituents present. Mr. Hoeven has to leave immediately and wants to introduce a couple of his constituents. We will be glad to have you do so now, Mr. Hoeven.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for me to remain, but before leaving I have two distinguished Iowans present whom I would like to present. They are here as witnesses.

First, I present Mr. Marion Steddom, past president of the Iowa Swine Producers' Association, and, second, Dr. J. A. Henderson, president of the Iowa Veterinary Medical Association.

And I need not tell you that I am in favor of the legislation you are about to consider.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Hoeven.

Our first witness is Dr. Kingman, who is with the American Veterinarian Medical Association. We will be glad to hear you now, Dr. Kingman, together with your associates.

STATEMENT OF DR. H. E. KINGMAN, JR., EXECUTIVE SECRETARY,
AMERICAN VETERINARIAN ASSOCIATION; ACCOMPANIED BY
DR. J. A. HENDERSON, IOWA, DR. HARRY GEYER, COLUMBUS,
OHIO, AND DR. HOWARD W. DUNNE, PENNSYLVANIA STATE
UNIVERSITY

Dr. KINGMAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Dr. H. E. Kingman, Jr., executive secretary of the American Veterinarian Medical Association. I am appearing in behalf of our association of approximately 15,000 veterinarians throughout the United States and Canada to urge the enactment of legislation to provide for increased efforts to eradicate hog cholera.

With me are three members of our association, each an expert in his respective field of veterinary science and each able to speak authoritatively with respect to a particular phase of the complex problem of hog cholera.

Dr. J. A. Henderson is a veterinary practitioner from Ankeny, Iowa. He is a member of the council on veterinary service of our association—I should correct the statement, he is not a past president, but is now president of the Iowa Veterinary Medical Association, and I apologize for making him a “past president”—and a member of the Committee on Hog Cholera Eradication of the State of Iowa.

At the conclusion of my brief introductory remarks, Dr. Henderson can relate to you his views of this legislation and its need with respect to the improvement of livestock health in Iowa.

Dr. Howard Dunne is an eminent research scientist at Pennsylvania State University and the author of several texts and articles on diseases of swine.

Dr. Dunne can answer questions regarding various scientific aspects of hog cholera.

Dr. Harry Geyer is the State veterinarian of Ohio; he is in charge of disease eradication and control programs in that State, and is with us this morning to bring to the committee the views of livestock producers and veterinarians in his State, as well as answer questions regarding the effect this legislation would have on the problems his Department encounters on a day to day basis in making sure hog cholera does not make hog production in Ohio a highly hazardous endeavor.

The bill under consideration by your committee S. 1908 (H.R. 7176, 7177, 7694, 7702)—I would suspect is one of the more easily understood agricultural legislative proposals to come before you.

We have made this a joint statement for both committees of Congress, and have listed all of the bills pertaining to this legislation.

We read from the bills that it is the intent of this Congress that hog cholera should be eradicated and that the resources of the Federal Government will be utilized within prescribed limits, to aid and accomplish this objective.

The bill stipulates that his program should be conducted along lines recommended by an advisory committee of interested and affected groups of persons to insure insofar as possible that his undertaking will be soundly administered. As an initial step in this program, it is considered essential to prohibit the indiscriminate traffic

in the biological agent responsible for the disease, virulent hog cholera virus, and we consider it wise to place this product under strict control as called for under this legislation.

And, with the committee's permission, I would later like to have Dr. Dunne comment on this point.

I am sure we all recognize that it requires much more than legislation and Federal support to accomplish a task of this magnitude.

Without full support and cooperation of all the vital segments of the livestock and meat industry within agriculture, it would be quite unwise to launch such an undertaking. To assure the Congress that this fundamental support does exist is our real purpose in being here to present testimony at this hearing.

Since the program envisioned by this legislation will require active participation of veterinarians throughout the swine producing areas of the United States, we have taken this question, through the organization of the AVMA, to our constituent (State) associations to determine the extent of practitioner support; to our research authorities to determine the extent of practitioner support; to our research authorities to determine whether they feel that we can fully support this program to our State regulatory people to determine their views. We are here today to inform you that the response was overwhelmingly in favor of the proposed legislation. We think that now is the time to go ahead with it, and we assure you that it will have our full support.

In conclusion, I would like to comment briefly covering my role and the role of our association in the Livestock Conservation, Inc., an organization frequently referred to as LCI.

I have distributed a prepared statement on the letterhead of the Livestock Conservation, Inc., which I will not read, but I would ask your permission to insert in the record of the hearings.

Mr. POAGE. Without objection, that will be inserted in the record at the finish of your statement.

Dr. KINGMAN. For the past 18 months, I have had the privilege of serving as president of this organization. My personal contact with the program of Livestock Conservation, Inc., goes back nearly 20 years to the time when this organization was winding up its vigorous efforts to eradicate bovine tuberculosis, and was bringing industry attention to focus on the problem of brucellosis in farm animals. The brucellosis program has not been concluded, but it has made remarkable progress over the past 15 years—so now LCI directs its energies toward the conservation of our livestock resources by attacking another of the "lossmakers," hog cholera.

Nearly all of the groups presenting testimony to this committee are member organizations of LCI. If you recognize a great deal of similarity in the statements made by various witnesses, it will probably be because this subject has been thoroughly and exhaustively discussed at LCI meetings for the past several years, and through this exchange of information rather general agreement has been reached regarding the type of program we need to get this job done. LCI's function is to mobilize leadership of national standing; focus industrywide attention on a specific loss; and coordinate the efforts of member organizations on a given problem, such as hog cholera when no other forum for industrywide discussion exists.

I am not attempting to speak for all of the member organizations of LCI—this is for them to do. Dr. Henderson, Dr. Dunne, and Dr. Geyer are presently serving on LCI committees; however, their attendance here today is in behalf of the organizations they represent, such as the American Veterinary Medical Association, the Ohio Department of Agriculture, and the Research Institute of Pennsylvania State University.

I feel sure they would be pleased to answer questions on this subject and express their views.

On behalf of the American Veterinary Medical Association and the Livestock Conservation, Inc., we appreciate this opportunity to be heard.

(The prepared statement of the Livestock Conservation, Inc., follows:)

STATEMENT OF LIVESTOCK CONSERVATION, INC., TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, SUBCOMMITTEE OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND GENERAL LEGISLATION RE S. 1908 AND TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE RE H.R. 7176, 7177, 7694, AND 7702

Livestock Conservation, Inc., has served as a vehicle through which the various segments of the pork producing and processing and related and allied interests have been able to develop a sound hog cholera eradication program. The first start was made in a National Hog Cholera Workshop, sponsored by LCI on September 22, 1956.

A subsequent workshop was held on May 16, 1957, under the same leadership. As a result of these two well-attended sessions, a national hog cholera committee as a national standing committee of Livestock Conservation, Inc., was authorized by the LCI executive committee.

Following much preliminary work and study, this national committee first met on February 19, 1958, in conjunction with the annual meeting of members of Livestock Conservation, Inc. Similar sessions were held under the same auspices in 1959, 1960, and 1961. Each of these sessions, including the two workshops, included a full representation of the Nation's swine industry along with State and Federal research, educational, and regulatory groups.

As the result of a recommendation at the 1960 annual meeting of the National LCI Hog Cholera Committee, four regional conferences were held at Chicago, New York, New Orleans, and Denver, respectively. The proceedings of these conferences were published by Livestock Conservation, Inc., under the title of "Hog Cholera Can Be Eradicated." Some 15,000 of these have been distributed with indicated requests for a third printing.

Special meetings of the National LCI Hog Cholera Committee in January and July 1961, resulted in clarifying the situation with respect to pending Federal legislation and other points relative to a sound eradication program. The program as approved by the National LCI Hog Cholera Committee is the result of the deliberations of the workshops and committee sessions listed above, of the National Livestock Sanitary Association, and of the counseling and guidance of both State and Federal research, educational and regulatory agencies.

In addition to the formal meetings, the staff of Livestock Conservation, Inc., has functioned to disseminate information through the Nation's agricultural press, radio and TV; personal contacts with key industry leader's seeking information, and personal and circular letters to LCI members and their interested associates.

In serving as a "vehicle" through which the various segments of the pork-producing and processing segments along with the interests allied with, and related to, the pork industry, Livestock Conservation, Inc., has functioned within its stated objectives in the field of livestock loss prevention; namely, encourage and initiate education and research; coordinate activities of its membership; secure new data, and disseminate reliable information.

The purpose of LCI is to promote practical and proper methods of livestock management which reduce the economic value of livestock, meat, milk, and related products. Hog cholera, with its estimated annual national cost of \$50 million or more can be classed as a national economic problem.

Dr. KINGMAN. With your permission, I should like for Dr. Dunne to take just a few minutes to talk about some of the research needs as we approach this legislation.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Dr. Kingman. Dr. Dunne, we will be glad to hear from you.

Dr. DUNNE. Mr. Chairman, my comments necessarily, will be brief at this point, although I am hopeful that if any questions arise I will have an opportunity to express our opinions from a research standpoint.

Those of us who are involved in research, recognize that as in all diseases there is a need for further answers, but I am sincerely of the opinion we have the scientific knowledge and the means of launching a successful program on eradication at this time.

There will be some areas, I am sure as the meeting progresses, in which we will find questions will arise, these questions will, probably, be in areas in which there has been a difference of opinion, particularly in the areas of diagnosis.

There are those who feel that, perhaps, there is a need for a more convenient method of diagnosis prior to launching on an eradication program. We presently have means of accurately diagnosing the disease, but it may not be quite as convenient to use as a red or green light type of a test by which we could very quickly determine "Yes" or "No." But it is not sufficient at this point to hinder us from embarking upon any eradication program.

There are those in other areas who have advocated that we cannot eliminate the use of virulent virus in vaccination procedures, under certain specific procedures. I think we have to bear in mind that any use of virulent virus constitutes the establishment of a potential foci of infection. I think we have to consider very seriously whether or not we should utilize the virulent virus in any procedure if we are to consider an eradication program.

The problem is not that of a potential difference in the amount of immunity established in one man's herd—it is the potential foci of infection that may spread to many, many herds throughout the country.

There are those who say that in the advance of the existence of a hog cholera infection in a given herd that virulent virus must be used to stem the tide of the infection. Experimental evidence which we have developed within our own laboratories has shown that this is not necessary; that this is not a part of the picture.

Perhaps, the greatest problem, the greatest emphasis has been placed on the use of virulent virus in those instances in which pigs are placed under considerable stress, but in which they have passed through sales barns prior to the vaccination with existing vaccines.

There are those who contend that virulent virus must be used on any such animals.

The problem lies not in the use of the virulent virus, but the elimination of a condition which exists as a result of old established methods of handling swine going through sales barns. In other words, these animals in the past have all been given serum as they passed through the sales barns—serum alone. This, in turn, has set up a bloc, and as a result of vaccination with the vaccines, after such a bloc has been unsuccessful in many instances.

Now that we know that this exists many States have already rectified their regulations, so that no longer is serum given alone in those cases. However, if neighboring States have not eliminated this particular type of procedure, they still may get pigs brought into their own States, pigs which have received serum alone, and the situation then is repeated.

Recognizing the need, of course, for a general regulation throughout all States on a subject of this nature.

I would like to say just one thing more. As I said, we cannot possibly cover all of the aspects of research, trying to anticipate the problems which will arise and the suggestions which will arise. There are new vaccines on the market—rather, there are new vaccines being developed which on an experimental basis, on very limited trials, have shown some promise.

One of these is a cattle virus which has shown, some self-providing protection against hog cholera.

I would only like to emphasize at this point that it would be well for us to look cautiously at any new product, recognizing that it is 10 years now since the attenuated vaccines have been used. We are just now finding the answers to some of those problems. And that in any attempt to set up an eradication program it might be wise not to plunge into an unknown product which may cause problems we have not thought of. We do not know whether the virus will, for example, spread infection to cattle—whether this will necessitate the vaccination of cattle, along with the swine because a particular vaccine is used. We do not know how the animals will react under stress with these types of vaccines.

One of the primary uses of a live virus, not the virulent virus, but the attenuated vaccines in animals going to sales barns is that it is the only way you can provide a long-term immunity. Also, at the same time, provide an immediate protection against any disease which may be brought in by virtue of going through a community auction.

The immediate protection is provided by the serum that is given simultaneously with the live vaccine. We need to know whether the new virus that is proposed, the cattle virus, could be used simultaneously with the serum and still provide an adequate immunity.

Again, with all of the factors involved in the situation, I do wish to point out that these are just a few of the answers that need to be known about any new product prior to embarking upon its use in an eradication program. I have not covered all of the factors.

At this point I would like to mention, also, that I do feel that any eradication program should—and I am sure will—entail a need for an advisory committee to the Secretary on the need for research in other areas as the eradication program develops.

Mr. Chairman, I think that concludes my remarks at the moment.

Mr. POAGE. The thing that disturbs me about your remarks is that I am not sure that I understand. Are you or are you not in favor of going ahead with this program? You said that you thought that we ought to be a little careful about undertaking this program, but then you told us that it would take 10 years to study this thing. Is it your thought to go ahead, that that is the decision to make?

Dr. DUNNE. In the initial statement I think that I indicated that we have the scientific knowledge to embark upon an eradication program. I am definitely for it.

Mr. POAGE. I know you did say that. And then you said that you did not know whether we should or not. You said that we must be careful. All I want to do is to get the record clear. You are in favor of proceeding?

Dr. DUNNE. I am in favor of proceeding. I was going to anticipate the arguments of anybody who might be arguing against it. I was trying to provide the answers in anticipation of those questions.

Mr. POAGE. You understand that the only thing that this bill does, as I would see it, is that it enables the Secretary of Agriculture to start moving and authorizes him to appoint a committee. So far as I understand it there is nothing else in the bill. You are the author of one of those, Mr. Grant, is that about the substance of it?

Mr. GRANT. I think that is it. Mr. Harvey has a companion bill. Perhaps he has some remarks to make on this.

Mr. HARVEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman. There has been some discussion among some of the swine producers as to just how far the authority we would vest in the Secretary should be extended with regard to stopping the movement of live virus in interstate commerce. It does give him that authority.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; it does give him that authority. That is in the bill.

Mr. HARVEY. Is there any danger; insofar as the promulgation of the program is concerned, that you would see in granting this authority to the Secretary?

Dr. DUNNE. No, sir.

Mr. HARVEY. You would favor granting that authority?

Dr. DUNNE. Yes.

Mr. HARVEY. You spoke about the difference between the virulent virus and the attenuated virus. Out of your own research experience is it your opinion that the attenuated virus could be used live in the program for eliminating hog cholera safely, in such a program as we are advocating here?

Dr. DUNNE. I think that is quite right. I do favor the vaccine, particularly, in this stage of the eradication program.

Mr. HARVEY. You think it would be better than the so-called modified serum?

Dr. DUNNE. Just a moment—the modified or attenuated vaccines are the things that I favor.

Mr. HARVEY. That is what I am getting at. We commonly refer to it in Indiana, in our section, at least, as the so-called modified serum. I did not know whether they were synonymous or not.

Dr. DUNNE. There are two different kinds of vaccines. One is commercially known as a modified; another as an attenuated. One of them is from a protein that comes from pigs, and the other comes from rabbits.

Mr. HARVEY. Will you speak louder?

Dr. DUNNE. There are two different types of vaccines. One of them comes in its final stage from swine. The other is developed in the final stage from rabbits. There are other types of vaccines which are made in tissue culture.

These are all live vaccines, live viruses, but they are attenuated; in other words, they all come under the category of attenuated vaccines, as opposed the virulent virus which is the type of virus which will produce the disease in swine.

Mr. HARVEY. I noticed a statement that has been published by the livestock group in which you are quoted as saying that there are two types, the actigenic type and the pathogenic type. Is that the thing you are referring to now?

Dr. DUNNE. Not necessarily, sir. The two types I am referring to there are variants of a virus—any virus. You can have an actigenic virus which means its ability to produce antibodies, specific types of antibodies which may be varied.

The pathogenic is the ability of the virus to produce the disease; in other words, if you can vary the pathogenicity, make it produce less disease without varying the actigenic which still produces antibodies to protect against the disease—this is the difference.

Mr. HARVEY. How long do you anticipate the so-called modified virus will protect the animals?

Dr. DUNNE. It is a question there—while not completely established, it is known to give protection for, at least, a year.

Mr. HARVEY. In other words, the problem that occurs very often with swine breeders is that they do not want to see the modified virus, because it will not give a lifetime immunity which they commonly ascribe to the virulent virus, and then they are fearful in selling some of their stock to customers they will, eventually, have it react against them.

Dr. DUNNE. This particular complaint usually arises when people vaccinate their pigs at a very early age, while still on the sow. People who vaccinate at 5 weeks, for example may have this type of a problem. This is because they have the antibodies from the sow in their system. The vaccine does not take in the presence of those antibodies.

Mr. HARVEY. In other words, you feel that this is not too serious a problem, then, if a proper stage in the life of the animal is observed when they are vaccinated?

Dr. DUNNE. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARVEY. Those are all of the questions I have. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any other questions?

If not, thank you very much, Dr. Dunne.

Dr. Kingman, do you want anyone else to be heard?

Dr. KINGMAN. Without imposing too much on the Committee's time, I should like for Dr. Henderson to express his views very briefly from the standpoint of the veterinarian practitioner.

Dr. HENDERSON. As Dr. Kingman mentioned earlier, I am a representative of several organized groups of veterinarians. And, naturally, as such we are much interested in a program of hog cholera eradication.

At first, I might say that when a program of hog cholera eradication was brought up for discussion in the profession, the veterinarians hesitated to take a position. It was evident that the profession wanted the swine industry to make the first move.

Now I might report as to what has happened in the State of Iowa, because this did occur. The chairman of the group that is active in Iowa will appear later. So I will make this brief comment in regard to the group's activity.

In March of this year a joint meeting was called with representatives from the following groups: The Iowa swine market operators,

the packers, the practitioners of veterinary medicine, the Iowa Department of Agriculture, the Animal Disease Eradication, USDA, the Iowa Experiment Station and the College of Veterinarians of Medicine, the Iowa Veterinarian Association, the Iowa Agricultural Extension Service, the Department of Animal Husbandry from Iowa State University, and, also, the extension news services and the farm press.

And also the following farm organizations: The Farmers Union, the Farm Bureau, and the NFO.

In Iowa they have this group that has been very active. I think, as Mr. Steddom will possibly relate to you later, they have passed a resolution that they are in favor of this legislation which we are discussing today.

I might add that if a program in hog cholera eradication is accepted that, in speaking for our profession, I am certain that the profession will cooperate wholly in any program you may accept. And as in the past, whenever a challenge is presented to the profession, I am certain that they will meet their challenge when that time occurs.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you.

Are there any questions of Dr. Henderson?

If not, we are obliged to you, Dr. Henderson.

Dr. KINGMAN. We have one additional statement we would like to have made by Dr. Geyer, of Ohio.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to hear from you.

Dr. GEYER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, speaking as a State regulatory official, we are faced with a very definite problem, in that within the State of Ohio we have organized a hog cholera eradication committee, comprised of all segments of the industry and the veterinarian profession.

We are in the throes of that program, but constantly we are faced with questions presented from industry representation relative to what is going to be done on the national level.

Perhaps it has been brought out in testimony prior to this that it is going to be literally impossible for a State to launch an eradication program if nothing is done on a national level.

It is our hope, as I state, certainly, and I think I can say the same thing for every State regulatory official, that within the permissive aspects of Federal legislation the right to promulgate regulations regulating the interstate traffic in swine is a part of it. If these factors are not provided, there is indeed the possibility that certain States who launch such programs will either adopt highly restrictive import regulations or place embargoes which can jeopardize the interstate traffic in swine.

This is an unfortunate situation that no State wants to have happen, but how else is a State going to protect the investment it is making in such a program if there is not some means to regulate the interstate traffic on a Federal level?

This is, of course, within the province of the Federal Government and the Agricultural Research Service. An eradication division, of course, under the Secretary, is in a position to promulgate such regulations.

While I have this opportunity I would also like to speak representing the United States Livestock Sanitary Association, having been a member of the initial committee on nationwide eradication of hog cholera, which was established in 1951. And through the efforts of that committee we prevailed upon all available scientific minds in the field of hog cholera research to compile a booklet relating briefly the facts on hog cholera. And that publication is available to the organization under the title of "What Is Known About Hog Cholera."

The United States Livestock Sanitary Association through resolutions repeatedly have gone on record supporting national legislation that would lend itself to the eradication of hog cholera from the United States. We are of the opinion, on the basis of the information as pointed out by Dr. Dunne, evidenced here in testimony, that sufficient information is available, knowledge is available whereby we can successfully launch an eradication program.

I think it is self-evident, if we review other disease eradication efforts that were undertaken in the past, that we did not have all of the answers when we launched those programs at that time. Certainly, if we wait for all of the research and provide all of the answers before we launch the eradication program on hog cholera, we will never get it launched.

Mr. POAGE. In that connection, might I ask you a question?

Dr. Kingman made a statement about eradication, about the eradication of tuberculosis. What is the situation there?

Dr. GEYER. I would answer that by stating that to the best of my memory, reviewing the Federal data that is available to all of the States, that the national incidence of tuberculosis in cattle approximates about 0.2 of 1 percent.

Mr. POAGE. How high was it when it was prevalent?

Dr. GEYER. I cannot give you the national incidence on that.

Dr. KINGMAN. About 8 percent.

Dr. GEYER. I can say that within our own State, in the counties in our State, 75 percent of the cattle were removed on the first test. So I appreciate the seriousness in certain areas.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, representing the State of Ohio and our Ohio Swine Committee, and the United States Livestock Sanitary Association, plus my affiliation with the American Veterinarian Association and the LCI, I am in sympathy, and these organizations are in sympathy with this legislation.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much, Dr. Geyer.

Are there any questions?

If not, we are very much obliged to you, Dr. Kingman, and to your associates.

Dr. KINGMAN. Allow me to say, Mr. Chairman, that we are very appreciative of this opportunity to be heard by your committee.

Mr. POAGE. We are glad to have had you.

Dr. KINGMAN. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Our next witness is Mr. Marion Steddom, president of the Iowa Hog Cholera Eradication Committee, and past president of the Iowa Swine Producers Association. We will be glad to hear from you now.

STATEMENT OF MARION STEDDOM, PRESIDENT, IOWA HOG CHOLERA ERADICATION COMMITTEE, AND PAST PRESIDENT, IOWA SWINE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. STEDDOM. Mr. Chairman, I am Marion Steddom, from Granger, Iowa, and president of the Hog Cholera Eradication Committee of the State of Iowa, and president of the Livestock Council of the State.

Mr. Chairman, lady and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you in support of this bill, this type of legislation, which is long overdue. We should have started the eradication program for this disease, probably, prior to this time.

It has plagued the industry for many, many years. Hog cholera was in the past, and still is, the disease that has cost the swine producers more in dollars than probably all of the other swine diseases combined.

The losses from this disease come in three forms to the U.S. swine producers:

First, the loss of swine from the cholera itself.

Second, the cost of vaccinating which runs into millions of dollars.

Third, the cost to producers in the loss of potential foreign markets for pork and pork products.

Now, the cost of this loss of foreign markets is hard to estimate. Today at least 21 nations prohibit the importation of U.S. pork because of our hog cholera threat.

This is one of the things that farmers have come to know as the "cost of living with hog cholera."

For example, we know that Jamaica is a potential market for U.S. pork, but the desire to keep out cholera is given the higher priority. So Jamaican trade imports pork—at relatively high prices—so that pork there is a luxury only the rich can afford.

Here sits a potential market within the shadow of our country which we cannot reach. This is just one of many markets now closed to the American hog producer.

Another cost of living with hog cholera comes away from the export markets, down on the farm itself.

This is the cost of vaccinating hogs to thwart potential outbreaks of the disease.

In one county, Franklin County, Iowa, an outbreak of hog cholera in 1959 cost an estimated \$75,000—including the loss of 2,500 hogs plus the costs of vaccination and revaccination costs.

That is the picture of the costs in one county. Now, let's bring this down on the basis of one farmer.

Bernard Collins, president of the Iowa Swine producers Association, said his veterinary bill in 1959 alone was \$1,710—of which \$1,395 was spent for hog cholera vaccination alone. This \$1,400—in the face of declining farm income—was badly needed in other areas of his farm enterprise during the price-cost squeeze days of 1959.

The producers in Iowa, where 20 percent of the Nation's pork is produced, have felt that this was one of the basic problems of the swine industry and have made ready machinery which could help eradicate hog cholera.

A State committee, consisting of farmers, college specialists, meat-packers, veterinarians, and others, has been named and has held several meetings.

We feel that anything we can do to increase the consumption of pork—either through domestic or export markets—has a bearing on the farm surplus question.

With a broader market for our pork, we can transform more of our vast supplies of corn and grain into a highly nutritious, healthful product, for use either at home or abroad.

Another reason why we are vitally in favor of this proposed legislation stems from the threat of hog cholera in the Midwest. At the present time, we have more cholera outbreaks scattered throughout the Midwest States than at any time in the past 20 years.

We need uniform legislation in regard to health standards, and requirements in the movement of livestock from one State to another.

We are not asking for the impossible—we have eradicated diseases like tuberculosis and have conquered outbreaks of hoof-and-mouth disease.

You gentlemen in your support of this legislation can open the door for the swine producers of America to take action—to eradicate hog cholera. And once this door is open, we can open another door that reaches far overseas—to the distant lands where live a hungry people. This is a method that could be used to help them—and to help ourselves.

This is basically the statement that I wish to present to you. I do not want to take a lot more of your time.

The swine producers, I am sure, of the Midwest feel that the time is ripe when they want to discuss this program, feeling that it can be done quickly, but this bill is not all, I think, that the producers would like to see, but it is a start. That is the basis of my testimony before your committee.

Mr. POAGE. I would just like to ask you, Mr. Steddom, just what do you want to do?

Mr. STEDDOM. I think that this is the start. I think if we really get into an eradication program, maybe that is 5 years from now—I think that you are going to have to have indemnities—I think that you will have to condemn herds when hog cholera outbreaks occur. I do not think that you can condemn herds without indemnities paid by somebody. If a producer happens to have some ill hogs and all of his herd has to be slaughtered, I think that you could break that producer. I think that we will have to follow the system that Canada has followed very successfully. They just slaughter them.

Mr. POAGE. Do you think that the indemnity should be paid by the Federal Government or by the State government or by whom?

Mr. STEDDOM. It may have to be by both.

Mr. POAGE. Probably by both?

Mr. STEDDOM. Much the same as we did in the tuberculosis program, but I do not think that we can really stamp out hog cholera without condemning herds when an outbreak occurs, eventually. We may have to go on a vaccination program much higher than it is now. Maybe we have to have some 75 percent of the herds vaccinated for a while before they really get into condemning herds and going all the way, but I think that, eventually, we will have to pay indemnities. I do not think that you can do it any other way.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any other questions of Mr. Steddom?

(No response.)

Mr. POAGE. If not, we are very much obliged to you.

Mr. STEDDOM. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Our next witness is a constituent of our colleague from Illinois, Mr. Findley. We will be pleased to hear from you now, Mr. Findley.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to introduce Mr. Charles S. Greene, of White Hall, Ill. White Hall is in the 20th District which, I think, is known to be one of the finest congressional districts in America, Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I agree with you.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Greene is president of the Gregory Laboratory in White Hall. He, also, is here representing Animal Health Institute and the Associated Veterinary Laboratories. Mr. Greene.

Mr. POAGE. We are delighted to have you here, Mr. Greene, and to hear from you now.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES S. GREENE, PRESIDENT, THE GREGORY LABORATORY, WHITE HALL, ILL.

Mr. GREENE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Charles S. Greene. My home is in White Hall, Ill., where I am president of the Gregory Laboratory. I represent the manufacturers of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus on the National Hog Cholera Committee of Livestock Conservation, Inc. Since 1940 I have served several terms on the control agency, a quasi-governmental body, the function of which is to administer the marketing agreement regulating the handling of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus in behalf of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I appear before this committee today as spokesman for the Animal Health Institute and the Associated Veterinary Laboratories, trade associations of the industry. Included in the membership of these associations are approximately 20 firms actively engaged in the production of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog cholera virus used for the prevention and treatment of hog cholera. Many of these firms have been in active production of hog cholera immunizing agents for around 50 years. My own company, the Gregory Laboratory, has been in the continuous production and sale of such products for 48 years.

On August 24, 1935, Congress approved the Anti-Hog-Cholera Serum and Hog-Cholera Virus Marketing Agreement Act, and thereafter, in December 1936, our industry entered into a marketing agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture for the handling of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus. Under the terms of this agreement, each manufacturer must have in inventory on April 1 of each year a reserve supply of completed serum equivalent to not less than 40 percent of his previous year's sales of all serum. This emergency reserve is held by the industry to insure the immediate availability of adequate supplies of serum with which to combat extraordinary outbreaks of hog cholera. As a result, continuous and adequate supplies of hog cholera immunizing agents have been readily available through the various channels of trade to all swine producers, the ultimate consumer of our products.

These facts are related to show the number of years and the manner in which hog cholera, a disease that became a major swine problem

around the turn of the century, has been controlled in the United States.

Through the years, the objective of this industry and its trade associations has been to do and to support that which would most benefit the swine producers and the consumer. After serious consideration, we have reached the conclusion, along with all of the leading farm organizations and other important influences in agriculture, that the adoption of H.R. 7176 and H.R. 7177 would be in the best interests of the swine producers and the consumer.

While it may appear that we are acting contrary to our own interests, and eventually this may be true, we are compelled by our own objectives to support a national hog cholera eradication program. It is our sincere belief that, if a proper program is carried out, hog cholera, for all practical purposes, can be eliminated.

The initial step in any such program would appear to be to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to take the action provided for in these bills. Therefore, we strongly urge the adoption of this legislation.

I have one other thing to mention, Mr. Chairman, so that there will not be more confusion here. When I speak of hog cholera virus it is an all-inclusive term. Under the marketing agreement hog cholera virus includes everything, attenuated, killed, live, and all of them.

Mr. POAGE. We thank you, Mr. Greene.

I believe we have another witness from the State of Illinois. I do not know whether he is your constituent, Mr. Findley. Do you want to introduce him?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will yield to Mr. Harvey.

Mr. HARVEY. The gentleman happens to be a good friend of mine. I will be happy to introduce him.

I am very happy to introduce my good friend, Mr. LaVerne Johnson, who is one of the more eminent swine producers and has served in an official capacity in the Swine Producers Association for several years. He represents that body.

Mr. POAGE. We are delighted to have you here, Mr. Johnson. We will be glad to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF LaVERNE JOHNSON, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL SWINE GROWERS COUNCIL

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am LaVerne A. Johnson, representing the National Swine Growers Council.

The National Swine Growers Council is made up of an affiliate of 30 State swine producer organizations. Our membership is composed of actual swine producers that are interested in promoting the swine industry and are interested in correcting the problems of the swine industry. We have no other reason for being in business. We are the only national organization that has this purpose.

The National Swine Growers Council strongly supports immediate passage of these identical bills—House of Representatives 7176 and 7177 and Senate 1908. We appreciate the efforts of Representatives Grant and Harvey in introducing the House bills. Equally, we appreciate the efforts of Senators Talmadge, Hickenlooper, Mundt,

Young, Hart, Eastland, Holland, and McCarthy. The interest of these men indicates a nonpartisan approach to this problem.

The National Swine Growers Council favors passage of these bills aimed toward eventual eradication of hog cholera because:

(1) The cost of the disease to swine producers is too great a burden on the swine industry. It is probably in excess of \$50 million annually.

(a) The cost of vaccination to insure prevention of cholera are in my case about 70 cents per hog. This has amounted to nearly \$11,000 in the past 20 years. Actual labor and shrink have not been figured.

(b) The costs to producers who gamble and do not vaccinate is much greater because, if cholera strikes, their entire herd will be wiped out as well as those of neighbors. Probably not over 40 percent of hogs raised are vaccinated for cholera prevention.

(2) The net income of swine producers is low. Cholera costs often eliminate, or nearly eliminate, a net income in the business.

(3) Exports of pork are restricted by 21 countries because cholera has not been eradicated in this country.

I have that list of 21 countries here for the record.

Mr. POAGE. Without further objection that list will be inserted in the record at this time.

(The list referred to follows:)

PORK IMPORT RESTRICTIONS ON ACCOUNT OF HOG CHOLERA

Great Britain	Italy	Jamaica
Canada	France	Barbados
Colombia	Germany	British Guiana
Austria	Switzerland	Dutch Guiana
Denmark	Netherlands	New Zealand
Sweden	Ireland	Australia
Belgium	Union of South Africa	Venezuela

Mr. JOHNSON. (4) The United States should not live with any disease that can be eradicated. Our history has been good in this respect. Good examples are hoof and mouth disease and vesicular exanthema.

(5) Elimination of any swine disease should improve the "image" for pork. We have a wonderful food product that we want American people to eat.

Two months ago the National Swine Growers Council sent copies of the hog cholera eradication bills to each of our 30 State associations. We requested criticism. We have heard no criticism. Last week we asked each State association to send their comments direct to the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture. If you have criticisms of the bill, they should be in your hands at this time.

If you have heard no criticisms from our State associations I feel that this is an endorsement. Maybe that is an assumption, but it works out that way.

Working out a program of hog cholera eradication will take time. The Secretary of Agriculture, in conjunction with the advisory committee made up of interested people, as recommended in the bill, will have authority to institute such a program.

Hog cholera eradication committees have already been established in a number of States and others are being developed. These committees are ready to help coordinate the eradication programs between the State and National level.

The swine industry is ready for hog cholera eradication. We need the help of the Congress to make such a program become a reality. We request that you, the agricultural leaders of the Congress, recommend that these bills be passed and we get on with the job.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I have a short letter from Mr. C. R. Mitchell, editor of the National Hog Farmer, which I should like to read to you; it is about one-half page.

Mr. POAGE. You may do just as you like.

Mr. JOHNSON (reading):

The National Hog Farmer, a newspaper serving the commercial hog producers of the Nation, strongly endorses the measures proposed to achieve the eradication of hog cholera.

In the past year, we have devoted an increasing amount of space to enlist the interest and active work of farmers in the campaign. We took the lead in proposing that farmers show their interest by contributing to a special fund to research in a better diagnostic method. Several hundred farmers in half of the States have donated to the fund, as well as contacting their neighbors in its behalf, in the face of the rush of spring fieldwork.

We have seen concrete evidence of a growing interest on the part of farmers to cooperate in a national program that can be established by means of the legislation under consideration. The confidence that eradication of hog cholera can be achieved, and therefore a real interest, did not exist several years ago, but it is here today.

We urge members of the subcommittees to give earnest consideration to this measure, with the realization that the vast majority of farmers who need and want the benefit of relief from the continuing costs of cholera cannot be present in large numbers to testify here.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you. Are there any questions? If not, we are very much obliged to you for appearing before us.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Our next witness is from the State of Indiana. Mr. Harvey will present him.

Mr. HARVEY. I am very happy to introduce Mr. Sherman O. Kessler from the State of Indiana, from the swine industry. Mr. Kessler is a very successful producer in his own right, like Mr. Johnson. I am sure that he will speak to us on this legislation.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Harvey. We are glad to have you here, Mr. Kessler and to hear from you now.

STATEMENT OF SHERMAN O. KESSLER, CHAIRMAN, INDIANA HOG CHOLERA ERADICATION COMMITTEE, NEW ROSS, IND.

Mr. KESSLER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am chairman of the Indiana Hog Cholera Eradication Committee and it is in their behalf that I am appearing here.

The objectives of this statement are two: One, is to give Indiana's position on programs for hog cholera eradication (*a*) some of the whys; (*b*) looking ahead from the Indiana position; and (*c*) the Indiana committee's attitude on the bills under consideration today.

The second objective is to see that this matter is settled on its merits. I will go into that when the time comes.

The 20-member Indiana Hog Cholera Eradication Committee has worked since October 1959 on hog cholera control and eradication. I have with me a sheet showing the members of this committee and the organizations they represent. I do not wish to read this into the record, but I have it with me in order to indicate to you that this

is an industrywide committee. The 20 members represent all segments of the swine industry in Indiana.

Indiana's position is about as follows:

(1) Swine production is an important part of our livestock and general economy. Therefore, we are quite interested in the control and eventual eradication of hog cholera.

(2) With today's complex marketing systems and the rapid transportation of animals we all know that it is impossible for any one State or area to make much headway alone; therefore, we are interested in a national program for the control of this serious disease.

(3) Indiana's position with reference to the use of virulent virus is as follows:

(a) We feel that simply the elimination of this immunizing agent is not in itself a control nor an eradication program;

(b) We feel very definitely that as we near complete and total eradication that all products capable of causing cholera will have to be eliminated and that, eventual elimination, of course, would include the modified live product as well as the full strength virus;

(c) We believe that virulent virus should be retained because it is still the strongest and longest lasting immunizing agent and is, particularly, useful in critical situations. If it is properly used there is no more danger of spreading hog cholera than from using some of the modified products. To draw a line between virulent virus and modified products, ranging in virulence from very weak to almost full strength and call virulent bad and all on the other side of the line good, is absolutely false. In fact, Dr. J. P. Torrey at Ames has shown that in successive passages from hog to hog some modified viruses become fully virulent. I will have more to say about virulent and modified viruses later.

No. 4, under Indiana's position, we feel that each State should be able to shape its program in accordance with its needs, and Federal assistance should not be contingent on absolute conformity to national recommendations. I think I can clarify that just a little.

Actually, that should have been stated that the Federal requirements for the States to meet in order to qualify would be such they could shape its own program.

(4) Indemnities: We fully realize that as complete eradication nears fulfillment it will be important for us to have the authority to dispose of entire herds of swine in the best interests of the industry. And we feel at that time it will be necessary for us to indemnify the owners. At the present time, however, we feel that the money spent for indemnification could much better be utilized in the areas of investigating outbreaks, immunizing exposed swine, establishing quarantines, supervising the slaughter of exposed animals, policing the movement of swine into and within the State.

Let other States speak for themselves. If they are in position to provide matching funds on a State basis with Federal funds to pay indemnities for death losses from hog cholera, if such Federal funds are made available, let them.

Further, we believe that (1) the background of the proposals at the national level should be thoroughly investigated. More on this

later; (2) how much propaganda is there in the stories that pork exports would be expanded greatly if full strength virulent virus (only) is outlawed; (3) research is needed, among other phases of hog cholera, one, to discover a quick, positive diagnosis, and two, to find out what is the residual carrier of hog cholera—is it the earthworm; and three, to develop a positive, long-lasting immunizing agent which cannot cause cholera.

Looking ahead from Indiana's present position, the Indiana Legislature this last session early this year passed a law which the State hog cholera eradication committee had recommended. It put in the terms which we asked for, but did not provide any money to activate it. So assuming we get some State money to activate the law, its provisions will be carried out to the best of the ability of the Indiana Livestock Sanitary Board and the State veterinarian.

Further, fully virulent virus will be used in the State at the decision of the producers and the general practitioners until something better comes along.

Also, the State hog cholera eradication committee will continue to be active in its objectives to assist in every way possible to bring about greater controls, reduce incidence and, eventually, the eradication of this disease.

It is our assumption that control is the immediate problem, but eradication is, certainly, a goal to be worked toward.

Now Indiana's attitude on hog cholera eradication bills: H.R. 7176 and H.R. 7177 and Senate bill 1908. Because we have a plant manufacturing an excellent full strength virus product within the State and will continue to use this product as noted above we are not objecting to the bill as we interpret it. However, we are recommending that No. 2, beginning on line 3, page 2, be removed from the bill. It is an unnecessary provision, in the first place, inasmuch as an eradication program properly carried out will, eventually, eliminate all immunizing agents capable of causing the disease.

In the second place, the support for the bill would be much greater with this taken out. It merely serves to fire up a controversy over live virus. With this section out, Indiana will do much more than remain neutral—we will support the bill wholeheartedly.

Objective No. 2, to see that this matter is settled on its merits. The reason I headed this section this way, shortly before I left to come here to appear before this committee a member of the Indiana committee said to me, "this matter will not be settled on its merits." I will elaborate on that as I go along.

This section of my statement will endeavor to insure that this matter is settled on its merits.

First, I quote from the proceedings of the U.S. Livestock Sanitary Association, the 55th annual meeting, November 1951, the report of the National Committee on the Eradication of Hog Cholera. Remember this is about 10 years ago. I quote:

at the onset your committee wishes to emphasize it believes eradication of hog cholera is possible—

and the next words are in italic:

but not so long as mass production and field use of virulent hog cholera virus is permitted.

And further quoting:

we further suggest that as soon as nonvirulent cholera immunizing agents have demonstrated through actual farm use that they are thoroughly effective vaccines, steps should be taken—

and that is the end of the quote there, but it concerns the further steps after this point is reached.

Now we maintain that it took a lot less than 10 years to prove that these are not thoroughly effective vaccines, that is, these nonvirulent cholera immunizing agents. I do not need to go very far into the massive evidence showing this, but will quote from Iowa veterinarian opposition to modified live virus vaccine. These experiences are true in Indiana as well as in Iowa, but they are well stated here and are not too long, so I am quoting from these.

No. 1:

The modified live virus vaccines have not yet withstood a real hog-cholera outbreak in the field. No large outbreak has occurred since their introduction in 1951 and 1952.

One veterinarian in Iowa reports that in a small outbreak which he experienced in 1956 within an area of 6 square miles all pigs vaccinated with modified live virus had to be revaccinated, while all hogs being vaccinated with serum and virus stood the test.

No. 2:

Serum reserves have been continually falling, and if we restrict the use of virus these reserves will be depleted even more. Thus, if hog-cholera breaks in epidemic proportions, the hog industry will surely be the loser.

No. 3:

The modified live virus vaccines cannot be used for delayed treatment which is required in the importation of feeder pigs or for treating sick pigs. This is a situation which confronts us. Feeder pigs before coming into Iowa are given 10 to 40 cc's of serum—3 to 14 days later these pigs are again vaccinated with serum and vaccine. And that vaccine means a modified product. When a pre-dose of serum is given it causes a cell block and the vaccine will not give lasting immunity.

Now if a serum and virus were given, that is, the full-strength virus, it is strong enough to break through the antibody protection produced by the earlier dose of serum and will give satisfactory immunity.

The basic point is that we cannot vaccinate pigs and obtain immunity unless we use live virus. All pigs leaving Missouri are required to have a dose of serum. Thus we need virus to vaccinate them to get lasting protection.

Then this is important:

This same picture also exists where sick pigs are being given antiserum and 9 or 10 days later are given virus to produce immunity.

I mentioned earlier that all modified vaccines are not the same. In this connection you may recall that I used the word "virulent" in connection with "modified." After I did this I thought that I had better look up the word in the dictionary. The bacteriological definition of virulent:

Infectious; able to overcome or break down the defensive mechanism of the host.

I did not err in using the two words together.

Dr. D. P. Gustafson of Purdue tells me that in controlled experiments to test the virulence of certain of the modifieds the pigs are killed as dead as by any other means.

There are some segments of the background in livestock disease control, particularly in the history of efforts working toward hog cholera eradication that I find very disturbing. There is a parallel I wish to call to your attention.

The Cuban fiasco earlier this year took place at Pig Bay. What does this have to do with hog cholera? I assure you that the name is not the main parallel. The parallel starts with the planning or the lack of planning behind the Cuban invasion.

As I appraise the background of hog cholera eradication efforts it seems to me that a group of certain agricultural journalists, organization men and Government career men have written and spoken a lot of words, have inbred their thinking, emphasized spectacular but minor points, and have refused to listen to their critics who by the way may be their best friends in the long run.

What might be the possible result? Could it be a Pig Bay for the hog industry? If we are going to fight this battle, let us not leave our best weapons at home.

I have approached and emphasized this area, not with the thought of stirring up controversy. On the contrary, I have suggested an effective way to resolve the controversy over fully virulent virus as far as getting full support in carrying out an effective eradication program is concerned. This is an issue and should be met.

In conclusion, I believe that there is in this room the brains to interpret the evidence and formulate an effective, fully supported program. We can determine what should be done from this point that will lead to the quickest and the best methods of eradicating hog cholera.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much, Mr. Kessler. As I understand your testimony it is that you think we should retain the live virus?

Mr. KESSLER. At this time in the present phase of fighting hog cholera it is still a control program and eradication is something which should be started upon, but which will come later.

Mr. POAGE. But you think we should retain the use and have the movement of live virus?

Mr. KESSLER. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. The bill provides that the Secretary shall handle that—it authorizes him to handle it—Do you agree with the point made there?

Mr. KESSLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. So that what you are suggesting is—

Mr. KESSLER. Yes, there has been work done in the Bureau of Animal Industry and probably in other parts—

Mr. POAGE. As it has been done in the past—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you yield there for a moment?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will say this off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. POAGE. What Mr. Kessler is recommending is that the Secretary select the committee.

Mr. KESSLER. I think so, but even there I would serve caution as to who was selected.

Mr. POAGE. You are pretty much opposed to the bill?

Mr. KESSLER. No, sir. I think that taking out No. 2, which I recommended, would make it a very desirable bill. And the industry and the committee would like to see that.

Mr. POAGE. This bill authorizes that live virus be outlawed. You do not think that the Secretary should do that. What good is the bill, then?

Mr. KESSLER. Well, in the first place, it does not permit the Secretary to outlaw the live virus. It only permits him to restrict or to prohibit its interstate movements.

Mr. POAGE. That pretty well outlaws it.

Mr. KESSLER. As I attempted to give the Indiana position on that we are setting out their believing that live virus should be retained. We have a plant in the State which now manufactures it. It does not ship it interstate so we can sit there and let it be passed as it is. I think it is more effective as a bill with this section taken out.

Mr. POAGE. And Congress cannot interfere with the intrastate business, you know that. Our only power is over interstate business.

Mr. KESSLER. That is right—that is the point exactly.

Mr. POAGE. So this bill goes as far as it can in that respect.

I was a little amazed that you said that you favored this bill, and then find fault with every provision in it.

Why do you want the bill passed? I do not see that.

Mr. KESSLER. It is a start. And you have to start some place.

Mr. POAGE. But you do not believe that it is a start?

Mr. KESSLER. That is not correct. I would be much in favor of the bill and getting a committee appointed and getting this to work.

Mr. POAGE. Who do you think should appoint the committee?

Mr. KESSLER. The Secretary should appoint it, all right, but it is a matter of proper selection in order to see that the right type of job is done.

Mr. POAGE. Who do you suggest ought to be appointed? Do you suggest the members should be selected to represent the swine and related industries? I am sure that you do not want to go to the automobile industry for members of the committee. Do you say the State and local governments and scientific groups and the public should be represented? Who else should be on that committee?

Mr. KESSLER. I would forgo the matter of proper selection within those groups. I could name some names, if you would like to have them.

Mr. POAGE. This committee is not going to direct the Secretary to name John Jones or any one else by name. We do not do that.

Are there any other questions?

Mr. SHORT. I have just one comment, Mr. Chairman. As I understand what you are proposing here is that the live virus vaccine be used as the best weapon available at the present time until such time as something better becomes available. Is that not about it?

Mr. KESSLER. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. SHORT. I do not know that I have too much quarrel with that. We have all recognized that the live virus vaccine does help. Yet, as long as you use live virus vaccine, you also always have hog cholera.

Mr. KESSLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHORT. What you are trying to say is that you would at some time in the future hope to completely eliminate hog cholera?

Mr. KESSLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHORT. Which necessitates the use of some other kind of vaccine?

Mr. KESSLER. Yes, sir; at least, a vaccine that will not cause the disease.

Mr. SHORT. A vaccine that is not a live virus.

Mr. KESSLER. Yes.

Mr. HARVEY. I have here a letter from Dr. Joe W. Green, State veterinarian, Indiana State Livestock Sanitary Board. He is a respected official of that board. I would like permission to read a couple of quotes from the letter which, I think, do not in any sense conflict with what Mr. Kessler has said; in fact, they more or less coincide. Dr. Green says as follows:

Although the trend has shifted very rapidly away from using virulent virus in Indiana, there are still a few who feel that it is the only product they can rely upon. These people would object to outlawing it entirely. There would be no objection if it were only banned from interstate movement.

Of course, as has been brought out in the committee hearings, our authority, so far as the Congress is concerned, extends only to interstate shipments.

Then to quote again:

Two, indemnities: Our committee is fearful that there would be wide-scale abuse if indemnity was a part of the first phase of an eradication program. It was their feeling that these moneys could be better spent in the areas of investigating outbreaks, supervising the disposition of infected herds, and generally policing the movement of swine. We are not, however, opposed to indemnities being used where the incidence of the disease is low enough to warrant such a step.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that both points are not in conflict with the bill. It was recommended here by a previous witness, including the witness for the American Veterinarian Medical Association and others who testified with them and, particularly, I believe, Mr. Steddom of Iowa, that none of them feel that indemnities should be used until the mopup phase of the disease.

I do not want to put words into Mr. Kessler's mouth—he is able to speak for himself—but I think what he is saying here is that they feel this is a very major step that should be approached cautiously and with a good deal of consideration for all of the factors involved.

I will state myself, Mr. Kessler, that, certainly, the Congress feels that it has a sense of responsibility in this. I have a feeling that you feel that once having passed the bill Congress would immediately wash its hands of any further responsibility in regard to the problem and give no further consideration as to how this program was proceeding. I would like to say that is not the attitude on the part of the Livestock Subcommittee of the House. This is simply a move in the direction that we are all, I believe, agreed we should make, but that does not mean if this piece of legislation is enacted that all further investigation or consideration by the Congress will immediately be abandoned. I hope that will be by nature of an assurance to you that most of the reservations have to do not with the idea, but with the way that you think it might be administered. Is that correct?

Mr. KESSLER. That is fundamentally correct.

Mr. HARVEY. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any further questions?

Mr. HARDING. Did I hear you mention the matter of matching funds? Do you believe that later on in the vaccination program that matching funds are going to be needed?

Mr. KESSLER. I think that should be started in time. If there is national legislation on this there might be funds provided for that.

Mr. HARDING. Do you think it is desirable—would you want matching Federal funds, to commence the program?

Mr. KESSLER. It would depend a little bit on what qualifications the States would have to meet the eligible—to be eligible. In the past, as I understand it, in order to qualify for those matching funds every State has had to do about the same thing and meet some qualifications that, perhaps, in this case some States would not want to meet. If that would pertain to the State of Indiana in this case, as I feel it, the committee would react, for instance—if Indiana could get money—if live virus were outlawed, it would not outlaw live virus in our State—it would just use State funds, if it did.

On the other hand, supposing the qualifications were, No. 1, that they have an active Indiana-wide hog-cholera eradication committee, like Indiana does, and has a legislative program which is aimed at hog cholera eradication, which Indiana, also has, that qualifies them to meet, to be eligible for Federal funds, then we would be glad to get some funds that way.

Mr. HARDING. And you would have Government controls on that. You would like to see Federal funds in the hog cholera eradication program on a matching basis?

Mr. KESSLER. Well, you said two things there. One is this matter of Federal control. I made a point that in order to get this money there should not be much Federal control go with it. I realize that is pretty farfetched.

Mr. HARDING. I think that it is. I think that if we are going to put Federal funds into a program there will necessarily be a reasonable amount of control. If the swine industry does not want any Government control or any Government regulation, I think they should think twice before coming here and asking for Federal cholera eradication legislation. I am sure you will agree with me, do you not?

Mr. KESSLER. Yes. I do not see any point of disagreeing with you there.

Mr. HARDING. So, Mr. Kessler, you are fully willing to accept the controls that this type of legislation will bring?

Mr. KESSLER. If it will lead to the goals, yes.

Mr. HARDING. That is all I have. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any further questions?

[No response.]

Mr. POAGE. If not, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Kessler.

Mr. KESSLER. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. We have one more witness scheduled this morning. Before we call the last witness, I want to insert into the record a telegram from Waxahachie, Tex., which reads as follows:

"Texas Swine Breeders Association gives full endorsement to the following bills: H.R. 7176, H.R. 7177, S. 1908." And that is signed Hosa Rogers, president.

Also, without objection, we will insert into the record at this point a statement from the Maryland Swine Producers Association, Inc.

(The statement of the Maryland Swine Producers Association is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MARYLAND SWINE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION, INC., MARION PROUGH, SYKESVILLE, Md., PRESIDENT; GEORGE LECHLIDER, GAITHERSBURG, Md., SECRETARY, ON HOG CHOLERA ERADICATION PROGRAM RESOLUTION

The officers and directors of the Maryland Swine Producers Association definitely resolve that when and if research and regulatory personnel conclude that a program of hog cholera eradication is both possible and practical and when such a program is initiated the use of any type of weakened or full strength virus vaccines must be prohibited. However, until a hog cholera eradication program is initiated this group is definitely and unanimously opposed to giving the Secretary of Agriculture the power to outlaw full strength hog cholera vaccines for the following reasons:

1. To include such powers in a bill would cloud, confuse, and complicate the highly controversial issue of full strength versus weakened hog cholera vaccines; and

2. Would deny the individual producer of his rights and privileges of insuring his herd against loss from hog cholera by the only method that has stood the test of time in providing lifetime immunity.

Unanimously endorsed on July 24, 1961.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At this point, may I have permission to insert a telegram from the commissioner of agriculture of the State of Florida?

Mr. POAGE. Without objection permission is granted.

(The telegram referred to is as follows:)

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., July 25, 1961.

D. R. MATTHEWS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Understand Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grain, Representative Bob Poage, chairman, will consider H.R. 7694 to establish Federal hog cholera eradication program Wednesday and Thursday of this week. Urgently request you attend this hearing and assist in obtaining favorable recommendation on this bill. The 1961 Florida Legislature authorized use of State funds for participation in a hog cholera eradication program in the event a Federal eradication program is authorized. Inauguration of Florida program now awaiting action on Federal program. Appreciate any assistance. Regards.

BOYLE CONNER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

Mrs. MAY. May I have permission to insert into the record a statement which I do not have with me at the moment from our commissioner of agriculture?

Mr. POAGE. Without objection, that permission is granted.

(The document referred to is as follows:)

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Olympia, May 15, 1961.

HON. CATHERINE MAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS MAY: Please find enclosed background material relative to national program of hog cholera education which I would like to urge you to support.

As far as hog cholera is concerned in the State of Washington we are relatively free, with only seven herds of 82 swine involved in the fiscal year 1959 and nine herds of 107 swine involved in fiscal year 1960 through January of 1961.

The State of Washington has recently tightened its import regulations on swine (Order No. 844) and has adopted new regulations regarding hog cholera vaccination and control (Order No. 833). We feel that these tightened con-

trols, plus the fact that incidence of hog cholera in Washington is very small, would leave us in a position to become cholera free without the necessity for any large State appropriation, if a national program for eradication were undertaken. On the other hand, without such a national program, the prospect for the State to become cholera free is remote. For that reason, we strongly support this legislation.

Sincerely,

JOE DWYER, *Director.*

Mr. POAGE. Our next witness is Mr. Charles Pepper, a grain and livestock farmer from Milton, Del., who is president of the Delaware Swine Producers Association. We will be glad to hear from you now, Mr. Pepper.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES PEPPER, PRESIDENT, DELAWARE SWINE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. PEPPER. I am Charles Pepper, a grain and livestock farmer near Milton, Del. I am president of the Delaware Swine Producers Association, and this statement is submitted in their behalf.

When our research men say they know how to eradicate cholera, and when the necessary authority and money are voted by Congress and the legislatures, then we will solidly back a hog cholera eradication program.

There will be no quick, easy, and cheap way to eradicate hog cholera. We must have the cooperation of all 50 States. We must have the cooperation of the farmers at the crossroads in every hog-producing area. We must have the authority for quarantine, for seizure, and for disposal. We must have authority to pay indemnities for hogs destroyed, and money to pay these indemnities. At the start, we may have to find a way to encourage or compel all farmers to immunize all their hogs with approved materials. Certainly live virus will be banned as one part of any eradication program. We cannot hope to do all this if we carry over old controversies from the area of cholera control, to this new area of cholera eradication.

Unwisely, we believe, H.R. 7176 as now written, grants authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to prohibit at any time the interstate movement of live virus. Until a complete eradication program is fully set up, any action to permit outlawing the interstate movement of live virus, is just one more move in the controversial issue of our cholera control problem. If H.R. 7176 is passed as now written, there will be those who try to persuade the Secretary to outlaw the interstate movement of live virus at once. There will be those who are compelled to oppose any such move. Old shadows will have dimmed what should have been a bright new page on cholera eradication.

Nothing will be gained by such a course—either in the long view, or the short view. The adoption of an eradication program automatically does away with all live virus (as in Canada). In the meantime, we know that outlawing live virus, by itself, is a most uncertain and disappointing step in cholera control. Last winter's severe cholera epidemic in Florida is the most recent in a long list of such unhappy demonstrations.

We urge your committee to amend H.R. 7176 by deleting the grant of authority to the Secretary to outlaw the interstate movement of live hog cholera virus. We will then have a climate where all can concentrate in harmony on an eradication program. When the advi-

sory committee presents its eradication program, Congress and the legislatures will have to be asked for authority to vaccinate, to quarantine, to seize, and to dispose. Money for indemnities will have to be appropriated. At that time, we will all join in asking that live virus be given a quiet burial, with none to regret its passing. Nothing will have been lost, and much will have been gained.

Respectfully submitted, on behalf of the Delaware Swine Producers Associations.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Pepper, you agree with Mr. Kessler, I notice. Mr. Kessler suggested that. Are your views the same as his?

Mr. PEPPER. In order to have this eradication program we have got to have something—they have got to set up authority to do the things. When you have the authority to go into a man's place and remove his hogs, he surely is going to feel that he is entitled to some indemnity.

Mr. POAGE. You are in favor of an immediate indemnity payment. You are also opposed to banning live virus?

Mr. PEPPER. The interstate movement, yes—I am not in favor of the committee.

Mr. POAGE. I know that you said that in your paper. You know that the Congress could not prohibit the intrastate movement.

Mr. PEPPER. No, not in the States, because if we want to vaccinate we have to get ours from some other State.

Mr. POAGE. In other words, you want to use the live virus—that is the point?

Mr. PEPPER. I want it so that we can get the virus until the eradication program is set up, so that we can get the virus, whatever we choose to vaccinate our hogs with.

Mr. POAGE. I think that is one of the issues that is before this committee, as to whether we believe it is desirable to continue to use a virus which, actually, is the disease itself, whether we believe it is wise to deliberately spread the disease, you might say, or whether to control it—that is really what we propose to do with this live virus, is it not?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. There are those who believe that it spreads the disease. I do not happen to know about that, but I know that some people believe it spreads the disease and that you can never eradicate the disease so long as you are moving the disease around by means of the virus, that you will never eradicate the disease.

Do you think it can be done?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, if it is properly handled, I think you can.

Mr. POAGE. I think that is the issue here.

Mr. HARVEY. Do you think it is the improper handling of it? You continually say "if properly handled." What do you mean by improper handling?

Mr. PEPPER. Let me say it this way: Did you ever see anybody improperly use anything, for instance, take something like this ash tray—suppose I throw it around on the floor—do you think that is proper handling? We do have people in the veterinarian profession who are not any better than I am about handling this in handling this vaccine. We have to know that, that some veterinarians do this work, and some of them are not just too careful—they are not all the same, of course—I am not speaking about everybody, but there are some.

Mr. HARVEY. I certainly am not here to quarrel with you over the qualities of the various members of the veterinary profession. I think, however, we have to accept as a foregone conclusion that we have various qualities among the veterinarians. Certainly there are possibilities throughout the brucellosis program among the cattle where shortcomings might have led to a breakdown in the program, but it seems to me that the authority is here which I happen to know can and only will be exercised by veterinarians in conjunction and cooperation with the State livestock sanitary boards in dealing with the problems of this kind, and the authority will not be taken away from the State of Delaware to have the use of proper officials to determine whether it is needed, that is, the virus.

I do not think that this legislation contemplates, Mr. Pepper, that live virus will no longer be obtainable or usable by your swine growers if emergency conditions demand it. That is what you are saying in essence, is it not, that it ought to be available for emergency situations?

Mr. PEPPER. At the present time we can use whatever virus we desire, or to have the veterinarian use whatever we desire.

Mr. HARVEY. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. We want to continue to use whatever virus we want to use until this eradication program is set up and in working condition.

Mr. HARVEY. I am sure that the committee wants to be sympathetic to the views of the producers. I do not see in all fairness how you can start any program of eradication so long as you insist on having this virus. How would you start a program of eradication, Mr. Pepper?

Mr. PEPPER. When your committee gets this eradication program set up, that will be approved then, will it not?

Mr. HARVEY. Certainly, it is obvious to me, at least, that part of the program will be the elimination of the live virus.

Mr. PEPPER. The way I have got it in my head, when this program is set up and in working condition, all of the virus will be gone. You will have some kind of vaccine—I do not know what. The veterinarians have explained that we will be able to vaccinate our hogs, or what have you, and we will not have any worry about spreading the disease. Is that not what we are working on?

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Pepper, I think what you are saying is that you want or you are anticipating that we will be able to have something whereby we press button A and—

Mr. PEPPER. No, no.

Mr. HARVEY. And we will go from position A to position B and we will be able to make that transfer.

I do not think that anybody can contemplate or should contemplate that.

What I am saying to you is that the promulgation of this program cannot be on at least except a 5- or 10-year basis—it has to be approached on that kind of a basis, and what we are saying in this legislation here is, let us get started on this program, but that does not mean that having started on the program that everything that is required to protect the interests of the swine growers will be ignored.

The thing is that we are going to have to use an organized effort to try to accomplish the objective that I am sure you want to ac-

complish. You are saying, I believe, in essence that we do not want any organized effort to bring about this.

Mr. PEPPER. You, certainly, have got to be organized to bring it about.

Mr. POAGE. The very question here is whether we want at this time to say that we ought to have a little longer to get ready to use something other than this live virus. Were we not told about 7 or 8 years ago that we needed a few more years, 5 or 6? Has that not been the history of this thing?

Mr. HARVEY. I think you are right, Mr. Chairman. However, I would only add this, that I am sure that in the intervening time much progress has been made in improving the quality of the so-called modified viruses. We have the statement here of the very best, reliable veterinarian medical authorities that I know of who say that they have those viruses today that are good enough to protect the interest of the livestock producers and that it is safe now to embark on the program.

I think you heard the testimony here this morning?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARVEY. That is, of the men who are presumed to be the authorities, at least, in their fields. You heard me ask one of the members of the delegation exactly that question. And he said that they did have available today the quality of virus, that is, modified virus, that is necessary for a start to be made on the program.

Mr. POAGE. If there are no further questions, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Pepper.

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. That completes our witness list for today.

The committee has an important bill before the House and the members will be expected to be there.

Tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock we will hear the Department of Agriculture witnesses on this legislation, and then we will hear from the farm organizations.

The committee stands adjourned at this time until 10 o'clock in the morning.

(Whereupon, at 12 noon, the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Thursday, July 27, 1961.)



complaint. I am not saying I believe in vaccines that we do not want and I am not saying I believe in vaccines that we do not want.

The vaccine I am talking about is the one that is being used in the United States. I am not saying I believe in vaccines that we do not want and I am not saying I believe in vaccines that we do not want.

Mr. Chairman, I think you are right. Mr. Chairman, however, I would not like to see a vaccine in the investigation time in the United States. I am not saying I believe in vaccines that we do not want and I am not saying I believe in vaccines that we do not want.

I think the vaccine is being used in the United States. I am not saying I believe in vaccines that we do not want and I am not saying I believe in vaccines that we do not want.

Mr. Chairman, I am not saying I believe in vaccines that we do not want and I am not saying I believe in vaccines that we do not want.

The vaccine is being used in the United States. I am not saying I believe in vaccines that we do not want and I am not saying I believe in vaccines that we do not want.



HOG CHOLERA ERADICATION

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 1961

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND FEED GRAINS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 1310, New House Office Building, Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Jones of Missouri, Matthews, Breeding, Harding, Short, Mrs. May, and Harvey.

Also present: Representative Grant; Christine S. Gallagher, clerk.

Mr. POAGE. The subcommittee will come to order.

We have with us today witnesses from the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Van Houweling will be heard first. I notice that you are accompanied by others, is that correct?

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF C. D. VAN HOUWELING, ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE; ACCOMPANIED BY F. J. MULHERN, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, ADE, ARS; AND S. P. LEJKO, ASSISTANT TO ADMINISTRATOR, ARS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am C. D. Van Houweling, Assistant Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, and with me I have Mr. F. J. Mulhern, who is the Associate Director of the Animal Disease Eradication Division, and Mr. S. P. Lejko, from our Agricultural Research Service.

I am pleased to appear before you to discuss H.R. 7176, 7177, and 7702, bills which would provide for a national hog cholera eradication program.

The bills would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to (1) initiate a national hog cholera eradication program in cooperation with the States; (2) prohibit or restrict the interstate movement of virulent hog cholera virus or other hog cholera virus to effectuate a hog cholera eradication program; and (3) establish an advisory committee of 12 members with a Department representative serving as chairman, to advise with respect to the initiation of a national hog cholera eradication program, and to review plans and procedures for carrying out such a program. The committee would meet at the call of the

Secretary, and would be authorized travel and subsistence expenses, or per diem in lieu thereof, when attending such meetings.

The Department favors the enactment of this legislation.

Hog cholera is an acute, contagious disease that is usually fatal. It is spread directly from animal to animal, and indirectly by feeding raw garbage that may contain scraps of pork from hogs that were harboring virus at the time of slaughter, as well as by the contamination of vehicles and facilities when occupied by diseased or exposed hogs. Hog cholera sick hogs are inactive, have high temperatures, are extremely weak, have little or no appetite, and often stand motionless, with tails and ears drooping. Conjunctivitis is another frequent symptom. Weakened hogs often sway and stagger when they move and suddenly collapse in any position. Very few hogs that become sick ever recover. This disease was first recognized in the United States about 130 years ago. It soon spread to all swine-producing areas of the country and is now generally recognized to occur in each State. This is in contrast to Canada, where for the past 50 years each outbreak has been stamped out as it occurred.

The striking difference in the reported cost of hog cholera to swine producers in Canada as compared to the United States is convincing evidence that the eradication of hog cholera in this country is economically advantageous. In 1960 Canada reported that to eradicate periodic outbreaks of hog cholera and to maintain national freedom from the disease over the past 45 years has cost one-half cent per pig marketed. In the United States the estimated cost is 45 cents per pig marketed. This covers only the cost of immunizing against the disease.

More than 50 years ago research developed a method for vaccinating against the disease by using fully virulent virus simultaneously with blood or blood serum. In the midforties inactivated virus vaccines were developed. During the early 1950's several modified live virus vaccines were developed, some for use with antiserum. These modified virus vaccines have been widely used and now represent approximately 90 percent of all the immunizing agents used for hog cholera control.

The increased knowledge and improved vaccines have not resulted in the elimination of the disease. Hog cholera is still reported from all the major swine-producing States and remains a most serious swine disease in the United States. The annual cost of hog cholera to the Nation's swine producers is estimated to be \$40 to \$60 million, including losses from death on the farm, condemnation at slaughter, and the continuing cost of vaccination. Not included, however, is the loss of potential foreign pork markets. Eleven countries ban or restrict such imports from this country because of hog cholera. These countries are: United Kingdom, Austria, Sweden, Australia, New Zealand, British Guiana, Denmark, Belgium, Barbados, Colombia, and Jamaica. This potential market is estimated at \$15 million annually.

Again, I think that these have been discussed by witnesses before the committee, and I will not, therefore, comment on them further at this time.

The development of the immunizing agents has resulted in the control of the disease and has made it possible to live with it, even though at a great annual cost. During the past 15 years there has been a

growing interest in the possible eradication of hog cholera from the United States. This interest has been expressed by a number of livestock, industry, and associated groups.

Initially, recommendations for eradication were voiced by the National Research Council followed by the United States Livestock Sanitary Association. In recent years Livestock Conservation, Inc., identified it as a major project and requested the Department to call a series of regional meetings. The National Swine Industry Conference last year listed hog cholera eradication as a primary objective.

Among organizations that have taken a position supporting a national program are: The National Farmers Union, National Swine Growers Council, National Livestock Producers Association, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Grange, American Meat Institute, American Farm Bureau. The National Association of State Departments of Agriculture has recommended Federal assistance and support for States desiring to initiate a hog cholera eradication program.

The Department of Agriculture, after careful consideration, concludes that it is feasible to initiate a hog cholera eradication program as proposed in this legislation. Scientists in the Department have for several years believed that the eradication of hog cholera would be feasible when the producers and others closely associated with hog production and processing are prepared to support such an eradication program.

The use of fully virulent virus is no longer needed for immunizing swine. It has long been recognized that it would be most difficult, if not impossible, to eradicate hog cholera as long as large quantities of virulent virus were being used. With the development of the inactivated and modified vaccines it is no longer necessary to use virulent virus. There are now 38 States and Puerto Rico which have laws or regulations prohibiting or restricting the use of virulent virus. A national eradication program would make it necessary that the Department control the movement of virulent virus.

Authorities have stated for years that the disease could not be eradicated as long as virulent virus was used as an immunizing agent. This legislation authorizes the Secretary to prohibit or restrict its use to effectuate an eradication program. So it is not a question of whether virulent virus and serum is better than attenuated vaccines, or vice versa. The question is whether or not the disease can be eradicated as long as the project is used, and our scientists have told us that it cannot. This legislation, if enacted, would remove any question in regard to the Department's authority to control such movements.

The heat treatment of garbage fed to swine has long been recognized as one of the basic requirements for any hog cholera eradication program. All States except Colorado have laws or regulations requiring cooking of garbage to a temperature adequate to kill any hog cholera virus that may be in the meat scraps making up the garbage. These States, with some assistance from the Federal Government, have programs organized to enforce the cooking laws or regulations.

The means for the diagnosis of hog cholera are at hand and will suffice for an eradication program. Diagnosis will ordinarily be made on the basis of the clinical signs of the disease, taking into account

the history, symptoms, and lesions of the affected swine. In questionable cases it may be necessary to resort to animal inoculations and laboratory procedures for a confirmation of field diagnosis.

Vesicular exanthema has been successfully eradicated from the United States. This disease is similar to hog cholera in the way that it is spread. It is also caused by a virus, it is highly infectious, and it is transmitted directly by infected and exposed swine, and indirectly through vehicles, holding pens, and meat scraps harboring the virus. The completion of the eradication of VE indicates that a similar eradication program, although of much greater magnitude, since hog cholera is firmly entrenched and widely scattered throughout the United States, would be successful if carried out against hog cholera.

In the event a national hog cholera eradication program would be authorized, the States would assume the responsibility for enforcement of State laws and regulations pertaining to the reporting of the disease, the quarantining of infested and exposed premises, access to premises for inspection purposes, and other intrastate measures necessary to prevent spread of the disease.

The Department would share in the payment of indemnities but would not exceed 50 percent, with the States assuming responsibility for the remainder. The payment of the Federal share would not be made contingent upon the State's payment of its share.

The Department would undertake responsibility for the enforcement of interstate laws and regulations, cooperation with the States in inspections, and the costs of epidemiological surveys and "traceback" inspections necessary to locate the origin of outbreaks and the possibilities of further spread from such outbreaks. The interstate movements of swine or of infected materials are often implicated in outbreaks and these must be traced back to their origin to find and deal with any infection at the source. At the same time, there are often found to have been movements of swine or of contaminated materials from the outbreak into one or more other States and these also must be investigated and any infection controlled and eliminated. Because of these factors, it is not possible to work effectively with any one State without a comprehensive system of inspection and surveillance in the other States to handle outbreaks as they occur.

The Department's laboratories also would serve as an aid to the States in the diagnosis of outbreaks where there is question as to the identity of the disease.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement. And with this, I submit for the record, the report of the Department dated July 26, 1961.

Mr. HARDING (presiding). Without objection, that will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The report of the Department of Agriculture dated July 26, 1961, is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1961.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We have received your letter of May 22, 1961, and appreciate the opportunity to report on H.R. 7176, a bill to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program.

The bill would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to (1) initiate a national hog cholera eradication program in cooperation with the States; and (2) pro-

hibit or restrict the interstate movement of virulent hog cholera virus or other hog cholera virus to effectuate a hog cholera eradication program. The Secretary is also directed to establish an advisory committee of 12 members with the Department representative serving as chairman. The committee would advise the Secretary with respect to (1) the initiation of a national hog cholera eradication program, and (2) the development of plans and procedures for carrying out the proposed program. The committee would meet at the call of the Secretary, and he would be authorized to pay their travel and subsistence expenses, or per diem in lieu thereof, in connection with their attendance.

This Department favors the enactment of H.R. 7176. We feel that with the support and cooperation of the swine producers and the States, hog cholera can be eradicated.

Hog cholera is an acute, usually fatal, disease capable of rapidly spreading from one swine herd to another through normal marketing practices. It is still considered the No. 1 killer of hogs in the United States and costs the swine producers of this country an estimated \$60 million annually.

There are a number of restrictions because of the disease which impede the movement of U.S. meat products into foreign markets. Countries which restrict imports of U.S. pork because of the hog cholera situation and the use of virulent virus in combating cholera are Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, British Guiana, Colombia, Denmark, New Zealand, Sweden, and United Kingdom. Jamaica prohibits the importation of pork products other than salted and cured products from the United States.

Representatives of the Department have personally discussed with officials of foreign countries the possibility of relieving some of the restrictions on U.S. pork. They have reached the conclusion that unless hog cholera is eradicated and the use of virulent virus prohibited, little headway will be made in this direction. Thirty-eight States now have laws restricting the use of virulent hog cholera virus.

Should the proposed legislation be enacted, we anticipate that the cost to the Federal Government for the first year would be approximately \$4 million (assuming that only a limited number of States would actively participate in the program during the first year). Of this amount, approximately \$1 million would be for program personnel and the balance would be for all other items, including the sharing of indemnity payments with the States. The costs of the program would increase substantially after the first year. While it is not possible to give accurate estimates of such costs, it is anticipated that expenditures by the Federal Government would average about \$10 million during the succeeding 4 or 5 years.

We would like to call to your attention the following paragraph appearing on page 5 of Senate Report No. 394, on the Agricultural and Farm Credit Administration appropriation bill 1962:

"During the hearings on the bill, officials of the Department informed the committee that the annual losses from hog cholera were estimated to run between \$50 and \$60 million. Present control programs are costing producers \$25 million per year. The officials of the Department testified that they know how to eradicate this chronic and costly disease of swine. Some States have already appropriated funds to eradicate hog cholera, but it is evident to the committee that it would be much better to have a nationwide program with full participation on a matching basis with the various States. The Secretary of Agriculture is requested to prepare and submit to the committee a complete statement within the next 60 days regarding the feasibility of initiating an eradication program, including cost estimates for the Federal share, and the cost to be matched by State and local sources."

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, while there is no objection to the submission of this report, it is of the opinion that, except for the authority to control the movement of hog cholera virus, the proposed legislation is unnecessary in view of existing authorities for this type of work.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

Mr. HARDING. Thank you, Mr. Van Houweling. Yesterday we had a witness from Indiana who testified that they had a plant in their State that manufactured virulent virus and that they objected to section 2, on page 2, which gives the Secretary authority to prohibit or restrict the interstate movement of virulent hog cholera virus.

According to the testimony today there would be no hope of the eradication of hog cholera unless the Secretary is able to stamp out the use of virulent virus. How would you be able to do that in any State, such as Indiana without the authority requested in the bill?

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. As section 2 says, the Secretary would have the authority to restrict or to prohibit the movement of virulent virus or other hog cholera virus to the extent he determines necessary in order to effectuate such an eradication program.

In the event a State had an access to virulent virus and continued to use it, it might, eventually, be necessary to have some control over the movement of hogs or pork from such a State in order to effectuate the national eradication program.

Mr. HARDING. Also, it was mentioned yesterday that Federal matching funds should be used in this program. Does the Department have plans to use Federal funds on a matching basis for the eradication of hog cholera?

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. In my statement I referred to some of the responsibilities the States would have to assume. There were certain other responsibilities pertaining to interstate movements which are clearly ours.

We propose that the Federal Government would pay the indemnity not to exceed 50 percent, with the State assuming the responsibility for the balance.

Mr. HARDING. Would it be possible that one of the conditions of eligibility for Federal funds would be the requirement that there was no virulent virus vaccine being used within a State?

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. We have planned, if the program is authorized and funds made available to carry it out, that we would work out a proposed plan of procedure which we would offer to the States, and when it was agreed to, we would proceed with a program based upon it and indemnity might be a part of the program. If the continued use of the virulent virus beyond a certain point in the program was something the State insisted on it might very well be that we could not participate in the indemnity payments, because the disease would be being introduced through the use of the virulent virus. The indemnity, of course, is for the purpose of eliminating the infection wherever it is found. So I can foresee that there might have to be restrictions on indemnity payments in States where the use of virulent virus was continued.

Mr. HARDING. Thank you. Mr. Short, do you have any questions?

Mr. SHORT. I am a little at a loss to know just what the approach is going to be in the event that the use of live virus vaccine is prohibited. Where do you go then?

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. Mr. Short, we have other methods of vaccinating, the inactivated or killed vaccines and the modified vaccines which do not carry with them the same danger of spreading the disease that the fully virulent virus does. The use of these other alternate methods of immunization would be part of the program.

Mr. SHORT. This question comes to my mind—there seems to be some question in the minds of the hog producers as to the protection that is afforded them in the use of these, shall I say, new vaccines.

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. I agree that there are some producers who feel like the immunizing ability of the new vaccines is not the same

as the virulent virus with serum. I do not believe this is the general opinion of the authorities. There are some occasions when treatment has been given, such as the use of the hog cholera serum alone, prior to the use of the modified vaccine, that does interfere with the immunity that is developed through the modified vaccine. The Department's position, and I believe it is generally supported by the authorities, is that if the modified vaccines are used properly that they provide almost, if not exactly, the same protection as provided by the virulent virus and serum.

Mr. SHORT. I have been thinking that, perhaps, the issue here is somewhat similar to the contention that has been going on for years among officials of the Department of Agriculture and, perhaps, some State sanitary officials in regard to the brucellosis campaign, and its effect upon the range livestock industry. In some instances, while people were not opposed to the idea of controlling brucellosis, the means of control offered to them sometimes in some people's opinion, were not good.

Is that what we are basically confronted with here now that the new approach, affects the individual hog producer at a particular time, he would wonder just where he is being left if he completely eliminated the use of the live virus vaccine which, after all, has over the years, at least, been a stopgap, a preventive of loss. It does not eliminate the disease. That is the question we are concerned with here now.

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. I think an adequate tribute to the efficacy of the new vaccines is that since they have been introduced 10 or 11 years ago they have taken over better than 90 percent of the market of the immunizing agents. In other words, those products are about 90 percent of all of the immunizing agents that are used.

In regard to the question of brucellosis, there is one similar issue, in that the approach is eradication versus control. The Department has maintained in brucellosis that if we did nothing but vaccinate against the disease, we will never eliminate it; but that if we would vaccinate and do the other things, and then, eventually, we will be free of brucellosis.

To that extent we are saying the same thing about hog cholera. The industry supports this position, I believe that it is now possible to completely eliminate the disease, as has been done in Canada.

Mr. SHORT. As has been done where?

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. In Canada, which has managed to stamp out the disease for 50 years.

In the early part of my statement I pointed out that fact.

Mr. SHORT. Do we not have to recognize that there are some other factors that come into the picture in regard to the danger of hog cholera, in Canada, due to climatic conditions, as compared to the United States, particularly in the southern part of the United States—do we not have to consider these?

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. There may be some points there, but in the southern part of the Province of Ontario, it is not too different from the general area of our major swine production. They have had outbreaks and they have stamped them out each time by slaughtering the affected and exposed swine.

In some cases they immunized the hogs surrounding the infected premises using serum alone.

They reported in 1960 that the cost over the past 45 years for eradicating the disease, living without it, in other words, stamping out each outbreak as it occurred, had been one-half cent per pig marketed over the past 45 years, whereas the cost in the United States, according to our best estimate, is about 45 cents per pig marketed just to immunize against disease. We still suffer losses from death, condemnation at packing plants, and interference with our foreign pork market because of the countries that have restrictions against our pork because we have hog cholera.

Mr. SHORT. That clarifies the questions to a considerable degree I had in mind. Thank you.

Mr. HARDING. Mrs. May, any questions?

Mrs. MAY. No questions.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Breeding?

Mr. BREEDING. No questions.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Harvey?

Mr. HARVEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman. There have been questions raised by the producers that I would appreciate very much having answers to from you for the record so that there may be no question as to the position of the Agricultural Research Service, which is charged with this particular problem.

To go a little further with regard to this question of indemnity, do you have any estimate as to how long we might have to go on with the eradication program before it would be feasible to employ indemnity payments?

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. I believe this would vary in different States. In States where there is very little, if any, hog cholera, probably because there are, also, very few hogs, we foresee that we could start almost immediately with stamping out any infection that occurs. In that case, if the States were willing, we would be prepared to participate with indemnity payments.

In other States where there are many hogs and the level of hog cholera is recognized to be quite high, it could very well be that we would proceed for some time with intensive vaccination to reduce the infection to the lowest possible level before we began the stamping-out procedures which involves payment of indemnity.

Mr. HARVEY. I believe you mentioned in the course of your answers to the questions of our chairman, Mr. Harding, that the qualifications the States might have to meet in order to qualify for sharing in the Federal indemnity funds, would be, a program of elimination of the use of the live virus in their respective States. That, of course, brings out a point that I know is difficult to answer specifically as to how you might have to proceed under any given set of circumstances, but I think that it would be appropriate to ask this question, that is, would it not be your plan in any event to proceed and work with the livestock sanitary boards in respective States where this problem might arise.

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARVEY. There would be no intention on your part, insofar as a given State was concerned, to come in and supersede, override, or ignore the efforts and the plans of the given State board?

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. You are exactly right, because our authority is to cooperate with the States. And much of the authority we

would rely upon to inspect premises and other parts of the program would have to stem from State authority. It would have to be a cooperative effort with the States.

Mr. HARVEY. I think some fear about the Federal Government's part of this program that has arisen has been due to the fact that there was the thought that the Federal Government might take a dominant position in this program and proceed without regard to the wishes of the State sanitary board. And having had your assurance that such a proposition is not in the policy of the Bureau of Animal Industry, that will cover that.

I believe you did say within your statement that if worst comes to worst and no other method of cooperation could be had with the given State that you might withhold indemnity funds to that State for an eradication program.

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. Yes, sir. I said that the purpose of the indemnity, of course, was to remove the infected and exposed swine, which eliminates the infection. And since virulent virus is extremely infectious, there would be very little point, it would seem, to slaughter and pay for hogs in an effort to eliminate infection, while the virulent virus was still being used, introducing the infection on the farms in that State.

Mr. HARVEY. Another question has arisen that I think deserves some consideration, that is, as to the type of personnel that you would expect to have on this Advisory Commission. And if I might be permitted I would say I think that there is a good deal of interest in this area as to whether the Commission would be entirely composed of professional people, such as veterinarians or be composed of producers, or just what kind of Commission personnel makeup would you anticipate.

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. The bill specifically provides that the 11 members be selected from representatives of the swine and related industries, States and local governments, professional and scientific groups, and the general public.

Mr. HARVEY. That is true, my bill does provide that. I think it would be reassuring if a statement as to how exactly you might anticipate the distribution of the Commission members to these various groups, in other words, do you expect to have 10 veterinarians and 1 hog producer, or just what do you anticipate?

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. No. We would anticipate, certainly, that there would be several producer representatives, representatives of marketing agencies, transportation companies, State governments, professional associations, which would provide for, I presume, a veterinarian, and someone from the general public, but, certainly, the preponderance of the committee would be made up of producer and industry representatives.

Mr. HARVEY. Would you deem it advisable to have a representative from the biological companies on the Commission?

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. I think that is another one of the related industries that could well be considered for representation.

Mr. HARVEY. That concludes my questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Grant, do you have any questions?

Mr. GRANT. No questions.

Mr. HARDING. If there are no further questions, we would like to thank you, Mr. Van Houweling, and your associates for the testimony you have presented to us.

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. We thank you for this opportunity.

Mr. HARDING. The next witness is Mr. Aled P. Davies, vice president of the American Meat Institute. The committee wants to welcome you today. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF ALED P. DAVIES, VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Chairman and members of the committees, I am Aled P. Davies, vice president of the American Meat Institute, national trade association of the meatpacking industry. Our membership of 735 consists of meatpackers, meat processors, and industry suppliers. Ours is the only national organization representing meatpackers of all sizes in all parts of the country.

I am appearing in support of S. 1908, H.R. 7176, H.R. 7177, H.R. 7694, and H.R. 7702 which provide for a national hog cholera eradication program. The American Meat Institute historically has favored the eradication of as many animal diseases as possible among the Nation's herd of meat animals. This is important to livestock producers, processors of meat, and meat consumers. Such diseases affect importantly the health and value of our animal agriculture, reduce our meat supply, and even restrict our export trade. An example of this loss is well illustrated in the case of hog cholera, No. 1 killer of swine.

Hog cholera has prevailed in the United States for generations. It might be said that its prevalence is due in a large measure to the fact that people generally in this country have tolerated it, have been passive about an effective and aggressive program to eradicate it, and possibly because the disease is known not to be contagious to humans.

Current evidence as presented by the Nation's top veterinarians points out that we can eradicate cholera from the Nation's swine population, if we resolve to do so. Our Nation has been successful in the elimination of livestock diseases when an effort has been made. Notable examples have been foot-and-mouth and vesicular exanthema.

Authorities have said that if foot-and-mouth disease became established in this country, it would cost over \$100 million a year. It was eradicated in 1929, 32 years ago.

Scientists have been telling us for the last 10 years that hog cholera could be eradicated. While we have been talking about eradicating this disease, we have not taken the necessary steps to start a program and the cost steadily mounts at the rate of \$50 million a year to the livestock producer. The longer we talk, the more it will cost.

The swine industry has had some difficult times in the past when the margins for profit have been quite slim—undoubtedly, we will have some in the future. Therefore, if our foresight at this time gains results, at least we may eventually reduce the operating expense relating to disease loss from cholera, allowing some relief in this area of production costs which aids the farmer who is caught in the cost-price squeeze.

We are raising more hogs on fewer premises. Thus, our investments are larger and when a disease such as cholera strikes, our losses are higher—in many cases the difference between profit and loss of the producer's entire enterprise.

We think the eradication of vesicular exanthema that resulted in all States promulgating laws or regulations to require that all garbage fed to hogs be cooked was the first necessary step taken in this country toward a cholera eradication program. The U.S. Department of Agriculture authorities in May 1961 estimated that only 1.5 percent of swine are fed uncooked garbage.

I would like to add that I was at a meeting in Chicago called by the industry when the vesicular exanthema first broke out. I think it was in Omaha. The decision at that time taken by the representatives of the meatpackers and the marketing agencies and the livestock producers and the veterinarian associations, and others, which was in 1952, I think, was that we make a decision whether we are going to live with vesicular exanthema or eradicate it, and the decision was taken that we have to eradicate it and have to start on a program. I cannot overestimate the cooperation we received from the Government, both State and Federal, in meeting this business of first of all attacking the garbage feeding step, which was the first step to the eradication. And this was, also, the first step that has already been taken to go after hog cholera.

In addition to requiring the cooking of garbage, scientists point out that a further step in the eradication would be to outlaw the use of virulent virus or the spread of the disease by man. Today the use of the live virus has declined to the point that it represents less than 6 percent of the hogs vaccinated.

Fully virulent hog cholera virus with serum was used as the only method for vaccinating swine against hog cholera for years. The changeover voluntarily to the new attenuated vaccines indicates the preference on the part of the users. The purpose of this legislation is to eradicate hog cholera. Authorities have stated for years that the disease could not be eradicated as long as virulent virus was used as an immunizing agent. This legislation authorizes the Secretary to prohibit or restrict its use in order to effectuate an eradication program. In other words, it is not a question of whether virulent virus and serum is better than attenuated vaccines or vice versa. The question is whether the disease can be eradicated as long as the live virus is used and our scientists claim that it cannot.

That seems to be the whole problem.

Four years ago when the subject of hog cholera was discussed before Congress and this committee, there were about 14 States which had outlawed sales of virulent virus. Today this figure has increased to 38 States and Puerto Rico, which is an indication of the widespread interest in this matter and acceptance of the vaccine.

While progress is being made in some areas of agriculture exports, there has been no progress in improving our foreign markets for pork in some countries that prohibit our fresh pork because of the hog cholera situation in the United States. These major foreign markets are Austria, Jamaica, Sweden, Denmark, Australia, New Zealand, British Guiana, Barbados, Columbia, and Belgium. England, Scotland, and Wales technically approve the entry of pork from the

States outlawing the use of virulent vaccine. However, our members have found it practically impossible to make the proper certification to satisfy the United Kingdom import requirements.

I know something from my own experience, that in 1956, when I was in London for the London Food Fair, we had to go through all kinds of gyrations to get pork into the show, that is, into the food fair. I had to sign my life away that this pork would be destroyed at the end of the food fair and would not be fed to anybody, although we knew that it came from clean herds at the time. But bureaucracy anywhere is tough when there is a fear, and the English refused to accept hog cholera and refused to live with it, and they wanted to keep it up.

In a large part of the world today pork is still the principal meat food item. The loss of potential foreign markets results in lower net farm incomes. Therefore, the eradication of hog cholera is of prime importance to U.S. swine and meat producers.

I do not need to say that the elimination of hog cholera would immediately open wide the doors to pork exports but, at least, it would remove some of the barriers that are now being used to keep pork out.

S. 1908 and the other bills provide for an eradication program for hog cholera and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to prohibit or to restrict the interstate movement of virulent virus. It further authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish an advisory committee. I would like to say in this connection that the advisory commission approach has real merit. For example, the Humane Slaughter Commission authorized by Congress has been most helpful in bringing together the various views of individuals and organizations on very controversial and difficult subject and in advising the Secretary of Agriculture and industry on how to proceed. Such a commission on hog cholera eradication being fully representative of animal agriculture would be equally beneficial to the swine industry.

I will, certainly, recommend that broad representation be on this commission, representing producers as well as some of the professional people.

I noted that only last week the Senate Agricultural Committee recommended passage of S. 860 which provides greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of livestock diseases. Such action should be applauded. These bills are of equal importance and passage by Congress would be the first step toward eradicating the most costly disease now burdening our swine producers.

The American Meat Institute joins with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, all of the major farm organizations, Livestock Conservation, Inc., and the American Veterinary Medical Association in support of this legislation. We in the packing industry realize full well that the time has long passed that we should "live with" animal diseases. We have the technical skill and the scientific know-how to eradicate animal diseases. Let us begin to clean up hog cholera by the passage of this legislation.

Mr. HARDING. Thank you for your very fine testimony. The Chair would like to ask you a few questions.

First, do you feel that the bill should be passed as it is without amendment?

Mr. DAVIES. It is quite satisfactory to us in its present form; yes.

Mr. HARDING. Secondly, do you feel that the Secretary should have authority to withhold Federal matching funds from any State that refused to outlaw the use of virulent virus within the State under the program to be developed?

Mr. DAVIES. Well, I would rather think a little on that. I think the Department feels—and they may correct me if I am wrong—that they should be precluded from going in to help correct the situation if the State has not acted. It seems to me that in vesicular exanthema that they were able to go into the State, but they were limited to making not more than 50 percent of the compensation and the rest of it had to be taken up by the State. Is that not the way it was on vesicular exanthema?

Mr. HARDING. This legislation gives the Secretary only authority to control the use of virulent virus in interstate commerce?

Mr. DAVIES. That is right.

Mr. HARDING. If he is going to restrict the use of it in any State he could only do it through the denial of Federal funds?

Mr. DAVIES. That is right.

Mr. HARDING. The Department stated here that they felt if a State refused to stop the use of virulent virus they might give them an incentive by withholding Federal matching funds.

Mr. DAVIES. I would follow that. I think that they know what they are doing. It seems to me that, basically, what we want is to start not only on just the use of virulent virus, but on an eradication program, to really get rid of this disease. As I said in my statement, the first step was the cooking of the garbage. So we have kind of gone half way in starting the program. It is much easier to move into this area now with the experience we have had than it would have been without it.

Mr. HARDING. Are there any questions, Mr. Short?

Mr. SHORT. No questions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. May I, Mr. Chairman, have the privilege of introducing into the record a statement on behalf of the Florida Farm Bureau Federation, favoring the passage of this legislation, and I suggest that it be placed in the record at the end of the testimony of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. HARDING. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARVEY. I have the same request to make, to have a statement of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., with respect to this subject, inserted into the record and I should like that to be inserted, too, at the end of the testimony of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. HARDING. Without objection that permission is granted. Mr. Breeding, do you have any questions?

Mr. BREEDING. I would like to ask a question. Yesterday we had a gentleman from your State of Indiana, Mr. Harvey, who was in opposition to this section on live virus transportation. Do you approve?

Mr. HARVEY. Yes.

Mr. BREEDING. They are not in favor of discontinuing the use of live virus. Why did he take that position?

Mr. HARVEY. I think it would be fair to ask the witness, and I would be very happy to have the witness state—he is here—he can answer the question for you much better than I can.

Mr. BREEDING. I would like to ask him the question, why did you take this position when most all of the testimony has been for it?

Mr. HARVEY. In fairness, he should not be asked to explain the thinking of everybody else, but I am sure that Mr. Kessler will be very happy to express his own views on this in reply to the question.

Would you care to answer the question?

Mr. KESSLER. First, I would like to point out that the testimony from the State of Delaware, also, was in support of that viewpoint, that they were not in favor of this.

Mr. BREEDING. Yes, the State of Delaware witness also testified and took this same position.

Mr. KESSLER. I attempted, I think, to give Indiana's position. In my testimony I said that with this position in the bill that Indiana would not object to it, because we have a plant manufacturing virulent virus of a high quality which the producers use if they want to. The way this bill is written now it would not affect Indiana and its use of this product.

This plant does not ship out of the State at the present time.

It would seem to me that the bill would be stronger with this provision out of it, inasmuch as it would be more fully supported by the eastern seaboard States, in particular, where they do not have plants within their State to get the virus from. And that including this provision in the bill would continue this controversy that has been going on for several years between live virus and modified vaccines.

Those were the reasons I took the position I did.

Mr. BREEDING. I am glad to have you explain it.

I would like to ask you this, do you think the eradication program could be carried on if we continued to use live virus nationwide?

Mr. KESSLER. There, again, I think I made the point yesterday that eventually all virus products will need to be eliminated after a certain stage in the eradication program. That would include not only the live virus, but the modified vaccines, also.

It was mentioned here this morning that Canada had an eradication program that has been working, but it was not pointed out that they do not permit the use of the modified vaccines, either.

Mr. HARDING. Thank you, Mr. Kessler.

The Chair has undertaken to step in at this point, Mr. Breeding, because we still have four witnesses to hear from. We did hear from Mr. Kessler yesterday.

Mrs. May, do you have any questions?

Mrs. MAY. No questions.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Poage?

Mr. POAGE. No.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Harvey?

Mr. HARVEY. No.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Jones?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No questions.

Mr. HARDING. The Chair wishes to thank you for your very fine testimony.

The next witness is Mr. Richard T. O'Connell, who is appearing for the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. We will be glad to hear from you now, Mr. O'Connell.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD T. O'CONNELL, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
FARMER COOPERATIVES

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I will ask that my statement be put into the record, that is, filed for the record.

Mr. HARDING. Without objection, that permission is granted.

Mr. O'CONNELL. The national council favors the establishment of a hog cholera eradication program as proposed in the aforementioned measures. We support the bills as written. The national council believes that a hog cholera eradication program should be begun immediately because, in our opinion, it will—

(1) Open additional markets abroad for American pork products. Many countries, at least 11 in number, prohibit the importation of pork products because of the hog cholera situation in the United States. A number of these countries are growing economically with the people having available more expendable income for food items. The advantages here are twofold:

(a) A successful and profitable export program in pork products would offer an additional income source for the American farmer; and

(b) Where the pork is held on a hard-currency basis it would be a further assist in maintaining a favorable balance-of-payments program.

(2) Significantly aid the American farmer and the American consumer. The elimination of the disease offers the American farmer another opportunity to lower his cost of production. Currently, he must take into account any losses from hog cholera in estimating the total cost of his swine program. Historically, lower costs of production in American agriculture have been passed on to the American consumer.

Of the 11 countries now prohibiting the importation of pork products because of the hog cholera situation in the United States, 7 are countries with relatively stable or growing economies. These include Austria, Sweden, Denmark, Australia, New Zealand, and Belgium. In addition, the United Kingdom has heavy restrictions on the importation of pork produced from hogs in the United States. The British Ministry of Agriculture states it will not accept any pork products from the United States unless they are: (1) free of cholera at time of slaughter; (2) come from a State which does not use live virus vaccine; and (3) originate on farms free from cholera for at least 6 months. An effective hog cholera eradication program in the United States would overcome many of these objections.

The cost of the hog cholera disease to the swine industry is a significant factor in recommending the immediate establishment of an eradication program. It is estimated hog cholera costs the American farmer approximately \$50 million annually. Or, to put it in the words of one leading Iowa swine producer, hog cholera reduces his net profit approximately 20 percent on each hog produced. This same farmer reported that out of a \$1,710 veterinary bill in 1959, \$1,395 or 76 percent of the total went for his fight against hog cholera. That includes such items as labor and the cost of vaccination by the veterinarian. He also estimated that the hog cholera disease has

cost him a total of \$20,000 over the past two decades. The same gentleman remarked in covering the entire situation in Iowa, based on 35 to 40 percent of the 21 million hogs vaccinated at 75 cents per pig would amount to about 20 percent of the net profit. He included in the total cost, the cost of labor, material, and a setback of 35 to 40 cents per hundred.

There are two questions that may be rated on the practicality of establishing hog cholera eradication program. One is, "Can it be done?" and, "Is there personnel available to handle the program?"

In answering the first question we may cite our good neighbor to the north, Canada, and their effectiveness in eradicating all hog cholera from their swine industry.

According to Dr. Kenneth Wells, Veterinary-Director-General, Canadian Department of Agriculture, the decision of Canada, not to live with hog cholera, began about 1910.

By 1915, the Canadians had ceased the immunization program; anti-hog-cholera serum is now used only in case of outbreak to protect swine from the premises surrounding the outbreak premises.

How did the Canadians do it? They laid out the following rather effective methods:

- (a) They halted movement of infected and exposed hogs;
- (b) Sacrificed all diseased animals and indemnified the owner;
- (c) Quarantined all imported swines; and
- (d) Controlled garbage feeding, which included permitting the use of only fully cooked garbage.

The Canadians have continued a strong program and, today, when an outbreak is reported, two veterinarians make a diagnosis of suspect herds. If hog cholera is determined to be the disease, all hogs on the premises are disposed of immediately with no salvage. Final diagnosis of the two veterinarians is made in the laboratory, but compensation is paid promptly to the farmer on the basis of the field diagnosis of the two veterinarians.

I will not go into further details as to how they did it. It has been covered very well by Mr. Van Houweling.

The Canadians further report there have been only two outbreaks during the 1947-59 period. Further, hog cholera outbreaks in Canada during the 50-year period 1910-60 coincided directly with the importation of pork from the United States.

Is the personnel available? We are informed that the U.S. Department of Agriculture Research Service has available a staff in all the States and they are ready and willing to tackle the task of eradicating hog cholera from the swine industry. We are certain this statement is accurate because of the history of success of the USDA in the brucellosis program.

In summary, we believe this is an opportune time to begin a hog cholera eradication program in the United States. There is a successful precedent in Canada. In addition, the rate of hog cholera per 10,000 swine is at its lowest level in 13 years—an ideal time to attack the problem. Further, the establishment of a hog cholera eradication program would potentially open additional markets for the sale of pork products abroad. The program is clearly within the concepts of any policy designed to benefit the public and the farmer.

The farmer would gain through reduction in his cost production. The American consumer would, no doubt, in the near future be able to obtain pork products at a price lower than they are now.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives respectfully urges the committee to pass the hog cholera eradication program as written in S. 1908, H.R. 7176, H.R. 7177, H.R. 7694, and H.R. 7702, without amendments.

We appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this committee.

(The prepared statement of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives follows:)

STATEMENT OF RICHARD T. O'CONNELL, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES

My name is Richard T. O'Connell, legislative counsel of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. We welcome this opportunity to present our views on S. 1908, H.R. 7176, H.R. 7177, H.R. 7694, and H.R. 7702. The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives is a national federation of 122 farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative marketing and purchasing associations and affiliated with approximately 5,000 farmer cooperatives throughout the Nation serving approximately 2.75 million farmer memberships.

The National Council favors the establishment of a hog cholera eradication program as proposed in the aforementioned measures. We support the bills as written. The National Council believes that a hog cholera eradication program should be begun immediately because in our opinion it will—

1. Open additional markets abroad for American pork products. Many countries—at least 11 in number—prohibit the importation of pork products because of the hog cholera situation in the United States. A number of these countries are growing economically with the people having available more expendable income for food items. The advantages here are twofold:

- (a) A successful and profitable export program in pork products would offer an additional income source for the American farmer, and

- (b) Where the pork is sold on a hard currency basis it would be a further assist in maintaining a favorable balance-of-payments program.

2. Significantly aid the American farmer and the American consumer. The elimination of the disease offers the American farmer another opportunity to lower his cost of production. Currently, he must take into account any losses from hog cholera in estimating the total cost of his swine program. Historically, lower costs of production in American agriculture have been passed on to the American consumer.

ELEVEN COUNTRIES RESTRICT PORK IMPORTS

Of the 11 countries now prohibiting the importation of pork products because of the hog cholera situation in the United States, 7 are countries with relatively stable or growing economies. These include Austria, Sweden, Denmark, Australia, New Zealand, and Belgium. In addition, the United Kingdom has heavy restrictions on the importation of pork produced from hogs in the United States. The British Ministry of Agriculture states it will not accept any pork products from the United States unless they are: (1) Free of cholera at time of slaughter; (2) come from a State which does not use live virus vaccine; and (3) originate on farms free from cholera for at least 6 months. An effective hog cholera eradication program in the United States would overcome many of these objections.

The cost of the hog cholera disease to the swine industry is a significant factor in recommending the immediate establishment of an eradication program. It is estimated hog cholera costs the American farmer approximately \$50 million annually. Or, to put it in the words of one leading Iowa swine producer, hog cholera reduces his net profit approximately 20 percent on each hog produced. This same farmer reported that out of a \$1,710 veterinary bill in 1959, \$1,395, or 76 percent of the total, went for his fight against hog cholera. He also estimated that the hog cholera disease has cost him a total of \$20,000 over the past two decades.

ERADICATION PROGRAM FEASIBLE

There are two questions that may be raised on the practicability of establishing a hog cholera eradication program. One is "Can it be done?" and "Is there personnel available to handle the program?"

In answering the first question we may cite our good neighbor to the north—Canada—and their effectiveness in eradicating hog cholera from their swine industry. According to Dr. Kenneth Wells, veterinary director-general, Canadian Department of Agriculture, the decision of Canada "not to live with hog cholera" began about 1910. By 1915, the Canadians had ceased the immunization program. Antihog cholera serum now is used only in cases of outbreak to protect swine from the premises surrounding the "outbreak premises."

How did the Canadians do it? They laid out the following rather effective methods:

- (a) They halted movement of infected and exposed hogs;
- (b) Sacrificed all diseased animals and indemnified the owner;
- (c) Quarantined all imported swine; and
- (d) Controlled garbage feeding, which included permitting the use of only fully cooked garbage.

The Canadians have continued a strong program and, today, when an outbreak is reported, two veterinarians make a diagnosis of suspect herds. If hog cholera is determined to be the disease, all hogs on the premises are disposed of immediately with no salvage. Final diagnosis of the two veterinarians is made in the laboratory, but compensation is paid promptly to the farmer on the basis of the field diagnosis of the two veterinarians.

The Canadians further report there have been only two outbreaks during the 1947-59 period. Further, hog cholera outbreaks in Canada during the 50-year period, 1910-60, coincided directly with the importation of pork from the United States.

Is the personnel available? We are informed that the U.S. Department of Agriculture Agricultural Research Service has available a staff in all the States and they are ready and willing to tackle the task of eradicating hog cholera from the swine industry. We are certain this statement is accurate because of the history of success of the USDA in the brucellosis program.

SUMMARY

We believe this is an opportune time to begin a hog cholera eradication program in the United States. There is a successful precedent in Canada. In addition, the rate of hog cholera per 10,000 swine is at its lowest level in 13 years—an ideal time to attack the problem. Further, the establishment of a hog cholera eradication program would potentially open additional markets for the sale of pork products abroad. The program is clearly within the concepts of any policy designed to benefit the public and the farmer. The farmer would gain through reduction in his cost of production. The American consumer would, no doubt, in the near future be able to obtain pork products at a price lower than they are now.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives respectively urges the committee to pass the hog cholera eradication program as written in S. 1908, H.R. 7176, H.R. 7177, H.R. 7694, and H.R. 7702, without amendments.

We appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this committee.

Mr. HARDING. We thank you very much, Mr. O'Connell. Are there any questions?

Mr. SHORT. As the use of the live virus-type of vaccine passed out of the picture—does the use of the limited virus vaccine take over to the same degree? Is one substituted for the other?

Mr. O'CONNELL. I believe that we could reach a point where we will not need the vaccination of either live or the modified.

Mr. SHORT. As of the present time, has the one type of vaccine merely been substituted for the other?

Mr. O'CONNELL. I understand that about 90 percent of the hogs vaccinated now are with the modified or the killed virus vaccine. So I would logically say that you are correct, that there has been a substitution.

Mr. SHORT. And approximately the same number of pigs are still being vaccinated?

Mr. O'CONNELL. I would say so, yes.

Mr. SHORT. What is the effect of the use of the modified vaccine as compared to the live virus vaccine in the acceptability of pork products in foreign countries?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Short, I would not attempt to answer that question because I do not believe I am qualified to do so in that technical manner.

Mr. SHORT. What I am asking in effect is, Is there any more acceptability of pork or pork products where the animal has been vaccinated with the new vaccine than there was with the old vaccine?

Mr. O'CONNELL. I would believe that it would be true in the case of the United Kingdom. I could not state it for any other country. I mentioned 10 other countries.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, would you ask anyone else in the audience who would be qualified to answer that question, to do so?

Mr. HARDING. Yes.

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. I will be glad to try to answer it. There has been a slight reduction in the total number of hogs vaccinated in the last 10 years, but I think it is safe to say that as the virulent virus is discontinued the other vaccines take their place. The number of hogs vaccinated fluctuates from year to year, depending partly on the price of the hogs and the total number raised in the country.

In regard to the second part of your question, the United Kingdom does permit our pork to come in from States that have banned the use of virulent virus, if we can certify that the hogs do not come from a farm where the disease has been within the last 6 months.

Mr. SHORT. In other words, the importing country takes a little different view of the hogs or pork products that are vaccinated with the modified virus as compared to the live virus?

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARVEY. If I might ask a question right on that point, which has to do with the import of pork products. We do import sizable quantities of Polish ham, for example. I wonder if the import of these products would have any bearing on our eradication program.

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. Mr. Harvey, those are canned hams that are permitted only if they have been cooked, because Poland is one of the foot-and-mouth disease countries of the world. Our laws prohibit meats to be brought in from that country, unless it has been cooked. Cooking would, also, destroy the virus of hog cholera.

Mr. HARVEY. Does the same apply to other countries that supply this same byproduct?

I believe that the Netherlands and Denmark, to a lesser degree, both supply the so-called Polish hams to this market.

Mr. VAN HOUWELING. There are relatively few countries of the world that enjoy freedom from the foot-and-mouth disease. Netherlands, Germany, Belgium are all considered infected. Denmark, also. So that there are very few countries where pork is imported from, that are free of the foot-and-mouth disease. All meat from those countries has to be cooked or dried before it can be brought in.

Mr. HARVEY. Thank you.

Mr. DAVIES. I wonder if I might clarify this question. That is, as to States not using this serum question. It is a very difficult thing for a meatpacker in the export business to be able to segregate the pork, to have it certified all the way back to the farm. So, therefore, it is a practical difficulty of meeting the requirements of the United Kingdom, to meet their regulations in that respect.

Mr. HARDING. Thank you. Are there any further questions? If not, we thank you.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I appreciate the help of my colleagues, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARDING. The next witness is Mr. Roy Battles, representing the National Grange. We are very happy to welcome you before the committee this morning. You may proceed with your testimony.

STATEMENT OF ROY BATTLES, ASSISTANT TO THE MASTER, THE NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. BATTLES. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Roy Battles. I am assistant to the master of the National Grange. I do not know how I can be of the most help to you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee this morning. Rather than to consume your time with our full statement, I wonder if it would be satisfactory if I filed the statement and then talked extemporaneously for a moment or two?

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Battles, you may file your statement for the record and summarize the contents thereof.

Mr. BATTLES. I might say that our people have discussed the matter of eliminating hog cholera from the U.S. scene for many, many years, and we have had questions about this whole overall possibility just as other rural groups in this country have had questions. Our folks, however, at the present time feel that the use of the modified viruses, the discussion and education that has been carried on among all segments of the hog industry, including the farmers themselves, has now gone on to the place where we can embark upon this program and be successful in eliminating hog cholera from the U.S. scene, and that this would have tremendous advantages, just as we have reached advantages in eliminating tuberculosis in cattle, the vesicular exanthema in hogs, and foot-and-mouth disease. And we are in the process of eliminating brucellosis, a disease that does have special problems, Mr. Short. Hog cholera, however, can quite easily be the next disease to be eliminated.

We agree insofar as we understand the technical aspects of the testimony given by the Veterinarian Medical Association, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other authorities as to the technical aspects of hog cholera, the problems connected with the control of the disease, the elimination of the disease versus living with the disease, the practicality now of a program designed to really eliminate the disease from the American scene as this legislation provides.

The advantages to the farmer and to the consumers, we think are twofold or threefold.

One, is that this disease does cost us farmers and consumers of this country to live with it in terms of the losses from the disease the cost of vaccinating and one thing and another, somewhere around the figure

that has been used here, somewhere between \$40 and \$60 million a year. And our estimaters think that \$50 or \$60 million a year is, probably, what it is costing us now. If we could eliminate this expense at this time of the cost-price squeeze, it would be fine.

Furthermore, it is a tremendous nuisance to have to vaccinate every year. We hope that in the not too distant future that vaccination can be eliminated completely from the American scene, that is, the necessity to vaccinate hogs. When we eliminate this disease we can, probably, give up this vaccination nuisance each and every year, a thing that a farmer sometimes neglects to do and then finds himself with disease losses.

Furthermore, this export market is an intangible thing, but as witnesses have indicated, we can increase exports to some degree. And there is the further advantage that Canada in this last cholera outbreak there, traced it to our country, to imports they received from our country into Canada. And we cannot have that happen too often or we will have the Canadian border closed to our exports of pork and pork products.

With respect to the issue raised here of the possibility that the authority to control the use of live virus should not be granted to the Secretary of Agriculture, it is true that, probably, in some of the Eastern States if this was done that you would have a little more support for this legislation. On the other hand, the 38 States that now have barred the use of live virus, I would think would have a lot less enthusiasm for this program. They are attempting to control hog cholera within their borders, and if a few States are still permitting the use of live virus and the shipping of hogs in certain stages after vaccination with live virus, into States where this program is underway, that would, most certainly present a real hazard to them.

So the States that are now in the process, or have already eliminated the use of live virus, I would think would cool off materially as to the benefits that this program could bring in helping them do their job if the authority to eliminate the use of live virus was not granted to the Secretary of Agriculture.

One more statement, Mr. Chairman. I call your attention to item No. 5 on page 2 of my testimony, and to item No. 7 on the same page. I do not know if anyone testified yesterday as to the potential cost of this program to the Federal Government. Our estimates, they agree with those of the Department of Agriculture, indicate that the total program which might take 5 years to accomplish the major part of and maybe another 5 years as kind of a cleanup period, envisioning possibly a 10-year program overall, might cost as much as \$100 million in terms of Federal expenditures. It might be as low as one-half that amount. If it is one-half that amount, it is about what we lose in 1 year as farmers from hog cholera. If it is \$100 million, why it would take us 2 years of losses on the farm to pay for the Federal portion of this expense.

So it is not an expensive program, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the great benefits that could accrue to our farmers and to the country in terms of eliminating it.

In item No. 7 I merely want to reinforce what has been earlier said, that this is a total program involving not only the things that have been talked about here in terms of vaccinating all hogs until vaccina-

tion is no longer needed or, at least, encouraging this, but includes the continuation of the cooking of garbage in hog feeding operations, prohibiting the use of the virulent virus, adequate reporting of all disease outbreaks, quarantining diseased herds, disposal of infected and exposed animals, cleaning and disinfecting contaminated premises, control of intrastate and interstate movement of hogs, and information and education programs actively pursued.

So you see, it will take all of these things to really do the job and get it done in 4 or 5 years, for the most part. Our people, however, are ready to embark upon this. We think the Department of Agriculture is. We think this is also true of State governments, at least, in a good share of the States.

And then the matter of indemnity payments: We would hope that the legislation would provide that the Department could go ahead and begin to gear up its total program in cooperation with the various States, even though a few States did not immediately appropriate money for their share of the indemnity programs. The Department could still go in and help the States, cooperate with them. In case a farmer had an outbreak, they could pay to him his half, that is, the Federal half of the indemnity payment which, in turn, would help materially in finding epidemics. It would also help prevent hogs from being infected, where a fellow has a bunch of hogs show up sick, and his first reaction is quite often to ship the hogs which spread the disease. This would, at least in this way, help show a farmer that he does not have a dead loss on his hands and we might be able to find these epidemics, as a result, and be able to stop them.

In short, we hope that you and the members of the committee will look favorably upon this legislation and recommend its passage by the Congress.

We commend the authors of the bills for the language, the study, and the vision they have in these bills.

We thank you, sir, and the members of the committee for this opportunity of coming here and expressing our viewpoints about this proposed program.

(The prepared statement of the National Grange follows:)

STATEMENT OF ROY BATTLES, ASSISTANT TO THE MASTER, THE NATIONAL GRANGE

The National Grange favors congressional approval of the above bills designed to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program. We commend the authors of this proposed legislation for their farsighted wisdom in envisioning a practical program to eliminate this costly disease of hogs from the U.S. scene. The Grange subscribes to the language of the bills without reservation.

We are grateful also to the members of this subcommittee for their interest in investigating the feasibility of the proposed program. The Grange bases its support of these bills upon the following points:

1. Hog cholera annually costs U.S. farmers somewhere between \$40 and \$60 million. This is because of direct losses from the disease and from the cost of immunizing hogs against the disease.
2. Because the United States has not eliminated hog cholera from its shores, U.S. exports of pork and pork products are barred from 11 countries around the world. Our loss in pork exports for this reason is estimated to amount to about \$15 million per year.
3. U.S. authorities in the field of animal science, veterinary medicine, and the livestock industry almost unanimously agree that the program envisioned by this legislation is practical, feasible, and desirable.

4. Canada and other countries have successfully eliminated the disease from their shores. Canada, by the way, had a recent outbreak of hog cholera which was traced to sources originating in the United States. If this happens often, we may well find the Canadian border closed to our pork exports. In 1960 the Canadians estimated that the 45-year cost of maintaining a hog cholera free nation was only one-half cent per hog marketed over that period. The U.S. cost per hog marketed to "live" with hog cholera runs nearly 100 times that much.

5. The initial Federal cost of eradicating hog cholera in this country is estimated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to run somewhere between \$60 million and \$100 million. (This includes indemnity payments and all other Federal costs.) In other words, losses to farmers in 2 years will more than offset this cost. The Department estimates further that with proper support from farmers, which we believe the program will receive, hog cholera can be eliminated in 5 years, with perhaps another 5-year period being required for the final cleanup.

6. The cost-price squeeze in agriculture is severe, and the savings to farmers and consumers that would be effectuated by this proposed program is significant.

7. We envision the proposed program as a total program involving the recommendations of the livestock industry as reflected through Livestock Conservation, Inc., and other organizations. These recommendations include—

- (a) Vaccination of all hogs, when and until vaccination is no longer necessary.
- (b) Continuation of garbage cooking in hog-feeding operations.
- (c) Prohibiting the use of virulent virus.
- (d) Adequate reporting of all disease outbreaks.
- (e) Quarantining diseased herds.
- (f) Disposal of infected and exposed animals.
- (g) Cleaning and disinfecting contaminated premises.
- (h) Control of intrastate and interstate movement of hogs.
- (i) Information and education programs actively pursued.
- (j) Indemnity payments to farmers suffering losses. These should be payments jointly provided by the various State and Federal Governments, but the program should be effectuated nationally even if a few States are tardy in providing matching funds to meet their portion of the indemnity payments. In the event that a few States are slow in implementing funds for the program, the Federal Government could and should pay its half of the indemnity payment to cooperating farmers suffering losses. This pattern was followed when V.E. disease of hogs was so effectively eliminated from our shores a few years ago. The proposed program provided by this legislation should not be implemented in our opinion, if a requirement is forthcoming which provides that all of the States must vote matching funds before the program can be initiated on a national scale.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, we would like to point out that this Nation has successfully eliminated tuberculosis of cattle, V.E. disease of hogs, and other livestock and poultry maladies from our shores. We have also made rapid strides in the elimination of brucellosis in cattle from the United States. We hope hog cholera can be the next big advancement in our perpetual struggle for a better and more prosperous Nation—including the farm segment thereof. We feel that this proposed program is feasible and practical, and that farmers will support it.

We respectfully urge your subcommittee to recommend congressional approval of the bill.

Mr. HARDING. Thank you. Do you have any questions, Mrs. May?

Mrs. MAY. No.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Poage?

Mr. POAGE. That estimate of \$50 million to \$100 million of Federal expenditures, does that include or does that exclude the possible indemnity payment?

Mr. BATTLES. It includes not only the possible indemnity payments, the Federal share thereof, but, also includes the cost of the personnel and other expenses—that is the total cost.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Jones, any questions?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No questions.

Mr. HARDING. If there are no further questions, we thank you, Mr. Battles.

Mr. BATTLES. Thank you.

Mr. HARDING. The next witness is Mr. Herman C. Aaberg, of the American Farm Bureau Federation. We are very glad to welcome you to testify before the committee this morning. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HERMAN C. AABERG, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, COMMODITY DIVISION, THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION; ACCOMPANIED BY J. B. THAYN, ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR

Mr. AABERG. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Herman C. Aaberg. I am assistant director of the Commodity Division of the American Farm Bureau Federation with headquarters at Chicago. My primary responsibilities are working on problems of livestock producers and feeders.

We appreciate the opportunity of presenting the views of the American Farm Bureau Federation on proposed legislation to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program. More than one-third of our 1,600,792 members produce and market hogs.

As we view it, the proposed legislation, H.R. 7176, H.R. 7177, H.R. 7694, and H.R. 7702, directs the Secretary of Agriculture (1) to initiate a national hog cholera program in cooperation with the several States, and (2) to prohibit or restrict the interstate movement of virulent hog cholera virus or other hog cholera virus.

The proposed legislation authorizes and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to establish an Advisory Committee to advise him with respect to the initiation of the national hog cholera eradication program and with respect to the development of plans and procedures for carrying out this program.

The members of the Committee would include representatives of producer organizations, research and educational personnel, regulatory officials, and representatives of other segments of the swine industry, including veterinarians, transportation companies, market agencies, stockyards, and packers. A similar committee was used by the Secretary of Agriculture very effectively in the national program to eradicate vesicular exanthema in swine which had spread to more than 40 States.

Our delegate body took action last December to outline a hog cholera eradication program which included specific recommendations for legislation as follows:

(1) The establishment of a swine disease control and eradication section in the Animal Disease Eradication Division of the Agricultural Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

(2) The enactment of legislation to (a) provide authority for cooperation between the States and the Federal Government to initiate and conduct a program for the eradication of hog cholera similar to the authority now used in the eradication of tuberculosis and brucellosis in cattle, and (b) outlaw the field use of fully virulent virus as an immunizing agent against hog cholera.

The delegate body also directed our board of directors to consider the possible need for indemnity payments.

In line with this request and with the advice of the National Live-stock Advisory Committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the board of directors adopted a program for the eradication of hog cholera which calls for—

- (1) Prohibition of feeding of raw garbage to swine (under State law or regulation).

- (2) Mandatory reporting of known or suspected outbreaks of hog cholera.

- (3) Strict quarantine and veterinary supervision of infected premises.

- (4) A requirement that the "new type" vaccines with serum be used to get a maximum number of immune animals.

- (5) A prohibition against allowing swine without proper certification of vaccination from going through sales or fairs, or from farms, except for immediate slaughter in approved plants.

- (6) Prohibition of the use of serum alone on hogs moving in commerce.

- (7) Payment of indemnities in those cases where States and individuals carry out the program recommended above.

- (8) Appropriate Federal legislation to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program.

In accordance with these policies, we strongly support the proposed legislation and urge prompt enactment in order that a sound and effective national hog cholera program can be developed and initiated at an early date. We believe that such a program will do much to safeguard the health of the swine herds of the Nation, prevent the spread of this costly disease, estimated at \$50 million annually, and assist materially in its eventual eradication.

We believe that such a program will greatly expand the export markets for pork and pork products which are now restricted by a number of countries because of the field use of virulent hog cholera virus by a small percentage of producers in 10 States. Thirty-eight States have already outlawed the use of virulent hog cholera virus and are now using new and safe immunizing agents.

The possibility of eradicating hog cholera has been widely discussed, for at least 5 years, and studied by officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, leading scientists, and a broad section of the swine industry. It is their nearly unanimous opinion that the time has come to eradicate hog cholera, instead of living with it, and that the necessary scientific tools are available. The thing that is needed is a national plan providing for State and Federal cooperation with all segments of the industry participating.

Again, we thank the committee for the opportunity to present our views, and urge early passage of this legislation.

I would like to say, further, that some question has been raised about the attitude of the swine producers in Delaware and Indiana. Mr. Baxter, who is the president of the Delaware Farm Bureau, is also a member of the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau and a member of the resolutions committee. He wholeheartedly endorses the position of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

I would like to say further that Mr. George Doup, president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, also is a member of the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation and a member of the National Livestock Advisory Committee, and is also represented on the Indiana Hog Cholera Committee, and is here and will testify.

And I might ask that he be asked to testify immediately after my statement, if possible.

I note, also, that the State of Florida Farm Bureau has asked to have a statement filed in the record. Perhaps it would be best if it could be incorporated immediately following this statement or the one to be made by Mr. Doup.

Mr. POAGE (presiding). Without objection, that permission is granted.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I received permission a few minutes ago to insert the statement from the Florida Farm Bureau Federation, and as I requested, I would like to have it placed here.

Mr. AABERG. Thank you.

Mr. HARVEY. I also made a request in behalf of a statement by Mr. Doup for the Indiana Farm Bureau. It would be agreeable with me, however, if Mr. Doup is here to have him testify, or, if he wants to do so, insert his statement in the record.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to include the statements in the record at this point, if that is desired. If Mr. Doup has something that he wants to say in addition, we will be glad to hear him. I do not see any necessity, however, to have testimony presented three or four times on the same subject in the same manner.

Do you desire to place your statement in the record, Mr. Doup?

Mr. DOUP. I would like to have it in the record but I would like to comment on it.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to have you do both. You can have your statement inserted in the record as previously stated and make your statement now.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE DOUP, PRESIDENT, THE INDIANA FARM BUREAU, INC.

Mr. DOUP. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is George Doup. As has been identified by Mr. Aaberg, I am president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, an organization of approximately 129,000 farmers.

Congressman Harvey and others of you know of Indiana's position in this.

We are large producers of hogs in Indiana. We have a definite interest in it. The Farm Bureau back as far as 1957 took a position on this in that we stated that we felt like we ought to have the control of the use of the live virus.

I would like to endorse the statement of Mr. Aaberg, but I would like to supplement it just in this area: The Indiana Farm Bureau helped initiate and establish the hog cholera eradication committee. We have two members on it. They have met in several meetings and developed some recommendations. In these, I think they are not in conflict with what this proposed legislation you are discussing today envisions.

I want to point out the nine points of their recommendations that I think are appropo to what you are considering.

No. 1, the call for the regulation and control of the sale of and usage of fully virulent virus for vaccination. That is a point of concern. I think the hog cholera committee in Indiana recognize this to be important and so said in their recommendations.

No. 2, to continue to prohibit the feeding of raw garbage to swine.

No. 3, mandatory reporting of known or suspected outbreaks of hog cholera.

No. 4, strict quarantine and veterinary supervision of infected premises.

No. 5, at this time, encourage the vaccination of more hogs for the the prevention of hog cholera.

No. 6, continue to require that all swine have proper certification of vaccination, except those hogs going to immediate slaughter.

No. 7, transport swine in clean conveyances.

No. 8, intensify and amplify hog cholera research.

And No. 9, start a long-range public educational program about the disease.

I think these nine points as developed by the hog cholera committee in Indiana are important. I do not think they are in conflict with the legislation. And so using that as the basis for my opinion of the feeling of the farmers in Indiana, along with the resolutions of the Indiana Farm Bureau, I would heartily endorse the legislation you are considering and would hope that this committee would favorably pass it and that the Congress would favorably pass it.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Doup.

I thank you, Mr. Aaberg.

Mr. DOUP. Thank you

Mr. AABERG. Thank you.

(The statement of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF GEORGE DOUP, PRESIDENT, INDIANA FARM BUREAU, INC.,
JULY 27, 1961

We appreciate this opportunity to present the views of the Indiana Farm Bureau concerning proposed legislation to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program. The Indiana Farm Bureau has a membership of approximately 129,000. Indiana is a major hog-producing State, and a sizable percentage of our Farm Bureau members produce hogs.

I am president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, a member of the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and a member of the National Live-stock Advisory Committee of the American Farm Bureau. The Indiana Farm Bureau helped to establish and has membership on the Indiana Hog Cholera Eradication Committee. I live on a farm in Bartholomew County and am in partnership with my brother. Our farm is a sizable producer of hogs.

I would like to completely endorse the statement made before this committee by Mr. Herman Aaberg, assistant director, commodity division, in charge of live-stock activities, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and would like to add a short supplemental statement supporting the position of the American Farm Bureau.

Indiana swine breeders, as well as all farmers throughout the Nation, are paying too high a price to live with hog cholera. It is recognized by research scientists in the field of disease control that hog cholera can be eradicated.

National legislation is needed to help the industry accomplish the eradication of this dreaded disease.

Delegates to the 1957 annual convention of the Indiana Farm Bureau approved a resolution calling for the discontinuance of the use of live virus for the vaccination of hogs for cholera.

Since that date, the Indiana Farm Bureau has continuously been on record favoring State and National legislation to discontinue the use of live virus.

The Indiana Hog Cholera Eradication Committee has developed specific recommendations that they felt are necessary in a program to eradicate hog cholera. They are as follows:

1. Regulate and control the sale of and usage of fully virulent virus for vaccination.
2. Continue to prohibit the feeding of raw garbage to swine.
3. Mandatory reporting of known or suspected outbreaks of hog cholera.
4. Strict quarantine and veterinary supervision of infected premises.
5. At this time, encourage the vaccination of more hogs for the prevention of hog cholera.
6. Continue to require that all swine have proper certification of vaccination; except those hogs going to immediate slaughter.
7. Transport swine in clean conveyances.
8. Intensify and amplify hog cholera research.
9. Start a long-range public educational program about the disease.

There may be some question in the minds of this Agriculture Committee about the position of the Indiana Hog Cholera Eradication Committee as presented in testimony by the chairman of that committee. You will note from the nine points developed by the Indiana Hog Cholera Eradication Committee that the first definitely states the Indiana Committee favors the regulation and control of the sale of and use of fully virulent virus for vaccination. It would seem to me the program developed by the Indiana Hog Cholera Committee is not in conflict with the proposed legislation you are considering.

The 1961 session of the Indiana General Assembly approved a part of the recommendations of this hog cholera committee by enacting into law a bill calling for the development of an eradication program in Indiana that would be coordinated with a national program. This legislation passed the Indiana General Assembly overwhelmingly.

In the June issue of the Hoosier Farmer magazine, a statement of policy of the Indiana Farm Bureau was released, which endorses the legislation your committee is considering.

Indiana hog farmers appreciate the interest Members of Congress are demonstrating in considering legislation that will assist in the eradication of this disease. We urge this committee and Congress to pass H.R. 7176 and H.R. 7177.

(The statement of the Florida Farm Bureau is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF FLORIDA FARM BUREAU BY T. K. McCLANE, JR., EXECUTIVE VICE
PRESIDENT

We appreciate this opportunity to present the views of Florida Farm Bureau on the proposal to authorize a national hog cholera eradication program. Florida Farm Bureau is a statewide general farm organization with over 32,000 farm family members.

Over 13,000 Florida farmers annually produce for sale about \$15 million worth of pork products. The biggest deterrent to the expansion of this vital industry in our State is the existence of the disease of hog cholera. An epidemic of the disease in 1960 caused heavy losses in many of Florida's hog-producing counties and remains a constant threat to the industry.

A pilot test area established in Suwannee County, Fla., in 1956 by USDA, to study the effectiveness of various serums and to study the possibility of eradication of the disease on a one-county basis has been very encouraging. Experts believe that eradication is possible and now is the time to begin while the incidence of the disease over the Nation is relatively low.

Leaders in the swine industry in Florida have led the Nation during the last year in efforts to develop a program for eradication of the disease from the State and to promote a national eradication program.

The Florida Legislature has appropriated money for control of hog cholera in the State for many decades. The 1961 legislature authorized the State department of agriculture to use this money and to transfer other funds for use in cooperation with a Federal-State cooperation program if one is established. The details for an eradication program in Florida are ready for implementation as soon as funds are available.

Federal-State cooperative programs have eradicated the screw worm, the Mediterranean fruit fly, and are making progress on the control of brucellosis and other plant and animal diseases and pests. These programs have returned to producers and consumers many times their cost. We feel that a hog cholera eradication program would be equally successful.

We urge your support of H.R. 7694 to establish a national hog cholera eradication program.

Mr. POAGE. Our next witness is Mr. Reuben Johnson of the National Farmers Union. We shall be glad to hear you now.

**STATEMENT OF REUBEN JOHNSON, THE NATIONAL FARMERS
UNION, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very happy to have this opportunity of appearing before this Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains on behalf of H.R. 7176, H.R. 7177, H.R. 7694, and H.R. 7702.

I think the record will show, going back into the history of the programs of the Agricultural Department to control livestock diseases, that the National Farmers Union strongly has supported these efforts.

We are strongly in support of the recommendations that have been made here by Mr. Van Houweling, Assistant Administrator of the Research Service. And I want to assure the subcommittee that the National Farmers Union will cooperate in any way in the development of national programs to eradicate hog cholera.

I thank you.

Mr. POAGE. We thank you very much, Mr. Johnson.

Are there any questions?

(No response.)

Mr. POAGE. If not, we are very much obliged to you, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. POAGE. The Chairman would now like to ask permission to insert in the record a statement to be filed later by Mr. J. W. Bausch, the Washington representative of Armour & Co., Inc.

(The statement of J. W. Bausch, Armour & Co., is as follows:)

ARMOUR & Co.,
Washington Liaison Office,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1961.

HON. W. R. POAGE,
Chairman, Livestock and Feed Grain Subcommittee,
House Agriculture Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Armour & Co., of Chicago, wishes to associate itself with the positions of the Animal Health Institute and of the American Meat Institute in urging passage of the legislation generally known as the anti-hog cholera bill.

We believe that the American farmer and the Nation's agricultural economy will be benefited by all measures possible to eradicate hog cholera, a costly and unnecessary animal disease.

Armour & Co. therefore respectfully requests that this company's position be made a part of the records of this hearing on that subject.

Very truly yours,

J. W. BAUSCH,
Washington Representative.

Mr. POAGE. And permission to insert into the record a letter from R. Harvey Dastrup, executive director of the Livestock Conservation, Inc., Chicago, Ill.; a letter and statement from Phil Campbell, commissioner of agriculture, Georgia; and a letter from P. O. Wilson,

secretary-general manager, National Livestock Producers Association, Chicago, Ill.

(The documents referred to are as follows:)

LIVESTOCK CONSERVATION, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., July 24, 1961.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Vice Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POAGE: We are most pleased to learn of the scheduled hearings on H.R. 7176 and 7177, bills to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program.

Since 1956 Livestock Conservation, Inc., has been providing the total swine industry with a "forum" for the consideration of problems pertinent to the implementation of this important swine disease eradication effort.

In 1958, the National Hog Cholera Committee became an official and national standing committee of Livestock Conservation, Inc. The purpose of its creation was twofold:

1. To motivate the total swine industry to the need of a national hog cholera eradication program.

2. The National Hog Cholera Committee through its parent organization, Livestock Conservation, Inc., to take leadership in promoting legislation pertaining to a national eradication program through all its member organizations.

These objectives have been actively pursued. Today all major segments of the total swine industry are in general agreement that hog cholera can, and should be, eradicated.

It is our understanding that a large number of representatives of member organizations of Livestock Conservation, Inc., will be appearing before your subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, in support of this important legislation.

Since LCI, as such, does not engage in the normal functions of legislative procedure, may we respectfully request the inclusion of this letter within the hearings record, as a statement of "intent and purpose" of LCI and its National Hog Cholera Committee in regards to their combined and cooperative efforts in "promoting legislation pertaining to a national eradication program through all its member organizations".

Very truly yours,

R. HARVEY DASTRUP, *Executive Director.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Atlanta, Ga., July 24, 1961.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Vice Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to submit the attached statement in support of a national hog cholera eradication program.

As vice chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, I will appreciate your considering my statement at the hearing before your committee and the subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, July 26.

Yours truly,

PHIL CAMPBELL.

STATEMENT OF PHIL CAMPBELL, COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE, STATE OF GEORGIA

Hog cholera can and must be eradicated in the United States if we are to continue to be a hog producing and exporting country.

Cholera is the main disease and cause of loss confronting the hog producer today. It is estimated that this disease is costing the U.S. hog farmer approximately \$50 million a year in loss and treatment.

The United States is already prohibited from exporting pork into 11 countries due to our serious cholera infestation. Canada will soon add her name to this list of countries which restrict importations produced in this country unless we eliminate the cholera threat.

The State of Georgia is vitally interested in participating in a program to eradicate cholera from our State and the Nation once and for all. Our legislature has already appropriated \$300,000 for use in this program and we are now awaiting action from the Federal Government before embarking on a cholera eradication program. For some years now Georgia has made an effort to control hog cholera as hog production accounts for approximately 8 percent of our farm income and cholera is costing our farmers approximately 150,000 hogs each year with a monetary value in excess of \$2 million. Elimination of hog cholera in Georgia or any other State still would not permit exportation to foreign countries of hogs from Georgia or any cholera-free State as the ban imposed by these countries applies to the United States as a whole.

Eradication of cholera in Georgia is virtually impossible as long as cholera exists in other States unless we wished to set up trade barriers around our State, prohibiting the entrance of any hogs from any other State. And Georgia certainly has no desire to restrain trade of any product from any of our neighboring States unless, of course, unfair trade practices in other States make this necessary.

It is, therefore, imperative that the Federal Government join with the States in a cooperative program to eliminate cholera from the hog farms of our Nation once and for all. The highly contagious nature of this disease makes a local attempt at eradication impossible without the imposition of impractical trade barriers.

Georgia is anxious and ready to do her part and to assist in any way possible in implementing the bill for the eradication of cholera introduced by our junior Senator, Herman E. Talmadge. As commissioner of agriculture of the 10th ranking hog-producing State in the United States, I respectfully and urgently request that Senator Talmadge's bill be given your most conscientious and discerning attention.

NATIONAL LIVE STOCK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., July 24, 1961.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POAGE: I regret that I cannot attend the hearing of your subcommittee on July 26, when the hog cholera bill H.R. 7176 will be under consideration. The National Live Stock Producers Association, representing members in most of the States, has for several years recognized the importance of eliminating hog cholera, and thereby reducing costs, and particularly opening the door for expanding export markets for pork and pork products, and has advocated a program of eradication.

We are assured by the experts that this disease can be eradicated: We therefore urge that you and the members of your subcommittee report favorably House bill 7176, and urge its passage.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

P. O. WILSON, *Secretary-General Manager.*

Mr. POAGE. Are there any other witnesses to be heard? Is there anyone present who wants to be heard?

Mr. GRANT. Well, while not a member of the subcommittee I would like to ask permission to file for the record two letters which have been directed to me, one from the Illinois Swine Herd Improvement Association, and the other from the American Humane Association of Colorado.

Mr. POAGE. Without objection they will be included in the record.

(The documents referred to are as follows:)

ILLINOIS SWINE HERD IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
Greenview, Ill., June 9, 1961.

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT,
U.S. Representative, Alabama,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned members of the Illinois Hog Cholera Eradication Committee in a recent meeting at Peoria, Ill., drafted the following resolution to be sent to Congressmen sponsoring legislation on this problem.

"Whereas hog cholera is costing American swine producers millions of dollars annually and the export of U.S. pork and pork products is retarded because of our inability to meet the health requirements of important foreign countries, and whereas, hog cholera now is controllable by known methods: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this Illinois Hog Cholera Eradication Committee, representing marketing agencies, commercial and purebred swine producers, general farm organizations and representatives of the veterinary medical profession, urges you to press for the passage of H.R. 7176 or H.R. 7177 or S. 1908 in the first session of the 87th Congress."

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE BRAUER, *Chairman.*

Committee members:

R. J. Riddell (Riddell & Perrine Commercial Co., Peoria Union Stock Yards).
James P. Monier (commercial swine producer, director, Illinois Swine Herd Improvement Association, Ohio, Illinois).
Dorsey Kirk (master, Illinois State Grange, Oblong, Ill.).
Milburn B. Cross (manager, Peoria Union Stock Yards).
J. D. Ray (Affiliated Laboratories Corp., White Hall, Ill.).
J. R. Pickard (extension veterinarian, University of Illinois).
Roy A. Thompson (State of Illinois superintendent of livestock industry, Springfield, Ill.).
Diego Segre (College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Illinois).
W. B. Peterson (Illinois Agricultural Association, Bloomington, Ill.).
E. J. Wilson (veterinarian in charge, USDA, ARS, ADE Division, Springfield, Ill.).
George Brauer (chairman, commercial swine producer, president, Illinois Swine Herd Improvement Association, Oakford, Ill.).
Fred Weidhuner (commercial swine producer, executive secretary, Illinois Swine Herd Improvement Association, Greenview, Ill.).
Russell L. Jeckel (commercial swine producer, Delavan, Ill.).
Charles L. Clark (practicing veterinarian, representing Illinois Veterinary Medical Association, Orion, Ill.).
W. R. Hunter (practicing veterinarian, representing Illinois Veterinary Medical Association, Alexis, Ill.).
H. G. Russell (livestock specialist, University of Illinois).
Wayne K. Urish (purebred swine producer, director, Illinois Swine Herd Improvement Association, Green Valley, Ill.).

THE AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION,
Denver, Colo, June 2, 1961.

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRANT: The American Humane Association has been for many years active in the program of Livestock Conservation, Inc., because of our common interest in the improvement of the health and welfare of animals.

The importance of a national hog cholera eradication program to the health of the people of our country, and to the improvement of livestock has brought our active participation in this program.

On behalf of our millions of friends and members, I wish to express our deep appreciation for your interest and concern in introducing legislation, which, if enacted will eradicate hog cholera throughout the country.

Sincerely,

RUTHERFORD T. PHILLIPS,
Executive Director.

Mr. POAGE. Is there anybody else that has anything to contribute to the record?

(No response.)

Mr. POAGE. If not, the committee will go into executive session.

(The following statements and letters were later filed with the subcommittee:)

STATEMENT OF THE HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

I wholeheartedly support a statement by the Honorable Phil Campbell, commissioner of agriculture for the State of Georgia, pointing out the need for a national hog cholera eradication program. Mr. Campbell is an expert on the problems faced by our farmers and methods for solving these problems. In his concise report, he points out that if the United States is going to continue as a hog producing and exporting country, cholera—the main disease and cause of loss confronting the hog producer today—must be eradicated.

Fifty million dollars a year is too much of a loss for hog farmers to endure but this is what hog cholera is costing our hog producers.

Consider Commissioner Campbell's additional statements: "The United States is already prohibited from exporting pork into 11 countries due to our serious cholera infestation. Canada will soon add her name to this list of countries which restrict importations produced in this country unless we eliminate the cholera threat.

"The State of Georgia is vitally interested in participating in a program to eradicate cholera from our State and Nation once and for all. Our legislature has already appropriated \$300,000 for use in this program and we are now awaiting action from the Federal Government before embarking on a cholera eradication program. For some years now, Georgia has made an effort to control hog cholera as hog production accounts for approximately 8 percent of our farm income and cholera is costing our farmers approximately 150,000 hogs each year with a monetary value in excess of \$2 million. Elimination of hog cholera in Georgia or any other State still would not permit exportation to foreign countries of hogs from Georgia or any cholera free State as the ban imposed by these countries applies to the United States as a whole.

"Eradication of cholera in Georgia is virtually impossible as long as cholera exists in other States unless we wished to set up trade barriers around our State, prohibiting the entrance of any hogs from any other State. And Georgia certainly has no desire to restrain trade of any product from any of our neighboring States unless, of course, unfair trade practices in other States make this necessary.

"It is, therefore, imperative that the Federal Government join with the States in a cooperative program to eliminate cholera from the hog farms of our Nation once and for all. The highly contagious nature of this disease makes a local attempt at eradication impossible without the imposition of impractical trade barriers."

Because of such concern which has been so ably expressed by the top agriculture official of my State, I am happy to join several of my colleagues in introducing legislation which calls for the enactment of a hog cholera eradication program, and I hope the distinguished members of the House Committee on Agriculture will give the legislation their favorable consideration so that an eradication program can be launched in the very near future.

THE NATIONAL INDEPENDENT MEAT PACKERS ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D.C., August 7, 1961.

HON. W. R. POAGE,
*Livestock and Feed Grains Subcommittee,
 House Agriculture Committee,
 House of Representatives,
 Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POAGE: In accordance with formal action taken by the executive committee of the National Independent Meat Packers Association at a recent meeting in Dallas, Tex., I have been directed to convey to your committee the support of our association for H.R. 7176, H.R. 7177, H.R. 7694, and H.R. 7702,

all of which bills would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate a program for the eradication of hog cholera. May we thank you and the members of your committee for this opportunity to submit the attached statement expressing our interest in and support of measures which would be of extreme benefit to the swine producers of our Nation and, consequently, to our own meatpacking industry.

Respectfully,

JOHN A. KILLICK, *Executive Secretary.*

STATEMENT OF JOHN A. KILLICK, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, THE NATIONAL
INDEPENDENT MEAT PACKERS ASSOCIATION

As executive secretary of the National Independent Meat Packers Association, I appreciate this opportunity to submit a statement in support of H.R. 7176, H.R. 7177, H.R. 7694, and H.R. 7702 which direct the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate a program for the eradication of hog cholera. Our association, which consists of approximately 400 independent meatpacking plants and 200 associated firms throughout the United States, has maintained a continuing interest in the enactment of measures which are calculated to improve the quality of livestock. It is our position that the producer, the processor, and the consumer share in the benefits which flow from the maintenance of high standards of health within the livestock industry. We, therefore, urge the enactment of this legislation which would, we believe, eliminate the threat which hog cholera presents to the swineherds of the Nation.

Hog cholera is recognized as a deadly, contagious disease which has, in varying degrees, appeared in every section of the United States. From the first manifestations of the disease, in the Ohio River Valley in 1833, until the present, hog cholera has become one of the Nation's most costly livestock diseases. It is conservatively estimated that hog cholera annually burdens the swine industry with a cost which approaches \$50 million. Much of this cost, of course, is attributable to immunization endeavors. However, even though an immunization program has been in effect for over 50 years, an estimated 50 percent of those hogs which die after weaning age are victims of hog cholera.

Since the discovery, in 1903, that hog cholera is caused by a virus, and the subsequent development of anti-hog-cholera serum, the primary method of immunizing hogs has been through vaccination. One method employed, however, that is, the virulent virus with serum method has, according to a study prepared by the subcommittee of the United States Livestock Sanitary Association, Committee on the Nationwide Eradication of Hog Cholera, proven dangerous. Although this method induces lasting immunity, the study of the subcommittee indicates that a hog, so vaccinated, sheds fully virulent virus for a time after vaccination and thus may infect the surrounding premises and susceptible hogs. Indeed, a recognition of the dangers inherent in this method of immunization has impeded the full development of the export market in pork and pork products. British pork import certificates, for example, require a verification that the State from which the hog originated forbids the use of virulent virus.

These bills, therefore, which seek to curtail the huge annual loss which is attributable to hog cholera, to prohibit or restrict the interstate movement of virulent virus and to expand the export markets for pork and pork products elicit the endorsement of the National Independent Meat Packers Association.

WICHITA, KANS.

Congressman HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.:

We are opposed to enactment into law of H.R. 7176 and H.R. 7177. Giving Secretary of Agriculture such self-discretionary powers indefinitely described in bill as to be of great injury to national pork producers. Air mail letter follows.

FRED CARP,
President, Kansas Swine Improvement Association.

WICHITA, KANS., July 25, 1961.

Congressman HAROLD COOLEY,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: The undersigned has been intimately acquainted with swine agriculture since my earliest recollection of seeing my father burn about three carloads of big hogs about ready for market that died of hog cholera.

In the fall of 1907 cholera again invaded our hog herds and losses incurred required I leave school at Warrensburg, Mo. No remedy or prevention was known at that time.

At Winfield, Kans., in 1911 cholera again broke out in our herd. By this time live virus and serum simultaneous vaccination was available; and we saved our aged breeding herd—pigs died. About this time we discovered or learned that hogs surviving a cholera outbreak or vaccinated with live virus and serum became cholera immune for life.

Since that time, except when in school and the Nation's Armed Forces (World War I and World War II) have raised hogs exclusively. I paid my way through Kansas State Agricultural College with funds from hog production. My experience with hogs is not hearsay. It was secured in my own herds and at my own expense. Up to now, this has involved thousands of hogs—now marketing 3,000 to 5,000 annually. Yesterday, I sold, then sorted, weighed, and loaded a double-deck trailer load. At all times have been ready to risk time and treasure on new developments. Have lost hundreds of hogs trying "serum alone"—a serious snare and delusion. Thus for the simultaneous vaccination with live virus and serum is the only practice that has proved adequate in eliminating cholera.

Since cholera-immune herds can be had by the use of live virus in vaccination, great strides in swine improvement have been made—and a person can sleep at night knowing any deaths in the herd are not due to cholera. Suckling pigs from cholera-immune mothers have been given life immunity at small cost in our own herds, using live virus and serum simultaneously, about the sixth week after birth. Were this method followed by a large percentage of producers widespread cholera outbreaks would not occur.

In recent years a big furor has been raised over cholera eradication; apparently by those who do not put in their own time in the hog lot and little or none of their own money in swine production—just dreaming over hearsay reports. Hence, they have gotten the cart before the horse, in so-called outlawing use of live virus which results in proper lifetime immunity when virus is used. Much misinformation and propaganda has resulted, finally, in costly cholera outbreaks. Last year National Hog Farmer reported Florida officials as stating every county in the State that had hogs had hog cholera; and in some counties every hog farm had hog cholera; likewise part of Georgia. And these and adjoining States had laws prohibiting use of live virus. Also reported that Delaware controlled an outbreak by the use of live virus vaccination, and the swine owners were the ones that had to pay the loss bill.

This proposed law in H.R. 7176 and H.R. 7177 is a serious threat to swine agriculture since it places too much and too indefinite powers in the hands of the inexperienced who have little or no financial commitments in swine. (I have more than \$250,000 invested in my pork production operations for land, equipment, feed, and supplies, operating capital, and animals.)

Much more information should be secured by increased investigation and experimentation as to how the causative agent of hog cholera operates, survives, how it is spread, and how recognized in early stages of an outbreak, before any such bill is enacted into law.

Kansas State livestock sanitary officials have gone slow in this eradication furor. They have used the experience of swine producers in the State to proceed with prudence in gradually developing a series of control measures in the handling and use of live virus that is gradually securing a measure of success. Large cholera outbreaks have been avoided. Respectfully submitted as a brief opinion of our Kansas Swine Improvement Association. We oppose the present bills.

Respectfully yours,

COL. FRED CARP,
President, Kansas Swine Improvement Association.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, STATE OF IOWA,
FIFTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
Des Moines, Iowa, August 3, 1961.

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOEVEN: The following statement in opposition to the provisions of House bills 7176 and 7177, a bill to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program, has been prepared jointly by George L. Paul, farm owner-operator, and Dr. James M. Barclay, D.V.M., a practicing veterinarian, both of Brooklyn, Iowa, a heavy hog-producing area for Iowa and the Nation. We shall appreciate it very much if you will have this statement incorporated in the hearing record of the House Subcommittee on Agriculture to which the study and recommendation of the bill was assigned.

George L. Paul worked on farms for relatives during the vacation periods between school terms until his graduation from Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa, in 1925, worked for a wholesale and manufacturing firm in Chicago, and in March 1935 began farming 2 miles south of Brooklyn, Iowa, where he has continued this practice for the past 26 years. He has served as township and county committeeman for the agricultural adjustment programs of the 1930's and the 1940's until his election to the Iowa General Assembly in 1947 where he has served continuously since. He has been active in agricultural legislation in the assembly and currently is chairman of one of the agricultural committees of the house of representatives.

Dr. James M. Barclay was born and raised on a farm near Wakefield, Kans., and in 1950 was graduated from Kansas State University with the degree of doctor of veterinary medicine. Since that time he has practiced continuously in a wide area surrounding the town of Brooklyn, Iowa.

Hog cholera was first recognized as a separate disease entity in 1833 and no one knows how long before that it was in existence. It existed from 1833 until 1908, to all intents and purposes unchecked, at which time the first simultaneous treatment consisting of an injection of serum and live virus at separate points was used. As readily destroyed as live virus is (drying easily destroys it and for this reason infected premises usually become free of the infection within a few days after infected animals have been removed) without a natural reservoir of some type in which to live, it could not have existed those first 75 years from 1833 until 1908. Since that time various groups have promoted the idea that vaccination alone has perpetuated the disease. The fact that the disease existed for at least 75 years before effective immunization in the form of the simultaneous treatment was perfected indicates beyond any reasonable doubt that the assumption is without any scientific basis in fact.

To further substantiate the thesis that natural reservoirs of infection to perpetuate the disease exist, Dr. R. E. Shope, M.D., an eminent scientist in the field of virus infections now associated with the Rockefeller Institute, has proved by research that virulent hog cholera virus remained viable when contained in swine lung worm eggs which had been ingested by the swine eating the common earthworm. It is possible for this reservoir of infection to exist indefinitely because in winter the earthworm descends below the frost line and in warm weather ascends to points near the ground surface. For hog-cholera virus to maintain its potency it must have a moist medium, so when dry conditions exist in the subsoil, the worms move to moist ground.

Chapter 143, Laws of the 58th General Assembly of Iowa, which met in regular session in 1959, outlawed the use of live virus for the treatment of hog cholera in Iowa. One pertinent exception is quoted as follows:

"e. For use in case of outbreaks of hog cholera, which require the use of virulent blood or virus, when such outbreaks exist as determined by the supervisor of the Iowa Veterinary Medicine Diagnostic Laboratory, Department of Veterinary Medicine, Iowa State University, the department of agriculture shall forthwith approve the sale of virulent blood or virus to those persons who are holders of valid unrevoked written permits to administer the same."

Since this law has been in effect, beginning July 4, 1959, sporadic outbreaks of cholera have occurred at several points in the State in both vaccinated and unvaccinated herds and were diagnosed as such at the university diagnostic laboratory. At this point, according to the above-quoted statute, live virus should have been made available to qualified users, but because of the intimidation of State officials by the Federal regulatory authorities in the State,

in many instances the use of live virus was denied even though a positive diagnosis had been made, thus deliberately defeating, disregarding, and flouting the intent and purpose of the Iowa law. This resulted in unnecessary and indefensible losses to many Iowa swine producers. One would naturally be led to inquire, "Who is running the State of Iowa, its legally constituted authorities, or the Federal bureaucracy assigned to work and cooperate with these authorities?"

Because of the fact that many of these outbreaks have occurred in vaccine vaccinated herds (and these records are available at the diagnostic laboratory at Iowa State University) it clearly demonstrates that the use of these vaccines, or no vaccination at all pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture under the provisions of section 1 of S. 1908, is a poor base on which to build a national program to control hog cholera. The word "control" is used advisedly because the word "eradication" used in the names or title of certain committees and regulatory bodies is a misnomer. If it were not so, why do we still vaccinate for smallpox? The analogy is clear. The only method of control is vaccination, revaccination, and continued vaccination for each succeeding generation for a virus caused disease, the natural reservoirs of infection of which are not all known.

In line 5, page 1 of the bill it is estimated that the disease costs swine producers in the United States about \$50 million annually. In view of the fact that something less than 30 percent of the 92 million pigs produced annually in the United States are vaccinated by any of the known methods for cholera, the \$50 million would appear to be a drop in the bucket compared to the cost to all the taxpayers of a slaughter-indemnity payment program, possible under the authority vested in the Secretary, that would be shared by both Federal and State Governments. Hog cholera often assumes epidemic proportions and if all vaccination were to be outlawed pandemics are sure to occur, especially if remedial measures were forthcoming as slowly from Washington as they now are from the functionaries of the State of Iowa. The cost of subsidizing such a program could well run into astronomical figures and in addition the swine industry would be seriously jeopardized because control materials would be unavailable in sufficient quantity to combat the epidemics.

The absolute failure of a similar eradication program in Florida in the past year is a matter of record and points up the folly of basing a national program on the same false assumptions and premises. What would happen if some States failed to appropriate matching funds or the increasingly urban-controlled Congress took a look at the ever mounting appropriation needs and resoundingly said, "No"?

There is no doubt that powerful forces consisting of men of integrity with good intentions are backing this proposed program, but it is apparent that their approach is idealistic and theoretical, and far divorced from reality. Most practicing veterinarians would feel that their last line of defense against the disease had been breached if they were denied use of all control measures except serum which is certain to be in short supply, great demand, and which must be administered at 3-week intervals to maintain a passive immunity. There will be a lot of irate farmers looking for someone's scalp if they have to wrestle 60-pound to 200 pound hogs every 3 weeks for a serum injection. Most veterinarians on the firing line have no confidence in this faith-healing approach to the problem despite the pressure exerted by the Federal regulatory officials. These men know that legislative bodies can outlaw the disease but that doesn't control it. You can sweep the dust under the rug but that doesn't get rid of it.

It has been assumed by protagonists of the bill that greatly expanded export markets for pork will result from prohibiting the use of live virus, or, from prohibiting or restricting the use of vaccines to control cholera. It is a well-known fact that at present a very infinitesimal percentage of our total pork production finds its way into the export trade, not particularly because we have permitted the use of live virus and vaccines to control cholera, but because our domestic prices are considerably above world price levels. The proposed eradication program would not change this economic fact of life in the least. The only way in which we could step up the export of pork products would be to adopt an export-subsidy program along the lines set forth in Public Law 480 in which dairy products under the support program are sold abroad in exchange for foreign currencies at prices considerably below our domestic levels. Heaven forbid that we ever embark on a support program for pork products.

In summary, for the reasons expressed above, we believe this proposed legislation is premature and that the situation needs considerably more study, thought and research. Until such time as better vaccines are developed and more wide-

spread use of them is practiced, it does not represent sound reasoning to dump indiscriminately all the controls that have proved effective in the past. The case for the so-called eradication program has definitely not been proved and we strongly urge the Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture not to recommend passage of S. 1908 or any bill similar to it.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE L. PAUL.
JAMES M. BARCLAY, D.V.M.

WESTERN STATES MEAT PACKERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1961.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains, House Committee on Agriculture, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POAGE: The Western States Meat Packers Association, representing 545 small companies which buy and process livestock in the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Coast States, western Texas, and Hawaii, heartily endorse H.R. 7176, and related bills, to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program. We urge prompt approval of this legislation by the Congress and assure you that we will do everything that we possibly can to insure the successful implementation of the program if it is adopted.

Because of the economic concentration which exists today in the meatpacking industry, and especially in the slaughtering of hogs, the small meatpacker is particularly sensitive to any factor which affects in the slightest degree his ability to successfully compete. His capital is limited; his sources of supply and his markets are of necessity often entirely local in nature; he cannot carry large inventories and afford to gamble on more favorable economic conditions. He is, therefore, highly susceptible to any condition which adversely affects the swine producer and his ability to operate at a reasonable profit.

It is reliably estimated that in spite of our immunization programs, hog cholera today costs our swine producers more than \$50 million annually—more than all of the other swine diseases combined. Prevention costs and actual losses from the disease are equivalent to approximately 20 percent of the net returns realized by some of our hog producers. In addition, exports of U.S. pork products are being barred from important markets in various parts of the world because we have not been more resolute in eliminating hog cholera from our shores.

These are only a few of the more obvious economic facts which emphasize the growing concern and the important stake of the small meatpacker in our hog-cholera problem. From our point of view as an important segment of American industry, proud of America's contributions to progress and advancement in almost every field of human endeavor, it seems almost unbelievable that we have lagged so far behind in this important area.

We know that hog cholera can be eradicated. Canada, our sister to the north, has effectively stamped it out. Surely, at a time when three-fourths of the world is adequately fed, when we are sharing our abundance as never before with needy nations of the world, and when we are now being called upon because of the deterioration of our affairs abroad to store and conserve great quantities of food for a national emergency, we can no longer tolerate the tremendous waste of hog cholera.

We urge once more your favorable consideration of H.R. 7176, and respectfully request that this letter be included in the printed record of the hearings.

Sincerely yours, &

L. BLAINE LILJENQUIST,
President and General Manager.

(Whereupon, at 11:25 a.m., the subcommittee proceeded into executive session.)

