

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 10, 1961

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Clarence W. Cranford, minister, Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

We are conscious, our Heavenly Father, of the importance of the decisions that are made in this room—decisions affecting the life and happiness of so many millions of people. We are conscious of the heavy responsibilities that rest on those who labor here, and of the many pressures brought to bear upon them. The Nation and the world expect so much of them. Yet they get tired, like other people. They need encouragement, like the rest of mankind.

So, our Father, give these leaders of our Nation strength for their labors and wisdom for their tasks. Grant them such a sense of moral responsibility that they never will place expediency ahead of integrity, or selfish interests ahead of national welfare. Give them such consciousness of Thine eternal presence that they will strive always to do that which is pleasing in Thy sight. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 9, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 4510) to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to con-

sider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Army nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Charles B. Martell, U.S. Navy, to be vice admiral.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY AND THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy and in the Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations in the Navy and in the Marine Corps be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ADJUSTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION OVER LANDS WITHIN FORT SHERIDAN MILITARY RESERVATION, ILL.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Fort Sheridan Military Reservation, Ill. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, covering operations

during the year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RENEWAL OF CERTAIN LICENSE IN SAFETY AND SPECIAL RADIO SERVICES

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsection (e) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit the Commission to renew a station license in the safety and special radio services more than 30 days prior to expiration of the original license (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

INCREASE OF SUBSISTENCE AND LIMIT MILEAGE ALLOWANCES OF GRAND AND PETIT JURORS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the subsistence and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 376 OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 376 of title 28, United States Code (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF SESSIONS OF DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 36th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the Lewis and Clark Expedition traversed north central Idaho on its way to the Pacific Coast on its famous overland journey from St. Louis in the fall of 1805 and traversed the same area on its return trip in the spring and summer of 1806, thereby laying claim to the Oregon Country for the United States of America; and

"Whereas the Lewis and Clark Expedition was encamped in the Clearwater Valley near the present city of Kamiah on their return journey from May 10 to June 10, 1806, while awaiting favorable weather conditions for the crossing of the mountains, during which time the expedition was greatly aided by the friendship and hospitality of the Nez Perce Indians encamped in that valley; and

"Whereas on Sunday, the 11th day of May, 1806, a great council was held by Lewis and Clark with the four principal chiefs of the Nez Perce Nation, representing most of the bands of these Indians, in which the intentions, purposes and attitudes of the people of the United States and of their Government toward the Indian people were

so satisfactorily explained, interpreted and understood, although expressed through the medium of five languages, namely, English, French, Minnatarea, Shoshone, and Nez Perce, with such accuracy, sincerity and good will, both on the part of speakers and hearers, that the bands of the Nez Perce Nation represented at the council remained ever faithful and loyal to the United States of America; and

"Whereas the period of this encampment by the Lewis and Clark Expedition in the Clearwater Valley in the heart of the Nez Perce Indian country was the longest encampment by the members of the expedition between winter headquarters on the Missouri River and Fort Clatsop on the Pacific coast; and

"Whereas a suitable permanent memorial of such encampment is considered to be proper, fitting and essential to the preservation and perpetuation of the significance of the Lewis and Clark Expedition in securing the Pacific Northwest as an integral part of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the portion of the Lewis and Clark Highway located within the State of Idaho will be completed in the fall of 1961 and suitable lands for such a memorial should be acquired in the near future at or near the site of their encampment at Kamiah: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (the Senate concurring therein), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that serious consideration be given to taking the necessary action to authorize the National Park Service of the United States to make a survey and study of the area, its historic background and possible sites in the Clearwater Valley to determine the advisability of such a memorial and monument; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby authorized and he is hereby directed to forward immediately certified copies of this Memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State, and to the Honorable Robert E. Smylie, Governor of the State of Idaho, and to each of the State senators and representatives from the counties of Lewis, Clearwater, Idaho, Latah, and Nez Perce now attending the session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho at Boise, Idaho; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho at Lapwai, Idaho."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 10

"Joint resolution ratifying an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia

"Whereas both Houses of the 86th Congress of the United States of America, at the 2d session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitu-

tion when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"Article —

"SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

"A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the State, but they shall be considered, for the purpose of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the 12th article of amendment.

"Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." : Therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint resolution, certified by the secretary of state be forwarded by the Governor to the General Services Administration of the Government of the United States in Washington, D.C., and to the Presiding Officer of each House of the Congress of the United States.

"W. P. KNOWLES,

"President of the Senate.

"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,

"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"D. J. BLANCHARD,

"Speaker of the Assembly.

"ROBERT G. MAROTZ,

"Chief Clerk of the Assembly."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION P

"BOWMAN HALEY DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT

"Concurrent resolution favoring the early construction of the proposed Bowman Haley Dam and Reservoir project and urging the Corps of Engineers to expedite the completion of a favorable report thereon

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers, Omaha District, has determined that the proposed Bowman Haley Dam and Reservoir project to be a feasible project which will when constructed—

"1. Eliminate recurring floods on the North Fork of the Grand River in North Dakota, which have caused heavy damage to agricultural lands and improvements thereon, and to livestock during the past 50 years;

"2. Store flood waters which are vitally needed for beneficial purposes in the affected area;

"3. Enhance the development of the lignite resources including the uraniumiferous lignite as well as other mineral and agricultural resources of the North Fork, Grand River Basin, which in turn will enhance potential population growth in the basin; and

"Whereas population studies made by the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission indicate that with favorable conditions the population of the communities of Bowman, Scranton, Gascoyne and Reeder, N. Dak., could increase from 2,675 persons in 1956 to 15,400 in 2012; and

"Whereas this population growth is concurred in locally as being reasonable and conservative in view of the industrial potential of the basin; and

"Whereas municipal and industrial water requirements of the communities of Bowman, Scranton, Gascoyne and Reeder are expected to increase progressively from a 1956 usage level of approximately 250 acre-

feet annually to 2,600 acre-feet annually by the year 2012 on the basis of population projections and per capita usage of 150 gallons per day; and

"Whereas the need for this storage is further exemplified as the ground water resources of the basin are subject to overdraft at present rates of withdrawal and geologic opinion indicates that complete development of the ground water resources will not provide an assured supply of the quantity required for future municipal and industrial growth; and

"Whereas the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission and the 37th Legislature of North Dakota recognize the need for the Bowman Haley Reservoir and Dam as indicated in the reasons mentioned herein and desire immediate construction; and

"Whereas certain assurances have been requested by the Corps of Engineers, whereby the State of North Dakota would assume the responsibility for the reimbursable payments; and

"Whereas the State Legislature of North Dakota can not financially obligate future legislatures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the 37th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota favors the early construction of the Bowman Haley Dam and Reservoir project for flood control, domestic, municipal, industrial and agricultural water supplies, power, recreation, fish and wildlife, and other uses, and urges the Corps of Engineers to expedite the development and completion of a favorable benefit-cost report thereon to the end that congressional approval thereof may be sought in the next flood control bill; and be it further

Resolved, That the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, the Game and Fish Department and the Health Department are directed to cooperate with the Corps of Engineers in its efforts to make the benefits of this project available to the residents of southwest North Dakota; and be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be mailed by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Committees on Public Works, the Chief of Engineers, the Omaha district engineer, and to Senators MILTON R. YOUNG and SHORTIN BURDICK, and Representatives DON L. QUENT and HJALMAR NYGAARD.

"R. FAY BROWN,

"Speaker of the House.

"GERALD L. STAIR,

"Chief Clerk of the House.

"ORVILLE W. HAGEN,

"President of the Senate.

"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,

"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 21

"Whereas there is an acute shortage of practical nurses in this State; and

"Whereas the hospitals and public institutions of this State are in need for a continuing program for training of practical nurses; and

"Whereas the present program of offering practical nurse training is a cooperative program of the Federal and State Governments; and

"Whereas the continuation of this program is important since the State of Arkansas would be unable, with limited funds available therefor, to continue the present program without Federal aid: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 63d General Assembly of the State

of Arkansas, That the general assembly does hereby strongly urge and recommend the continuation of the present program, financed jointly by Federal and State funds, for practical nurses training in this State; and be it further

"Resolved, That the general assembly urges the Federal Government to continue its present program of offering aid to the States to be used in practical nurses training programs."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Whereas Senate Joint Resolution 40 of the Senate of the United States, sponsored by Senators MAGNUSON, CASE of South Dakota, CHURCH, DWORSHAK, HRUSKA, JACKSON, LONG of Missouri, MANSFIELD, METCALF, MORSE, MUNDT, NEUBERGER, and SYMINGTON, is now being considered by the U.S. Senate Committee on Public Works; and

"Whereas Senate Joint Resolution 40 would develop a plan for a system of highways to be known as the Lewis and Clark National Tourway, which shall extend from St. Louis, Mo., along the general route of the Lewis and Clark Expedition; and

"Whereas the proposed Lewis and Clark National Tourway would pass through the State of Washington, entering at Clarkston, and thence to the Tri-City area, and along the north bank of the Columbia River to the Pacific Ocean; and

"Whereas this tourway would contribute to the recreational and historical resources of the State of Washington and to the potential development of such resources for use in esthetic and cultural enjoyment and historical interpretation for the benefit of the touring public of all of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Washington commend Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON and the other Senators for their sponsorship of Senate Joint Resolution 40 and petition the Congress and the President of the United States to speedily enact Senate Joint Resolution 40 into law; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of Washington, and to the secretaries of state of the States of Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Idaho, and Oregon."

A resolution adopted by the mayor and Board of Aldermen of the City of Atlanta, Ga., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide appropriations to commence construction of the West Point Dam on the Chattahoochee River, in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the House of Representatives of Massachusetts recently passed a resolution supporting the New England Senators group in its efforts to end the restrictions on imports of residual oil. In the resolution, it specifically commended the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] who has done a magnificent job in presenting the case for our region in this important issue.

I note that yesterday the Secretary of the Interior issued new regulations liberalizing the restrictions on residual oil. While the new regulations do not cure the situation, they represent a step

in the right direction, and show this administration is continuing recognition of the hardships the restrictions place upon New England industry.

I ask that this resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION COMMENDING SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE OF RHODE ISLAND AND THE NEW ENGLAND SENATORS' CONFERENCE FOR THEIR EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE CERTAIN UNFAIR FUEL-OIL PRICE PRACTICES

Whereas the restrictions on oil imports imposed by the Federal Government have resulted in hardship to the fuel-oil consumers in this Commonwealth and the other New England States; and

Whereas these restrictions have resulted in a shortage of residual fuel in the New England area and forced oil prices up 15 cents a barrel and burdened the oil consumers of New England with \$10 million in costs; and

Whereas JOHN O. PASTORE, U.S. Senator from Rhode Island, and the New England Senators' Conference have called for the removal of the oil import restrictions and the elimination of unfair fuel-oil price practices: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby endorses the action undertaken by Senator JOHN O. PASTORE and the New England Senators' Conference whose purpose is to assure an adequate supply of fuel oil to the New England States at more reasonable prices; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, and to the members of the New England Senators' Conference.

Adopted February 28, 1961, by the house of representatives.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF CITY OF MALDEN, MASS.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of Malden, Mass., favoring an amendment to the Federal Housing Act that will allow cities and towns in urban renewal areas to receive Federal participation for public buildings.

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

Resolved, That it is the sense of the city council that requests be made directly to Senators SALTONSTALL and SMITH and Congressman MACDONALD that an amendment be made to the present Federal Housing Act that will allow cities and towns in urban renewal areas to receive Federal participation for public buildings serving entire cities and towns in which they are located, such as a city hall, high school, and so forth.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1278. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to authorize the Secretary of State to waive the requirement for a nonimmigrant visa in the case of certain nonimmigrants, and for other purposes; and

S. 1279. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to authorize the Attorney General to permit certain aliens to pass through the United States without complying with certain provisions of such act relating to inspection and examination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1280. A bill to permit visitors from abroad to bring a limited amount of gifts into the United States free of duty; and

S. 1281. A bill to permit the importation of a trademarked article, without the consent of the owner of the trademark, when such article is for the personal use of the person importing such article; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1282. A bill to exempt from the provisions of the act of July 31, 1894, as amended, the person first appointed to serve as the Director of Operation and Management of Armed Forces Radio, Taiwan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1283. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders;

S. 1284. A bill to repeal section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to the water-carrier bulk commodity exemption, and for other purposes; and

S. 1285. A bill to amend paragraph (10) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to change the basis for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control comes within the exemption provided for by such paragraph; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1286. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code for the protection of members, officers, and employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1287. A bill to amend section 204(a) (3) of the Interstate Commerce Act respecting motor carrier safety regulations applicable to private carriers of property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1288. A bill to amend section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL) (by request):

S. 1289. A bill to amend section 4200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to eliminate the oath requirement with respect to certain export manifesters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1290. A bill for the relief of Andreas Glinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1291. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charged for learners' permits; and

S. 1292. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948, relating to the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1293. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 1294. A bill to supplement and amend the act of June 30, 1948, relating to the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation Project, and to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior issued under the act of June 22, 1936; and

S. 1295. A bill to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Nez Perce Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHURCH (by request):

S. 1296. A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857, 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), with respect to the sale of Indian timber;

S. 1297. A bill to authorize the payment of per diem to members of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board at the same rate that is authorized for other persons serving the Federal Government without compensation;

S. 1298. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Interior to revoke in whole or in part the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation;

S. 1299. A bill to amend the act of June 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies"; and

S. 1300. A bill to amend the law relating to mining leases on tribal Indian lands and Federal lands within Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1301. A bill for the relief of Katherine Ena Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1302. A bill for the relief of Georges Makris; and

S. 1303. A bill for the relief of Thomas Gargano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 1304. A bill to provide for a program of civil works in economically distressed areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1305. A bill for the relief of Kazuo Ito and Satomi Ito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1306. A bill to amend section 38 of the Shipping Act, 1916, by adding a new subsection (a) to authorize compromise, remission or mitigation of fines, penalties, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1307. A bill to amend section 128 of title 28, United States Code, to constitute Richland, Wash., a place of holding court for the eastern district of Washington, southern division, and to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington, Southern Division, holding court at Richland, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1308. A bill to incorporate the Sea Cadet Corps of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 1309. A bill to authorize the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon to acquire land within the boundaries of their reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED REVISION OF VISA REQUIREMENTS FOR TOURISTS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would eliminate the U.S. visa requirements for tourists from a country which does not require them from U.S. visitors. I believe that enactment of such a bill into law would attract thousands of additional foreign tourists to the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1278) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to authorize the Secretary of State to waive the requirement for a nonimmigrant visa in the case of certain nonimmigrants, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also introduce, for appropriate reference, three other bills to streamline U.S. laws to promote more tourism.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

S. 1279. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to authorize the Attorney General to permit certain aliens to pass through the United States without complying with certain provisions of such act relating to inspection and examination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1280. A bill to permit visitors from abroad to bring a limited amount of gifts into the United States free of duty; and

S. 1281. A bill to permit the importation of a trademarked article, without the consent of the owner of the trademark, when such article is for the personal use of the person importing such article; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the visa bill would make it possible for the Secretary of State to waive, on a reciprocal basis, visa requirements for tourists and business visitors entering the United States for less than 90 days. The bill would ease travel from 43 countries which currently require no visas for U.S. tourists for stays of up to 60 or 90 days.

The recent action of the State Department abandoning the long form questionnaire for visa applicants and substituting a simplified form is a step

in the right direction but we need to go much further.

It has been well established that we need to attract more foreign tourists to America to help correct the unfavorable balance of payments. American tourists now spend more than \$2 billion a year abroad while foreign visitors to this country spend less than half that amount. Whether we will correct that imbalance may well depend on whether the United States removes restrictions that tend to reduce the number of foreigners visiting our shores.

Other bills I am introducing would:

First. Eliminate visas for in-transit visitors, who now require them when they pass through the United States as part of a continuous journey. This would help visitors to Canada or Mexico, for example, who must land in New York because of transportation problems, before going on by plane or train to their destination.

Second. Permit visitors to the United States to bring in gifts duty free up to \$100 instead of the present \$10 limit. The current limit has been a source of irritation to foreign visitors who cannot understand why U.S. tourists abroad can spend up to \$500 while they are limited to \$10.

Third. Permit the importation of trademarked articles without the consent of the trademark's owner when the item is for the personal use of the traveler. This would remove a restriction that has caused annoyance and embarrassment to American travelers and considerable inconvenience for customs officials.

Mr. President, the last three bills also derived the work of the Honorable Clarence Randall, the special consultant to the President, appointed to study this question pursuant to an amendment which I moved to have made a part of the Mutual Security Act a few years ago.

The entire problem has been one which has had very longstanding attention by me. I was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs which held the first hearings, which pointed out what we were losing in tourism, and how much we were losing, in 1954 and 1955.

I have worked on the problem ever since. I am delighted to see, at long last, the full recognition which is being given to this urgent problem, to which we could have been attending years ago had the views of people like myself and those in the tourist industry, as well as the report of the Honorable Clarence Randall, been listened to.

It is better late than never. I should like to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. MAGNUSON], who has picked up the ball and run with it so very effectively. I hope very much he will give these measures which I am introducing today the same attention as that which resulted in the passage of the measure, so long overdue, to create a U.S. Travel Office.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO LIABILITY FOR VIOLATIONS OF SUCH ACT BY COMMON CARRIERS BY MOTOR VEHICLE AND FREIGHT FORWARDERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders. I ask unanimous consent that the recommendation of the Commission relative to this bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the recommendation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1283) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The recommendation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

This proposed bill would give effect to Legislative Recommendation No. 11 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 190 of its 74th annual report as follows:

"We recommend that section 204a and 406a be amended to make common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders, respectively, liable for the payment of damages in reparation awards to persons injured by them through violations of the act."

JUSTIFICATION

The attached draft bill would amend sections 204a and 406a of the Interstate Commerce Act, which relate to actions at law for the recovery of charges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders, so as to make such carriers liable for the payment of damages to persons, including the United States as a shipper, injured by them as a result of violations of parts II and IV of the act, respectively. It would also give to an injured party the choice of pursuing his remedy either before the Commission or in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction. Appropriate periods of limitation are provided with respect to the commencement of such actions or proceedings.

At present, such liability exists, and such remedy is provided, only with respect to violations by railroads and other carriers subject to part I and by water carriers subject to part III of the act. Prior to the decision of the Supreme Court in *T.I.M.E. Inc. v. United States* (359 U.S. 464, May 18, 1959), the Commission, upon petition, made determinations of the reasonableness of past motor carrier rates on the assumption that the petitioner was entitled to maintain an action in court for reparations based upon the unreasonableness of such rates. However, in that case, the Court ruled that a shipper by a motor common carrier subject to part II cannot challenge in postshipment litigation the reasonableness of the carrier's past charges made in accordance with applicable tariffs filed with the Commission. A shipper, therefore, is without remedy for injury arising from the application of an unreasonable rate. Since the pertinent provisions of part IV are similar to those under

part II, a shipper by freight forwarder subject to part IV is in the same plight.

The motor carrier industry has attained stature and stability as one of the chief agencies of public transportation, handling a substantial volume of the Nation's traffic. It seems appropriate, therefore, that shippers should have the same rights of recovery against motor carriers as they have against rail and water carriers for violations of the act.

The need for the relief proposed is evidenced by the number of proceedings instituted by shippers for redress against motor common carriers prior to the decision in the *T.I.M.E.* case. During the years ended June 30, 1958, and 1959, for example, 20 and 14 formal complaints or petitions, respectively, were filed to secure the Commission's determination of the reasonableness of established motor carrier rates ancillary to court actions for the recovery of reparations. During the calendar year 1958, a total of 101 informal complaints were filed against motor carriers claiming damages for unreasonable rates and practices. In 1950 only 10 such complaints were handled by the Commission, but by 1954 the number had risen to 110. Prior to the decision in the *T.I.M.E.* case, adjustments of such complaints were negotiated, in appropriate cases, by an informal and inexpensive procedure involving informal conferences and correspondence with the parties. Many informal complaints, however, were found not to be susceptible of adjustment by such means. If the Commission had then been vested with the requisite authority, the filing of formal complaints seeking awards of reparations probably would have followed, as is now the practice under parts I and III of the act. In this connection it should be noted that reparation procedures before the Commission are more simple and less expensive than actions in court to attain the same end. It may be anticipated, therefore, that although both the courts and the Commission would be authorized under the proposed amendments to award reparations, shippers would prefer resort to the Commission since, in any event, the reasonableness of the rates involved would, under the provisions of the act, have to be determined by it upon referral of the question by the court.

While experience under part IV has not shown an important need for a provision authorizing awards of reparations against freight forwarders, it seems desirable and logical to have all four parts of the act uniform in this respect. Appropriate amendments to section 406a have therefore been included in the draft bill.

For the reasons set forth above, the Commission recommends early consideration and enactment by the Congress of this proposed measure.

REPEAL OF SECTION 303(b) OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO WATER-CARRIER BULK COMMODITY EXEMPTION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to the water-carrier bulk commodity exemption, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the recommendation of the Commission relative to this bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the recommendation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1284) to repeal section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to the water-carrier bulk commodity exemption, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The recommendation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

This proposed bill would give effect to Legislative Recommendation No. 7 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 187 of its 74th annual report to Congress as follows:

"We recommend that section 303(b) relating to the water-carrier bulk commodity exemption be repealed, but with provisions preserving the rights of those carriers presently engaged in such operations under the exemption."

JUSTIFICATION

The attached draft bill would enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate domestic water transportation more effectively in the public interest by repealing the so-called bulk commodity exemption in section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act. It would also provide "grandfather" rights for those carriers presently engaged in operations under the exemption.

Improved navigation facilities on the Nation's rivers have made them important water highways for low cost transportation of goods in commerce when speed in transit is not a controlling factor. New and improved methods of providing services are being introduced continuously, with a growing trend toward the utilization of vessels having higher cargo capacities and greater power. The size of barge tows on inland waterways has also increased steadily. For example, on the Columbia River, where tows formerly consisted of 1 or 2 barges, tows comprised of 6 to 12 barges are not now uncommon. Barges are not only being built larger, but are also being designed and constructed to accommodate commodities requiring specialized handling, such as those requiring unusually high or low temperatures or specially lined tanks.

It is probably not generally realized, but, despite the substantial operations involved, domestic water transportation is for the most part exempt from economic regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It has been estimated that only about 10 percent of the tonnage shipped by water in the domestic trade is subject to regulation. Private carriers are not subject to regulation by the Commission and should not become so unless shippers are to be deprived of the opportunity to transport for themselves. However, the many exemptions in the act leave the greater part of all domestic water transportation free from regulation. The most important of these is the bulk commodity exemption in section 303(b), under which the transportation of commodities in bulk by water carriers is exempt when the cargo space of the vessel in which such commodities are transported is being used for the carrying of not more than three such commodities. This exemption does not apply when nonexempt commodities are transported in the same vessel or tow as bulk commodities.

Bulk commodities transported in the domestic trade under this exemption consist mainly of grain and grain products, coal and coke, ore, sand, gravel and stone, phosphate rock, salt, and sulfur. Such traffic also comprises a substantial portion of the tonnage handled by the regulated barge carriers. However, because these carriers seldom find it economically feasible to segregate tows, bulk and nonbulk commodities are moved together. Consequently, the bulky exemption is not applicable and the regulated car-

rier must, among other things, adhere to its published tariff rates.

The unregulated carriers need only examine the published tariffs of the regulated carriers in order to determine how low they must place their quotations to the shipper in order to obtain the traffic. The regulated carriers, on the other hand, have no ready means of ascertaining the rates charged by the exempt carriers, since those carriers need not publish their rates. This, of course, places the regulated carriers at a distinct competitive disadvantage. A natural result of these conditions is instability of rates.

Further, it should be pointed out that rail and water rates, particularly in the case of inland waterways, are not separate but are intermingled in very complex, competitive relationships. This means that shippers and carriers lack a firm basis for resolving the differences which develop among them when one group of carriers is able to change its rates at will and vary them from shipper to shipper.

The public interest in stable, reasonable, and properly related rates cannot find expression in the complete absence of control of a large part of the bulk-carrying trade. Enactment of the proposed legislation would provide a means of correcting these undesirable conditions, and would also constitute an important step toward achieving broad equality of treatment of carriers of the various modes.

The proposed amendment to section 418 of the act would merely make that section conform to the other parts of the act by removing therefrom the reference to common carriers by water engaged in transportation exempted under section 303(b) of the act.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO PROPOSED UNIFICATION OR ACQUISITION OF CONTROL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend paragraph (10) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to change the basis for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control comes within the exemption provided for by such paragraph. I ask unanimous consent that the recommendation of the Commission relative to this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the recommendation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1285) to amend paragraph (10) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to change the basis for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control comes within the exemption provided for by such paragraph, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The recommendation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

This proposed bill would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 5 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 186 of its 74th annual report as follows:

"We recommend that section 5(10) be amended so as to make gross operating revenue, instead of the number of vehicles

owned or operated, the basis for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control is exempt from the provisions of section 5."

JUSTIFICATION

The attached draft bill would provide a more reliable criterion for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control involving only motor carriers comes within the exemption of subsection (10) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

One of the tests for determining whether a proposed transaction is exempt from the requirements of section 5 is whether or not the aggregate number of motor vehicles owned, leased, controlled, or operated by the parties, for purposes of transportation subject to part II of the act exceeds 20. In applying this test, numerous questions have arisen as to whether certain vehicles should or should not be included, as, for example, (a) those used in intrastate commerce, exempt transportation, or private carriage, but which are available or suitable for regulated interstate service, (b) equipment of non-carrier affiliates, (c) vehicles leased for short periods, (d) disabled vehicles, and (e) combinations of vehicles. The amount of time and effort expended in establishing the number of vehicles on which jurisdiction depends, has, where the question is close, proved to be disproportionate to the benefits intended by the exemption. Moreover, in many instances, it has been virtually impossible to check whether the exemption was, in fact, applicable to transactions purportedly consummated thereunder.

The proposed amendment would substitute a more definite and practical basis for the exemption. Gross operating revenues are, in most cases, readily ascertainable from the annual reports which, with certain exceptions, are required of all for-hire carriers, and the quarterly reports required of such carriers with average gross revenues of \$200,000 or more. On the basis of a limited study, it appears that the proposed \$250,000 restriction on the exemption corresponds roughly to the present scope of the exemption in paragraph (10).

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE FOR PROTECTION OF EMPLOYEES OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code for the protection of members, officers, and employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I ask unanimous consent that the recommendation of the Commission regarding this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the recommendation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1286) to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code for the protection of members, officers, and employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The recommendation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

This proposed bill would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 14 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set

forth on page 192 of its 74th annual report to the Congress as follows:

"We recommend that section 1114, title 18 of the United States Code, be amended to protect members, officers, and employees of the Commission against assault while engaged in or on account of the performance of their official duties."

JUSTIFICATION

The purpose of the attached draft bill is to extend the protection of existing statutes against assaults to members, officers, and employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission while engaged in or on account of the performance of their official duties.

Under section 111 of title 18 of the United States Code it is a Federal crime to attack any person designated in section 1114 of the same title while such person is engaged in or on account of the performance of his duties. Among those designated are Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, post office inspectors, officers and employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Narcotics, and the Secret Service. Members, officers, and employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission are not, however, included. The general intent of these sections is to create a strong deterrent against physical attacks on persons exposed to them because of the nature of their official duties and activities.

The proposed bill goes somewhat beyond the general tenor of section 1114 by embracing all persons in the Commission and not just those whose activities are most likely to expose them to attack. To restrict its coverage to specifically designated classes would be difficult and impractical. For example, the following employees regularly conduct inspections and investigations in the field: safety and service agents, safety supervisors, locomotive inspectors, and hours of service inspectors in the Bureau of Safety and Service; district supervisors, safety inspectors, and rate agents in the Bureau of Motor Carriers; special agents in the Bureau of Inquiry and Compliance; district supervisors in the Bureau of Water Carriers and Freight Forwarders; and accountants in the Bureau of Accounts, Cost Finding and Valuation. These job titles or classifications are of course subject to change. If changed, the individuals affected might well be excluded from protection by any detailed and exclusive statutory designation of persons to be covered.

The above-mentioned employees do not constitute an exhaustive list of the categories of Commission personnel requiring Federal protection, for it is not only the field employees who are authorized to conduct inspections and investigations. Sections 12(1), 20(5), 220(d), 313(f), and 412(d) of the Interstate Commerce Act authorize the Commission or any duly authorized special agent, accountant, or examiner thereof to enter upon, to inspect and examine any and all lands, buildings, and equipment of carriers and other persons subject to the Interstate Commerce Act and related acts, and to inspect and copy any and all accounts, books, records, memoranda, correspondence, and other documents of carriers, and other persons subject to the act. In addition, by an order of the Commission dated March 24, 1959, the duties of the directors and assistant directors of five of the Commission's bureaus include those of a special agent, accountant, or examiner with the corresponding authority to conduct inspections as described above.

Moreover, at times, the members of the Commission as well as its permanent staff of hearing examiners conduct hearings in the field. These are generally held in places where court officers are not present to maintain order and respect. It is therefore conceivable that an assault might occur at such a hearing.

The need for the protection proposed is aptly illustrated by an incident which occurred in Fort Worth, Tex., last year. On March 8, 1960, one of the Commission's district supervisors was investigating alleged illegal transportation from Houston to Fort Worth. In the process he called upon a consignee to obtain his shipping records for inspection. On returning the records the following day, he was assaulted by the irate consignee who objected to this lawful inspection. Previously, a similar assault was made on a Commission supervisor investigating alleged illegal transportation, again in Fort Worth, in March of 1948.

While these are the only instances of summarized assaults, the activities of many of the Commission's employees are surrounded by an explosive atmosphere where physical violence is a possibility. Illustrative of this, in August of 1960 a district supervisor investigating alleged unauthorized motor carrier operations in El Paso, Tex., was told by the trucker, displaying a revolver, that bodily harm would come to anyone interfering with his operations. Specific reference was made to the inspector whose report had led to the carrier's conviction for motor carrier safety violations.

Enactment of this proposed amendment should create a strong deterrent against physical attacks on Commission personnel who because of the nature of their official duties are exposed to such assaults.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RESPECTING CERTAIN MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY REGULATIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 204(a) (3) of the Interstate Commerce Act respecting motor carrier safety regulations applicable to private carriers of property. I ask unanimous consent that the recommendation of the Commission regarding the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the recommendation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1287) to amend section 204(a) (3) of the Interstate Commerce Act respecting motor carrier safety regulations applicable to private carriers of property, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The recommendation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

This proposed bill would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 10 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 189 of its 174th annual report to Congress as follows:

"We recommend that section 204(a) (3) be amended to make more definite the Commission's authority to prescribe regulations governing the safety of operations and equipment of private carriers of property by motor vehicle."

JUSTIFICATION

The attached draft bill would make it clear that regulations prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission respecting safety of operations of motor vehicles are applicable to private carriers of property.

Section 204(a) (3) of the Interstate Commerce Act authorizes the Commission to establish for private carriers of property by motor vehicle "reasonable requirements to

promote safety of operation, and to that end to prescribe qualifications and maximum hours of service of employees, and standards of equipment." Pursuant to these provisions, the Commission has, since 1940, prescribed rules and regulations for the safe operation of the equipment of such carriers, including the safe transportation of explosives and other dangerous articles. In *United States v. Pacific Powder Co.*, F. Supp. —, however, the U.S. district court for the district of Oregon on August 25, 1960, dismissed all 191 counts of an information on the ground that the Commission has no authority under the aforementioned provisions of section 204(a) (3) to regulate private carriers except as to standards of equipment and qualifications and maximum hours of service of employees.

The Pacific Powder Co. case involved a private carrier whose truck, loaded with dynamite and nitro-carbo-nitrate, was left unattended in a downtown area of Roseburg, Ore. During the night a fire, which had broken out in several nearby trash cans, spread to the truck. The truck exploded. Thirteen people were killed and about 125 others were injured. In addition, eight or nine city blocks were almost completely destroyed and property damage was estimated to be between \$10 million and \$12 million. The Department of Justice declined to appeal the decision.

While the 1960 amendments to the Transportation of Explosives Act, which made that act applicable to private carriers, will probably preclude the specific problem involved in the Pacific Powder Co. case from arising in the future, the decision in that case will have a serious adverse effect on virtually every other aspect of motor carrier safety insofar as private carriers of property are concerned. For example, under this decision the Commission's regulations against driving at speeds exceeding those prescribed by the jurisdiction in which the vehicle is being operated and against unsafe loading no longer apply to private carriers. Also no longer applicable to such carriers would be the Commission's regulations respecting the safe parking and fueling of vehicles, of stopping when involved in an accident and rendering assistance to injured persons, and against transporting unauthorized persons. In addition, there are certain other safety regulations which, although considered by the Commission still to be applicable to such carriers, are now subject, as a result of the decision, to a contrary holding by a court. Included in this gray area are the Commission's regulations prohibiting driving while under the influence of alcohol or while ill or fatigued and its regulations prescribing the use of compulsory equipment such as tall lamps, low beams on headlights, flares, and lanterns. In the latter connection it should be noted that without the power to prescribe regulations for the safe operation of vehicles, the Commission is placed in the awkward position of being able to require certain standards of equipment but of being unable to prescribe the manner of their use.

As of November 1959, there were an estimated 76,548 private carriers of property operating 678,091 vehicles in interstate commerce in the United States, not including Hawaii. By comparison there were, as of the same date, 18,788 for-hire carriers, not including carriers of exempt commodities, operating 836,462 vehicles in interstate commerce in this country, excluding Hawaii. With this number of vehicles on the Nation's highways, the incidence of exposure to accidents is very great. This, coupled with the fact that the size and weight of vehicles have steadily increased and that authorized speed limits often reach 60 miles per hour amply illustrates the importance of making it clear in the statute that the Commission's regulations respecting safety of operations

are just as applicable to private carriers of property under section 204(a) (3) of the act as they are to common and contract carriers under section 204(a) (1) and (3) thereof.

The following brief descriptions of several accidents involving private carriers of property illustrate even more vividly the necessity of making it clear that such carriers are subject in full measure to the Commission's motor carrier safety regulations:

On July 12, 1957, a tractor-semitrailer-full trailer combination having a gross weight of 76,000 pounds, transporting plywood sheets, allegedly as a private carrier, ran wild down a long and steep grade of highway into Dunsuir, Calif., where it struck 12 other vehicles and 4 buildings. Two deaths, eight injuries, and \$42,000 damage to property resulted therefrom. The investigation report indicated that one of the primary factors responsible for this accident was a violation of the Commission's safety regulation requiring the driver of a vehicle to satisfy himself that certain parts and accessories are in good working order before driving the vehicle.

On October 8, 1957, near Caledonia, Minn., a truck operated by a private carrier and loaded with 14,000 pounds of animal-rendering products struck a schoolbus carrying 32 children. One child was killed, six others were injured, and \$4,000 in property was damaged. The investigation report of this accident cited the prohibition against the driving of commercial vehicles by persons who are ill or fatigued as one of the Commission's safety regulations that had been violated.

On July 18, 1960, a tractor-semitrailer combination operated by a private carrier, transporting a dismantled merry-go-round went out of control while descending a long grade into Westfield, N.Y. The truck collided with a station wagon, knocked down a large tree, and smashed into a brick church.

The driver of the station wagon was killed, the truck driver and his helper were injured, and property damage amounted to \$46,000. Safety regulations violated, among others, were those relating to driving while ill or fatigued and against consuming alcoholic beverages while on duty.

Since the decision in the Pacific Powder Co. case may establish a precedent for decisions in other district courts, the Commission is of the view that the public interest requires early congressional consideration and enactment of this proposed measure.

ELIMINATION OF OATH REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN EXPORT MANIFESTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 4200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to eliminate the oath requirement with respect to certain export manifests. I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the proposed amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1289) to amend section 4200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to eliminate the oath requirement with respect to certain export manifests, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The explanation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

Title 46, United States Code, section 92, requires an oath on shipper's export declarations when filed with the collector of customs. This oath requirement imposes a burden on the public and also on the collector of customs. The workload of the customhouse is increased to the extent necessary to return shipper's export declarations for the required verification when it is inadvertently omitted. Inconvenience, delay, and expense to both the Government and the public result.

Ample precedent for this proposed change exists. Treasury Decision No. 53268 of May 25, 1953, is an example of how this problem has been taken care of administratively by the Treasury Department. It reads, in part, as follows:

"To eliminate the administrative requirement of oaths the customs regulations of 1943 (19 CFR, ch. 1), as amended, are amended as follows: Paragraph 3.71 is amended by substituting 'certify' for 'make oath' in the first sentence."

At present, legislation is being processed through the Congress to amend the Federal Communications Act by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission.

Title 18, section 1001, United States Code, provides that whoever makes any false or fraudulent statements or representations concerning any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

It is obvious, therefore, that the elimination of the oath requirement would not adversely affect the interest of the Government and would, in fact, benefit both exporters and the Government at a time when our Government is very actively endeavoring to increase our exports.

AMENDMENT OF SHIPPING ACT OF 1916, TO AUTHORIZE COMPROMISE, REMISSION OR MITIGATION OF FINES, PENALTIES, ETC.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 38 of the Shipping Act, 1916, by adding a new subsection (a) to authorize compromise, remission, or mitigation of fines, penalties, and so forth. I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1306) to amend section 38 of the Shipping Act, 1916, by adding a new subsection (a) to authorize compromise, remission, or mitigation of fines, penalties, etc., introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The explanation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

Authority is now provided (19 U.S.C.A. 1618) to the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of any vessel, etc., seized, or a fine or penalty imposed, to remit or mitigate such fine, penalty, or forfeiture if he finds that it was incurred without willful negligence or without intention to defraud or to violate the law, or finds such mitigating circumstances as to justify remission or

mitigation, etc. Similar authority is given the Secretary (26 U.S.C.A. 7122) to compromise civil or criminal cases, arising under the internal revenue laws, prior to reference to the Department of Justice for prosecution; the Attorney General or his delegate is authorized to compromise any such case after reference to the Department of Justice.

Provision of similar authority to the Federal Maritime Board, or to the Administrator, or their delegates, to remit or mitigate fines, penalties, or forfeitures, upon petition, if mitigating circumstances are found to justify such action, would relieve the Board, or the Administrator, as well as industry officials and counsel, of a vast burden of costly, time-consuming controversies and problems, much of which are technical, or stem from lack of clarity in the statute or regulations, or conflicting interpretations, lack of time, etc.

By and large, the violations thus sought to be compromised would be less serious infractions than many now permitted to be compromised under authority provided the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General as cited above.

Section 38 of the Shipping Act, 1916, provides "that all forfeitures incurred under the provisions of this act may be prosecuted in the same court, and may be disposed of in the same manner, as forfeitures incurred for offenses against the law relating to the collection of dues."

Attached is a draft of a proposed act to extend such authority by further amending the 1916 act, to add a new subsection (a) to section 38 to give the Federal Maritime Board or Administrator the necessary authority.

POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF MEDAL TO DR. THOMAS ANTHONY DOOLEY III

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the 2d session of the 86th Congress I joined in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 148 to authorize the President of the United States to confer a medal on Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley. Just a little over a year from introduction of that resolution Dr. Dooley died of cancer.

I have paid tribute to the memory of this great humanitarian here on the Senate floor. Dr. Dooley devoted his life and fortune to combating disease in the jungles of Laos. He was a cofounder of Medico—Medical International Cooperation Organization—which established nine medical service programs in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. He was the author of three best sellers: "Deliver Us From Evil," "The Edge of Tomorrow," and "The Night They Burned the Mountain." From the proceeds of these books he helped to establish two hospitals in Laos.

Father Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University, where Dr. Dooley attended school, said of him:

Although young in years, Dr. Dooley exemplified in his life and death a spirit of selfishness and Christ-like charity which has earned the admiration of peoples throughout the world.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed

in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, and that it may remain on the desk until March 17 in order that my colleagues who wish to join in sponsoring it may have an opportunity to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 64) to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the gallant and unselfish public service rendered by Doctor Thomas Anthony Dooley III in serving the medical needs of the people of Laos living in the remote areas of the Laotian jungles, and of peoples in other newly developing countries, the President of the United States is authorized to award posthumously to Doctor Thomas Anthony Dooley III, in the name of Congress, an appropriate gold medal. For such purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause to be struck a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,500 for this purpose.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor), and the appropriations used for carrying out the provisions of this section shall be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sale.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article from the American Medical Association News of March 6, 1961, paying tribute to Dr. Dooley be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

AMA BOARD PAYS TRIBUTE TO DR. DOOLEY

The late Thomas A. Dooley, M.D., founder of Medico and world renown for his work in Laos, was honored by the board of trustees of the American Medical Association in a testimonial adopted at its recent meeting.

Dr. Dooley, who died of cancer in January at the age of 34, was praised as one who "carried to the underdeveloped areas the image of the healer—selfless, interested in helping rather than getting."

"Dr. Dooley represented medicine in its finest traditions," said the testimonial, "and the AMA hopes his work will serve as an inspiration to others to serve the sick and suffering in other lands."

MEDICAL AMBASSADOR

"Recent events have demonstrated, as never before, the necessity for greater understanding among the world's peoples. Medical ambassadors, such as Dr. Dooley, can be mighty weapons in the relentless cold war since they carry both good will and benefit to humanity in their satchels.

"Because the health of all peoples is interrelated, the AMA has embarked upon a new program of international health with projects to assist medical missionaries and

cooperative programs with the World Medical Association, the World Health Organization and other national medical associations.

"Since the world looks to America to provide leadership in many fields, including medicine, we will encourage young physicians to help fight disease wherever it may be. We will also encourage more programs which provide medical students the opportunity to study in underdeveloped areas under American physicians now serving in those areas."

THE GOOD AMERICAN

"The work of Dr. Dooley provided a bridge for bringing together peoples widely separated in space and customs, and thereby increasing mutual understanding and good will so vitally needed.

"Dr. Dooley won the reputation of 'the good American' for his dedication to the art of healing and constructive work for peace. Others are needed to carry on this work in Laos and other underdeveloped areas throughout the world.

"What he lacked in modern medical facilities, he made up in human warmth and compassion. His hospitals became symbols around which men of good will rallied. And he carried to the underdeveloped areas the image of the healer—selfless, interested in helping rather than getting. For 'whatever house he entered, there he went for the benefit of the sick.'"

AREA REDEVELOPMENT, 1961— AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (S. 1) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas. I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the amendments be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement presented by Mr. LONG of Louisiana is as follows:

Senator LONG's amendment concerns the continued activation or reactivation of permanent military installations in redevelopment areas and in other areas. This amendment would operate in four different cases:

1. Where the permanent military installation is in a redevelopment area and is to be closed or moved for reasons of economy, the Long amendment would prohibit the closure.

2. Where a permanent military installation is in a redevelopment area and has been closed or moved within the past 5 years, for reasons of economy, but is useful for military purposes and justified in other respects, the Long amendment would require the installation to be reactivated.

3. Where a permanent military installation is not in a redevelopment area and is to be closed or moved for reasons of economy, the Long amendment would require an investigation of the effects of the closure, including the gain or loss of money to all levels of government, and a report of the investigation to the Secretary of Defense and to the Congress before the deactivation could take place.

4. Where a permanent military installation is not in a redevelopment area and has been closed or moved for reasons of economy within the past 5 years, the Long amendment would require an investigation

of the effects of the closure, including the gain or loss of money to all levels of government, and a report of the investigation to the Secretary of Defense and to the Congress upon which a possible decision to reactivate the installation could be made.

The importance of the third and fourth categories is emphasized by the fact that a decision taken in the name of economy may in actuality have the opposite effect. For example, it is possible that the closure of a military base might result in the saving of \$2 million in the operating budget of the Army, but be accompanied by a \$20 million loss on FHA-guaranteed mortgages. If it is necessary to reactivate the base within 10 years, there would have been a net loss to the Government, although there would have been a saving to a single department. These are the kind of economies "which break the taxpayer's back." Presently, there is no agency to consider the overall aspects of such decisions.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ADDITIONAL FUND FOR FISHERY RESEARCH PROGRAMS AND FISHERIES RE- HABILITATION AND DEVELOP- MENT PROJECTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 7, 1961, the names of Senators BUTLER, DODD, HOLLAND, JAVITS, JORDAN, KEATING, and KUCHEL were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1230) to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act so as to establish an additional fund for fishery research programs and fisheries rehabilitation and development projects, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators) on March 7, 1961.

CONTINUATION OF COLLEGE HOUS- ING PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL CO- SPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 7, 1961, the names of Senators BARTLETT, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, CLARK, HART, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, YARBOROUGH, LONG of Missouri, GRUENING, MAGNUSON, LONG of Hawaii, and AIKEN were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1245) to amend title IV ("Housing for Educational Institutions") of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators) on March 7, 1961.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL FUELS STUDY—ADDITIONAL CO- SPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of March 2 and March 7, 1961, the names of Senators BARTLETT, BEALL, BENNETT, BIBLE, BOGGS, BRIDGES, BURDICK, BUSH, BUTLER, BYRD of Virginia, CAPEHART, CARROLL, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, COTTON, DIRKSEN, DODD, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, FONG, GORE, GRUENING, HART, HARTKE, HICKEY, HILL, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, JAVITS, JOHNSTON, KEATING, KEFAUVER, LAUSCHE, LONG of Hawaii, MCCARTHY, MCCLELLAN, MCGEE, McNAMARA, MAGNUSON, METCALF, MORSE, MORTON, MOSS, MUSKIE, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, PELL, PROXMIER, ROBERTSON, SALTON-

STALL, SCOTT, SMITH of Massachusetts, SPARKMAN, SYMINGTON, WILEY, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YOUNG of North Dakota, and YOUNG of Ohio were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 105) to create a Special Committee on National Fuels Study, submitted by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia) on March 2, 1961.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 289) relating to the time for filing a report on renegotiation by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THOMAS E. STAKEM, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, among the host of appointments made by the President, one indisputably excellent choice is that of Thomas E. Stakem as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board. Mr. Stakem possesses broad experience and knowledge of maritime affairs, and shipbuilders and ship operators alike look to him with confidence and continuing hopes for a rejuvenated industry.

In Wednesday's Baltimore Sun, an editorial entitled "Maritime Man" summarizes succinctly the qualifications of Mr. Stakem, concluding:

Mr. Kennedy can be certain of one thing: Mr. Stakem is an advocate of a stronger merchant marine under the American flag.

I believe that the President can also be certain that the maritime industry approves wholeheartedly his choice for Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, whose duty to preserve and strengthen the American merchant marine is more urgent today than ever before.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the March 8 edition of the Baltimore Sun, entitled "Maritime Man," be printed in the RECORD.

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

MARITIME MAN

Members of the Federal Maritime Board are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President alone holds the right to choose the Chairman from among the members and the man so chosen heads the Maritime Administration—the agency which administers the Federal Government's shipbuilding, ship operation and port development programs. The reasons for Maryland's special interest are obvious: We have one of the leading ports of the country with a heavy investment in shipbuilding and ship repairing.

Last June when Vice Adm. Ralph E. Wilson, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Logistics, retired from the service, President Eisenhower appointed him to the Maritime Board and then named him Chairman.

President Kennedy has now made a change; he has selected member Thomas E. Stakem for that post.

There was some wholly groundless objection to the Wilson appointment and designation; it was even claimed on the west coast that while Admiral Wilson was born in Colorado and reared in Oregon he was a resident of Chevy Chase, Md., and so would be inclined to give special consideration to Maryland.

We have heard no such claim about Mr. Stakem but it is interesting to note that he was born in Midland, Md., and his wife is from the same community. However, he is now a resident of Arlington, Va. But one thing is clear: Mr. Stakem is well prepared for his job. He began his civil service with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He joined the old Maritime Administration as chief investigator in 1943. Ten years ago he became assistant to the Deputy Maritime Administrator. In 1956 he became a member of the Board. Mr. Kennedy can be certain of one thing: Mr. Stakem is an advocate of a stronger merchant marine under the American flag. Whether this can be taken as an indication of the Kennedy view remains to be seen.

SHELLFISH PROBLEMS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, for centuries Maryland and oysters have been as synonymous as Virginia and baked ham, Boston and baked beans, Florida and orange juice. But of late the Maryland oyster industry has been threatened by a deadly blight which has worked its way down the Atlantic coast and into the lower reaches of Chesapeake Bay. Fortunately, Maryland has not yet been attacked by the blight organism, but every attempt is being made to research this mysterious blight.

That research, Mr. President, is being conducted on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. In the words of a recent front page article by Maurice Rimpo, editor of the Cambridge Banner, "the Nation's oyster industry is looking to the Eastern Shore for answers to the problem of the disappearing oyster." The article goes on to describe the work of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries' new biological laboratory in Oxford, Md.

In an accompanying editorial, the Banner newspaper emphasized the importance of accepting scientific fact as the basis for conservation policy, for without this acceptance, the oyster industry may fall so far that it will never rise again.

The editorial somberly remarks:

It is hard to see much future for the seafood industry unless current attitudes change. The short-range outlook is not good even though scientists tell us Maryland's production prospects are brighter than any other area in the Nation.

In view of the national importance of the biological laboratory and the commonsense contained in the aforementioned editorial, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article "Nation Looks to Oxford Lab for Answers to Its Shellfish Problems," and the editorial "Unless Attitudes Change," both in the March 8 edition of the Cambridge Banner, printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Cambridge (Md.) Banner, Mar. 8, 1961]

SCIENTISTS AT WORK: NATION LOOKS TO OXFORD LAB FOR ANSWERS TO ITS SHELLFISH PROBLEMS

(By Maurice Rimpo)

The Nation's oyster industry is looking to the Eastern Shore for answers to the problem of the disappearing oyster.

At the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries' new biological laboratory in Oxford, a group of specialists are trying to fit together the parts in this jigsaw puzzle.

The driving force behind the lab is Director James B. Engle. A marine biologist with degrees from Columbia and Rutgers, Engle has been with the Federal Government for 25 years.

It was Engle who inspected 55 prospective sites on the Eastern Shore before deciding to locate the laboratory on the banks of the Tred Avon. Choptank River pollution ruled out Cambridge as a contender.

Last September Director Engle and his staff moved into the modern T-shaped building which houses administrative offices, a public relations section, and scientific laboratories.

The laboratory's building program is not finished. This summer the director hopes to have a boat basin to harbor the lab's 50-foot research vessel. Also on the docket for 1961 is a series of outdoor tanks for growing and observing oysters.

Planned for the future are several quarter-acre experimental ponds. The addition of genetics and culture laboratories to the main building will complete construction.

Sizing up the new Oxford installation and its mission, Engle says, "Our principal effort will be pathological studies. We are losing oysters so fast, if we don't catch up, we may have to start all over someday."

Maryland, at the moment, is free of the blight organism which has decimated oyster rocks in Virginia and Delaware. "We may have a condition—perhaps the right salinity—that protects us, but that has not been proved," the director comments.

As long as the blight continues nearby, Engle warns Marylanders: "Before you throw anything overboard, know its source."

On the lab's scientific staff are Dr. James E. Hanks, assistant director in charge of shellfish biology and ecology; Dr. Melbourne E. Carriker, head of the oyster mortality program; Richard Burton, pathologist and parasitologist; William Shaw, chemist, biologist, and ecologist; John Webster, shellfish culturist; Austin Farley, histology technician.

Engle is hoping to add a biological chemist who will specialize in the structure of marine animals and a microbiologist.

Three major programs are being undertaken at Oxford: Shellfish culture, shellfish mortality, and shellfish biology and ecology, according to Engle. The group will study both healthy and diseased shellfish. Special attention will be paid to the relation of the shellfish to their environment.

Although oysters and soft clams will be the lab's main concern, Engle guesses that crab studies may be added later.

The heart of the Oxford installation is the bright tiled laboratories for chemical and biological work. Here chemical analyses are made, diseased tissues prepared for microscopic study, and life cycles studied.

In one room, seawater from the Tred Avon runs into three large concrete tanks. Diseased Chincoteague Bay oysters share one tank with healthy Talbot oysters to learn how the deadly blight can be transferred.

Director Engle explains that contaminated waste water is filtered through 100 feet of

sand to eliminate any chance of disease from reaching open water.

Engle explains that he and his staff hope to produce results which will benefit Maryland's seafood industry and, eventually, the Nation's.

An array of tanks and ponds will enable the staff members to move the most promising oysters from laboratory back to open water through a series of controlled experiments.

Engle and his colleagues are not doing it alone. Oxford is one member of a team studying the Chesapeake Bay shellfish problem. He is happy about the cooperation between private, university, State, and Federal agencies.

The Oxford Laboratory does not operate behind a stone wall. One wing of the building is devoted to public relations. This ranges from a large technical library for use of the staff, to inservice training courses and publication of the results of experimental work.

Next month a group of visiting specialists will gather at Oxford for a 2-day meeting. In the lab's big conference room they will organize an association of Atlantic fisheries research biologists. A similar west coast group has headquarters at the University of Washington in Seattle.

Although the laboratory's main function is specialized research and teaching, the taxpayer is not shooed away.

Engle, who combines the duties of administrator and scientist, says "We are glad to have interested people come in to see us."

Sometime in the next few months he expects to hold open house.

[From the Cambridge (Md.) Banner, Mar. 8, 1961]

UNLESS ATTITUDES CHANGE

Maryland is not alone in having an ailing oyster industry. Statistics just released by the Department of the Interior show that the U.S. 1960 oyster take of 59 million pounds of meats hit practically an alltime low. This was the lowest harvest in more than 100 years. It was less than 40 percent of the amount taken in 1880. But what has happened to oysters is not typical of the rest of the seafood industry. There were record catches of tuna, salmon, menhaden, and scallops. There were also record imports: Seven million pounds of canned oysters came into the country.

Happily, a number of agencies are at work on the problems of the Chesapeake Bay fishery. The U.S. Government recently opened a laboratory at Oxford where scientists will probe into the question of the disappearing oyster. At Solomons, the state department of research and education is tackling this and related shellfish matters. There are also private institutions like Johns Hopkins with specialists on the job. From studies like these will come facts to help shape future policy on shellfish and fish conservation practices.

Facts won't do much good if they are left to lie in shelved reports. They must be implemented. Marylanders must be educated up to the point where they will accept scientific fact as the basis for conservation policy. Most modern businesses use factual data as a starting point. The seafood industry may be one of the few which still looks askance at research. While this is not true of the entire industry, it does apply to many who make their living from the water. One of the Chesapeake laboratories at work on shellfish recently set up an oyster experiment in a small area in front of its property. Although this was barren bottom and although natural oyster rock existed on three sides of these test plantings, watermen immediately sailed in and tonged up all of the lab's oysters.

No one is caught in the middle of this oyster problem as much as the lawmakers are. Facing reelection next year, they are not anxious to alienate the interests of any sizable bloc of citizens. In the past their chief worry has been the rather well organized watermen. Now they must also consider the seafood workers, almost equal to the watermen in number, who are really the forgotten segment of the industry. Seafood legislation has been aimed at preserving the status quo—no leasing, no clamming, no outside interference. A new industry washed down the drain when a majority of 150 present at a recent public hearing made it clear to the legislators that they oppose clamming anywhere in Dorchester. Even though this was only an inconsiderable fraction of the voters or residents or watermen of the county, it will undoubtedly be translated by the legislators into a mandate.

It is hard to see much future for the seafood industry unless current attitudes change. The short-range outlook is not good even though scientists tell us Maryland's production prospects are brighter than any other area in the Nation. The county would do well now to turn its face toward new horizons, to concentrate its efforts on industry which offers something to all the people, and to train its oysterhouse workers in new skills. With only a handful of packinghouses left in the county, it is not hard to foresee the day when all the oysters caught in Dorchester waters are shipped out for processing in other counties and States. This will mark the end of a noble experiment whose motto has seemed to be: "The public be damned."

PLACE OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL COUNCILS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE COURTS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, as the Senators well know, the newspapers and other publicity media have recently been filled with comment relative to legislation now pending in the Congress which is designed to create a large number of new Federal judgeships. Much of the comment has been severely critical of the Judiciary Committees of both branches of the Congress as being responsible for undue delay in authorizing these new officials and usually charge that extreme partisanship has been the dominant factor in preventing timely appropriate legislation.

Every Senator knows that the factor of political party affiliation is one that has entered into every list of nominees for Federal judicial office sent by the President to the Senate for confirmation since the adoption of the Constitution. It is undoubtedly true that in the past the party affiliation of nominees has often been an important factor in the presidential nominations. It is also very probable, unless methods of selections for nomination are changed, that the party factor will be one of considered importance in future nominations sent to the Senate by the Chief Executive.

The fact that party affiliation has been a heavy if not a dominant factor in the selection of Federal judges, has negated the statement of President James Madison, that our constitutional method of such judicial selection has removed from our Federal judiciary, so far as possible, the element of partisanship.

This Senate has authorized and directed the Committee on the Judiciary,

or any authorized subcommittee thereof to make a full study of the Federal judicial system and specifically enjoined a study of the selection, appointment, tenure, and duties of judges in our Federal court system. A subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary under my chairmanship is currently making a careful study of this particular area of inquiry. Every Federal Judge, circuit and district, has been asked to give this subcommittee the benefit of his experience and thinking in this particular field of study. Over 300 letters have been sent to these judges within the past 2 weeks and over 100 replies have been received to date.

In the February 1961 edition of the American Bar Association Journal on pages 169 through 172 appears an article by the Honorable J. Edward Lumbard, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, entitled "The Place of the Federal Judicial Councils in the Administration of the Courts." This article is so timely, pertinent, illuminating and soundly based, that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

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

THE PLACE OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL COUNCILS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE COURTS

(By J. Edward Lumbard, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit)

In the belief that the judicial councils are a means whereby the Federal courts can best perform the larger and more important service which is being required of them, and with the hope that some thoughts about the greater usefulness of the judicial councils would be of interest, I venture to discuss the Federal judicial councils despite the certain knowledge that this is an area where angels fear to tread.

In my opinion, Federal judges taken singly or as a group will measure up to any other group in their own calling or in any calling. The overwhelming majority are dedicated to their work and have a deep sense of duty. The Federal judiciary as a whole, and judges on the average, are doing a great deal more work per judge than they ever did before. But from its very nature, any system of justice must always aspire to find better means of enabling men content to settle their disputes peaceably.

The Federal judicial councils were created by Congress in 1939 as the machinery whereby the judges could supervise the courts in each circuit. This was largely at the suggestion of Chief Justice Hughes who urged that responsibility be decentralized and that the powers of judicial administration be placed in the judges most familiar with local conditions.

These broad, overall powers of the 11 judicial councils, which consist of the active circuit judges in each circuit, are contained in two short sentences of section 332 of the Judicial Code:

"Each judicial council shall make all necessary orders for the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts within its circuit. The district judges shall promptly carry into effect all orders of the judicial council."

As this language is about as broad as it could possibly be, there is no doubt that the Congress meant to give to the councils the power to do whatever might be necessary more efficiently to manage the courts and administer justice.

Now, after 21 years, it seems clear that the performance of the councils has fallen far short of what was hoped and expected.

Now, after 21 years, it is still necessary to persuade a substantial majority of our Federal court brethren that it is more desirable to govern ourselves than to have regulation thrust upon us in forms and by means which might ultimately become a real threat to judicial independence, to say nothing of being most discomfiting to the judges.

Those who comprise the councils must do the work by example, leadership, and persuasion. The making of orders and their publication should be the last resort, rather than the first.

But we must face the fact that in order to bring about the climate for the necessary consensus and acceptance by the judges, the organized bar must become an active partner in the process for reasons which I shall develop later.

Lastly, I shall attempt to show that the signs are plentiful that if we continue to do little or nothing to keep our house in order Congress will intervene in the public interest and establish nonjudicial controls which may well go beyond what is necessary or desirable.

The anatomy of our problems and the idiosyncrasies of the 300 judges who create it defy description.

In 1909, when Learned Hand became a district judge, there were only 4 judges in the southern district of New York, and only 12 districts in the entire country with more than 1 judge—as the system then was there were 82 districts with only 1 judge—it was really 66, counting the territories which now are States. In almost every district, the district judge was the lord of all he surveyed—except for possible reversals in particular cases, he dictated how all Federal business was conducted in his domain. The rules were what he said they were. With life tenure and no supervisory power to take into account, there were few or none who dared say him nay. There just were no problems of administration. The threat of impeachment was indeed remote; in the 120 years from 1789 to 1909 only five judges had been impeached and only two had been removed from office.

It was not until 1922 that the Judicial Conference of the United States was created. Until then there was no occasion for judges to meet and discuss matters having to do with administration. Many judges did not even know most of their fellows in the same circuit.

OLD JUDGES WERE UNFORGETTABLE CHARACTERS

Boasting a tradition of isolated splendor and almost unlimited power, it is little wonder that the Federal bench spawned many unforgettable characters. They were cantankerous, strong-minded, and ornery; they lent color to the American scene. Men like Charles M. Hough did not merely preside; they literally scared you to death. Bold spirits like Felix Frankfurter and Emory Buckner walked around the old Federal Building three times before they dared to visit Hough. Fortunately, behind the bellow and the rough manner was a kindly and friendly spirit and a great judge.

Judge Howe, of Vermont, was such a character, in New York as well as in the Green Mountains. It was a sight to see and hear him administer criminal justice. At the end of the Government's case he usually summoned the marshal and in stentorian tones he commanded: "Mr. Marshal, open the window. Out goes another Government case."

And there is the oft-told story about the chief judge in a two-judge district who, by accident, met his colleague in the elevator. They had not seen each other in many months. The junior summoned a smile and said, "How are you today, judge?" After a long pause, the senior replied, "It's none of

your damn business, and I wouldn't tell you that much if I hadn't known you for 30 years."

Into these well-ordered realms of district court autonomy came the 1939 legislation—the creation of the judicial councils and the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts whose function it was to assemble the information regarding Federal judicial business which would give the circuit councils the basis for action.

It is hardly to be wondered at that the Congress' hopes of 1939 were not greeted with enthusiasm by judges who had grown up in the tradition of every judge a king in his own district. The fact is that most of those who ruled the roost in 1939 did little more than go through the form of holding two meetings of the council each year. With the exception of one circuit, none of the councils has taken much notice of its powers under section 332. Only the third circuit has made any orders, such as that a particular judge was not to undertake any more matters until he had disposed of business already before him. In addition the 10th circuit council has recently had occasion to enter orders relating to the administration of business in the district of Utah. Undoubtedly there have been cases where measures have been accomplished by other means. But it is equally true, and more important to note, that the councils by their many failures to act have themselves contributed to a feeling on the part of many judges that section 332 gave the councils no real power; and some judges have thereby been encouraged to defy the councils. In one circuit, the suggestion that a term of court be held as the statute required, brought forth a flat refusal. Curiously enough, such recalcitrance has led some chief judges to feel that neither they nor the councils should make any suggestions or orders because they would be disregarded and, in any event, no sanctions were available. But so far as I can ascertain, no judge has ever disobeyed a formal order of a judicial council. One could draw the conclusion from this record—or, perhaps it would be more accurate to say, from the lack of any record—that, until now, most of the chief judges and the councils have not really wanted to do anything.

However possessory may be the feeling that many judges acquire for their office, it should never be forgotten that whatever power they do possess is held in trust for the people, and whether they are faithful trustees is to be determined for the people by the Congress.

Quite recently the Congress has made it abundantly clear that in their view the judicial councils have failed to make use of section 332, although the conditions in many circuits and districts have badly needed supervision and action.

Two committees of the Senate have busied themselves with the conditions of the courts. On April 14, 1960, an interim report of a Senate Judiciary Committee subcommittee to study the Federal judicial system, chaired by Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, listed the "areas that would seem to offer real promise in terms of improving judicial machinery" and area No. 6 is "an examination of the statutory functions of the judicial councils of the circuits to determine whether they are properly constituted and organized to discharge their responsibilities with respect to the efficient operation of the respective circuit and district courts."

A year before, in April 1959, the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which Senator CARL HAYDEN is chairman, made public a report of a field study of the operations of the U.S. courts. Prepared by Paul J. Cotter, and known as the Cotter report, it is not a very enthusiastic review of the way the

courts are running their business, as a few quotations demonstrate:

The report speaks of a "grave lack of administrative direction in the operation of the business of the U.S. courts, with resultant serious, and, in some cases, shocking conditions of delay and neglect of cases on court dockets."

"Some courts are doing a superlative job while others are hopelessly enmeshed in outmoded, inadequate, and at times, amateurish and most unbusinesslike practices and procedures."

"There is a great tendency to continue practices and procedures long outmoded and to resist change. In some courts, inertia and complacency predominate."

The report says that many judges feel that "administrative control is an impingement upon their judicial autonomy and would impair the freedom and independence which surround their conduct of the court's business." "In some judges this attitude amounts almost to a phobia against any type of administrative supervision which they term 'regimentation.'"

"There is a very serious lack of administrative control and direction throughout the whole system."

JUDGES ARE NOT ORGANIZATION MEN

The Cotter report suggests that "each associate judge should be required to submit to the chief judge a signed biweekly report reflecting the duties he has performed, specifically the number of days and hours in attendance in court * * *" showing "time spent on the bench and time spent in chambers, and the cases and type of work which occupied his time. * * *" Let me hasten to comment that this suggestion is unwise, unnecessary, and unworkable. Unworkable because an additional secretary would be needed to keep a diary; unnecessary because the least busy judges would keep the fullest diaries, and vice versa; and unwise because you cannot make organization men out of Federal judges—and, if you could, they would be no good as judges.

More specifically as to judicial councils, the report notes: "Seemingly, there has been great reticence on the part of the judicial councils of the circuits to give orders and instructions to the district courts within their respective circuits"; and

"The extent to which judicial councils have taken action under their authority to improve conditions within the courts of their respective circuits * * * appeared to consist of isolated instances of bringing pressure on superannuated chief judges to retire, or suggestions to a district court to conduct a study of its docket conditions." And my last quotation reads:

"The most startling and paradoxical condition found, however * * * was the general disregard of a 20-year-old law which charges the judicial council of each circuit with the supervision of district court dockets"; and "requires the judicial council of each circuit to * * * make all necessary orders for the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts within its circuit."

Is it not clear that it is up to the judicial councils to answer the Cotter criticism by more fully informing themselves and by acting as the situation in each circuit may require and to the extent of the means available?

In most of our districts, the district judges are today doing an outstanding job. In such cases, the circuit councils need do nothing and should do nothing except to give thanks and give help when needed. But even in the best run districts, matters will occasionally come to the attention of some member of the council. These matters should always be handled in an informal manner through the chief judge of the district. This approach will dispose of most matters with a minimum of embar-

assment. Formal action by the judicial council should be the last resort and only after it has become quite clear that other means have failed. If a judge should refuse to comply with a formal order, the judicial council might have no alternative but to report the matter to the Congress.

But if an important committee of the Senate publishes such a report as the Cotter report, it would seem high time that we ask ourselves some questions.

If the judges in a multijudge district seldom or never meet to discuss calendar control and the many problems of such a court, why should not the council see that this is done? This should hardly require an order but, if it does, the order should be issued.

If the physical or mental condition of a judge is such that it is reasonably apparent that the judge is not fit to try and decide cases, why should not the judicial council secure the facts promptly and act accordingly? It is in this area that the bar usually is very loath to be of any assistance, and I think mistakenly so. Of course in a proper case the statute empowers the council to certify disability to the President and the President may then appoint another judge (title 28, sec. 372(b), U.S.C.). While there is no specific statutory authority, I think it follows from this provision and from section 332 that the judicial council may direct that the disabled judge should no longer sit or act as a judge. It would be an unusual case where these powers would need to be exercised; the mere fact that the powers exist should be enough to solve any situation if it is apparent that the council will see the matter through.

If a judge has an important case undecided for 6 months, or a year, or 2 years, after submission, why shouldn't the council direct that no new matter be considered by that judge until the old business is disposed of?

If it is apparent from reports of the administrative office that a court is falling behind because one or more of its judges is not trying cases, why shouldn't the council make inquiry and act on what it finds?

And if one or more judges fail to take assignments to which they have agreed and instead plan to spend several months on vacation, why shouldn't the council take action to prevent such dereliction of duty?

In one district not so long ago, a district judge took 5 months off every year. When someone asked him how he could do this, he replied that when the job was offered him he was told that the last judge had always taken 5 months' vacation, so he was simply making sure that he got what went with the job.

COUNCILS SHOULD ACT BY ORDER ONLY WHEN NECESSARY

If questionable practices are being engaged in by assistants of the court or the judges, why shouldn't the council advise itself and act as the situation requires?

These questions are not merely suppositions. I repeat: most of the situations can be handled in such a manner that the district courts and the judges are spared any embarrassment. The councils should act by order only when necessary. If they are alert and wise, as well as firm, matters will almost always work themselves out in the proper way.

But it may need more than pure reason and talk of duty to persuade many of our circuit judges that they should take any action which might offend any of their brethren. At this point it is crystal clear that the organized bar is a necessary partner.

In every case I have supposed, many litigants would suffer serious, and sometimes irreparable, injury if the conditions continued without corrective action. It is the duty of the bar, as well as the duty of the judges, to see that litigants are protected from these conditions. In my opinion the

judges and the councils are always receptive to being informed about how the courts are run. This was the principal reason for establishing the circuit conferences in 1939. The conferences have done much to establish frank and friendly relations between the bar and the Federal bench.

There is no justification for the bar to stand on the sidelines, privately to criticize the courts and the judges, and, in the bar associations, to pretend that all is well and to counsel against action. We all know that the councils often are the last to hear about what is going on. The bar can only be a positive force for improving the administration of justice if it is ready, willing, and able to act on the basic fact that it is the duty of the bar to inform the judges. This should be done on the initiative of the bar; the bar should not wait until it is placed under subpoena.

I know of no judge who is not keenly concerned about what the bar thinks of the courts and the judges, particularly about what the bar thinks about him. I know no judge who will not listen; I know no judge who would not be considerably influenced by the opinion of the organized bar. The fact is that the bar has too seldom acted as an equal partner and adviser in the administration of the courts.

Lastly, I suggest we must have help from two other sources, the Congress and the President.

The councils cannot act unless they can be advised of the facts. This is the duty of the Administrative Office, and it does an excellent job within its limited means; but that Office is undermanned and it can make only a very few of the studies which are imperatively needed. The Federal courts are a big business and cannot be properly run on a miserly budget. It is the duty of the Congress to provide sufficient funds so that the courts can be properly run.

Even more important, there has been a serious lack of judicial manpower in many districts and circuits since 1954. As you know, no new judgeships have been created since 1954; in fact, there are now three fewer judges than there were in 1954, since three temporary judgeships have been vacated.

As to the second circuit, there is little sense in talking about its judicial council doing more when there are not enough judges and not enough clerical help to do the work of the court of appeals as it should be done. The assignment of judges from other circuits and from district courts, themselves already overburdened, should be a temporary expedient and not a permanent condition. Congress cannot fully expect the councils to do their part without the necessary help.

Moreover, it seems strange for the Senate to complain about councils not functioning, when the Senate itself further contributes to our lack of judgepower by delaying action on judicial nominees for many months.

The President is also our partner.

First, I suggest that the President should select judges with more consideration of their capacity to try cases and their understanding of the necessity of improved court administration. No judicial council and no system will work unless the judges have these two basic qualifications in addition to wisdom, uprightness, and learning.

Second, there should be as little delay as possible in nominating judges to fill vacancies. The President, as well as the Senate, must share the responsibility for the delays in filling vacancies which have plagued the Federal system for the past 5 years.

I have tried to demonstrate that we have been given a responsibility which we should accept and meet. To the extent that we are not properly equipped by those who are the only ones who can equip us, the Congress and the President, it is our duty to speak out. The Federal courts have taken a beating for a long time. Is it not high time that the judges should talk back and speak

frankly? We should tell our side of the story so that the bar and the people may better decide what needs to be done and by whom.

Meanwhile, whatever others may do or fail to do, the Federal judges must do all they can to govern themselves, as the statutes intend, through alert and active judicial councils so as better to serve litigants and the bar.

THE GOVERNMENT SUPPORT LEVEL FOR COTTON

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am deeply disturbed over the effects of the newly announced Government support level for cotton.

When Secretary of Agriculture Freeman recently set the cotton price-support level for 1961 at 82 percent of parity, I am certain that he did not intend that this should raise the price of cotton shirts and dresses to our consumers.

And when he set the export subsidy rate at 8.5 cents a pound, I am certain it was not his intention to cripple the domestic textile and garment industries in the United States.

But higher prices to consumers and crippling blows to manufacturers will be the results of what he has done.

The 1961 cotton support price to cotton farmers will raise the price of cotton from 3 to 5 cents per pound and will put pressure on the price of everything we buy that is made of cotton.

Raising the export subsidy on raw cotton from the present 6 cents to 8½ cents per pound will give a 30-percent advantage to foreign textile mills which are now in hot competition for the United States market.

Mr. President, in Pennsylvania our textile mills and garment manufacturers employ about 235,000 people. This is a lower figure than last year and it will go lower still when the effects of the cotton subsidy program are felt.

We in Pennsylvania cannot understand why the Kennedy administration on the one hand proposes large-scale Government programs to help the unemployed, while on the other hand it institutes programs like this which will throw out of work men and women who are now employed.

Neither can we in Pennsylvania understand why we must pay twice to support cotton farming done elsewhere in the country. Pennsylvania taxes pay to raise the price of cotton and Pennsylvania consumers pay the higher price when the goods are sold to us.

Here are some of the things my constituents are writing to me:

With other countries operating under lower wage standards we have always been under some handicaps. But this further handing over of 8½ cents per pound raw material savings to our foreign competition now endangers the very existence of any textile concern making stable products in Pennsylvania or any other State.

A Pennsylvania manufacturer said to me:

We can meet competition from foreign manufacturers when the competition is based on production efficiency, style and quality. But we cannot compete against foreign manufacturers when they have the American Government on their side.

Yet another writes:

We must compete not only with lower labor costs abroad, but with the higher raw material cost resulting from the cotton export subsidy program. My company formerly had an export business amounting to some \$5 million annually. But we have lost our markets because of lower priced cotton yarn produced in Portugal, Spain, Italy, and Egypt. When the cotton export subsidy program operates to the stark disadvantages of American manufacturers, it is only a question of time until we will lose an essential industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks the transcript of a portion of a television and radio program done recently with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania and the senior Senator from Minnesota, both of whom have been advised that this will be inserted in the RECORD.

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

[From "Your Senators Report," program done jointly by Senators HUGH SCOTT and JOSEPH S. CLARK, with guest Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. Released to 15 television and 38 radio stations on Sunday, March 5, 1961]

Senator SCOTT. What I wanted to turn to was this subject of the recent directive or decision of the Secretary of Agriculture, Governor Freeman, from your State, in which he has fixed, beginning in August, a subsidy to foreign users of American cotton. He has increased that subsidy from 6 cents to 8½ cents and the support price from 70 to 82 percent. Now I don't know whether this was done to get Congressman COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, back in the good graces or to get the President in good graces of Congressman COOLEY, or what the purpose was of it.

But here is what it does in Pennsylvania: We are already being flooded with imports from foreign countries who are making shirts and cotton goods, ladies' dresses—sending them over here—and we can't compete. Now, instead of the manufacturer—in some place in the Orient, let's say—being able to use our cotton to make a cotton dress and pay 6 cents a pound less for it, he's going to pay 8½ cents a pound less for it and that's going to drive out of business some of our cotton goods and textile people in various parts of Pennsylvania. I heard from Berwick, Pa., today about that.

We're worried up in the Northeast about that because if shirts go up, say from \$2.95 to \$3.50, if ladies' dresses go from \$9.50 to \$10.75, some of our people are going to be out of work as a result of it. And all of our people are going to be paying more. Now, Secretary Freeman said that others—meaning, I think the Secretary of Commerce Hodges—very reluctantly agreed with him (on the subsidy). I can understand against the administration statements that they're going to try to keep down the cost of living and keep employment up.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Senator, you can raise the price of raw cotton considerably and it won't affect the price of a shirt a penny insofar as raw cotton is concerned. Now let's not fool ourselves about that. You can increase the price level of raw cotton—that is the fiber that comes out of the field—as much as 25 percent and it won't add 5 cents to a shirt; that is the cotton price itself. You can argue the merits or demerits about whether or not there ought to be an increase in the cotton price support program. And that is really what has happened. I mean the adminis-

tration is recommending a reasonably good increase—about 82 percent of parity, if I'm not mistaken, on certain types of cotton—long-staple cotton that has a good market both at home and abroad. Actually, the cotton industry has been suffering—that is the producer. And very frankly, if you want people to produce cotton, they ought not to produce at a loss. They ought to be able to produce at least at a breakeven and I would hope at a profit.

Now this matter of imports is a very serious matter. And may I say this isn't confined to Pennsylvania, gentlemen. We make quite a few textile products in Minnesota. We want to make more. I happen to believe that one of the needs or one of the programs of this administration should be to work out something, particularly with the Japanese exporters to impose—I won't say impose, but to agree—on certain quotas and shipments rather than just flooding the American market. I also would suggest that sometimes by the technological improvement of our own mills and our own processes that we will place ourselves in a better competitive position.

Senator SCOTT. Senator HUMPHREY, what I can't understand is if cotton has gone up—and I'm no expert—but they use as a standard what they call Middling 1-inch, and the price of that cotton has gone up—I am told—from 30 cents to 34 cents. Now if the price of cotton has gone up, presumably we are subsidizing the foreign producers in order to enable them to continue to compete strenuously against us. I don't go by your theory that cotton is in trouble. If the price has gone up to 34 cents and I don't see why you raise the support from 70 percent to 82 percent when cotton is on the rise unless it's to buy the Southern Democrats.

Senator HUMPHREY. No, no.

Senator SCOTT. Joe wants to buy the Southern Democrats, he's always—

Senator HUMPHREY. We don't have to. They are good loyal Democrats.

Senator CLARK. I just want to put in HUBERT's mind before he answers you, this thought. You've been on the Agriculture Committee—

Senator SCOTT. He doesn't need any bailings out.

Senator CLARK. No; but tell the people of Pennsylvania this, because my good friend, Senator SCOTT has been pulling this line on this show ever since back in November—

Senator SCOTT. This is a new subject. I'm tired of our old subjects.

Senator CLARK. He used to tell us back in the campaign that the Kennedy program would increase the cost of food by 25 percent. Now you know. You just tell our listeners how much of the price of a loaf of bread is in wheat; how much of the price of a shirt is in cotton. Isn't this a vastly exaggerated bill of goods that my friend is trying to sell our listeners?

Senator SCOTT. That was a loaded question. We'll get a loaded answer.

Senator HUMPHREY. I was willing to tolerate that kind of exaggeration as to the increased cost of living by the Kennedy farm program during the campaign, because most Americans are somewhat immune to this sort of talk. But once you're in the process of governing a country, I think you ought to be a little more responsible. And when you are running a government as is now the case, why we'd just as well face up to what the facts are. You could have increased the price of wheat to a dollar a bushel and you wouldn't increase the price of Grapenuts as much as a penny a box. You could have doubled the price of oats and it wouldn't have made any difference in the price of oatmeal at all. In fact the label on the oatmeal box costs more than the oats in the oatmeal box.

Senator SCOTT. Your argument, basically, is that if you increase the cost of the basic

food product, it doesn't increase the cost to the consumer.

Senator HUMPHREY. I didn't say that.

Senator SCOTT. I heard it that way.

Senator HUMPHREY. We know that that's the case in perishable commodities. But Senator SCOTT I have never believed that it was the duty of Pennsylvania manufacturers to subsidize consumers in Minnesota, nor have I believed that it was the duty of Wisconsin farmers to subsidize New Jersey manufacturers. What I'm trying to say is that farmers are entitled to a fair deal and so are manufacturers. Now, I'm not unimpressed at all. I am impressed by the seriousness of foreign competition in some of these markets of ours, particularly textile markets. And may I add that some of this competition is from American firms who have seen fit to move their capital and their plant overseas and to manufacture with cheaper labor overseas goods to ship back into the United States. I think this picture needs a much broader look than merely saying, "Let's keep cotton producers down; let's keep farmers down, and let's hope and pray that some of our textile manufacturers can survive at home here." Let's take a look at the total picture and I think that's what Governor Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, is trying to do.

Senator SCOTT. Senator HUMPHREY, Senator CLARK has been trying to make the point that if the increase in wheat or in oats doesn't increase the cost to the consumer are you prepared to say that 1 year from now, under this administration, the cost of the loaf of bread will not go up a cent; the cost of a quart of milk will not go up a cent? Do you anticipate it will go down in view of these expected high parity programs? Do you think that my shirt—and it's a good American shirt by the way—

Senator HUMPHREY. Mine too—made in Minnesota.

Senator SCOTT. And your shirt and the ladies' dresses are going to be less next year? I'm telling you now, ladies and gentlemen, your shirts and your dresses are going to cost more. The order has already been put in and after August you can expect about next spring a rise in the cost of your clothes. Now these gentlemen will disagree with me and they will come back here next spring and we'll do it again.

Senator HUMPHREY. Now Senator, I know that you want to make this program informative and not merely rhetorical and, if that is the case, let's face it. There are possibilities that there will be increased costs. And if there are increased costs, it may be due to a hundred and one factors. Maybe the taxes are going up in Pennsylvania, I don't know.

Senator SCOTT. Oh, yes; with a Democratic Governor, they're going up in Pennsylvania.

Senator HUMPHREY. Maybe they're going up in Minnesota. I know they are. May I say that we can compensate for that in Minnesota with a Republican Governor. He's doing a fine job.

Senator SCOTT. He's only had a month—

Senator HUMPHREY. Leaving no one in second position. He's right out in front.

Senator SCOTT. He hasn't increased taxes, though.

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh, yes. He's doing well. He's going to. But again, let's try to be informative here. The fact is that you can have a hundred and one items that enter into the cost of production of a particular finished item and no one can say that these finished items may not go up. All that Senator HUMPHREY is saying is that I don't believe that it is the duty or the responsibility of Pennsylvania coal miners to subsidize Minnesota coal consumers. I don't believe that it is the duty of Minnesota farmers to subsidize Pennsylvania manufacturers or consumers. I am for all of it. And I think

the job is to try to bring some equity—some reasonable degree of equity. Now one thing that we'll be able to do that may reduce the cost a little bit, Senator, is to get the cost of financing down which has been the biggest racket of recent years. We'll get the cost of interest payments down on homes, on automobiles, and on the public debt. That will be a whole lot more significant in savings, may I say, than trying to keep the cost of wheat down another 2 cents a bushel because of the cost of interest. The fellow that invented that interest really got ahead of something, I want to tell you that.

Senator SCOTT. Yes; he was quite a man and he worked very well under Democratic administrations too. That's when he knew his greatest prosperity too, that old man.

DEATH OF K. C. LI

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on last Tuesday, March 7, my State of Nevada, the United States, and the world at large lost an outstanding citizen with the sudden passing of K. C. Li, internationally known mining engineer and chairman of the Wah Chang Corp. Just recently returned from a trip to the Middle East and Europe, as a member of the delegation planning the New York World's Fair in 1964-66, Mr. Li suffered a heart attack while working in his New York office.

"K.C.," as he was affectionately known to countless friends around the world, had extensive mining interests for many years in eastern Nevada and at Bishop, Calif. He was beloved by those who knew him, and respected by all for his wisdom and ability. He leaves behind a fine family who will miss him as will all of us who had the great privilege of getting to know this kindly, brilliant, and warm person whose passing leaves a void in the hearts of people from the deserts of Nevada to Brazil's high mountains and out to China and the wide Pacific.

I request permission, Mr. President, to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a brief biography of a great American, K. C. Li.

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

Widely known as China's unofficial ambassador to the United States, Mr. K. C. Li, a naturalized American, was born in Changsha, China, in 1892. He was educated at Hunan Technical Institute, China, and at the Royal School of Mines, London, becoming a world authority on tungsten. Mr. Li discovered and developed the first tungsten deposits in China and shipped the first ore to this country in 1915.

Recognition came to him early as an expert in the field of minerals, when he was asked to serve as adviser on antimony to the Allied and British Governments during World War I, and as adviser on tungsten to the U.S. Government during World War II, being primarily responsible for providing the Allies with strategic materials, including tungsten. Mr. Li established the New York office of Wah Chang Corp. in 1916, expanding its operations to include the processing and production of molybdenum, columbium, tantalum, tin, zirconium, and hafnium. Wah Chang now has affiliates all over the world, and operates its own plants in Glen Cove, N.Y.; Fairlawn, N.J.; Texas City, Tex.; Albany, Ore.; and Huntsville, Ala.

During his long career, Mr. Li served as representative of the Chinese Ministry of Finance and Commerce, as adviser to the Chinese Embassy in Washington, and as a

Chinese delegate to the Bretton Woods Conference. He was a director of the Commodity Exchange, Inc., of New York, and of Howe Sound, Inc.

K. C. Li served actively on the Council on Foreign Relations, and was a trustee of China Foundation for Education and Culture, and the China Institute in America, as well as holding membership on the development council of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and the visiting committee on Far Eastern civilizations at Harvard. He established the Li Foundation, and annually awards the K. C. Li Medal and Prize at Columbia University as well as scholarships at the University of Nevada for students excelling in mining engineering and research.

Long identified with civic affairs, Mr. Li had been a member of the Mayor's Reception Committee of the City of New York and of the Executive Committee of the United Nations Committee of the City of New York. At the time of his death, he was honorary president of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce of New York; general chairman of the New York-Tokyo Sister-City affiliation; and a director of the New York World's Fair Corp. Mr. Li was an important contributor to professional journals, as well as the author of Chinese textbooks on mathematics and other significant scientific documents.

Surviving Mr. Li are his widow, Grace; a brother, Tao Kai; three sons, Kuo Ching, Jr., John Choi, and Lien Yen; and five daughters, Mrs. Gordon Chun, Mrs. William Distin, Mrs. Rho-Hwa Ho, Mrs. Edward Leong Way, and Mrs. Alfred Wu. He was a member of many professional organizations, and belonged to Piping Rock and Creek County Clubs, among others.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S GREAT HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, again the Nation is thrilled by a voice of vigor and vision sounding from the White House.

Yesterday, the President sent to the Congress an important message outlining a program to improve American housing.

I am pleased to note the Presidential recommendations for liberalization of FHA mortgage insurance; low-interest rate loans for rental and cooperative housing; and, especially, plans for increasing the availability of low-rent public housing. All of these are badly needed, and I shall, with enthusiasm, support the recommendations of President Kennedy.

To Alaska, the emphasis of the President on planning for urban centers and on the importance of careful utilization of land resources comes with particular significance.

Alaska is experiencing a population increase of exceptional proportions. The 1960 census shows that Alaska experienced an increase of population of more than 75 percent over its 1950 record. This is a statistic we expect to continue its present trend. The westward movement of Americans continues, and has reached the Last Frontier in a way that must be taken into account by my State, in connection with all aspects of community development.

Among other impacts of increasing population on Alaska is the effect on housing and community planning. These new Alaskans must find good housing, at prices commensurate with their income. A unique aspect of this objective in Alaska accentuates our need for Federal

assistance. This is the notoriously high cost of living there. It is largely due to the high cost of maritime transportation, for which past Federal action is primarily responsible. I have often referred to this fact of economic life in Alaska; and, again, I make reference to the results of numerous economic studies which show that the cost of living in Alaska is the highest in the Nation. Construction costs are in keeping with other high costs, and are progressively higher as we proceed northwestward, along the course of transportation, from the Port of Seattle. Thus, costs of housing there are far beyond those of other States.

In order to develop, Alaska must attack on many fronts this problem of high living costs. Meanwhile, it must be taken into account in connection with all legislative proposals which affect my State. Liberal Federal assistance to Alaska to provide low-cost housing can be a major factor in normalizing the economy of the State. Thus, Alaskans are particularly desirous of having the legislation recommended by the President enacted as soon as possible.

As the population of Alaska increases, we must give more and more careful thought to planning the communities in which our people live. In the new State of Alaska, we have an opportunity to build model communities unblemished by the slums and dilapidated housing which are characteristic of the older urban centers. We can, with care, and with the help of the Federal Government, such as that proposed by President Kennedy, build beautiful new cities of which the entire Nation can be proud.

Beyond these desirable objectives, the President's housing program will provide sorely needed reemployment, not merely the building trades, but also in the factories where building supplies originate. Thus, enactment of this proposal into law will be doubly beneficial.

It is my hope that no time will be lost by the Congress in enacting the housing program which the President has presented, and in making a reality of the housing policy which the Congress proclaimed 11 years ago, and which President Kennedy describes as "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

HUNGARY AND TIBET MUST REMAIN ON UNITED NATIONS AGENDA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have been very much concerned by reports of efforts to eliminate the issues of Hungary and Tibet from the United Nations agenda. It is said that these questions and other cold war issues may be removed from the agenda until next fall's General Assembly meeting. Mr. President, this is such a serious step and so detrimental to the interests of the whole free world that I think it would be disastrous.

Last night, I sent a telegram to United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson urging that these issues remain where they are on the United Nations agenda, since they reveal so clearly the long-term designs of the Communist dictators.

Basic principles are involved here. Cold war tensions have not been caused because free nations seek a full investigation and condemnation of these events. Quite the contrary—what has caused cold war tensions are the events themselves—the aggressive behavior of the Soviet Union and Red China. Hungary and Tibet are the most blatant examples to date of deliberate, long-range Communist disregard for human rights and for the authority of the United Nations.

There is no doubt that the problems in the Congo and the financing of Congo operations are of greatest urgency at the moment, but it is vital that ruthless instances of Communist aggression not be swept under the rug in an ill-conceived effort to appease the Communists. Any hopes that the Soviet Union will relent in its efforts to bring on a Congolese civil war by such yielding on the part of the United States are illusive and unworthy of the United States as leader of the free world. I certainly intend to do everything in my power to protest and resist such a policy.

I hope that I shall be joined in that position by others whom I know entertain the same views which I do on this important issue.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I commend my colleague for his statement, which I think is timely. I think it is right and typical of him to have been perceptive of what is going on and what we need to do to stop the trend toward concentrating upon what might be the glowing issue of the moment and forgetting the deep moral issues which underline the cold war, and he brings us face to face with our fidelity to them.

I congratulate him.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my colleague from New York for those words, and I wish to say that we all know that he stands, as I do, firmly against anything that could smack of approaching appeasement with regard to the Soviet Union or Red China.

NATIONAL 4-H CLUB WEEK

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, National 4-H Club Week has just been observed. That is a time when more than 2,300,000 boys and girls of America move to the forefront in this most commendable organization.

Mississippi, a key State in the early organization of 4-H Clubs, proudly claims 106,000 boys and girls enrolled in 2,700 4-H Clubs. Coming mostly from the rural sections of Mississippi, these young people have exemplified a concerted effort to improve themselves and their communities.

Their 4-H Club motto is a credit to good citizenship for indeed it promotes and encourages every 4-H Club boy and girl to strive for greater achievement in fulfilling the motto; "To Make the Best Better."

No county in Mississippi is without a 4-H Club whose youthful members are guided by dedicated adult leaders and volunteers in bringing about a healthier, happier people for all Mississippians.

As President Kennedy launches his own new Youth Peace Corps as a weapon of his New Frontier, I invite the President and members of the Senate to refresh their own knowledge of the wonderful work of 4-H Clubs in America.

Through active 4-H Club membership, rural youth have learned how to develop skills in many fields; they have obtained vast knowledge of new methods of farming; they have improved their herds and flocks, increased their production of corn, cotton, and soybeans; they have sharpened their awareness of good citizenship, developed leadership in public speaking; they improved their row crops and bake a better cherry pie; their personalities glitter where once they were obscure.

Their whole program is a bright one with a brighter future than ever before. We salute the 4-H Clubs of America on this special week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what business is now before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business will not automatically be laid before the Senate until 2 o'clock; but in the meantime it can be taken up either by unanimous consent or by motion.

FEED GRAINS PROGRAM FOR 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 993, the unfinished business, to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961, be laid before the Senate for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 993) to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For the information of the Senate, the Chair will read the following:

The committee amendment is in the nature of a substitute. In such a case, under the precedents of the Senate, the substitute language is, for the purpose of amendment, considered as original text, and not as an amendment in the first degree. Therefore, the substitute is subject to amendment in two degrees—either by a perfecting amendment or by a substitute amendment.

The Parliamentarian suggests that this statement will put the Senate on notice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the bill now before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 7]

Aiken	Bartlett	Bible
Allott	Beall	Boggs
Anderson	Bennett	Bridges

Burdick	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bush	Hickey	Muskie
Butler	Hill	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Pell
Cannon	Humphrey	Proxmire
Carlson	Jackson	Randolph
Carroll	Javits	Robertson
Case, N.J.	Johnston	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Saltonstall
Chavez	Keating	Schoepfel
Church	Kefauver	Scott
Clark	Kuchel	Smathers
Cooper	Lausche	Smith, Mass.
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Dirksen	Long, La.	Stennis
Dodd	Magnuson	Symington
Douglas	Mansfield	Talmadge
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thurmond
Ellender	McClellan	Wiley
Engle	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Gruening	Metcalf	Yarborough
Hart	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Hartke	Morse	Young, Ohio
Hayden	Morton	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS RELATING TO MIGRATORY LABOR—CALENDAR NO. 61, SENATE RESOLUTION 86

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday, during consideration of various resolutions from the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senate passed over Calendar No. 61, Senate Resolution 86, relating to migratory labor. This appears on page 3568 of the Record.

The Daily Digest, however, shows this resolution to have been adopted. It does not appear on today's printed calendar of business. For the information of the Senate, however, I announce that the resolution was in fact passed over yesterday, and was not adopted.

It is the intention of the leadership to consider this resolution at an early date.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader and other interested Senators, I send to the desk a proposed

unanimous-consent agreement and ask that it be read and considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the proposed agreement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, March 14, 1961, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to clarify two points:

First, must an amendment which is to be subject to this debate limitation, or entitled to the benefit of it, be now on the desk? May it be offered subsequently?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It may be offered subsequently.

Mr. JAVITS. The second question deals with a matter which has sometimes been called into question. I understand that the leaders may yield time from the time on the bill to debate a particular amendment, longer, perhaps.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is provided for.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BUSH. I am sorry I was late. May I ask what the suggested agreement is?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would limit the debate to 2 hours on any amendment or substitute, and to 6 hours on the bill; and the limitation would start after the morning hour on Tuesday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

FEED GRAINS PROGRAM FOR 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 993) to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the chairman of that committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER],

are on the floor. I wish to announce to the Senate that there is a strong possibility that there may be a yea-and-nay vote on final passage of the feed grain bill. Does the Senator from Louisiana have anything to say on that subject?

Mr. ELLENDER. So far as I am concerned, I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote. If any other Senator desires to do so, that is his privilege, of course.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know what may develop in the course of the debate. It is not my intention at this time to request a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. KEATING. I shall be very happy to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BUSH. I make the same request. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands this request to be for a yea-and-nay vote on final passage. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

The yeas and nays were ordered on final passage of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senate is now on firm ground and on notice.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason why I said I would not request a yea-and-nay vote is that I believe the Senate bill is very much better than the House bill. The yeas and nays have now been ordered, and that is that. I should like briefly to speak on the bill itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. Those who desire to converse will please retire to the cloak-rooms.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the bill which is now before the Senate is definitely a more acceptable bill than the one which was passed by the House yesterday. I wish to give credit for its improvement to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who has done a great deal of work in trying to bring about legislation which will be as beneficial as possible and the least harmful as possible.

I do not believe that the bill as it is now written is going to do as much good as its proponents expect it will. On the other hand, the House bill contains section 3, which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to sell feed grains at 17 percent below the support price. The purpose of the provision, I believe, is to permit him to use that authority as a persuader to encourage more producers of feed grains to enter the program. However, that provision in the House bill would be disconcerting to the grain market, to say the least. Some people even go so far as to say that it would be demoralizing. In the light of this sentiment, it was wise to leave it out of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. We in Rhode Island use a considerable amount of feed grain in the poultry industry. Will the Senator from Vermont be good enough to inform the Senator from Rhode Island what effect the bill would have upon the consumers of Rhode Island?

Mr. AIKEN. That would depend on how charitable the poultry raisers of Rhode Island might be.

Mr. PASTORE. They are very charitable, but they have to pay the cost.

Would the price be higher or lower after the bill has passed than at the present time?

Mr. AIKEN. The purpose of the proposed legislation, and the purpose of other programs which have been set forth from time to time, is to raise the price of grain. How much that would be, I do not know. I have only estimated it for dairy feed. I would say that the increase in price would be a minimum of \$5 a ton, and probably a maximum of \$8 a ton. I presume the same increase would result for the poultrymen. If the poultrymen wish to absorb the additional cost, the effect on the consumer would be negligible. If they are not in a position to be charitable, and pass the cost on to the consumer, the price to the consumer would be increased.

Mr. PASTORE. Will it be any comfort to the senior Senator from Vermont to know that the Senator from Rhode Island is opposed to the bill and shall be recorded against it?

Mr. AIKEN. If I were the senior Senator from Rhode Island I would be opposed to it also. Being the senior Senator from Vermont, I am likely to follow the opinion of the senior Senator from Rhode Island. However, I do wish to say, in deference to the chairman of the committee, that the bill is much better than the House bill. I wish to say, in behalf of the Secretary of Agriculture, that he has resisted pressure from all sides and has tried to conduct himself fairly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. One observation which the Senator from Vermont has made perplexes me a little. I understood him to say that the pending bill is better than the present law.

Mr. AIKEN. No; it is better than the House bill, I said.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The particular question I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont relates to the language which appears at the bottom of page 7 of the Senate bill, and which reads as follows:

For the purposes of this subsection the average annual yield of each commodity shall be the average annual yield per harvested acre on the farm for the years 1959 and 1960, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and other factors as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

I may say to the Senator that the crop year 1959 was not a good crop year in South Dakota. It was not an average crop year in South Dakota—1960 was—1958 was more nearly the average. If the factor of 1959 is balanced against the crop year 1960, we would not get an average result, particularly in the production of corn. In fact, it would be less than 50 percent of the average. I have obtained rather complete figures on this subject from the State agricultural committee. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ver-

mont, who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, whether the term "adjusted for abnormal weather conditions" would place upon the Secretary of Agriculture the responsibility as well as the power to take into consideration the fact that the year 1959 would, as one of 2 years, result in a figure below the average?

Mr. AIKEN. It would place upon the Secretary a responsibility which he would have very great difficulty in carrying out. In fact, I believe the use of a 2-year average is bound to result in injustices in many parts of the country.

Both 1959 and 1960 were typical corn years. In parts of the country, such as the Senator's home State of South Dakota, one year was a good year, and the other year was not. I do not know how the Secretary of Agriculture will fulfill his responsibility and be fair to everyone.

In the committee, as the chairman will remember, I raised the point that we ought to take a 5-year period rather than a 2-year period, but the experts who were present pointed out that administratively, it would be almost impossible to do that in time for any legislation to take effect in the coming crop year.

If I may yield to the chairman of our committee without losing the floor, I should like to do so, because he may have something to say about this question.

Mr. ELLENDER. The language which the Senator from South Dakota read is similar to present law, and has worked pretty well. It gives the Secretary broad leeway in order to adjust the base yield to what would be produced on given acres normally.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the present law provide for the use of only 2 years?

Mr. ELLENDER. The present bill does provide for that. The reason is, as the Senator has just stated, that it would not be possible to go back 3 or 4 years. It would take too long to do that, and then in many instances, it would simply be guesswork.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, may I, without forfeiting the right of the Senator from Vermont to the floor, address a question to the chairman of the committee?

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee, whether the language "adjusted for abnormal weather conditions" places upon the Secretary both the power and the responsibility to recognize the situation if one year or both years 1959 and 1960 were so abnormal as to result in bringing the 2 years below a longtime average.

Mr. ELLENDER. I feel certain it does. In other words, the purpose of the language is simply to give the Secretary the power to adjust production to what would be normally produced.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The power? What about the responsibility?

Mr. ELLENDER. I suppose they go together.

Mr. AIKEN. They go together, and they are very difficult to assume. In the final analysis, I assume the responsibility would lie with the duly elected representatives of the area affected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator has introduced a factor which seems rather encouraging. That is the suggestion that the Secretary, in exercising power and accepting responsibility, would give some weight and consideration to the facts as they would be developed in any State by the State committee.

Mr. AIKEN. I would expect the Secretary to make such a judgment. However, I do not know that the Secretary could base his allocations on the extremely favorable years for an area, either. I think he would have to average them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would work both ways. We are seeking what would be a truly average condition.

Mr. AIKEN. I feel certain the Secretary would try to fulfill his responsibilities fairly. It would be an almost superhuman task for him to carry out all his responsibilities without committing injustices somewhere, however, because he has only a few weeks in which to work.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I realize it is a difficult matter; but I hope we may establish by these interrogations a history of the legislation in the way in which it has been here developed—that is, that the Secretary would have both the power and the responsibility to attempt to assess abnormal conditions and reach a fair average result.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Vermont I may place in the Record a letter and figures, as supplied to me by the State committee for South Dakota, which show how abnormally low 1959 was, and also the figures for 1960 and 1958, to the extent that they are available.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. AIKEN. I think the assumptions of the Senator from South Dakota are sound. I am certain that the Secretary will take them into consideration and will deal as fairly as is humanly possible with the farmers in all the grain-growing areas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from South Dakota has raised the issue of large areas where there are crop losses and crop reductions in a particular producing year. I wish to call attention to the problem in smaller areas where losses occur by reason of hail damage. Does the Senator from Vermont believe that the State committee—and we might even go clear back to the county committee—will be permitted to make some individual adjustments for farms in an area where unusual destruction was caused by hail,

something which is not a usual occurrence?

Mr. AIKEN. The ultimate responsibility would rest with the Secretary, but I am satisfied that he would have to rely on the State, county, and local committees for the information necessary to make a determination. I cannot conceive of his not taking into consideration a loss of yield due to hail storms or for other reasons over which there was no control.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I feel certain the Secretary would take such factors into consideration, and I am also sure that under the law he would be required to do so.

Mr. CARLSON. This discussion should be helpful in advising State and county authorities. After all, the matter gets right down to the county committees.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the discussion will be helpful to the Secretary.

Mr. CARLSON. I am sure it will; but I hope some consideration will be given to this problem, because it can be quite damaging in some areas.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the point which the Senator from Kansas raises is very important. Is it not correct to say that in the application of the law, the averages are determined on a county basis, and not on a statewide basis?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On that assumption, the conditions described by the Senator from Kansas clearly should be taken care of.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, because hail storms are seldom statewide; they are countywide.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The junior Senator from New York and, I feel certain, the senior Senator from New York, both rely heavily upon the judgment of our close and favorite friend, who is sometimes called the agricultural Senator from New York, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

I did not hear fully the reply made by the Senator from Vermont to the Senator from Rhode Island about the effect of the bill on the consumer. Is the Senate bill better than the House bill, which in the judgment of the junior Senator from New York was something of a monstrosity? Furthermore, is the Senate bill an improvement over present law? I would appreciate it if the Senator from Vermont would address himself to these two questions.

Mr. AIKEN. I would not say that the bill would not result in increased costs to the consumers. If farm prices rise, it is only natural that the prices to the consumers will be raised; possibly to the same extent, possibly to a greater extent, possibly to a lesser extent—although probably to a lesser extent. However, the income of the farmers has been out of line on the low side for a long time, and we know that the average earnings

of farm people have not kept pace with the earnings of people engaged in other occupations, although probably they have been a little more favorable in specialized farming. In effect, the farmer has been subsidizing the consumer in the past.

I do not believe the bill will accomplish all that its advocates think it will. With the supply of farm products that is now on hand, I doubt whether there will be any material increase in prices to the consumers, but there will be some.

Mr. KEATING. I do not wish to interfere with the Senator's trend of thought. I realize that the consumer is not the only one to be considered. However, in the State of New York, as the Senator knows, the interests of the consumers are extremely important. From the point of view of the farmer, it is my understanding that the farm problem does not relate simply to corn and feed grains; tremendous amounts of wheat also are stored by the Federal Government. Why is it that we now are asked only to vote upon feed grains?

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from New York wants to know my real opinion, it is because the wheat situation probably is a little too formidable to be taken up on short notice.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President—

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from North Dakota, who is on his feet, will, I believe, agree that it is a very formidable situation.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will permit me to answer the question—

Mr. KEATING. Certainly, because information is what we are seeking.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. There is nothing we can do about this year's wheat crop, because the price program was set last July, in last year's referendum. We have until about June to change next year's program.

But if we want to do anything about feed grains, we have to do it now; in fact, it may now be a little late.

The price of corn, in the heart of the corn-producing area, has dropped from about \$1.60 a bushel, 8 or 10 years ago, to 85 or 90 cents a bushel, last year. But because of the effective work done by you folks in the New England area, the prices of dairy products are about as high as they ever were due to the price supports and marketing orders.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am not sure that the Senator from Vermont and I would entirely agree with the Senator from North Dakota; but I appreciate his clearing up the uncertainty as to why the measure before us deals with only one part of the total farm problem.

I read with great interest the views of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, which are attached to the report.

Let me ask the Senator from Vermont—and I again point out that all of us in our part of the country look to him for advice. Am I correct in understanding that he opposed this bill and voted against reporting it out of committee?

Mr. AIKEN. I did.

Mr. KEATING. Does he share some of the views expressed by the Senator from Kentucky; or are they in some disagreement?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from Kentucky is on sound ground when he states that a farmer raising perhaps only 10 acres of corn might find himself in an uneconomic situation if he reduced those 10 acres to 7 acres—as he would be required to do under the present wording of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have promised to yield to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. But if the Senator from Kentucky desires to speak to the point raised by the Senator from New York, I shall yield now to the Senator from Kentucky, and then to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. COOPER. I shall be glad to wait.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, this bill may contain some benefits for farmers who produce cash feed grains, but it would have an adverse effect upon the larger number of producers who feed livestock and poultry.

Producers who use the feed grains produced by them to feed their own livestock or poultry would obtain no benefit from the bill. They would have no incentive to participate in the program. They would not receive the benefit of price support, and they might be required to purchase feed if they participated in the acreage reduction.

Poultry and milk producers who must buy feed would, of course, have their costs increased by this bill to the extent that it may succeed in its objective. The bill would raise the required corn support level for 1961 from about \$1.05 a bushel to \$1.20 a bushel; the grain sorghums support level from about \$1.52 a hundredweight to \$1.88 a hundredweight; oats from about 50 cents a bushel to about 62 cents a bushel; and barley from about 77 cents a bushel to about 93 cents. There has been a great deal of discussion about the cost-price squeeze that has been experienced in recent years. This bill would intensify that squeeze on the West Virginia poultry and dairy producers.

It has been argued that low feed prices mean low poultry prices and low dairy prices, and that the bill is intended to stabilize feed prices, and poultry prices and dairy prices, as well. Stabilization of feed prices might help to stabilize poultry and dairy prices, although such mutual stability does not always occur. However, the bill would not stabilize feed prices, but would destabilize them by raising support prices above existing levels, to the disadvantage of producers who must buy feeds and have made their production plans

upon the basis of existing price levels and feed stocks.

There are a great many poultry products in the eastern part of West Virginia, and there is considerable dairy production in West Virginia. I believe this bill would be detrimental to those poultrymen and those dairymen; and I intend to vote against the bill, on the final rollcall.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont for yielding to me.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia has stated clearly the reason why the Senator from Vermont voted against reporting the bill favorably from the committee. As the bill was reported from the committee, with no executive action on the part of the Secretary, the bill would have severely penalized dairymen, livestock feeders who do not raise their own feed, and, particularly, poultry producers. Inasmuch as no executive action had been taken, I voted against the bill.

In fact, I do not think the bill is going to do what its advocates think it will, anyway.

I wish to say—and my saying it may save a little discussion on the floor, if I announce it now—that I had offered an amendment on dairy price supports, and it was printed. It would establish for the 1961 marketing year a support price for manufacturing milk at \$3.35 a hundredweight, and for butterfat at 62 cents a pound. I had intended to offer that amendment today.

However, I am advised that either this afternoon or certainly not later than tomorrow morning—but probably this afternoon—the Secretary of Agriculture will announce the new support prices for dairy products, and they will be very satisfactory prices. They will offset, I am sure, the increased cost to the dairymen which this bill would induce when it becomes law, if it works. If it does not work, it would not make much difference.

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

Mr. AIKEN. So, Mr. President, this afternoon I expect the Secretary will announce the support levels for manufacturing milk and butterfat for the rest of this year. Therefore, since those levels will be satisfactory, I shall not offer the amendment which I had printed.

However, that is not going to help the poultryman or the cattle feeder or the turkey raiser who does not raise his own feed; he still will have the problem to meet. In other words, the money will be taken away from the poultryman and will be given to the feed grower.

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

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

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not know to whom to yield first; but I think the Senator from Minnesota was on his feet some time ago. After yielding to him, I shall yield next to the Senator from Florida, and thereafter I shall yield to the Senator from Kentucky—in that order.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, Mr. President, in view of the concern the Senator from South Dakota—who is not now in the Chamber—had over counties being involved in the yield, in averaging out the yield, I wanted to say that that is provided for in the bill, and he does not need to be too much concerned about that.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And I think the Senator from Vermont was very helpful in the discussion on that particular point.

But I wanted to direct my remarks to my good friend, the Senator from West Virginia. I know that a lot of dairy products and a lot of chickens are produced in West Virginia; but, without being unkind, I wish to say that I think more are produced in Minnesota. The price of broilers in my State, this year, has been at levels such as have not existed since the depths of the depression; and hundreds of chicken raisers were going out of business, one after another.

Furthermore, Minnesota is one of the largest egg-producing States in the Union; and Minnesota is the second largest turkey producing State in the Union—exceeded only by California. I saw the price of feed grains, for feeding turkeys and chickens, at unprecedented lows since the days of the depression, and farmers in the turkey business and in the broiler business were going out of business by the hundreds.

Let me say there is a relationship between a fair price for feed and a fair price for broilers and a fair price for turkeys and a fair price for ducks and a fair price for eggs—for farm production of that kind; and it is not an unconscionable price.

We are trying to say that we like to buy cheap and sell high; that those who are in areas where the producers do not produce enough feed to take care of their poultry would like to have feed as cheap as they can possibly get it, and would like to sell their poultry for as high a price as they can possibly obtain.

Let me say very frankly that the poultry industry in this country has suffered because of low feed prices, not high feed prices.

The egg industry has suffered because of low feed prices, not high feed prices. The bill offers a reasonable balance. I am with the Senator from Vermont—I am not sure this bill is going to do all that its advocates think it is going to do. I think it is highly problematical as to whether it will. But I do not think anybody can justify some of the farmers in our country, as in my State, producing wheat and oats for 40 cents a bushel.

I heard the Senator from North Dakota talk about corn. I saw top grade corn sell in Minnesota for 80 cents a bushel, and I did not see a chicken raiser get rich—not one. I saw good poultry sell for 8 or 9 cents a pound. I saw grade A eggs selling for 18 cents a dozen.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not have the right to yield the floor.

I say to the Senator from West Virginia, please do not oppose the bill on the basis that because it may result in an increase in feed prices to the chicken growers in his State, therefore he should vote against it. I predict that if we get feed prices on a reasonable basis—not at a high cost, but lower than it has been before—the result will be beneficial, because when cheap feed grains are available, everybody goes into the chicken and turkey business, and the next thing we know, everybody is losing money.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not think I can yield for general debate, under the rules. I hope when I yield it will be for very short statements. But I know how entrancing a discussion of agricultural programs is. The situation has not changed much in the last 20 years. Also, views have not changed too much in the last 40 years. If one reads the debates of 40 years ago, I think he will find the same arguments were made then.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I said I would yield to the Senator from Florida next.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will try to be mindful of the suggestion just made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Will the Senator advise us whether or not an advance in the support price for processed milk products would be helpful to dairies in large parts of the Nation that produce milk for sale as liquid milk, rather than for milk products?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the result of raising the support price for manufacturing milk and butterfat will have the effect of bringing the prices of milk produced for manufacturing purposes more nearly in line with blended prices paid in the marketing order areas than they are now.

The reason why there is such a wide diversity in the price of milk paid in different areas is that in certain parts of the country the price for manufacturing milk will drop in the spring of the year. The price of class I milk, or milk for home consumption, does not vary to any marked extent across the country nor is it affected seasonally as much as manufacturing milk. I think it is probably as high in Florida as anywhere. I would say the price of class I milk is \$1 more per hundredweight there than in Chicago or Minneapolis or Boston.

Mr. HOLLAND. My impression has been, from talking with dairymen in Florida—and I know this applies to many areas where milk is produced for consumption as milk or cream—that they are not helped in any way by an increase in the support price for milk for manufactured milk products, such as is proposed, and that if this bill were passed, they would be confronted by an increased feed cost without having any commensurate relief of the type mentioned by the Senator from Vermont, which would grow out of the increased processed milk products price. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Florida is absolutely correct, if his State does not intend to produce manufacturing milk. Dairy farmers in his State

sell a large percentage of their milk as class I milk, and, naturally, their blended price is higher. I think the dairymen of Florida have less to gain than the dairymen of almost any other part of the country by having the support price for manufacturing milk raised.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator follow that statement by saying the dairyman of Florida would have more to lose?

Mr. AIKEN. His costs will go up, if this bill should work.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does not a milk marketing order take into consideration costs? Milk marketing orders are the reason why the price of milk in Florida is high.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know what the milk formulas call for over most of the country. In the Boston marketing area, the price of grain is given one-sixth of the total weight. So if the feed price went up \$6 a ton, the dairyman, under the formula, could recover \$1.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The change varies in different parts of the country.

Mr. AIKEN. The price of feed grain may have a large weighting in Florida.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. So far as the Senator from Florida knows, there is only one milk marketing agreement in Florida, and that is in the Miami milk shed marketing area; but the milk prices for Orlando, Tampa, Jacksonville, St. Petersburg, Pensacola, and various other areas are not affected by milk marketing agreements. I think that situation is general throughout the South and throughout the West, and that the dairy people in large parts of the Nation would be adversely affected by an increased cost of feed, without having any benefit whatever from the proposed change in the support price of milk for processed products.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and then the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. I hope my questions will not be long, but, because of the inquiry directed by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], I think I shall have to explain the amendment I proposed in my separate views included in the committee report.

I hope I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLENDER]. I voted to report the bill, and I shall vote for the bill. We owe a great debt to the chairman of the committee for the work he has done on the bill.

I suggested, in my individual views, that to induce more farmers to enter the program, because it is a voluntary program, we should provide that farms which produced no more than 30 acres—my amendment will be changed

to 20 acres—could include their entire production of 20 acres under the terms of the bill. As reported, only a 30-percent acreage reduction could be made.

The reason I make this proposal, may I say to the Senator from New York and to members of the committee, is to make acreage reduction economic and attractive to small farmers—and reduction is the purpose of the bill. I obtained the latest available statistics from the Bureau of the Census. They showed that in 1954 more than one-half of our farms produced less than 20 acres of corn. About 2,800,000 farms produced corn in that year, and 1,600,000 of the total had corn acreages of 20 acres or less.

If I may argue my case for a moment to the members of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, and to the chairman, I think we all agree that if this bill is to work—it being a voluntary bill—it must induce farmers to cooperate, and withdraw feed grains acreage from production. We know that farmers are intelligent and must look after their best interests, as is proper. They will choose to enter a farm program, if it is good farming to do so. We have only to remember that in 1958, when we passed a corn bill, farmers looked that bill over, and, as several of us had predicted on the floor, instead of lowering production, they raised production. Corn production in 1960 was nearly 600 million bushels above production in 1958, the year we passed the bill.

We must ask, what in this bill will induce farmers to cooperate? The administration has urged its method in section 3 of the House bill. It would coerce cooperation by threatening to lower the price on surplus stocks.

I do not believe this should be permitted. It could be a coercive measure, on the part of the Federal Government, and would absolutely contradict the voluntary character of the bill.

A second way, which I propose, would secure, I believe, larger cooperation from small farmers. As I have said, more than one-half of the corn farms produce less than 20 acres. My proposed amendment would say to these farmers, "you may put your entire acreage under the bill's provisions." It may be uneconomical for such a farmer to reduce his 20 or 15 acres by 30 percent. The amendment I propose, permitting any farmer to reduce production by 20 acres or by 30 percent, whichever is larger, would be of great help.

I will offer such an amendment and I hope the distinguished chairman will consider it. I say to Senators that unless there is some way to induce the farmers, in good sense and for practical reasons, to enter the program, we may end, as we did in 1958, by paying the costs of this program, with no reduction in production.

I believe my amendment will provide one inducement. The House adopted such an amendment. I hope the chairman will consider it.

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

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to pursue further the thought raised by the Senator from Kentucky, whether the provisions of the bill recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture are of a nature which will make participation voluntary or compulsory.

I read the report and I read the testimony which was given before the committee. Repeatedly it was emphasized, with respect to the House bill, that the virtue of the bill resided in the fact that the farmer was at liberty to participate or not to participate. The Secretary of Agriculture in testifying emphasized that fact.

Based upon this, I assume the proponents recognize the significance of freedom of action on the part of our farmers. They wish the farmer to be free. They do not wish to have the farmer placed in a straitjacket. Therefore they said, "This is a voluntary plan."

However, in reading the House report I find certain language on page 8, the subparagraph identified as 4:

The Commodity Credit Corporation would be authorized to sell during the marketing year for the 1961 crop, at current market prices, as much grain as the successful management of this feed grain program requires.

Then there is this startling statement:

The knowledge that these stocks could be placed on the market would encourage producers to participate in the program rather than gamble on market prices.

The question is, Is it a voluntary program or is it one under which subtle coercion and compulsion are to be practiced? In the one breath it is said:

We will allow you to enter if you wish, or to remain out.

In the next breath it is said:

But if you do not enter we will dump into the market surplus feed grains to such an extent that they will depress the market price and compel you to participate.

Mr. AIKEN. I reply to the Senator from Ohio by saying that that provision is not in the Senate bill at all, as reported by the committee. The Senator refers to section 3 as a subtle means of coercion to force farmers into the program. I would amend that by saying it is not so subtle a means. It is not very subtle at all. It is in the original bill for the purpose of forcing farmers into the program, when otherwise they would not participate, by saying, "If you go ahead and raise your crops without cooperating in the program we will put the price so low that you will lose money on what you raise."

It is as simple as that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, when the "voluntary" label is attached to the proposal, it is sought to mislead the farmer, because in truth this is a compulsory, straitjacket program, and in effect it is declared, "Unless you join we will ruin you by the prices which you will get while you remain outside the operation of the proposal."

Mr. AIKEN. The Senate committee did not approve that proviso. The chairman strongly opposed it. I do not believe there was much support for it.

There may have been some support, but it was not very vocal.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that, and I am in thorough concurrence.

There is one further thought I should like to express, if the Senator from Vermont will yield further.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we begin to compel a farmer, as a part of his right to operate, to enter this program, and thus have him regulated by Government, does it not follow that the time will come when we will apply compulsion to other segments of the economy by trying to fix the floor of income and the ceiling of income?

Mr. AIKEN. When one resorts to compulsion one cannot stop with a single class of farmers. It is very doubtful that one could stop with farmers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that the House bill which has been passed attempted to soften the impact of the compulsion by saying, "We will not dump absolutely everything and let the market seek its level. We will not permit the dumped goods to be sold at less than 83 percent of the support price fixed at \$1.20."

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I yield to the chairman of the committee, who, I think, wishes to reply.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the provision in the House bill. It has been softened to the extent the distinguished Senator from Ohio has mentioned; no grain could be sold for less than 83 percent of the support price.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, I say to the Senator from Louisiana that in principle, though a floor has been established, the program still involves compulsion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would judge it to be so.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the purpose, I believe.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to leave one thought with the Senate, if the Senator from Vermont will yield further. There is far greater significance in the provisions of the House bill than is generally understood. The bill contemplates putting a straitjacket on the farmer, by saying, "Unless you join this program, we will so manipulate the prices that you will be compelled to come in and accept what we propose, whether you wish to do so or not."

This proposal deals with liberty. I suggest to those who are promoting it that they are meddling with one of the fundamental liberties about which we have spoken in our country.

I commend the Senator from Vermont for the position which he has taken in regard to the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. As I said to the Senator from Ohio before, it would be a not-so-subtle form of persuasion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I used the word "subtle." I think it is insulting to the farmers.

Mr. AIKEN. It had a purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND rose.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Florida desire to have me yield to him at

this time? I rose to speak for possibly 10 minutes. I could conclude my remarks, and then yield the floor.

As I started to say, the bill before us is decidedly better than the one which was passed by the House yesterday. As I said before, I give the chairman of the committee a great deal of credit for the improvement. However, I do not believe even this bill would be workable. If it did work, it would be bound to raise prices and costs to dairymen, poultrymen, and livestock feeders who do not produce their own grain. It may be that prices should be raised to consumers. I think the farmer has been subsidizing consumers for a long time, and it is about time to equalize the burden.

I am a little disturbed, however, that in considering the farm situation, we are continually resorting to superficial remedies of temporary conditions rather than taking into account the long-range, basic problems which we must face. As has already been pointed out, the situation today is that there is a huge supply of wheat in this country. I think we could well reduce our supply of wheat by a billion bushels and still have safe reserves left over. It may be that at this time we have a surplus of possibly 500 million bushels of feed grains, primarily corn and grain sorghum. But I do not look on that surplus as alarmingly as some people do. We are increasing our use of feed grains in this country by more than 200 million bushels a year. We are now feeding at the rate of about 450 million bushels of grain a month. Suppose we have 500 million bushels more than a normal safe carryover in this country. That amount represents only a month of feed supply at existing rates of feeding.

It has been pointed out that there are very large supplies on hand today. Of course there are. We must have such supplies, because between now and next November we shall probably feed in the neighborhood of 3 3/4 to 4 billion bushels of the grain which is now on hand, and that use will not make us look so bad off.

Certainly we have not more than 2 or 3 months' supply over and above what would normally be a safe requirement on hand at the present time.

As the Senator from North Dakota has pointed out, we are considering the feed bill at the request of the administration before we consider the wheat bill, because much of the wheat is already planted, and if legislation can be enacted quickly, we might do something about reducing the feed supply in this country for the coming year.

The bill has for its purposes, first, to raise the price of feed grains, and second, to retire land in order to prevent the production of possible surpluses. I use the word "possible" because I am not at all sure that there will be surpluses. We have just gone through two of the finest grain growing seasons that this country has ever known. There have been bad spots, such as in the Dakotas in 1959, I believe, because of drought. We shall have bad spots in other years; but we have gone through two of the finest growing seasons we have ever known.

The bill provides that in return for a farmer taking 30 percent of his grain acreage out of production, he will receive part payment in kind and part payment in cash.

I worked out some figures, with which I shall not burden the Senate. I do not think the grain grower himself will do any more than break even by participating in this proposed program, but that could be a matter of opinion.

I should like to talk for the next 5 minutes or so about the effect upon our entire economy of drastic reductions in farm production of this country. I am frankly scared of any proposal that seeks very heavy reductions in the production of our farm commodities. Suppose we cut our grain production 30 percent; suppose we cut all farm production a certain percentage; such action would not affect merely the 10 percent or less of the people who produce these crops on the farm; it would affect approximately one-third of the entire labor force of this country, because that percentage of our labor force is engaged in processing and distributing food and fiber supplies for our cities. That is why the consumer is dependent on the farm.

If it were not for the farm market, we would find unemployment reaching terrific proportions at this time. In spite of the fact that practically all our meats and poultry products are transported by truck today, 15½ percent of the tonnage carried by railroads is made up of farm commodities.

With respect to gas and oil, not only is a good share of the transportation of gas and oil to the farm, but 13 percent of all petroleum products used in this country are used on the farm today.

Two years ago 43 percent of all the cargo carried by our merchant marine consisted of farm commodities. Today that percentage is undoubtedly near 50 percent.

Hundreds of thousands of people are engaged in the processing, handling, packaging, and merchandising of farm commodities. So let us have it in mind that when we cut down drastically on the production of farm commodities, we are not only cutting down on the 10 percent of the people who live on farms, we are cutting down on approximately 35 percent of our entire population in this country.

I should like to say something about the effect of grain prices on livestock production.

Last year, after the good crop year of 1959 with unlimited production we had sufficient increase in feed grains in this country so that in 1960 the support price of corn dropped from \$1.12 to \$1.06 a bushel. One might have believed that that decreased price would encourage increased feeding of meat animals and other stock. What happened was this: Cattle numbers did increase 1 percent, but the top market in Chicago yesterday, I noticed, was \$28 a hundred—not too bad. But hog numbers were reduced 6 percent. From January 1, 1960, to January 1, 1961, hog numbers went down 6 percent, notwithstanding the lower costs of corn.

In the same year sheep numbers went down 1 percent and chickens were down 3 percent.

Since my friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], has mentioned turkeys, I invite his attention to the fact that the turkey producers are apparently the culprits in this picture, because on January 1 they had evidently responded to low grain prices and had 21 percent more turkeys on hand than they did the year before.

However, adding the entire meat supply together, the indications now are that the per capita supply of meats in this country for this year will be one pound less than it was last year. So anyone can give any answer he chooses to that problem. But certainly lower prices last year did not over-encourage meat production, at least fast enough to keep up with the increase in population.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator state to what the one pound that he referred to relates? What would be the magnitude of production?

Mr. AIKEN. I am reading from my notes, which say that the per capita meat supply in the 1961 meat production went down 1 percent from the 1960 level. In 1960 the supply of meat available to the average American was 161.7 pounds. In 1961 the Department's experts believe that the figure will drop 1 pound or more.

Then I have a note which states that this should be very discouraging news to the unemployed and the low-income people who are struggling hard enough now to get money with which to pay for a little meat. I will not burden the Senator with the rest of my notes. However, we do have a meat situation which indicates that we had better go very slow in reducing the production of feed grains in this country.

Some people say we have too much grain. The President sent a message to Congress on the 16th of February in which he said:

The existing program has failed. It has resulted in accumulating burdensome and dangerous surpluses mainly of commodities for which there is no adequate demand even under our expanded programs of providing food for those in need.

That statement was in the President's message. By coincidence, on the same day, another message was sent to Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture, in which he asked for authority to export \$2 billion worth more of our surplus food commodities overseas between now and the 31st of December 1961, believing that the \$2 billion worth was needed to fill orders which we might get from overseas. This food would be sold under title I of Public Law 480, of which my friend the senior Senator from Kansas was the original sponsor, I believe.

If we have no further outlet for these commodities anywhere, it would hardly seem necessary to ask for authority to sell \$2 billion worth more of them overseas.

I believe that the Secretary, rather than the President, is right, and that

there is a market for these commodities overseas so long as they are sold on terms that make it possible for countries in need to purchase them from us. Those terms, of course, should be long-term payments, or possibly we should take payments in the currency of the countries involved. Even if we take foreign currency in payment we would be able to use it for purposes for which we would otherwise appropriate dollars to spend in those countries. So it appears that there is a market overseas. I do not believe we should be talking about a 30-percent reduction in feed grains, when the requirement for them is growing.

I have talked with people from other countries. They are trying desperately to produce enough food for their needs. They do not understand our making so much fuss because we have all we need and a little besides. They realize that the independence of people depends on having enough food.

If anyone needs any proof of that statement, it can be pointed out that in every country in the world in which the government controls the people, there is a food shortage today. It is all very well to say we should starve them into rebellion against their government. It does not work out that way. People who are hungry do not rebel against their government. Russia is having a food shortage today and cannot supply enough meat to go with potatoes, cornmeal, and so forth. China is having desperate trouble because of a shortage of food. No government ever had any greater control over its people than the Chinese Government has over its people. That statement can also be made with respect to Cuba.

So I say that a country which has plenty of food or has all it needs and some besides, is far less likely to fall under the control of a totalitarian government than a country which has barely enough, or possibly has a shortage of food.

The President pointed out in his message that if we do not do something to cut production, we will have to provide storage for 200 million to 250 million bushels more of feed grains. What is wrong with that? We would have to do that anyway, because we are using 200 million to 250 million bushels more each year. We have a great deal of grain, and we must have a place to store it. To object to having grain because it requires storage space is like saying we should do away with money because it requires our buying pocketbooks to put the money in. The same line of reasoning seems to apply.

We are a growing country. As we grow we must have more storage. The storage business is a multibillion dollar business. It is not only corn storage that we are concerned with. There is also cold storage, and other forms of storage.

If we want to bring food supply and demand into balance in this country, it is possible to do it without resorting to compulsion or anything of that kind. We can do it by seeing to it, for example, that all the needy and deserving people in America are not deprived of adequate

diets merely because they are poor and needy. If I remember correctly, I read in the papers yesterday that there are 6 million families in this country who have an income of less than \$2,500 a year, which would mean something like \$700 per capita.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I remember that when a similar agricultural bill was before the Senate recently it was estimated that the carrying charges on surplus commodities were \$500 million a year, or approximately \$1½ million a day. Is the Senator in a position to tell us whether that figure has gone up?

Mr. AIKEN. That is probably true. That is a charge against the taxpayers. If the taxpayers were not paying it, private industry would be paying it.

Mr. BUSH. That is, if we had the surplus.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I have brought the storage business into the picture to show what a tremendous business it is in this country. The storing of surplus commodities for the Federal Government is only a small part of it.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator believe that if the bill is passed it would have the effect of reducing the heavy burden of the storage problem, or increasing it?

Mr. AIKEN. I doubt if there would be much of a change because of the passage of the pending bill. If we give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to dispose of \$2 billion worth of surplus commodities—

Mr. BUSH. That is another matter, though.

Mr. AIKEN. To countries overseas, that would reduce the need for storage in this country. I do not know how much storage the Senator has in his State. In some States it is quite considerable in amount. A good many people in some communities depend on that business. If it were decreased, there would be a good many people who would be writing to their Senators and Representatives urging them not to ruin their communities.

Mr. BUSH. I would be glad to turn in our storage business if everyone else would turn in his, and we could get rid of the problem.

Mr. AIKEN. I rather think that the per capita loss from storage would not mean as much to Connecticut as it would to other States, although I believe the Senator's State does have much cold storage business.

Mr. BUSH. On the other hand, our share in carrying it on a per capita basis is one of the highest.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe there are three ways in which we can bring supply and demand into balance and keep them in balance: First, by making certain that all the needy and deserving people in America are not deprived of adequate diets simply because they are poor and needy. Next, we can sell a reasonable part of our so-called surpluses to people in other lands on generous terms of payment. And, third, we can continue our research into the fields of utilization where the potential mar-

ket is still strong and underdeveloped. I am certain that further development can be made in that field.

If we really want to improve farm income, we can enact legislation which will stop the merciless harassment of farm cooperatives by the Department of Justice whenever farmers try to use their bargaining power to an effective degree.

We all know that whenever farmers try to reduce the spread between themselves and the consumers, they promptly find themselves haled before the bar of justice. Sometimes their competition goes before the bar of justice, but whenever a business is charged with unfair competition, it pays a \$5,000 fine and then goes on to do a billion-dollar business. Farmers cannot do that.

We can broaden our Marketing Agreement Act so as to give farmers an opportunity to use their bargaining power, which they would normally have, and which they normally ought to have.

If we go too far in the direction of restricted farm production, we can take a few billion dollars off our gross national product. We can put 2 or 3 million more people out of work. But we cannot improve our economy by walking backward.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield? I should like to address two or three inquiries to the Senator from Vermont, who is so very well informed on this subject, before he concludes his remarks.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I previously asked the Senator about the feed grain bill from the point of view of the consumer and from the point of view of stock, dairy, and poultry producers. From his replies, I gained the impression that the bill would have an adverse effect on them. There is a question as to the extent. Now I wish to ask the Senator about the corn farmers themselves.

It is my recollection that corn farmers never accepted—indeed, they voted against—acreage allotments for their crops. Is that not correct?

Mr. AIKEN. As I recall, in the last year acreage allotments were in effect, actually only about 8 percent of all corn plantings was in compliance with acreage allotments. Of course, they did not have a marketing penalty. But there was only a small percentage of them who complied with the allotments.

I believe the corn situation has improved materially. In fact, in 1960, according to the Department of Agriculture, the net income of the corn producers was up materially. I have felt, since we enacted legislation affecting corn and cotton 2 years ago, that we ought to give both those programs a chance to be tried, particularly the cotton program. I know there have been some changes in the cotton support program. I am a little fearful of the result, because we have recovered our cotton business in the world and in this country, too. I certainly hope that no action which has been taken will have any adverse effect upon the cotton industry of this country, but my fingers are crossed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont further yield,

to permit me to add to what he has said with respect to the corn bill?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana for that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. The corn farmers not only did not comply; they would never accept strict acreage controls, as was the case with cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. One of the bad things which has occurred in the last 4 or 5 years is that even noncompliers were given a good support price. In the case of cotton and other commodities, a penalty was imposed. However, in the case of corn, when acreage allotments were in effect noncompliers received a support price only slightly lower than compliers.

The point I wish to emphasize is that the corn growers have never tried, in my humble judgment, to make the law work as we intended it. Even noncompliers, as the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, had no penalties imposed; instead, they were paid a fair support price.

Mr. KEATING. I have a parochial interest in consumers and also in poultry and dairy producers, who are of such great importance to the economy of my State. This question does not affect the economy of my State, but my recollection is that the corn farmers themselves voted against virtually the very program which the bill will institute. Am I incorrect?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from New York is incorrect. What happened was that 2 years ago the law was changed and provided for a support price equal to 90 percent of the average of the last 3 years, with no acreage limitations, and, of course, with a minimum of 65 percent of parity.

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to have this matter clarified.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I think that what the Senator from New York may be thinking of is that after we passed the corn bill in 1958, a referendum was held among the farmers, and they voted against allotments.

Mr. AIKEN. But are we not providing allotments in the bill?

Mr. COOPER. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not necessarily. It is optional; it is a voluntary program.

Mr. AIKEN. We are giving farmers the right to put plantings in the soil bank, up to 30 percent of their average planting of the last 2 years. In fact, if they put any of their planting in the soil bank, they will have to put in 30 percent.

Mr. KEATING. Why is this a 1-year program? Is it simply a test program? Why is it for only 1 year?

Mr. AIKEN. I have the feeling that the President plans to send to Congress a message requesting certain long-range programs, and the bill now being considered is in the nature of a stopgap. With respect to the support price for manufacturing milk, which the Secretary of Agriculture will announce, I expect this afternoon, the dairy farmers in New York undoubtedly will be quite happy. In the case of the New York dairymen, the increase in the price of

manufacturing milk will more than offset the increased cost due to this bit of proposed legislation, assuming it becomes law.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator think that the action expected to be taken this afternoon by the Secretary of Agriculture is in any way significant in connection with the timing of our voting on the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. Several Members of the Senate have for some time been urging the Secretary to reach a decision, because we felt that the longer he delayed, the more the dealers would profit, and the less the farmers would get from any possible price increase.

Mr. KEATING. I think an increase in the dairy price support is desirable. The industry is hard pressed, but it will be harder pressed if the feed grain bill passes. I wondered whether the timing of this action was a mere coincidence, or whether it had some connection with our action on this bill. I am naive about these things.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator from Vermont will permit me to answer the question further, I do not think the expected action by the Secretary has anything to do with the action being taken on the bill, because the price of grain may go up if we pass the bill, and the Secretary necessarily will have to take that fact into consideration in fixing the price of raw milk.

Mr. KEATING. But the price of grain will not go up if we do not pass the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator made a statement a while ago about the vast amount of feed grain which was disappearing in comparison with the past 2 years. I placed in the RECORD yesterday a statement indicating that the total disappearance from 1955 to 1961 has increased by 25 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. We are using a billion bushels more a year than we were 4 years ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the total supply has increased at the rate of 42.6 percent, and the carryover for 1961 will be in the neighborhood of 2 billion bushels of corn only, in contrast to a 1954-58 average of 1,200 million.

So this bill seeks to curtail the production or prevent the production of more of these grains, because increased production—that is to say, to have a greater supply—would further aggravate the situation.

It is my considered judgment—and I have had 25 years of experience on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—that if we keep piling up these feed grains to such excesses, that will be an invitation for more people to go into the poultry business and will invite more people to go into the turkey business, and will invite more people to go into the cattle business, and that will result ultimately in hurting those who now are in those businesses. I think there is no doubt about that. The record has shown that in the past.

That is why I am so anxious to put this bill through, so that we can curtail the production of feed grains to the extent of, let us say, 500 million to 700 mil-

lion bushels this year. If we can reach that goal, then we can soon pass a bill—probably before May—that would put corn and other feed grains on the same basis as is the case with cotton and other supported crops. By that, I mean simply this: If a corn producer desires to have price support from the Government, he should be willing to curtail his acreage to the extent necessary, so as to put supply and demand more in balance.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, following what the Senator has said, I wish to state that I am not even afraid of a 2-billion-bushel grain surplus in this country, when we are using it at the rate of nearly 500 million bushels a month. At that rate, 2 billion bushels is only a 4-month supply ahead. I would far rather take a chance on a 2-billion-bushel surplus than on a 200-million-bushel shortage. The former is much safer.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield, so that I may comment on the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I have great respect for the long tenure of the Senator from Louisiana as chairman of the committee and as an expert in this field. But it seems to me he makes a curious argument when he says this bill is good because it will make going into the poultry business or into the dairy business so unattractive that others will not go into it, and therefore it will keep in that business those now in it, because it will raise the price of feed to the poultry raisers. The Senator from Louisiana thinks that by raising the price of feed to the poultry raisers and making it a less attractive industry, others will not go into that industry.

Mr. ELLENDER. It will keep others out; that is the point.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me that is a peculiar line of reasoning.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may ask a question?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President. I have the floor. If I may yield for the purpose requested, without losing the floor, I shall be glad to have the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] impart wisdom to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wonder whether the Senator from Louisiana would also feel that if we were to enact a law which would double the price of fertilizer that is used for cotton, that would solve the cotton surplus problem.

Mr. KEATING. I wonder how the Senator from Louisiana would comment on that point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If we accept the line of reasoning that we can control the price of poultry by raising the price of feed, and thus make the poultry business unprofitable, does the Senator from Louisiana think that, similarly, we could, by enacting a law which would double the price of fertilizer that is used for cotton, solve the cotton problem?

Mr. ELLENDER. I think the two are not comparable.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I think the only difference

between them is that one affects Louisiana and the other affects some other areas.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think the Senator from Vermont has served on the committee for almost as long a period as I have.

Mr. AIKEN. For 4 years less.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the price of feed grains decreases ultimately the business is less attractive to the poultry producers or to the dairy producers; there is no doubt about that.

This bill will curtail the production of feed grains for this year, and will try to get it more in line with demand. After this bill is enacted, it is our hope to pass another bill—a long-range bill—which would create a situation whereby we could reduce the feed grain acreage to the point where we shall try to keep supply and demand more in line. That is what we are trying to do. If we do not do that, the feed grain market will continue to deteriorate, and prices will continue to go lower and lower; and that is bound to invite more people to go into the pig-raising business and the poultry-raising business, and is bound to demoralize the entire livestock industry, in my humble judgment. There is no doubt about that, in my mind.

We often hear it said, "The cattle people are making out fine, because of the price supports." But if it were not for the fact that we have a program to stabilize the price of the grain, there would be no telling what the price of beef would go down to. But the fact that we have a stable price on the commodity those animals consume has a tendency to stabilize the prices in that industry. And that is what we are trying to do in this case.

In other words, as I pointed out a while ago, the increase in total disappearance from 1955 has been 25 percent, but the increase in the total supply has been 42.6 percent, so that the carryover has been increasing constantly each year.

Let us consider the increases in the past few years. The carryover was 1,202 million bushels for the period 1954-58. In 1958, it was 1,470 million bushels. In 1959, it was 1,530 million bushels. In 1960, it was 1,789 million bushels. And in 1961, it was 2 billion bushels. Unless we stop that trend, the price of grain is bound to be depressed, and in that event there may be more and more farmers going into the business of raising poultry and raising cattle or what-have-you; and in my opinion that will demoralize the whole industry.

Mr. AIKEN. Well, we had a need for more than a billion bushels of additional carryover, just to take care of the increased use in the last 5 years.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to comment on the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana. I still feel that if his line of reasoning—namely, that the situation can be cared for by raising the cost of production of a commodity—is correct, and it is true of one, it is true of another, and if it will work

for feed grains it will work for cotton by raising the price of the fertilizer that is used for the production of cotton. But I disagree with the Senator's reasoning on both.

I believe that if the Senator will examine the historical record of these commodities he will find this to be true: The poultry industry has been in the process of increasing its production in the last 6 months of 1960 and in 1961. Why are those producers increasing their production? They are doing so because in the preceding 12-month period that business was profitable and they were making money; and inasmuch as they were making money from the production of eggs and inasmuch as the price of eggs was higher and the price of broilers was higher, they increased their production.

By the same line of reasoning, why did the prices go down a couple years ago? They went down then because those producers were operating at full capacity. Then they began losing money—they cut back their production, and then prices stabilized.

I venture to say that, with or without the enactment of this bill, even though the price of corn is raised to \$1.20, which would increase the cost of feed, we will find an increased production on hogs and turkeys next year—not because of the increase or decrease in the cost of feed, but because there has been profitable production in the past year, and, human nature being what it is, the farmers will increase their production. That is the reason why there will be increased production, and not because of any superiority of the wisdom of any bureaucrat in Washington.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Delaware was not present in the Chamber when I referred to the increase and decrease in production of meat animals. As the Senator from Delaware knows, the support price of corn was dropped from \$1.12 to \$1.06 for the year 1960; but on January 1, 1961, in spite of the low price for grain, cattle numbers had increased only 1 percent, and hog numbers had dropped 6 percent, coincidentally with the lower price of feed. Sheep numbers were down 1 percent and chicken numbers were down 3 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the point I am making. Hog and pork prices having been at a profitable level for the past 12 months, I venture to say, even with the enactment of this bill and the raising of the support price of grain and feed prices thus being increased, we will still find increased production next year. If the farmers then lose money they will in the succeeding years cut back production again.

Someday Congress is going to wake up to the fact that the law of supply and demand cannot be regulated out of Washington, either on agricultural commodities or in any other field, and the more we attempt to do this the greater will be the loss to the taxpayers and to the very industries we are trying to help.

Besides these points, we must not overlook the fact that the great danger

inherent in this bill is its trend toward Government control over American agriculture. For that reason alone the bill should not be defeated.

I do not think the two factors will be found to be related, except that, as feed prices are raised and cattle or hog operations become unprofitable, and as those farmers are forced into semibankruptcy, they will be forced out of business, just as, if title 3 were put back into the bill, as the Senator from Vermont pointed out before, the Secretary of Agriculture could force American farmers under the program, with the alternative of their going bankrupt if they stayed out.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield now to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I was interested in the extent of the price increase in milk and butterfat contemplated by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Senator said it would take up the increased cost of feed which is contemplated by the bill. Would it also take up the increased price which the producers have been strongly contending for to make their operations profitable?

Mr. AIKEN. I could not answer the Senator from New York with any great degree of accuracy. I must say that I have not used my pencil in ascertaining whether the increased support price for manufacturing milk which the Secretary said he would announce this afternoon would more than offset the increased cost of dairy feed, assuming the bill works as its sponsors hope it will work. So it is very difficult to answer the question.

I am sure the support level which the Secretary will announce will make the dairymen of New York State quite happy, because in New York there is class C milk, as the Senator knows, which goes down to pretty low levels during a few months of the year. I think the dairymen of New York State will be happy on that score, and they will find that the blended price for New York will come into line with the price received in New England and other areas much better than it has in the past few months.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for that information. I am confident the Senator's influence has been very strong, in a constructive way, in this whole effort.

What does the Senator assume will be the price to the ultimate consumer as a result of the increase? I ask that question because in New York our milk producers in the milkshed are in one part of the State. Then there are the large cities, which are full of milk consumers. We must make a constant effort to hold a balance between the two.

Mr. AIKEN. The support price will not apply to class I milk, which is the milk delivered to the consumer's doorstep or to restaurants. It will be applied to manufacturing milk, which, in effect, when we get down to class C, is surplus milk. The Secretary also will set a price for butterfat, but I would not expect that the consumer will find any great

change in the price of butter, because butter has held up in price. It went up half a cent yesterday in New York. It was in the neighborhood of 62 cents per pound and it has been close to that all winter long. Now we are coming into the flush season when the price would normally drop 3 or 4 cents a pound.

I should say that the effect of the Secretary's order would be to prevent a sharp drop in the price to the farmer, rather than an increase in price to the consumer. At least, I hope it will work that way.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator knows how persons like myself greatly respect his views on this subject. Notwithstanding the Secretary's proposed action, the Senator is still opposed to this bill, and feels that it is an improvident and unwise way in which to proceed. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Secretary's action this afternoon in fixing prices for manufacturing milk will soften the effects of this bill. However, I voted against the bill in committee. The poultrymen and the cattle feeders who do not raise all their own feed will still be left on the outside, in a pretty vulnerable position to suffer losses. Therefore, in order to be in a consistent position, I expect to vote against the bill. However, I give the Secretary credit for having tried to do a good job. I give the chairman of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee credit for having greatly improved the situation over what it might have been. We will hope for the best.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to identify myself with the views of my colleague.

Mr. AIKEN. From the standpoint of our geographical position, I feel that the bill still would affect us adversely rather than improve the situation.

Mr. JAVITS. When the Senator says "affect us adversely," and "improve the situation," he means that the bill and the Secretary's order, taken together, on balance, will affect us more adversely than if we did not have either. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Poultry raising is a very important industry in the Northeast. We also fatten a great many cattle and buy corn for that purpose. So I think, all facts considered, in spite of higher support for manufacturing milk, we probably would not be in an improved situation. However, I give the Secretary and the chairman of the committee full credit for having improved the legislative situation materially; and my opposition to the bill, I must say, is not as strong as it was yesterday or the day before.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one other comment on that particular point?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The increase in support price for dairy products will not help the poultry people, will it?

Mr. AIKEN. Not a bit.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me significant, let me say in reply to the argument made by the distinguished Senator

from Louisiana, that I have not received any mail or communications from the poultry producers saying that they want to see this bill passed. The poultry raisers know the facts, and they know that to raise feed costs is detrimental to their position, notwithstanding the position taken by the Senator from Louisiana that the proposal to raise the price will keep other people out of the poultry business. I do not think that is an argument which the poultry producers will accept.

I thank my friend from Vermont. Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have used the 8 or 10 minutes I announced

I would use when I rose. I now yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

SOUTH DAKOTA CROP AND LIVESTOCK REPORTING SERVICE, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., February 28, 1961.

HON. FRANCIS CASE, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Yield data on feed grains requested in your wire to Mr. Roy Potas are enclosed. However, 1960 county estimates are not yet available. Tentative yields for 10 representative counties for 1960 are shown. The 3-year and 5-year average yields are shown only for these 10 counties and the State. The 1960 county estimates will be sent to you as soon as they become available.

Yield data for corn are shown separately for corn for all purposes and for grain. The yield of corn for all purposes includes an allowance for corn harvested for silage or forage adjusted to an equivalent grain yield. County yields of corn for grain are not available prior to 1958; therefore the 5-year, 1956-60, average is shown only for the State.

Only district estimates of grain sorghum were prepared prior to 1959. County estimates for 1959 have been prepared for the central, east central, south central, and southeastern districts only.

We are glad to be of service to you.

Very truly yours,
FLOYD E. ROLF,
Agricultural Statistician, Acting in Charge.

County and district	Corn: Yield per harvested acre, South Dakota, 1958 and 1959 by counties; preliminary 1960, 1956-60 average, and 1958-60 averages for selected counties										Oats: Yield per harvested acre, South Dakota, by counties, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1956-60, and 1958-60 averages for selected counties					Barley: Yield per harvested acre, South Dakota, by counties, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1956-60, and 1958-60 averages for selected counties				
	Corn for all purposes ¹					Corn for grain					1958	1959	1960 ²	1956-60 average	1958-60 average	1958	1959	1960 ²	1956-60 average	1958-60 average
	1958	1959	1960 ²	1956-60 average	1958-60 average	1958	1959	1960 ²	1956-60 average	1958-60 average										
Butte.....	37.0	51.0				33.0	66.5				38.0	27.0				27.5	22.0			
Corson.....	15.0	7.5				16.0	11.0				32.0	11.5				23.5	8.5			
Dewey.....	16.0	7.5				17.0	12.0				38.0	12.5				30.0	8.0			
Harding.....	17.0	10.0				18.0	15.0				37.5	19.0				29.0	12.5			
Perkins.....	14.5	8.5	8.0	12.4	10.3	15.0	15.0	16.0		15.3	34.0	15.5	22.0	23.1	23.8	24.0	13.0	18.0	17.3	18.3
Ziebach.....	12.5	7.0				13.0	11.0				32.0	10.0				26.5	8.0			
Northwest district total.....	16.9	12.1				18.5	11.9				34.6	15.0				25.9	11.7			
Brown.....	22.5	9.0				23.0	10.0				45.0	13.0				34.0	8.5			
Campbell.....	20.0	14.0				20.5	17.0				37.0	20.5				24.0	12.0			
Edmunds.....	19.5	7.0				20.0	9.5				39.0	12.0				34.0	7.5			
Faulk.....	19.0	6.0				19.0	8.0				42.0	8.0				30.0	6.0			
McPherson.....	19.5	9.0				20.0	10.5				42.0	15.0				30.0	10.5			
Potter.....	21.5	7.0	14.0	19.0	14.2	22.0	9.0	19.0		16.7	48.0	10.0	41.0	31.3	33.0	34.0	10.0	29.0	21.9	24.3
Spink.....	19.5	7.5				20.0	9.0				37.0	10.0				27.0	7.5			
Walworth.....	24.0	9.0				24.5	10.5				45.0	17.5				30.0	12.5			
North central district total.....	20.9	8.3				21.4	10.1				41.7	13.5				31.1	8.8			
Clark.....	18.5	18.0				19.0	19.0				39.0	15.0				31.0	9.5			
Codington.....	18.0	19.0				18.5	21.0				42.5	14.0				30.0	9.0			
Day.....	17.0	6.0	24.0	22.1	15.7	17.5	8.0	26.0		17.2	43.0	11.0	44.0	31.5	32.7	34.0	9.0	30.0	23.3	24.3
Deuel.....	34.5	26.5	38.0	35.0	33.0	35.0	28.0	39.0		34.0	51.0	27.0	50.0	40.3	42.7	41.0	19.0	34.0	28.4	31.3
Grant.....	34.0	17.0				34.5	19.0				53.5	17.5				37.0	10.5			
Hamlin.....	28.5	18.0				28.5	19.5				47.0	19.5				35.0	16.0			
Marshall.....	22.0	14.0				22.5	15.0				45.0	18.0				33.0	11.0			
Roberts.....	28.5	17.5				29.0	18.5				52.5	21.0				40.0	16.0			
Northeast district total.....	25.7	17.5				26.3	19.7				46.6	18.7				33.3	11.3			
Haakon.....	13.5	9.0				14.0	14.0				32.0	19.0				36.0	14.5			
Jackson.....	15.0	7.0				16.0	12.0				29.0	18.0				30.0	13.5			
Lawrence.....	23.0	11.0				23.5	16.0				39.0	17.5				25.5	13.5			
Meads.....	16.5	9.0				17.0	15.0				35.0	13.0				29.0	13.5			
Pennington.....	14.5	7.0	5.5	12.5	9.0	15.0	9.0	9.0		11.0	32.0	13.5	24.0	23.4	23.2	27.0	12.5	16.0	16.0	18.5
Stanley.....	14.5	9.0				15.5	13.0				38.5	18.0				28.0	16.5			
West central district total.....	15.4	8.5				16.0	12.6				33.9	15.5				29.7	14.4			
Aurora.....	22.5	11.0	27.0	24.2	20.2	22.5	13.0	29.0		21.5	32.0	10.5	43.0	24.6	28.5	27.0	9.0	32.0	19.4	22.7
Beadle.....	21.5	12.0	22.0	21.0	18.5	22.0	13.5	24.0		19.8	34.0	12.5	35.0	25.3	27.2	26.0	10.0	25.0	17.9	20.3
Brule.....	21.0	9.5				21.0	11.0				32.0	9.5				27.0	10.0			
Buffalo.....	22.0	7.5				22.5	10.5				40.0	9.5				29.0	14.0			
Hand.....	20.5	8.0				21.0	9.0				38.0	10.5				25.0	5.0			
Hughes.....	16.0	5.0				16.5	7.0				35.0	12.5				30.0	6.5			
Hyder.....	20.5	7.5				21.0	10.0				41.0	7.5				33.0	7.5			
Jerald.....	25.5	16.5				26.0	17.5				34.0	9.5				27.0	9.0			
Sully.....	15.5	8.5				16.0	11.5				40.0	9.0				26.0	6.0			
Central district total.....	20.5	10.2				21.0	12.7				35.3	11.3				26.8	9.4			
Brookings.....	29.0	24.5				29.0	24.5				46.5	24.5				37.0	19.5			
Davison.....	27.0	9.0				27.5	9.5				35.5	9.0				29.5	9.0			
Hanson.....	30.5	8.5				31.0	9.0				35.5	8.5				32.5	7.0			
Kingsbury.....	34.5	30.5				35.0	30.5				48.5	27.0				34.0	19.5			
Lake.....	33.5	29.0				34.0	29.0				42.5	26.0				32.5	16.0			
McCook.....	28.5	20.0	42.0	32.0	30.2	28.5	20.5	43.0		30.7	34.5	17.0	48.0	29.2	33.2	32.0	12.0	36.0	24.3	26.7
Miner.....	22.5	13.5				22.5	14.5				34.0	14.0				28.0	12.0			
Minnehaha.....	34.5	38.0				35.0	38.0				39.0	33.5				33.0	28.0			
Moody.....	34.0	32.0				34.5	32.0				45.0	30.5				39.0	22.0			
Sanborn.....	27.5	16.0				28.0	17.0				34.0	11.0				30.0	12.0			
East central district total.....	31.0	25.1				31.4	26.8				40.1	23.4				33.0	18.0			
Bennett.....	24.0	15.0				25.0	17.0				38.0	21.0				20.0	19.0			
Custer.....	30.0	33.0				15.5	40.0				28.0	21.0				20.0	14.0			
Fall River.....	31.0	30.0				33.0	32.0				35.0	16.0				31.0	15.5			
Shannon.....	20.0	10.0				20.5	14.0				36.5	22.5				20.0	18.0			
Washabaugh.....	18.0	8.0				18.5	11.0				25.0	14.5				21.5	15.0			
Southwest district total.....	26.1	20.2				26.2	24.4				33.8	19.9				23.2	17.2			

See footnotes at end of table.

County and district	Corn: Yield per harvested acre, South Dakota, 1958 and 1959 by counties; preliminary 1960, 1956-60 average, and 1958-60 averages for selected counties					Oats: Yield per harvested acre, South Dakota, by counties, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1956-60, and 1958-60 averages for selected counties					Barley: Yield per harvested acre, South Dakota, by counties, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1956-60, and 1958-60 averages for selected counties									
	Corn for all purposes ¹					Corn for grain					1958	1959	1960 ²	1956-60 average	1958-60 average	1958	1959	1960 ²	1956-60 average	1958-60 average
	1958	1959	1960 ²	1956-60 average	1958-60 average	1958	1959	1960 ²	1956-60 average	1958-60 average										
Gregory.....	30.5	14.0				30.5	14.5				32.0	13.5				28.0	13.0			
Jones.....	14.0	8.0				14.0	10.0				35.0	14.5				25.0	17.0			
Lynan.....	22.5	8.5				23.0	10.0				33.0	9.5				30.0	10.0			
Mellette.....	23.0	9.0				23.5	12.0				35.0	9.5				23.5	10.5			
Todd.....	19.0	7.0				19.4	9.5				32.0	10.0				20.0	8.5			
Tripp.....	30.0	10.5	19.0	21.8	19.8	30.0	11.0	21.0		20.7	35.0	11.5	39.0	24.7	28.5	28.0	12.0	34.0	19.6	24.7
South central district total.....	27.3	11.3				27.9	12.7				33.5	12.4				26.9	12.3			
Bon Homme.....	32.5	27.0				33.0	27.5				31.0	22.5				28.5	19.5			
Charles Mix.....	23.5	11.0				23.5	12.0				31.0	12.0				27.0	9.5			
Clay.....	36.0	38.0				36.5	38.0				39.0	36.5				36.0	28.0			
Douglas.....	24.0	9.0				24.5	10.0				30.0	10.0				25.2	7.0			
Hutchinson.....	30.0	13.0				30.5	14.0				32.5	14.5				31.0	11.5			
Lincoln.....	29.5	35.5				29.5	35.5				37.0	33.5				31.0	30.0			
Turner.....	38.0	28.5				38.5	29.0				35.0	28.0				29.5	22.0			
Union.....	41.5	44.5				41.5	44.5				42.5	37.0				32.0	29.0			
Yankton.....	34.5	34.5	48.0	36.0	39.0	35.0	34.5	49.0		39.5	36.5	29.0	42.0	31.4	35.8	30.0	24.5	24.0	23.8	26.2
Southeast district total.....	31.7	26.4				32.1	29.9				34.3	24.7				30.2	21.5			
State.....	27.0	19.5	32.5	28.0	26.3	28.0	24.0	35.0	30.2	29.0	39.0	20.0	41.0	31.0	33.3	30.5	13.5	30.0	22.5	24.7

¹ Includes corn harvested for silage or forage adjusted to an equivalent ear-corn basis.

² Preliminary for counties.

Source: South Dakota Crop and Livestock Reporting Service, Feb. 28, 1961.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have expressed, in my colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Vermont, my opposition to the pending measure. I do not believe that it is saved by the proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture, about which we have heard, and which is justified on the grounds of trying to do what we can to increase the support prices for dairy products, for which we have been contending and working together for a long time. This involves a demand which is quite different from demands which might be created by the terms of the bill. This has been clearly and excellently expressed by our colleague from Vermont.

It is estimated that the passage of the bill could cost our dairy farmers in New York \$275 million a year in increased feed bills. What the Secretary of Agriculture intends to do we do not know, but certainly we do not wish to contribute further to the pillaring of costs, when it is either unwise or improvident, simply to attempt to meet needs or to provide equity in situations quite apart from what would happen under the terms of the bill.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote against the passage of the bill.

In addition, I think it is fair to say that for many years we have been pursuing policies which do not seem to be leading to a balanced and viable farm program. Very largely this is attributable to the "single shot idea," wherein we do not recognize in passing legislation—although I know the distinguished members of the committee and the distinguished Senators who have been speaking recognize it—the interrelationship of the various elements to each other.

I believe it would be very much in the interest of the people in my State—who mainly are interested in dairying, poultry raising, and other branches of agriculture so vital to our State's economy—before we ask them to foot any bills, to see what the whole scheme looks like

in terms of its interrelationship, insofar as it affects these farm products and insofar as it affects other products.

For that reason, in addition to the others I have mentioned, I shall vote against passage of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is out of the city, but he desired to have considered an amendment which was offered for printing under the rule on March 8. I call up the amendment now. I have no particular desire to discuss it. I have discussed it with the chairman of the committee, and he may have something to say at this particular time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

Sec. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, with respect to the marketing year for the 1961 crop of any feed grain commodity for which price support is made available under this Act, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell any such commodity at less than 25 per centum above the current support price for such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as chairman of the committee I am opposed to the amendment, which really would have the effect of killing the bill. The only provisions of the committee amendment as now written, providing for the disposition of feed grains by the Commodity Credit Corporation, are those which provide for payment in kind for diverted acres.

Under the law as it would stand, if this were to pass, the Commodity Credit Corporation could sell corn and other feed grains only if the price thereof were 105 percent of the current support price plus carrying charges, which in this case,

if the bill is enacted, would be about \$1.26, if the sale fell within the exceptions of section 407 of the 1949 act.

What this amendment seeks to do is to increase the CCC selling price to the point that corn would probably have to sell for \$1.60 before any of it could be disposed of. I am sure the members of the committee as well as the Senate would not wish to have that occur.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to make the record clear that I have indicated no particular position on the amendment. Since the request was made that it be offered, I have talked it over with the chairman of the committee. The Presiding Officer can put the question, because I am not interested at the moment in discussing the amendment further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on behalf of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have had a very good discussion today with respect to the pending legislation, the so-called feed grains bill, and in the moments that I shall speak, I wish to try to set the record straight, as I see it, in reference to some of the comment that has been made today. First, we ought to remember that the legislation with which we are dealing is emergency legislation, in order to provide a price support structure and controls over production of feed grain for this crop year.

I was pleased that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] responded to the Senator from New York on the question of wheat, because the quotas for wheat, the acreage, and the price support levels have already been set for this year's production, and there is nothing we could do by legislation this year that would affect the wheat program for the crop year 1961. It is my hope that we shall have a wheat program before the Congress, and one that

is better than the present program. I have been given to understand that this is the purpose and desire of the Secretary of Agriculture and the President.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I understand that a long-range farm bill has been prepared and is in the White House at the present time. It apparently was destined for transmittal to Congress earlier this week, and it is being withheld for some reason. Is the Senator from Minnesota informed on that question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that very serious consideration is being given to a long-range farm bill. I have been told that a message will be forthcoming on such a program.

I think we would all be well advised to remember that the new administration has been in office only since the 20th of January, and that to present an overall long-range farm bill relating to this complex farm economy in a hurry would, in my mind, be less than wise and might very well lend itself to a good deal of misunderstanding or misinterpretation.

Mr. HRUSKA. I appreciate that point, but the voices through the press were to the effect that there was a bill, that it was ready to be transmitted, that the decision to transmit it was countermanded, and it was being held presumably until the instant bill had been acted upon by Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not believe there is any relationship.

Mr. HRUSKA. It occurred to me that it would be helpful to Senators, as it would have been helpful to Members of the other body, to know whether or not that long-range bill was in that situation, and what it contains, in a general way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In responding to the Senator from Nebraska I should like to say that any long-range farm bill which would be sent down and would include items of feed grains would surely have had no effect upon this year's crop, because we could not possibly process and pass a long-range farm bill in this Congress between now and March 15, 16, or 17, or the period of time that would be required.

Mr. HRUSKA. No; and that situation is understood by the Senator from Nebraska. On the other hand, we have had repeated declarations—and the Senator from Minnesota has made one just now—to the effect that the bill before us is an emergency bill. If a long-range bill has already been prepared and is a reiteration of the bill before us, seeking to thrust into the future what the instant bill will do for the next 12 months, it would be helpful to some of us in our thinking, and perhaps in our voting, if we knew that fact.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can only say that I do not believe the long-range farm bill should be judged on the basis of what we are doing here today. I will say only this further: The press is a great medium of communication, but I doubt that it has knowledge of all the intimate details or intricate details of the farm bill.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is for that reason that I asked a better informed source, namely, the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not writing a long-range farm bill. All I know is that we have a bill before us, and if we delay passage of or action upon this bill, I think it will have some rather unfortunate consequences upon the market.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. For many years the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has been a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I understand that he is not now. But I know he is familiar with this program. It has been a pleasure to have worked with him in the past. If he would be willing, I should like to discuss with him one or two items in the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would like very much to do so, if the Senator will permit me first to make a few general observations about the bill. Then I wish to engage in colloquy with my colleagues in order that we may have an exchange of views.

First I wish to point out that we are talking about a bill which is a 1-year program based upon recommendations placed before the Congress by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture. It is an emergency program that was designed to meet some of the needs of the producer, the consumer, and the taxpayer—in fact, the American economy as a whole.

In testifying before the committee the Secretary noted that the bill was designed, first, to assure increased income for participating farmers, that is, for the farmers who participate in the program in the important feed-grain sector in our economy.

Second. The purpose of the proposal was to assure the consumer of fair and stable prices for meat, poultry, and dairy products.

Third. The purpose of the bill was to reduce the cost to the taxpayers something like \$500 million less than the present program, and to reduce the Government's holding in feed grains.

Having made that statement, let me make it perfectly clear that I believe it is necessary to have a reserve of feed grains. I am not one of the Senators who believe that we should bring our agricultural economy into daily balance as between supply and demand. I believe such action would work a catastrophe upon the Nation, upon the market, upon the consumer, upon our foreign policy, and upon our national security. We need reserves. We need holdings. We need storage. I agree with much of what the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] said earlier in reference to the long-term needs of our Nation and of the world, in terms of feed supplies.

I have become more skeptical over what we call the rigid control program. I make this statement frankly, because in my earlier days in the Senate I argued vigorously for the most rigid type of controls. I feel that in an expanding population, in a world situation that is surely unpredictable, food becomes a

vital element of our whole national security, and that bountiful reserves, even though they cost something for storage, are within the national interest.

Having made that statement, all we are trying to do is to arrive at what I consider to be a certain degree of reasonableness in terms of reserves or inventories, and I believe that is what the program is designed to do.

It is not the intention of the Senator from Minnesota to offer any amendments to the Senate bill. I happen to feel that there are portions of the bill passed by the House that may be better, from my point of view, than the Senate bill as it came from committee. But I believe that the Senate bill will be helpful. I do not wish to indicate for a moment that we can solve the so-called surplus problem with feed grains. That is not something that can be done in 1 year without destroying the farm economy. Furthermore, we have never defined what we mean by a surplus of feed. I do not consider a surplus of feed to be a few more bushels than the current market requires. I have long felt that we needed national food reserves—set-aside—of substantial quantity and quality so that we would have no danger in America from drought or disaster, from war or nature.

In other words, let us protect the livestock industry of America. Let us protect human beings, our fellow citizens. Let us strengthen the Nation in its relations with other nations by having an adequate supply of food. I think this is all to the good. Nevertheless, we can make certain improvements, and I believe that the bill tends to do so.

Let me discuss for a moment the difference between the House bill and the Senate bill, in broad terms. The Senate committee, in the bill which is now before us, has set a fixed support on corn at \$1.20 a bushel. The House did not do that. It set a minimum of 65 percent of parity, giving the Secretary discretionary authority to set supports at 65 percent or above. However, the Secretary has said repeatedly that he would set the support level at \$1.20. Therefore, the Senate committee, in its wisdom, has said, "If that is what the Secretary intends to do, that is what we will write into law."

This is a 1-year program, Mr. President.

The Senate bill does not permit the Secretary of Agriculture to sell out of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks any stocks below support levels. This is the traditional position of the Senate. I say that with some background of service on the committee.

The House bill would permit the Secretary to sell out of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks at prices up to 17 percent below support levels. That means that 83 percent of the support level would be the price at which the Secretary could sell Commodity Credit Corporation stocks in the market. Under the Senate bill it would have to be 105 percent of the support level.

There is a very significant difference. The purpose of the House language is to

bring about more compliance with the program, thereby cutting back production.

It is my belief that with the support level of \$1.20 on corn and other feed grains having support levels based on their feed equivalent value—and there is a formula for all this in the law—unless there is a way in which to discipline or exercise some authority over production, it might well result in promoting more production than we have today. Therefore, the House bill and the Senate bill call for very substantial acreage reductions. The House bill gives additional authority to the Secretary to step into the market to force compliance with the program, by selling Commodity Credit Corporation stocks in the market, as a penalty against noncompliers.

This is a complicated business. When we discuss farm legislation we are discussing the most complicated economics of the Nation. I see my good friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who is a wise man in this field, is smiling. Every one of us who deals with this subject feels a sense of inadequacy, because at just about the time when we begin to understand a program like the so-called support program for corn, so many changes are made in the formulas that it is necessary to start all over again.

I have spent hours in trying to understand the bills. As one who hopes to continue his interest in agricultural legislation, I have studied the bills as one would in a seminar or in a graduate course. I have studied the bills until the present moment, because I wished to be as sure of my ground as I could possibly be.

There are philosophical differences in the Senate with respect to farm policy. We will not change those differences by any argument.

I am sure that every Senator holds his philosophy on this subject sincerely. I merely wish to say that when we offer a farmer a price on a commodity, that farmer, if he is to take that price and be satisfied with it, must accept some restrictions on his production. Otherwise the Government will, by act of Congress or act of the executive branch, encourage ever more production and depress the market ever more, costing the taxpayer untold millions of dollars.

The farm program has gotten into such condition that last year it cost the American taxpayers more than \$6 million. We cannot continue like this. I come from an agricultural State. However, we want a farm program that is not a burden upon the Federal Treasury, and not a burden upon taxpayers who are not farm people. What we are seeking, therefore, is a statement of policy as to the role of food and fiber in our economy, the purpose of food and fiber in our foreign policy and in our national security. The policy should be in proper perspective, and we should try to design programs that will bring into reasonable balance the supply that is needed in relation to the demand or the consumption, plus the establishment of national reserves.

I note that the Senate Committee amendment to the Senate bill does not contain a price support for soybeans.

I forget now whether the report recommends against such support. Perhaps it merely ignores the soybean price support. The House bill includes a recommendation to increase the support level on soybeans to \$2.30.

The House bill requires only a 20 percent acreage reduction, and all the supports would be paid in cash on the 20 percent. That is, it would be necessary to average out the production on the acres for the past 2 years and to pay in cash on the amount of production.

The House bill makes provision for another 20 percent voluntary reduction, which could be paid for in kind up to 60 percent of the previous production. The Senate bill requires a 30-percent acreage reduction from last year's planting, and the support payments on this amount would be made one-half in cash and one-half in kind.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. With that explanation of the two bills, possibly I can answer a question or two of my distinguished friend from Maine. Then I shall wish to say something more with respect to the economic concept involved in the proposed legislation.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator knows that I come from a State which is interested in the bill primarily as a taxpaying State and as a feed consuming State. I am interested in having the Senator's judgment as to what the net effect on the taxpayer would be if the bill should become law and the program should be implemented.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have asked the Department of Agriculture to give me some figures on this point, and the Secretary gave me some information, which I have before me. However, the report had something to say on the subject, too. According to the report—and this is from the Secretary of Agriculture—

The total estimated cost of the program in the long run is only the cost of the conservation practice payments—\$400 to \$500 million. This would replace the estimated expenditures under the existing program of \$1.5 to \$1.6 billion of which we could expect to recover eventually only \$500 million. The net saving under the proposed special program as compared with the existing program would be in the order of \$500 million.

Let me say to my friend from Maine that these are estimates. I have been on the scene long enough to know that often estimates are very conservative.

Mr. MUSKIE. I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The committee feels that this is a reasonably accurate estimate. However, as I said, it is an estimate, because we do not know what the production will be.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is based on 70-percent compliance. The higher the compliance, the greater the saving.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The original estimates of some technicians of the Department show that with 70 percent compliance the saving would be a little more than \$500 million. However, the committee in its report estimated the saving at \$500 million, on the basis of the Senate bill also. Is that what the Senator from Louisiana understands?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. How firm a figure is the 70-percent compliance figure? On what is it based? Is it guesswork?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, no. It is based upon what I think would have to happen. I think the chairman has made a very good statement on this point. If and when the bill is passed the President and the Secretary of Agriculture must ask the county committees—the ACP committees—to go out and really sell this program to the feed producers. The Senator from Louisiana has made it quite clear, as chairman of the committee, that we have had a little trouble in the feed grain sector of the farm program. We have had much trouble with the so-called corn program. We will not go over that sad story. The chairman has said—and I think it is a word of warning—that the Secretary of Agriculture has assured us that we must have broad participation. What the Secretary seeks to do, and what he will do, I feel certain, is to ask the county committees to go out and work and to sign up the farm producers in the feed grain areas, because a program providing \$1.20 a bushel guaranteed price—that is the floor—plus payment in cash and payments in kind, which payments in kind would be negotiable certificates, is a rather good, solid program, and should produce genuine profit for the farm producer.

Mr. ELLENDER. I point out in this connection that it will be bigger if the Senate bill is enacted. If there is as much as 70-percent compliance, the increased income to the farmers who participate will range from 7 to 8 percent higher than under the present program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A 50-percent compliance would still effect a very large saving to the Government and to the taxpayer. The Department estimated \$626 million, if there is 70-percent compliance. Even if compliance were reduced to 25 or 30 percent—and I hope and pray there will be a much better compliance than that—there would, even then, be a saving of \$200 million or \$300 million as compared with the present program.

So under the worst of circumstances—and I cannot contemplate a program in which there would be less than 25-percent compliance—there would be a saving of more than \$200 million to the taxpayer.

Mr. MUSKIE. How important to compliance is section 3 of the House bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think section 3 of the House bill provides considerable weight in gaining compliance. I am not willing to say, however, that I think it is the only factor in compliance, because the Senate bill, while it did not do what I would have hoped it would do in section 3—because I support, in my own heart and thinking, the purpose of section 3 in the House bill—provides for payment in kind. It provides for cash for the acres taken out of production. It provides that certificates and payment in kind are negotiable elements which can be converted into cash.

I think there is quite an incentive there, plus making the program a really national call, on the part of the President and Secretary of Agriculture, to get something done.

Mr. MUSKIE. Some cynics say that acreage controls will not be effective; and if they are not effective, then compliance is not so important a factor in tax savings as it might otherwise be. There are cynics who say that the farmers who comply will simply throw more fertilizer on the remaining acreage and will produce as much grain as they would have produced on their original acreage.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Most of the farmers have already thrown a great deal of fertilizer on the very ground that they will be cropping next year or in this crop year. The corn farmers planted 18 million new acres of corn under the program we passed some years ago, a program I voted against and warned against. I do not want to say, "I told you so," but that program added about an extra billion bushels of corn to the total production. The farmers put plenty of fertilizer on that land when there was no difference in the price paid to the farmer who was complying and the farmer who was not complying.

In other words, Congress, over the opposition of the Senator from Minnesota, and at the insistence of the recent administration, put into the corn program a guaranteed price of \$1.06 a bushel. The farmers merely plowed up the sidewalks to plant corn. That is one of the reasons why we have the feed grain problem today. I should say one would have to "go some" to beat those production records.

My estimates on the bill before the Senate are based upon the fact that we have already gone through some of the worst or most difficult days, in which fertilizer, seeding, and every conceivable practice, including the narrowing of the distance between the rows planted, has been practiced.

I do not want to overestimate, because I have learned the rule of caution as to overproduction, but I have the feeling that there will be a substantial reduction in the feed grain program by reason of the passage of the bill.

Mr. MUSKIE. Did the committee seriously consider bushel controls instead of acreage controls?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall leave the answering of that question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, since this is more or less a crash bill for 1 year, we did not even discuss that question. The idea behind the curtailing of acres planted was to reduce production. However, we have in the offing a long-range bill which will affect corn and other feed grains, as well as wheat. That question will be taken up then. This bill, as I have said, is for 1 year only. It is a crash bill, intended only to reduce the enormous surpluses which are now on hand. That is the sole purpose of the bill. If that objective can be accomplished under the bill, and if there is 70-percent compliance, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, that will result in quite a saving to the Government.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator. I am happy to learn that the committee will consider production controls.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A staff consultant has indicated to me that from 1955 to 1960, on a yield-per-acre basis, there was an increase of 30.5 percent on corn, and 118 percent on sorghums. On oats the increase in yield-per-acre was 12 percent; for barley, 10 percent.

I believe this tends to prove my point that fertilizers were applied and new planting practices adopted, as well, under the so-called low price support formula. Instead of the low price support formula reducing production, it increased it. There was also the fact that there were no acreage controls at all. The farmers were simply told, "Go to it, boys. See what you can do." I can tell the Senator that they made a fine record.

Mr. MUSKIE. Then, the lower the farmer's price goes, the more he must plant in order to come out whole.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. I should like to ask one or two questions to clarify the impact of the bill upon the dairy and poultry farmers in my State. I shall ask the questions based upon the statistics I obtained from the Department of Agriculture. Therefore, I assume they are representative and realistic.

I understand that feed is composed, on the average—and the averages are by weight—of about 40 percent feed grains, 20 or 25 percent soybean meal, and 35 to 40 percent miscellaneous miller's grains, brewer's grains, middlings, and so on.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is considered to be a sort of basic formula.

Mr. MUSKIE. Let me put this question to get an understanding of how the bill will affect broiler growers. I understand that the price for the feed ration for broiler growing, in recent months, has been something like the following: On February 15, 1961, \$4.60 a hundred pounds; on January 15, 1961, \$4.55 a hundred pounds; a year ago, \$4.70 a hundred pounds; 1955 to 1959, on the average, it was \$4.94 a hundred pounds. These are national averages, as I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There has been very little fluctuation.

Mr. MUSKIE. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. About 40 cents a hundred pounds.

Mr. MUSKIE. From \$4.55 to \$4.94 is the range shown here. If 40 percent of one of the rations by weight is corn, for example, it seems to me that the direct impact upon the price which the broiler grower pays would be that. The price-support figure for corn under this bill would go from \$1.06 to—

Mr. HUMPHREY. To \$1.20.

Mr. MUSKIE. To \$1.20 a bushel?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. A bushel is approximately 40 pounds?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a fair average.

Mr. MUSKIE. So in a hundredweight of feed, at \$4.60 a hundred, the proportion of that price attributable to corn would go from \$1.06 to \$1.20?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. Or a 14-cent increase a hundredweight, as compared to \$4.60

for the cost of that hundredweight of feed? Is that accurate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Undoubtedly the Senator is using accurate mathematics. The computation has to be made rather quickly, but it sounds reasonable.

Mr. MUSKIE. Does the chairman of the committee agree?

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot figure that rapidly. But I should like to point out that we have made a study of the increase in mixed feeds, in contrast to the price of corn, let us say. For instance, in 1956, when the corn price support was \$1.50, mixed dairy feed cost \$3.59 a hundred. With corn at \$1.06, it was \$3.65. So it does not have the effect that some Senators think it has.

Mr. MUSKIE. I think the Senator will find, if he will let me pursue my questioning, that my questions are directed toward the same conclusion the Senator has suggested.

As I understand the impact of the bill, if a broiler producer pays \$4.60 for a hundredweight of feed at this point—

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under the present law?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. Under the present law—if this bill goes into effect—there will be added to that price 14 cents, representing the increase in the price support of corn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And that would be an increase of about 12 percent in the price level.

Mr. MUSKIE. No; it would be about 3 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; 3 percent.

Mr. MUSKIE. Three percent for the broiler producer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. I understand that the dairy ration on February 15 of this year was \$2.95 a hundred. If we use corn again, the increase there would be a little under 5 percent, for the dairy farmer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. The poultry ration on February 16 was \$3.35 a hundred; and, again, if we use corn, the percentage increase would be a little lower than that for the dairy ration.

I should like to have both Senators listen to my next question, if they will.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Maine is speaking only of corn, is he?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes; only of corn, for purposes of illustration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. Is it accurate to suggest that the day after the bill went into effect, or a reasonable time after it went into effect, the increase in the price support for corn would be directly translated into exactly the same increase in the price of feed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

Mr. MUSKIE. I would appreciate obtaining the Senator's reasons as to why not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me cite one instance: I hold in my hand today's Washington Post, which states the prices on the Chicago market. The price of corn in Chicago, for May futures, is \$1.19; for March, \$1.15½. This is what they are having to pay right now, for corn to mix into their feed.

Mr. MUSKIE. In other words, the Senator is saying that other factors which come into play may very well offset the increase in the price support for corn?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly. The purpose of the price support—as the Senator has so well stated, and as he knows—is to provide a floor; and it is a fact that if the open market price for corn went way down and if the feed processors were buying in that market, that would lower the price of feed—theoretically.

But the fact is that today the buyers are buying corn at anywhere from \$1.12 to \$1.14 to \$1.15 to \$1.19 a bushel, for the feed the Senator from Maine is talking about; and under this bill the support level is \$1.20.

Mr. MUSKIE. Let me ask another question, in order to suggest another offsetting factor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Perhaps the chairman of the committee wishes to comment on this point.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us say that the formula for laying mash would be as follows: The cornmeal used in 2,000 pounds of mash would be only 779 pounds, or about one-third of the total. So it would not affect the greatly overall cost of that entire ton; it would be only a small part of it.

But in connection with this discussion, I should like to place in the RECORD a document, obtained from the Department of Agriculture, showing that the price of corn, sorghums, oats, and barley as a rule had very little impact on the price of mash.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order, if the Senator who has the floor will yield: With all due respect, let me point out that small gatherings around the desk of one Senator, where the conversation is held in a very low tone of voice, make it very difficult for some of us to know what is going on, unless we, too, join the little huddle; and if we do that, other Senators are unable to hear.

So I wonder whether Senators who have been engaging in the debate will speak somewhat louder.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly, Mr. President; we shall trumpet the truth with greater clarity. [Laughter.]

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am interested in many of the fallacies that are being discussed here at the moment. So I wish the Senator to provide a little more clarity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under the circumstances, I can say one of two things; either I can say that we can and we will speak louder in stating the truth, or I can say that the Senator from Iowa is not speaking loud enough.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand that Senators do not wish to shout when they are standing only a few feet from other Senators. But I believe it would be helpful if the volume were increased a little.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we shall speak up.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have been saying that the fluctuation in the price of corn, oats, or barley does not necessarily have a great impact on

the price of laying mash, broiler mash, or mixed dairy feed.

To demonstrate that, let us consider the situation for the year 1956: Corn was supported at \$1.58, and the price of laying mash was \$4.35. In 1960, with a price support of \$1.12 for corn, the mash was the same price.

Consider the case of broiler growing mash, in the same year, and with the same support price for corn: In 1956, broiler mash was \$4.79, with corn at \$1.58; and with corn at \$1.12, broiler mash was \$4.69.

As regards dairy feed: In 1956, with a corn support price of \$1.58, the mash sold for \$3.59; and with corn at \$1.12

in 1960, the mash sold for \$3.67—at a higher price than its price when the support price for corn was much higher.

Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, I should like to place this statement in the RECORD, so it can be seen that what I have been presenting is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. I shall be glad to have that done.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Selected livestock feeds: Price per hundred pounds paid by farmers as of Jan. 15, 1955-61, and price-support levels in effect

Year	Commercial feeds			Price supports			
	Laying mash	Broiler growing mash	16-percent mixed dairy feed	Corn	Sorghum grain	Oats	Barley
	Dollars per hundredweight			Dollars			
1956	4.35	4.79	3.59	1.58	1.78	0.61	0.94
1957	4.48	4.93	3.80	1.50	1.97	.65	1.02
1958	4.29	4.81	3.56	1.40	1.86	.61	.95
1959	4.52	4.98	3.75	1.36	1.83	.61	.93
1960	4.35	4.69	3.67	1.12	1.52	.50	.77
1961	4.29	4.55	3.65	1.06	1.52	.50	.77
	Percent change						
1956-61	-1.3	-5.0	1.6	-32.9	-14.6	-18.0	-18.0

Source: Agricultural prices: USDA.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Senator is saying, then, that an increase in the price support for one of the ingredients of the feed ration does not necessarily mean an increase in the price of that feed ration to the industry that consumes it; is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. In other words, there are offsetting factors which have a varying impact on the total price?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. The result may or may not be an increase, depending on the value of the offsetting factors?

Mr. HUMPHREY. At least, in the case of the processed product the increase in price is not proportionate to what would be the increase in the price of the raw product. In other words, we can raise the price of oats and barley, but the price of the mash to the consumer will not vary very much unless the cost of the label that is placed on the carton increases.

Mr. MUSKIE. I was really trying to obtain some education, and I was not sure that other Senators required similar education. So perhaps I lowered my voice more than I should have done.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator is meeting my request magnificently. It is very fine.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator.

On page 8 of the Senate report, the committee had something to say about the statement of the Secretary of Agri-

culture in his memorandum to the President, as follows:

Support prices for soybeans will be raised to \$2.30 per bushel and the support price for cottonseed raised to a competitive relationship with soybean support prices. This will encourage the diversion of a part of the current feed grain acreage to soybean production.

Has the Secretary actually exercised the discretion which would permit him to raise the soybean support price to \$2.30?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He has not, but it is his intention to do so.

Mr. MUSKIE. Is that action on his part conditioned on passage of this bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not, necessarily.

Mr. MUSKIE. In the event this bill passes and in the event the Secretary does increase the support price for soybeans, which I understand the committee discourages, then I should like to explore the impact upon feed.

Referring back to the composition of feed by weight, as I stated, 20 to 25 percent of the weight is soybean meal. I am told the Chicago market price on soybeans on March 8 of this year was \$2.96 a hundredweight.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is right—\$2.95½. May futures, \$3.01.

Mr. MUSKIE. The support price is considerably lower than the market price.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. I understand that one of the reasons why the current market price is so high is because of a short crop last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. I understand the Secretary hopes, by increasing the support price, to increase the production of soybeans. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He hopes, by the increase in price support, to divert acres from production of corn and other feed grains into soybeans. The feeling is—and there is good justification for it—that there is a better market for soybeans both in meal and oil. The oil is needed in our oversea program, and the meal is of great value for our dairy and meat feeding.

Mr. MUSKIE. In the event the proposed increase in the soybean support price had the desired effect, would the resulting increase in production result in a drop in the price of soybeans?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I think there would be a tendency to have the price drop below the high we now have. The present high is \$2.95. The price of the beans has been going up rather rapidly since December. I would think with a larger crop the tendency over the entire year would be toward a more stable price in soybeans, and not up to \$3.05 or \$3.10 that some of the futures indicate.

Mr. MUSKIE. Does the Senator see any relationship between the Secretary's proposal on soybean supports and the fact that November futures are now at \$2.35 a hundredweight?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely do. That is what I was trying to indicate a moment ago. I think the Secretary's contemplated proposal on soybean supports will have a tendency to stabilize the market, which went to rather unfortunate lows. It got down to about \$1.84. At any rate, it was below \$2 for a considerable time. I think it got down to \$1.82 or \$1.83. The support level was \$1.85. The price was right down to about the support level. So what will result from the \$2.30 support is withdrawal of some corn acres into soybeans, increasing soybean production, which would have a tendency, over the 12-month period, to level out the price, as the futures indicate.

I think the Senator indicated that the November future price was \$2.35 a hundredweight. Is that correct?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes; \$2.35.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Well, the boys in the market have a pretty good idea of what the price will be.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Do I correctly understand the Senator is proposing a price on soybeans at a level that will maintain the price at \$2.30?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is not what the Senator is saying. The Senator is saying that, with the low support level last year, there was a wide fluctuation, down to about \$1.85, and it goes to a high future price of \$3.10.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We have the same level now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is right, because we had a poor crop; but even with

a \$2.30 support level, there will be a tendency to have a more stable price throughout the year.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator consider that last year's crop—not the present crop, which the Senator said was a bad crop, but that of the year before—was a normal crop?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not prepared to say. I do not remember the statistics. If I did, I would give the Senator an answer.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not know either, or I would state it to the Senator; but if it were a normal crop year, and the price on the market were \$1.84, or \$1.85, or \$1.86, then, if we had a normal crop this year, plus the inducement which a support price of \$2.30 would bring to plant more soybean acreage, would we have a storage problem?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are not confronted with that problem. We have never had that problem. There is greater consumption of soybeans as we go along, as we get more and more into a beef and livestock economy, as our foreign markets expand. In that connection, I am going to have something to say a little later about the soybean situation. There is good reason why the demand for soybeans will be high. I say that, even with the transfer of corn production to soybean production, there will not be an excess of soybeans, but with a reasonable support price, there will be a better and a more stable market during the year. That will be of benefit to the farmer who produces the soybeans and to the feeder who uses them.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But soybean producers are doing very well. They are in an excellent position. Why fool with it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The main reason why they are in an excellent position right now is that there are not enough soybeans.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But if more soybeans are produced, the price will go down.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. The farmer is not asking for \$3.80, but he does not want a price of \$1.85. He wants a more stable price. When he comes to market his beans, he does not want to be caught in a market of low prices. If he can sell his beans at \$2.30, rather than \$1.85, he will be 45 cents better off on each bushel of beans.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I fail to see the logic of injecting Government into a crop area when that crop is doing very well on a free market, or a free enterprise market. I do not see why the Government or the Secretary wants to inject Government controls. I would prefer to see the free market operate as long as it is returning a fair price to the farmer for his product.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may call to the attention of the Senator that for the last 10 years there have been some support levels for soybeans, just as there have been for cottonseed. The specialists and economists, who are wiser in this field than I am—and I am sure they are not as wise as the Senator from Iowa—say that if we fix a pretty decent support level for soybeans, we will tend

to draw acres from less productive acreage, because farmers produce to make money, just as insurance companies sell policies to make money.

The idea behind the \$2.30 support level is, first, to give the farm producer a fair price; second, to assure stability of the market price; and, third, to draw out surplus acres from corn and from other feed grains into the soybean area, since there is a greater demand for the product.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Why should the farmers not simply retire those acres?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Why not retire them? If people wish to have soybeans, soybean meal, and soybean oil, why should the farmers not use the land? The farmer can make a dollar or so. It would be a new experience for the farmer, and he is entitled to some thrill in life, I think.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I fail to see how the farmer can make more at \$2.30 than he can make at \$2.85.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The trouble is that a lot of the soybeans today are not owned by the farmers. They were bought up by others and held. The farmer simply received the support price and that is all. The farmer received the low price.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am simply looking at the market today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I come from the second largest soybean producing State in the Union. Our production is exceeded only by that of Indiana, and we will soon pass their production. Soybeans are our best cash crop. We wish we had a little more stable market. The way to obtain stability is to have a price-support level, so that when the farmer starts to market his product he can get a better price in the beginning, rather than a theoretical price after he has lost control.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We could stabilize all agriculture by comprehensive Federal laws, if they were constitutional, by freezing the farmer's prices and freezing the farmer in a straitjacket. We could stabilize the farmer's prices and destroy his opportunity for gain.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Iowa and I have disagreed for a long time about certain subjects. I do not think we can settle the argument now. The last disagreement we had was about the corn program, and the Senator ended up with a billion more bushels of corn and 18 million more acres than anybody else estimated. I must say that was the grand prize.

I believe that I would prefer to stick with the crop concerning which I have been arguing, which is soybeans. This is one of the few crops with respect to which there is still an opportunity to divert acres from surplus corn production.

Both Iowa and Minnesota have a lot of land. Iowa has more than Minnesota. The farmers of Iowa could put some of the land into soybeans, and thereby the farmers could do a better job.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I must agree that both Iowa and Minnesota,

obviously, have more corn production than Maine has.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are interested in selling some to the people of Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am interested in nailing down one or two more points, as a Senator representing, in part, a consuming State.

I wish to refer again to the line of questioning in which we were engaged a while ago. Was the Senator saying that the increase in support prices provided by the bill may or may not be reflected in an increase in the price of feed rations, depending upon other possible offsetting factors?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. Of which one may be the proposed program with respect to soybeans?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

I wish to make it equally clear that I am not saying if we increase the support levels, which we hope will increase market levels, that this increase will not be reflected in part in the processed feed. We wish to be honest. Indeed, it may be reflected in part.

As the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] pointed out, when corn was at a support level of \$1.58, oats were at a level of about 80 cents instead of 50 cents. Oats were at the equivalent price.

Mr. ELLENDER. Sixty-one cents.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will give some of the other prices. Oats were at 61 cents. Barley was at 94 cents.

In the last year oats were at 50 cents and barley was at 77 cents.

All of these feed grains which are mixed into a processed feed were substantially higher in 1956, yet the price of the finished product did not vary more than a few cents. The difference between 1956 and 1961 was \$4.35 a hundredweight for laying mash as compared to \$4.29.

In the meantime, the farmer took a licking of 52 cents a bushel on every bushel of corn. The farmer took a licking of 11 cents a bushel on the price support for every bushel of oats. The farmer took a licking of 17 cents a bushel for every bushel of barley, and he took a licking of 26 cents a bushel for every bushel of grain sorghums.

Therefore, in Maine there was a small benefit, after the farmers in the Midwest and the Southwest, who are basically the feed producers, had taken a licking of really tremendous proportions in terms of the prices they received. The Maine farmers received an advantage of about 6 cents a hundredweight on laying mash. The saving, however, was reduced by the freight rate increase which was granted. The farmers in Maine paid a little higher price after a while, because the freight rates were increased after a while. The farmers in Maine did not do too well, and in the meantime some of the people I represent in the Senate were going broke.

A farmer cannot make money producing oats at 60 cents a bushel. By the way, that did not help either Maine or Minnesota.

Mr. MUSKIE. What the Senator is saying is that it does the overall economy

little good if, in order for one group of farmers to prosper, it is necessary to have disaster strike another group.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has made a proper analysis.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator from Minnesota made a statement earlier today which I should like to have him elaborate statistically, if he can.

The Senator from Minnesota pointed out that when the feed grain growers are faced with a price below the cost of production the tendency is for them to move into the production of poultry, of dairy products, and of hogs. Are there any statistics available to show at exactly what point this would occur? In other words, what is the point at which the feed grain grower becomes a competitor of Maine poultry farmers or Maine dairy farmers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There are figures on that. I deeply regret that I do not have them at my fingertips, but there are statistical estimates or statistical generalities, we might say, to demonstrate this fact.

There is, for example, the corn-hog ratio. This varies somewhat in terms of the type of hog about which we speak. The consumers like a better product today. They like a leaner hog with not quite so much fat. The figure used to be something like 13 to 1. I forget what it is.

Mr. ELLENDER. Twelve to one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Twelve to one.

When the price of corn is down to less than 80 or 90 cents a bushel the condition develops which is an invitation to the fellow who does not have hogs to go into hog production. This arises because he says to himself, "I have all of this cheap feed available. In the meantime, the hog prices look pretty good. In a year or so I can get a pretty good crop." Of course, by the time the hogs have eaten up all of the corn, the price of pork has gone down.

I remember the hearings conducted by the chairman of the committee on this subject. The committee traveled around the country. The chairman went around with us. We went to North Dakota and to Minnesota, as well as to Oklahoma, to the West, and to the Southeast. There was demonstrable evidence that there is a direct relationship between the price of a perishable product such as poultry, beef, or hogs, and the price of feed grains. When the price of feed grains goes down, sooner or later the price of the perishable commodity goes down. In the meantime, farmers are led off or sort of diverted into that kind of production.

A year or two ago some farmers from New Jersey came to me with questions about competition. These men were broiler producers and egg producers. They said:

Senator, people all over the United States are in the chicken business now, although they were never in the business before. They are in the egg business now, though they were not in the egg business before. They have ruined our market.

I said to them:

I will tell you why they are in the business. In parts of America I know well, like

the Dakotas, feed grain prices have gone down.

The distinguished present Presiding Officer, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] could tell the story as it relates to North Dakota. For years North Dakota was essentially a feed-producing State, a wheat-producing State. When the feed grain prices went down so that the farmer could not make an honest dollar from barley, oats, rye, or wheat, the farmer had to go into the production of something else. The farmers started producing poultry. They started producing hogs. They started producing beef.

There has been a change in the whole pattern of production in the United States.

Frankly, if we could ever get these farm prices within some degree of stability, for which we have worked for a long time, we would have some stability not only in the price pattern, but also in the production pattern with regard to the very things in which the Senator is interested.

Maine has an agriculture which is different, we might say, from that of Minnesota, of Iowa, or of the Dakotas. The agriculture of Maine is affected by what happens to the market prices on feed grains in the feed grain surplus producing areas.

I hope that this discussion will be of some help to the constituents of the Senator from Maine. I think we can demonstrate repeatedly that even if we were to cut the price of corn another 10 cents under the present price support levels down to 95 cents, let us say, the cost of feed to dairy producers up in Maine would not be reduced 5 cents a hundredweight, and in the process, thousands of farmers would be bankrupted. Those farmers really are the great consumers. They consume electricity. They consume processed foodstuffs, many of which are processed in the State of Maine. The farmers consume timber. After all, one of our great housing needs is in the rural areas of America, and the State of Maine is known for its timber.

We are all tied together in this problem. I do not think we can afford to have one part of America trying to support another part of America by low prices. I am opposed to it.

Mr. MUSKIE. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota one further question relating to another section of the agricultural economy of Maine. One of the great problems which has confronted our potato growers in Maine has been the diversion into potatoes of excess acreage in those States having crops which are price supported. Is there a provision in the bill to prevent diversion into potatoes of acreage which is retired from corn production or feed grain production?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In order to take advantage of price support levels, there is a provision in the bill that a farmer must have complied with the so-called cross-compliance regulations. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and I believe that if we are to offer better

prices to producers, we must ask them to comply with some kind of controls.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator. I have appreciated this colloquy. I believe I have learned something from it.

Mr. President, as a Senator from a State where agriculture constitutes an important source of income, I am naturally concerned about our agricultural problems. We may not loom as large as the Midwestern and Western States on the agricultural horizon, but in our area of the Northwest we rank first in farm operations, accounting for 30 percent of farm income in New England. Maine produces 17 percent of New England's milk, 23 percent of the region's eggs, 57 percent of the broilers in this area, and 87 percent of the potatoes grown in New England.

Because of the importance of agriculture to the economic health of my State, I want to be sure that we have a sound farm program that will help stabilize markets, provide maximum return to farmers, and assure an ample supply of food for consumers at reasonable prices. My New England rearing has taught me to count the cost of any such program.

In reviewing farm policies in recent years I have been dismayed by the mounting evidence of failure—failure to keep the costs of farm stabilization operations within bounds and a failure to provide improved farm income. I have been anxious to have an opportunity to vote for a program which would meet the twin tests of fair income to the farmer and fair costs to the taxpayer.

In recent weeks I have been pleased to find that the Secretary of Agriculture, true to the promise of the President and true to his own record as a public servant, is ready and willing to take positive steps to help farmers in trouble. We have had a very difficult potato situation in Maine. I brought this problem to his attention, and the Secretary acted promptly and sympathetically.

Today we are voting on a farm program which does not deal directly with the products grown in Maine, but it does concern us. Farmers in our area are justifiably wary of price-support programs for feed grains which may mean an increase in the cost of feed to them. Poultry and dairy operations, the major feed grain consumers, constitute about 60 percent of Maine's agricultural production. At the same time, these constituents do not wish to see a continuation of a program which cost the taxpayers \$289 million last year for storage, transportation, and handling costs alone.

The current mess in agriculture is intolerable. It is costly to the taxpayer; it is inadequate for the farmer; and it offers no hope for a rational and stable agricultural sector in our economy. With the \$289 million we spent in fiscal year 1960 for storage of feed grains we could have made major strides in meeting our educational needs; we could have alleviated unemployment problems in urban and rural areas through an area redevelopment program; and it would have met many of our major needs in conservation, especially in water pollution control.

I have examined the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture and the

report of the Committee on Agriculture on S. 993. In my opinion, this proposal, providing for emergency relief for feed grain farmers, may well meet the tests of reasonable cost and fair return to farmers. It is designed to reduce present Government stocks and help clean up some of the backlog acquired under folly of previous policies. I think it is worth a trial.

In the long run, such a program should benefit farmers in our area. Cross-compliance provisions will protect potato farmers from increased potato production in normal corn and feed grain areas. Stable income for feed grains will reduce the possibility of tremendous increases in dairy and poultry production in the Corn Belt, putting our farmers at an extreme competitive disadvantage. Stabilization of the feed grain market should reduce inefficient operations and resultant excessive costs.

For several years we have needed an approach to the feed grain problem which made sense. The previous programs have not made sense. I do not contend that this bill is perfect. For example, we may find that production controls would be more satisfactory than acreage controls. But, in its essentials, the program strikes at the heart of the feed grain problem. As an emergency measure it is worthy of our support.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank my good colleague from Maine.

My final word on this subject is that we have heard about the dairy situation, and the manufacture of milk and butterfat. I have been one of those who have urged upon the present administration the announcement of dairy support levels. As was indicated, that announcement will come today, tomorrow, or very shortly.

The bill ought to be considered on its own merits, and not as related to a dairy support level. From what I have heard about the projected dairy support level, I believe it will offer considerable relief. The Senator from Wisconsin and I come from milk producing areas where surplus milk is produced. It is what we call manufacturing milk. Butter is also produced for a number of creameries. The States of Minnesota and Wisconsin are surely involved in that industry.

I also come from an area in which food milk, that is, class 1 milk, is produced, which is sold through the dairy for household consumption.

That grade of milk is generally under a marketing order, and a marketing order has been one of the best ways of protecting price. I refer to the milk that comes to our doorsteps.

But manufacturing milk is used in processed food products, such as processed cheese and dried milk. There is great need for dried milk overseas. In fact, we are short of dried milk right now in view of our own foreign policy and security objectives. So I hope my colleagues will not wish to deny a feed-grain producer a modicum of justice on the basis that it will increase the price of milk.

If such be the case, there are many other industries about which we could start complaining. The two Senators from New York are deeply concerned

about this measure. The prices we must pay in Minnesota for some products from New York do not make us very happy. But I know it costs a good deal of money to produce and to live in New York; and it costs a good deal of money to live in California and in many of the great metropolitan areas.

I have always pleaded with our consumers at home to be somewhat considerate of the needs of others, and if we ever get into an argument in this body or in the other body of Congress that what we want someone to do is to produce cheaply, so that we can manufacture goods at cheap cost and sell at high prices, then we shall be in one fix in America.

One great thing about our country is that we have attempted to have some degree of balance. I could have given my views on the Senate bill with what I consider some of its shortcomings, but I shall ask for the passage of the bill. I hope with the passage of the bill we will meet the deadline in reference to the feed-grain plantings.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I have appreciated the discussion of the bill by the Senator from Minnesota. I believe he has explained it very well. I appreciated also the remarks of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on the bill. I shall support the bill. I expect to vote for it. I do so with some misgivings. I do not believe it would bring an agricultural utopia in the feed-grain sections of this Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I fully concur in what the Senator from Kansas has said.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate that statement. I know that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who has been working in this field for many years, knows some of the problems. It is not easy to vote for proposed legislation which would reduce acreages 15, 20, 30, or 40 percent in the agricultural sections of the Nation. I know the problem that is confronting us.

In the wheat sections of Kansas we have reduced our acreage. In 1951 we planted 18 million acres of wheat. Our allotment at the present time is 10.3 million. So one can see what happens to an agricultural State when we begin to reduce acreages.

I shall support the bill on that theory.

There are one or two sections of the bill that concern me. One is in regard to the price supports for feed grains. Of course, the bill establishes \$1.20 for loan support prices for corn. Then it provides:

Crops of oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums shall be such level as the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) determines is fair and reasonable in relation to the level of price support for corn—

That reads very well. The bill further provides—

taking into consideration the feeding value of such commodity in relation to corn

Then it is spoiled by the language—

And the following additional factors.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is not that the provision of the present law?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is in the law now. We copied from the existing law.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate that situation. I complained about it bitterly to the previous Secretary of Agriculture. I was told that the loan support price on sorghum was based upon all these other factors, but not feed value.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Senator from Kansas has a point. At one time he and I combined on that complaint. But since the bill was for only 1 year, a one-shot proposition, it did not seem that we should rewrite the so-called feed equivalent value. I am not a member of the committee, but I heard some of the members talking about rewriting the feed equivalent value section. But "additional factors" surely includes many other things.

Mr. CARLSON. It would ruin the price support for grain and sorghums. The feeding value of grain sorghums as compared to corn is 95 percent of the feeding value of corn. On that basis I should be delighted if support prices were based upon that principle, but other factors are contained in the bill, as the distinguished chairman of the committee has stated. I was concerned about it then, and I would not let the point pass at this session without complaining about it now. I do not think the provision belongs there. It should not be there.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to say to my good friend from Kansas that very soon we shall consider a bill dealing with corn and other feed grains on a permanent basis, and it is entirely possible that something may be done to modify the formula about which we have been speaking.

Mr. CARLSON. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Those are the most encouraging words I have heard in a long time. I know the interest of the chairman of the committee in this subject and his ability to deal with the problem. I sincerely hope he will give consideration to that phase of it, because that is one of the sore points of the language that reads plainly that it is to be based upon the feeding value of corn. That is not done.

I would like to mention briefly another item in regard to supporting an amendment to the bill which would eliminate corn used for silage.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That provision is contained in the House bill.

Mr. CARLSON. The House has already agreed to that amendment. It occurs to me that we are considering a crop which is not on the market. The farmer himself uses his own silage.

I am hopeful that we can adopt an amendment in the Senate that would strengthen the bill by adding sorghums. There is no reason why when we eliminate corn for silage we should not also eliminate sorghum for silage. I would urge the chairman of the committee

to give some thought to this matter. I do not like to offer an amendment on this point this afternoon, but I do think it has some merit.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that I have given some thought to it, and I am sorry to have to tell him that I would have to oppose it, because it would practically kill the purpose of the bill. If we permit corn to be planted for silage, it is entirely possible that a farmer could produce enough silage for his own use and plant corn on the side and sell it.

If corn for silage is not included as a designated feed grain under the proposed feed grain program, it will remove from the historical base acreage of corn approximately 7 million acres. This could result in a reduction in the acreage actually diverted from corn under the program of at least 1 million acres. It is recognized that the per acre feed equivalent of corn utilized for silage is equal to or greater than the feed value of an acre of corn harvested for grain. Moreover, if corn for silage is excluded under the program, it will result in a greater acreage of corn being devoted to silage since the farmer would utilize for silage any acreage of corn on the farm found to be in excess of the permitted acreage. Without all corn being included in the program, it would not be possible to prohibit a farmer from utilizing excess corn acreage for silage. Furthermore, if corn for silage is removed from the program, there would be little, if any, justification for retaining in the program grain sorghums used for silage.

I hope the Senator will not press the amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator from Minnesota would yield further, I would say that there are a great many farmers who plant 15, 20, or 40 acres of corn silage, and the same thing is true with respect to sorghums. Are we going to cut production back 15, 20, or 40 percent in order that they will not have feed for their livestock?

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of our distinguished Senators is about to offer an amendment which I believe will take care of that whole situation. He stands over there with a most benevolent look on his face and holds in his hand a most worthy proposal. Very shortly he will offer it, and every Senator will vote for it and the bill.

Mr. CARLSON. I assure the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I expect to support the Senator from Kentucky, who will offer the amendment. I did not know that he was going to offer it. I trust the chairman of the committee will not oppose it vigorously.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared in justification of a price support increase on soybeans.

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

JUSTIFICATION FOR PRICE SUPPORT INCREASE ON SOYBEANS

Increased level of price support on soybeans is justified on the following basis:

Demand for soybeans and their end products has expanded rapidly in both domestic

and foreign markets in recent years. As example, the domestic consumption of soybean oil during the past 5 years has increased at the rate of 167 million pounds per year. There is every evidence to expect continued increase in this domestic market. Likewise, exports of both beans and oil have climbed rapidly and can be expected to at least equal the rate of increase of recent years, if not surpass it.

There are persistent reports that the Chinese bean production will drop sharply this year. If these reports prove true, China's share of the world bean and oil market will be available to other exporting countries. As one of the leading exporters, the United States will share in that increased demand.

The strength in the market of soybeans is indicated by the very high level of prices for beans. Even last fall, during the peak harvest months, soybean prices to farmers were well above the support level. In fact, since the Korean situation, the price received by farmers has averaged \$2.20 per bushel.

As of October 1, 1960, total stocks of soybeans were only 24 million bushels—less than 2 weeks' supply—and only 4 percent of our annual production.

It is difficult to understand the concern expressed by some with regard to increased production of soybeans. If we are to move in the direction of using our food and fiber abundance, and the productive genius of the American farmer as a part of our foreign policy—in a food for peace and freedom program—there will be greater need for edible vegetable oils. These are essential and welcomed dietary supplements to wheat, rice, dried milk, etc. We believe there is great opportunity in using additional soybean production at home, in dollar markets overseas, and for the needy both here and abroad. Even if this were not true, and assuming bean production this coming year should result in supplies above demand, the Government costs of handling and storage per acre output are considerably less for beans than for corn or other feed grains. Furthermore, if the price support level on corn is increased, as this bill would contemplate, with no increase in the bean price, we could expect a reduction in bean production.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, between lines 20 and 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

(d) The producers on any farm may elect—

(A) to increase the reduction of corn and grain sorghums under clause (1) of subsection (b) to any acreage up to 20 acres; and

(B) to increase the reduction of nonconsuming crops under clause (3) of subsection (b) and the acreage devoted to soil and water conserving uses and withdrawn from crop production or grazing under clause (4) of subsection (b) to the amount of the total feed grain reduction.

Producers electing to make an additional reduction of corn and grain sorghums acreage under this subsection shall be entitled for the number of acres of each commodity represented in such additional reduction over the number of acres of such commodity represented in the required reduction to additional payments under clauses (1) and (2) of subsection (c). The additional reduction provided for by this subsection shall not be a condition of eligibility for price support.

Mr. COOPER. Earlier today I discussed the purpose of my amendment. I

will repeat my statement. The bill before the Senate seeks to secure a 30 percent reduction in the acreage which has been used for feed grain production. The amendment I have offered concerns small farms which have 20 acres or less in corn and grain sorghums; to a smaller degree it affects farms having up to 66 acres of corn and grain sorghums. In addition to the 30 percent reduction which is required under the bill, these farmers would be authorized to withdraw from production up to 20 acres of corn and grain sorghums, all under the same conditions as provided in the bill now.

Mr. CARLSON. Do I understand correctly that the amendment would permit a farmer to have 20 acres outside the corn allotment quotas, and the same with respect to sorghums, for silage production?

Mr. COOPER. Suppose a farmer has a history which shows that for 1959 and 1960 he had 20 acres in corn or sorghum. Under the bill he would be permitted to withdraw from production 30 percent of the 20 acres, or 6 acres. I pointed out yesterday that one-half of the corn farmers in the United States produce corn on 20 acres or less. It might not be economical for these smaller farmers to withdraw only the 30 percent. My amendment would permit a withdrawal of the full 20 acres. It is not mandatory.

Mr. CARLSON. That is one of the difficulties we run into when we start dealing with farm problems. Many small farm operators are seriously hurt when we begin to apply a 15 or 20 percent reduction. I would like to get something that would be of assistance to the small farmer.

Mr. COOPER. I think the amendment would do that. Suppose a farmer had 15 acres in corn last year. Under the bill, he could withdraw only 4½ acres. The amendment would permit him to withdraw his 15 acres, if he desired. It would be better for the small farmer. It would help secure one of the purposes of the bill, and that is to induce a withdrawal or a reduction of acreage. Otherwise the bill cannot be successful.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the amendment, if it should be adopted it would further encourage the curtailment of grain production. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. It would, without question.

Mr. ELLENDER. The small farmers could take out up to 20 acres and participate in the payment program. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this amendment would permit any producer to increase the corn or grain sorghum acreage retired by him under the bill to 20 acres.

This amendment was recommended by Senator COOPER in his individual views accompanying the committee report. It would increase the benefits of the program to farmers who might otherwise be required to retire two or three acres, or some other small number of acres, in order to obtain price support. It probably would be easier both for the

farmer and the Department in administering the act if the more substantial area of 20 acres were to be retired.

I have considered the amendment, and I have discussed it with a few members of the committee. I offer no objection to the amendment.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. In order that I may clearly understand the amendment I should like to ask one question. In the instance of a farmer having 30 acres, would he be able to retire 20 of those 30 acres, or would the amendment apply only to acres of farmers who have 20 acres or less?

Mr. COOPER. He could retire 20 acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. Up to 20 acres.

Mr. COOPER. It would not apply to the case of a man who had 1,000 acres, or even 100 acres. It would be necessary for a farmer to have less than 67 acres before the amendment would apply. Suppose a farmer had 50 acres of corn. Under the bill, he could withdraw 15 acres. Under my amendment he could withdraw 5 additional acres and obtain the same benefits of the program for doing so. However, the amendment is of greatest value to the farmer who has only 15 or 20 acres of corn, and wants to put the whole field in grass this year, growing no corn, as many of them did under the soil bank. That will also make the program much easier to administer.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I wish to point something out with respect to the history of wheat production. In that respect we allowed 15 acres of wheat to be produced. We found throughout the country that we were getting land and farms going up and pyramiding and accelerating 15-acre tracts. We have reached the point where the 15-acre tracts are producing in the aggregate between 500 million and 600 million bushels of wheat a year. I should like to ask a question. Would the amendment permit, from a historical standpoint, a minimum or a maximum of 20 acres, whichever the owner elected?

Mr. COOPER. No. I believe this would cure the fault the Senator finds with the wheat program. Instead of permitting a grower to raise 15 acres, as under the wheat program, the amendment would permit him to withdraw the full amount, up to 20 acres.

I gave my example a few minutes ago. Suppose a farmer has 20 acres which he planted last year in corn or sorghum. Under the provision of the bill which came before the committee, he could withdraw only 6 acres. I do not think it would be much inducement to him to be able to withdraw 6 acres from production. The amendment will permit him to withdraw the entire 20 acres from production.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. It is only with reference to withdrawal? It would not permit him to grow any more?

Mr. COOPER. It is for withdrawal.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there are some things which ought to be said about the bill in its relation to the recommendations of the task force. There were a number of task forces. I must confess to some bewilderment concerning the recommendations which the task force made. I hope no one will feel that I am intruding with any kind of partisan or political note, but I must always go back to the Gospel and Scripture.

Since this is the administration's first farm bill, I have no other way of measuring promise and performance than to go back and see what the promises were which were made last year.

In the platform of the New Frontier, there appeared a statement which, of course, distressed me somewhat last year. Probably it does not distress me quite so much now. However, I quote it:

Unimaginative, outmoded Republican policies which failed to use these productive capacities of our farms have been immensely costly to our Nation. They can and will be changed. We repudiate the Republican administration of the soil bank program which has emphasized the retirement of whole farm units, and we pledge an orderly land retirement and conservation program.

An administration task force was created. It consisted of three gentlemen, one of whom I know fairly well. The three men were J. N. Efferson, Lauren Soth, and Jesse W. Tapp. I recall when Mr. Tapp was in Government. I have always esteemed him as a very distinguished, knowledgeable citizen, a man of real discernment and analytical power.

In the report of that task force set up by the administration there was this statement:

We believe the most practical way to deal with the grain surplus is to undertake a greatly expanded land retirement program. We believe it would be unwise to raise price supports on wheat and corn under present circumstances. This would increase the problem of getting production in line with markets and would increase surplus accumulation.

That is taken from the report of the task force. They said it would be unwise to increase price supports on wheat and corn. So here is a very competent task force telling us it is unwise to do what is being done in the bill. On the theory that they are very discerning and comprehending people, who want to—

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Nebraska causes me to split an infinitive, but I will yield just the same.

Mr. CURTIS. I am sorry. However, so many infinitives have already been split that this one will not be noticed.

Was this task force report made before or after the election?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it was made after the election. I do not know at this

date, particularly, but I have a copy of the task force report before me; and since such reports have a way of becoming lost, I shall place it in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the task force report be printed at this point in my remarks. That will make up for the split infinitive.

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

KEY ELEMENTS OF THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

FARM PRODUCTION PROSPECTS

Under present Federal agricultural programs, with average weather, total farm output probably will continue to rise at a faster rate than market outlets. This means that with no change in programs, the United States will continue to accumulate surpluses. The net cost of Federal farm price supports, storage and disposal programs probably will remain in the range of recent years—\$2 to \$4 billion.

The overproduction of grain is the center of the farm surplus problem—affecting most of American agriculture directly or indirectly. During the current marketing year, the Nation is adding 400 million bushels of grain to the carryover, and this rate of accumulation probably will continue. For corn and other feed grains, there are price supports but no production restrictions. Other major commodities appear to be coming into better balance between production and market outlets, but the grain situation is becoming unmanageable.

If the grain surplus is not brought under control soon, it will spill rapidly into the livestock industries, resulting in expansion of meat, dairy products, and poultry products and sharply lower prices and net incomes for the producers of these products. The livestock industries are in fairly good balance now, primarily because of the Government programs which hold a considerable quantity of grain off the market.

PROSPECTIVE DEMAND

Expansion of the domestic market for farm products will be limited largely to growth of population. There will be more heavy eating teenagers in the population in 1965 but also more people in old age groups. The effects of changes in age groups will be largely offsetting. If consumer income grows at about the same rate as in the 1950's, per capita disposable income in 1965 will be 10 to 15 percent above the 1959 level. However, this increase in income would have relatively little effect on the per capita demand for food.

We can see little possibility of substantial expansion in export markets. Every effort should be made to increase the use of our surplus food in hungry countries by special programs and by commercial exports, but it would be unrealistic to look to foreign disposal as a solution for the farm surplus problem.

Distribution of food surpluses to needy people in this country also should be encouraged in every way possible, but the expansion in the total market for food from this source is not likely to be great.

BALANCE BETWEEN PRODUCTION AND MARKETS

If present programs are unchanged, we expect a further decline in net income of commercial farmers in the next 5 years. Gross income to commercial agriculture will increase slightly, as a result of larger volume at approximately the same level of prices. However, costs of production undoubtedly will continue to rise, so net income will continue to drift downward, although not drastically so long as present programs are maintained.

ADJUSTMENT IN NUMBERS OF FARMS

The number of commercial farms is not likely to change greatly in the next 5 years. The income squeeze is not so great as to cause a rapid reduction in the number of commercial farms. The number of farms with gross sales above \$2,500 has held approximately steady for the last decade, and the reduction has been in noncommercial farms of low productivity and low income.

The decline in total number of farms and number of people in farming will continue in the next 5 years under present programs. The speed of this movement will depend largely on the rate of economic growth for the economy as a whole and on the level of employment. If the rate of unemployment continues above 6 percent, we expect a slowing down in the rate of agricultural adjustment, because nonfarm jobs will not be available for farm people.

Income to farm families from nonagricultural sources has become increasingly important in recent years. About one-third of the total net income of the farm population came from nonfarm sources in 1959. This nonfarm income of farm people will be under pressure unless the economic growth rate is increased.

SHORT-RUN POLICIES

We believe the most practical way to deal with the grain surplus is to undertake a greatly expanded land retirement program. This land would be removed from production of any crop for market or for livestock feed or pasture. Nothing can be done about the 1961 wheat crop, since most of it is planted, but plans should be made to adjust plantings in the fall of 1961.

Participation in the land retirement program at some minimum level should be a condition for receiving price support or other benefits from farm programs. Land retired from cotton, wheat, and other crops with acreage allotments should be placed in the conservation reserve.

An effort should be made to retire a considerable acreage of land that has been planted to feed grains in recent years. We believe that a substantial increase in payments for land retirement in 1961 would be partly offset in the Government budget in subsequent years by lower costs for price supports and storage. Land retirement costs will be high, but the more money spent on this program, the lower the costs for price supports, disposal, and storage. And these expenditures for land retirement would be moving agriculture in the direction of long-run adjustment.

An effort should be made to curtail Government programs that are tending to increase production of farm products. For example, the \$250 million agricultural conservation payments might well be used as part of the fund for land retirement, instead of for enlarging the productive capacity of agriculture. Land reclamation and other programs increasing land in cultivation should be curtailed.

We believe it would be unwise to raise price supports for wheat and corn under present circumstances. This would increase the problem of getting production into line with markets and would increase surplus accumulation. The emphasis should be placed on restraining production of grains.

Cotton and rice are also in surplus, but the maladjustment of supply and demand is not as serious as for wheat and feed grains. The market position of these commodities would be improved by a general land retirement program. We believe the general level of dairy price supports should be unchanged for the next year and that surplus accumulation at this support level would not be excessive.

In our judgment, farmers would be unlikely to support rigid supply control programs at this time. We believe, however,

that they would support a comprehensive land retirement program.

LONG-RANGE POLICIES

These recommendations for action in 1961 would fit in with a long-range policy of land retirement. In this long-range program, the emphasis should be on retiring whole farms so as to get a better adjustment of manpower and land resources in American agriculture.

We believe the programs for depressed areas should include some marginal areas of agriculture. The present rural development program could well be expanded to help increase the earning power of many people who are now earning little in agriculture.

We repeat, however, that long-term agricultural adjustment depends largely on the achievement of a vigorous rate of growth for the rest of the economy and the availability of nonfarm jobs.

J. N. EFFERSON.
LAUREN SOTH.
JESSE W. TAPP.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD another task force report to the President on a wheat program for the 1960's; and also a statement made by Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at the farm conference held on January 26 by the agricultural subcommittee. I ask that they be printed in the body of the RECORD, with my remarks.

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

A WHEAT PROGRAM FOR THE 1960'S SUMMARY

Under the proposed wheat program:

1. The increase in CCC stocks of wheat would be stopped, and a firm timetable of carryover reduction established.
2. Treasury costs of the wheat program, now near \$1 billion each year, would be reduced by nearly one-half.
3. Feed grain production would be reduced by 4 to 5 million tons per year, and the cost of the feed grain program would be reduced accordingly.
4. Farm income would be increased.
5. The national marketing quota would be apportioned equitably among all regions and growers under uniform procedures.
6. A program to place land in conservation use, similar to programs proposed for feed grains, would be established for wheat.

INTRODUCTION

This is a report of a committee named by Senator Kennedy October 20, 1960, "to formulate a national wheat program which can be made fully effective next year." The committee worked largely within a framework of proposals made or endorsed by Senator Kennedy in the 86th Congress, and by other Senators and Congressmen. These are found chiefly in S. 3159 of the 86th Congress.

The committee was asked to consider those proposals, together with those of a number of farm organizations, and to spell out in as much detail as necessary, the blueprint of an effective, operating program. The report indicates legislative and administrative changes needed to put a sound wheat program into operation. It provides also a description of the operating mechanics of the program, and shows comparisons with the present program.

The need for change in the wheat program has been apparent for several years. Proposed legislation has failed to pass, however, and stocks of wheat and other grains owned by the Federal Government have grown year by year. Farm incomes have declined or

remained at relatively low levels. Wheat stocks may exceed 1.5 billion bushels by the time a new program could become effective for the crop to be harvested in 1962. Feed grain stocks may be near 3 billion bushels when harvest of the 1961 crop begins. Farm prices in 1961 will remain near longtime lows unless present trends are reversed. Faced with those conditions, farmers, consumers, and taxpayers agree on the need for a new farm policy. The committee believes that these groups can also agree on the elements of sound national farm policies and programs for the 1960's.

TIMING OF AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION—1961

Passage of wheat legislation early in the 87th Congress is essential. Under present law, the Secretary of Agriculture must proclaim the wheat marketing quota by May 15 of the year preceding harvest of the crop to which the quota applies. This is followed by announcement of acreage allotments and price support levels, and by a national referendum. Wheat legislation should be passed by May 15, 1961, to be effective for 1962 crop wheat with minimum interference with farm operations. However, if new legislation were passed by August, it could apply to 1962 crop wheat. If the August deadline were not met, wheat stocks might climb to 1.8 billion bushels by 1963.

Production of feed grains is closely related to wheat production; the two are inseparable from the standpoint of public policy. Much of the difficulty in farm programs the past decade has resulted from failure to prevent land taken out of wheat from being planted to other crops, chiefly feed grains. Passage of feed-grain legislation early in 1961 is perhaps as important as early approval of a new wheat program. Serious consideration should be given either to establishment by new legislation of a land retirement program for feed grains in the late winter, or to full use of present administrative authority to reduce feed-grain plantings in 1961. Addition of 6 to 8 million tons of feed grains to stocks from the 1961 crop might thus be avoided.

DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS

Before further restrictions on agricultural production are accepted as national policy, efforts should be underway to expand food consumption among low-income people at home and abroad, and to define our own food reserve needs for national security. Neither a firm schedule of production requirements nor a timetable of reductions in grain stocks can be established until these important responsibilities are fulfilled.

The American people and friendly foreign nations have been assured that the new administration would apply food distribution programs sympathetically and wisely, that the international food-for-peace program would be administered vigorously, that food reserves for civil emergencies at home would be studied and proposed, and that efforts to establish food reserves for friendly nations through the United Nations would be accelerated.

The quantity of annual marketings of wheat, the extent of land retirement needed to reduce feed grain output, and the rate of reductions in Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) stocks depend heavily on decisions in these matters. Once utilization of our abundant food supplies has been pushed to the limits of the public interest at home and abroad, reductions in annual production could be recommended with a clear conscience.

A NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTA FOR WHEAT

The national marketing quota for wheat under existing law is, in practice, all that can be produced on the statutory 55-million-acre national allotment. But that statutory marketing quota is supplemented by pro-

duction from about 4 million acres planted in excess of the national acreage allotment under an exemption granted in the existing law. Under present conditions, about 1,250 million bushels of wheat are expected to be produced each year. From 100 million to 250 million bushels will be added to CCC stocks each year under the existing program. Budget costs will rise accordingly until the program is changed.

The commitment to support the price of all that can be produced on an excessive acreage allotment is a serious weakness in the wheat program. It requires CCC to add to its stocks in most years in order to meet its price support obligations.

The principal provision in the proposed Wheat Marketing Act of 1960 of the 86th Congress, and the major proposal in this report, is to terminate the open-end price support commitment of present law and to support the price only of a stated volume of wheat marketed in any year. A second major provision would require the Secretary of Agriculture to set the national marketing quota somewhat below annual disappearance so long as excessive wheat stocks exist, permitting wheat to be removed from CCC inventories at a price level to be established by Congress. The CCC sale price would become, in effect, the level of price support for wheat.

These key changes would introduce significant budgetary control into a program which is not now subject to such control, and in which budget estimates have been notably inexact.

Subject to a decision that it will be in the national interest to reduce wheat stocks at a different rate, the committee recommends that the national marketing quota be set initially at a level which would permit a net reduction in CCC stocks of 150 million bushels of wheat in the first year of operation of the program, and 100 million bushels in each subsequent year, so long as stocks are excessive.

Thus, the national wheat requirement for primary use, or the national marketing quota, would be the number of bushels estimated by the Secretary to be used as human food in the United States each year (including members of the Armed Forces outside the United States), plus the amount to be exported either as wheat or wheat products during the year under all export programs, less 150 million bushels (later 100 million) which would come from CCC stocks. If total disappearance of U.S. wheat in the first year of the program was equal to 1960-61 disappearance, the wheat situation would be as shown in column 1 of the example below. A smaller estimated disappearance would require a smaller national marketing quota, as in column 2 of the example.

Producers would receive certificates to market 900 million bushels the first year, and 950 million bushels in subsequent years for milling and export, even though the two uses required 1,050 million bushels. The remainder would come from limited release of CCC stocks into the open market at prices determined according to criteria established by Congress.

Example 1
[In millions of bushels]

	Col. 1	Col. 2
Estimated disappearance:		
Domestic food.....	500	500
Cash exports.....	150	150
Public Law 480 and all other exports.....	400	350
Total.....	1,050	1,000
Estimated supply:		
National marketing quota.....	900	850
CCC.....	150	150
Total.....	1,050	1,000

If in any year the disappearance of wheat for domestic food and exports exceeded the Secretary's estimate, CCC stocks would be reduced by more than was expected. If disappearance fell short of the estimate, stock reduction would fall behind schedule. It would appear equitable to share the effects of such errors between wheat producers and the public in subsequent marketing periods. Thus, if CCC stocks were reduced by as much as 200 million bushels in the first year, or by 150 million bushels in a later year, the national marketing quota estimated by the Secretary for the succeeding year might be increased by half the excess, giving producers half the gain from the larger sales and retaining half the gain for the reduction in CCC stocks.

If CCC stock reduction fell behind schedule in any year by as much as 50 million bushels, the national marketing quota for the succeeding year might be reduced by half the shortfall, so that producers, through reduced marketings, and the public, through slower stock reduction, would share the burden of unexpected reductions in wheat sales.

The program would not depend upon carryover reduction for successful operation. Once wheat carryover was down to normal, the national marketing quota would be equal to expected disappearance for food and export. Prices would be stabilized through buying and selling by CCC. Great operational flexibility for CCC would be required to reduce stocks in the early years of the program. Similar flexibility would be needed to stabilize and support prices without accumulating stocks in later years. Establishment of a statutory minimum national marketing quota comparable to the present minimum national acreage allotment, in place of a marketing quota to be determined by the demand for wheat and the urgency of carryover reduction would seriously hamper CCC inventory operations.

APPORTIONMENT OF THE NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTA

Under present law, the national acreage allotment, and implicitly, the national marketing quota, are apportioned among States, counties, and farms on the basis of acreage history in the preceding 10 years, adjusted for unusual circumstances. In addition, under a 1941 amendment to the wheat program, producers with allotments less than 15 acres may harvest wheat from as much as 15 acres and market it without penalty. In recent years, this provision has had the effect of adding 4 million acres to wheat harvested and 100 million bushels to marketings each year.

It was recognized by the committee that wheat produced under the exemption granted growers with small acreages was grown under the law, and is a legitimate addition to acreage and production history. It is recommended that the average acreage harvested in excess of the national acreage allotment in the 3 years preceding the effective date of the new program but not more than 15 acres per farm, be added to the national base acreage prior to apportionment of the national marketing quota. In this way, all marketing rights would be apportioned under uniform regulations, a significant improvement over the present program. Producers now planting under the marketing quota exemption would receive about the same credit for wheat acreage history as would producers now subject to the marketing quota.

The committee understands from preliminary study that the national base acreage would be increased by about 3 million acres by this action, and that the share of the national marketing quota which would be apportioned to farms formerly planting under the marketing quota exemption would be about 50 million bushels greater than if credit had not been given for previous acreage in excess of the farm acreage allotments.

This is a major change from the provisions, but not the effect or intent of the Wheat Marketing Act of 1960. There, the national marketing quota would have been apportioned according to the national base acreage, excluding plantings under the exemption in recent years, weighted by normal yields. Growers who had been planting in excess of their allotments but who had base acreages less than 15 acres, would have been permitted to apply for an increase in their base acreage and marketing quota. Marketing under this provision would have been in addition to the national marketing quota for primary use. The effect would have been to increase the supply of wheat by perhaps 40 to 70 million bushels above the primary marketing quota, and to slow the reduction in CCC stocks by a similar quantity each year.

NORMAL YIELDS

Normal wheat yields have been established in most counties and on many farms. In the past they have served as a basis for soil bank payments, and for computation of penalties for wheat planted in excess of acreage allotments. Normal yields would assume new importance in a bushel marketing quota program. Base acreage times normal yield, reduced by a factor to be determined by the Secretary, would become the State, county, and farm marketing quotas. It is recommended that normal yields be studied thoroughly, and that they be revised administratively under uniform regulations where indicated, to assure equitable apportionment of National, State, county, and farm marketing quotas.

WHEAT IN RELATION TO FEED GRAINS: THE PLACE OF LAND RETIREMENT AND CONSERVATION IN THE WHEAT PROGRAM

Just prior to reactivation of the wheat acreage allotment program for 1954 crop wheat, about 80 million acres were planted to wheat each year. With some adjustments, this is the national wheat base acreage of nearly 82 million acres.

By the late 1950's, largely because of acreage allotments, wheat was harvested from only 49 to 50 million acres of that base, and from about 4 million acres under the exemption described above. The remainder, near 30 million acres, was chiefly in feed grains, with small acreages in soybeans, minor crops, and summer fallow.

Permitting land taken out of wheat to be planted to other crops indiscriminately is a serious weakness in the present program, one which ought to be remedied.

The national marketing quota described above, plus 100 million bushels to be used for seed and to maintain present levels of wheat feeding, can be produced on 45 million acres in the early 1960's, 8 million acres less than are presently used in wheat production. Land diverted from wheat would be used to produce grains for feed in the absence of legislation preventing it. At least 10 percent of the wheat base acreage, the equivalent of 8 million acres now producing wheat, would have to be removed from production of grains for harvest to avoid increasing the feed grain supply as a result of the reduction in wheat marketings.

If wheat producers were required to reduce plantings of grain crops by 20 percent of their base acreage as a condition for receiving a marketing quota, or if incentive payments were offered high enough to attract that amount of land to a conservation use, land from the wheat base, now in feed grains, would be reduced substantially as shown in the tabulation. Such a program would be comparable to land-use programs under discussion for the Corn Belt.

Disposition of wheat base acreage

	1958-60	1962, 20 percent of base acres idled
Producing wheat for market.....	39.0	42.0
Producing wheat for seed and feed.....	3.0	3.0
Producing wheat for stocks.....	8.0	0
Abandoned or not seeded to wheat.....	5.0	5.0
Grains for feed; soybeans, additions to summer fallow, etc.....	24.7	17.8
Land retired from cultivation.....	2.3	17.2
Total.....	82.0	85.0

The committee believes that a wheat program which would not worsen the feed-grain situation could be formulated and implemented without a comparable feed-grain program. However, with feed-grain stocks excessive, it may be desirable to propose a feed-grain program in which resource use and production would be reduced in traditional feed-producing areas by amounts similar to the reduction in grain production proposed here for specialized wheat-producing areas.

Cornrowers are rightly sensitive to the possibility of turning wheat lands to feed production. It would require not only a well-designed wheat program, but also an intensive educational effort to assure them that this would not once more be the result of changes in the wheat program. Similarly, wheat producers can scarcely be expected to bear the main burden of reduction in grain output, and might welcome a comparable program in corn areas.

PAYMENT FOR LAND RETIREMENT

Under the proposed Wheat Marketing Act of 1960, producers would have been required to reduce crop acreage by 10 percent of their wheat base acreage without compensation, and an additional 10 percent for compensation if funds were available.

If compensation under the land conservation program were equal to 50 or 60 percent of gross value of crops per acre, the increase in wheat prices needed to provide an adequate return to farm producers through the market would be smaller.

WHEAT PRICES AND INCOME FROM WHEAT PRODUCTION

Immediate steps should be taken to define parity income in concrete terms. Once defined, it should be achieved as rapidly as possible.

Wheat prices near 100 percent of parity (now \$2.35 per bushel) were the goal of proposed legislation early in 1960. The committee recommends that the prices at which meat will be supported in the next several years be established at levels which will most nearly reach parity of income.

This is illustrated for a 160-acre farm, which prior to 1953, planted 120 acres of wheat and fallowed 40 acres. Since 1955, this farm would have had a wheat acreage allotment of 80 acres; 1,600 bushels of wheat would have been produced and 1,472 bushels marketed; 40 acres would have been in fallow and 40 acres in sorghum grain, producing 800 bushels.

Under the proposed program for 1962, this farm would have a marketing quota of 1,148 bushels, and would continue to use 128 bushels for feed and seed. These amounts could be produced on 62 acres. Thirty-four acres in grain sorghum would complete the cropping program. Land in crops would be reduced by 24 acres, or by 20 percent. If compensation of \$15 an acre were paid on only half that acreage, and the wheat price increased to \$2.25 per bushel, comparative incomes would be as shown in the example.

Example 2

1958-60:	
Sale of wheat (1,472 bushels at \$1.75).....	\$2,576
Sale of sorghum (800 bushels at \$0.85).....	680
Land retirement income.....	0
Gross income.....	3,256
Cost of operation.....	2,400
Net income.....	856
1962:	
Sale of wheat (1,148 bushels at \$2.25).....	2,583
Sale of sorghum (680 bushels at \$0.85).....	578
Land retirement income (12 acres at \$15).....	180
Gross income.....	3,341
Cost of operation.....	2,280
Net income.....	1,061

If compensation for placing land in a conservation use were paid on the full 24 acres at a slightly higher rate of \$18 per acre, net farm income could be raised with a smaller wheat price increase.

The committee recommends that if it is found to be appropriate to increase wheat prices substantially, payment should be made for only part of the land taken out of production. If full payment is made, some limits should be set on the amount of any farm which could be contracted for compensation.

With the price at the level specified in the example, the export subsidy would increase from 60 cents to about \$1.10 per bushel. The cost of wheat for food would increase about seven-tenths of 1 cent per 1 pound loaf of bread.

The committee recognizes that these two factors would raise important objections to a large price increase. A more modest price goal would minimize these objections, while increasing the need for compensation to avoid a further decline in farm income.

TREASURY COSTS

The cost of the present wheat program is about \$1 billion a year. The proposed program, either with large land use payments, or a sizable increase in the price of wheat (and the export subsidy) would reduce costs by about half.

Annual cost of wheat program

[In millions of dollars]

	Present program	Proposed program
CCC acquisitions of wheat.....	300	0
Storage, transportation, etc.....	400	1,200
Export subsidy (500,000,000 bushels).....	300	400
Land use and conservation.....	0	300
Total.....	1,000	900
Less receipts from CCC sales.....	0	200
Less savings from reduction in feed grain production and CCC acquisitions from wheat base acreage.....	0	150
Total.....	1,000	550

¹ After about 5 years.

ACCEPTANCE BY WHEAT PRODUCERS

Under present law, only producers with allotments greater than 15 acres are eligible to vote in the wheat marketing quota referendum. Under this proposed program, all wheat producers would be subject to the provisions of the marketing quota, and, therefore, would be eligible to vote in any referendum held. The committee recommends that if this program is offered to producers as an alternative to another program, a simple majority, or at least less than a two-thirds majority, should be enough to place the program into operation.

If this program were offered as an alternative to the present program and should fail to pass, it would be essential that fur-

ther steps be taken, since present law is clearly untenable. Hearings were held in both sessions of the 86th Congress on proposed amendments which would be improvements over present law.

OWNERSHIP AND REDISTRIBUTION OF MARKETING RIGHTS

Under present law, marketing rights are attached to land. No change is proposed here. However, in order to make it possible for new growers to receive marketing quotas, it is recommended that a reserve of not to exceed 2 percent of the quota of each county be maintained for distribution by the county committee.

Also, a system should be established under which the marketing quotas of growers with production history, but who do not market wheat for several years, might be distributed to growers who wish to market wheat. This loss of marketing quotas by producers would not apply to those farmers who failed to produce because of weather conditions, or participation in the land retirement program. Lacking such a provision, a large backlog of unused marketing quotas might accumulate in some areas.

PROBLEMS OF TRANSITION FROM PRESENT TO IMPROVED PROGRAMS

After the effective date of this program, millers could not process wheat for flour unless it was covered by a certificate of primary use. To insure minimum disruption, CCC should issue such certificates to millers in the amount needed to cover working stocks of millers and exporters until new crop wheat is marketed under 1962 certificates. Details of this transition should be developed by specialists in consultation with representatives of millers and exporters.

CONTINUATION OF LOAN PROGRAM

Low market prices might occur at harvest, just as under the present program. To avoid large losses to producers who must sell at harvest, a loan program at a rate at least as high as in the present program should be maintained. Since market prices should be near the level at which CCC may dispose of its stocks during most of the year, little grain should be acquired by CCC under the program except through neglect on the part of the producer to redeem his loan at the higher price. Continuation of the loan program would also make it possible for growers and merchants holding old crop wheat when the new program became effective to avoid the large losses they would incur if they had to sell it at feed grain prices.

DEMOCRATICALLY ELECTED FARMER COMMITTEES

Consideration should be given to improving the election procedure for farmer committees which administer farm programs—especially to direct election of county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees.

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

(Presented by Charles B. Shuman, president, at Conference of Farm Organizations and Commodity Groups called by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, Washington, D.C., January 26, 1961)

We are happy to participate in this conference. We agree that there is a real need for a careful reappraisal of existing problems, probable causes, and proposed solutions. Above all, we need to take account of our experience to date with the difficulties and problems inherent in the use of political processes to solve economic problems.

As an introduction to our recommendations I would like to say a few words about Farm Bureau, its members, and their philosophy.

Farm Bureau is an organization of 1,600,792 farm families with member units in 2,674 counties in 49 States and Puerto Rico. Our policies are developed through an extensive policy development program which involves study, discussion, and action by the members, and their elected representatives, at literally thousands of meetings each year. Every member has the opportunity to participate, and all are encouraged to do so. We do not claim this process to be perfect. We are constantly seeking to improve it; however, we are proud of the fact that our policies reflect the active participation of hundreds of thousands of members.

As a general farm organization—representing members who live in all important farming areas and produce all of the many farm products grown in this country—Farm Bureau must, of necessity, reconcile regional and commodity differences. Our goal is to serve the best interests of agriculture from an overall standpoint and to do so on a basis consistent with the national interest. For example, our policies on international trade reflect an effort to strike a reasonable balance between the demands of some farm commodity groups for protection from imports and the more general interest of agriculture and the Nation in a high level of mutually advantageous trade with other countries.

While we hope, and expect, to find areas of agreement at conferences such as this, it should be made clear that Farm Bureau leaders are not free to compromise basic principles set forth in the policy resolutions as developed by the membership. At times this means that we cannot reach agreement with other organizations—who also have a responsibility to represent the views of their members. Such an expression of divergent viewpoints is both inevitable and desirable. After all, the final responsibility for public policy determination does not rest with private groups. It is the function of private organizations to represent the views of their members.

It is the function of the Congress to reconcile conflicting recommendations and to determine the policy that will best serve the national interest. The Congress should not encourage—or permit—either the executive branch of Government or private organizations to perform its role in policy formulation. We intend to insist that the Congress discharge its responsibility in this regard.

OBJECTIVES, GOALS, AND PHILOSOPHY

A major objective of Farm Bureau policy is to create conditions which will make it possible for farmers to earn and get high per-family real incomes in a manner which will preserve freedom. You will note that we stress per-family real income. Farmers don't spend national income statistics. It would be easily possible to increase national farm income, and at the same time reduce substantially the incomes of most commercial family farmers. We would expect this to happen if it should become national policy to reward inefficiency in order to keep a larger than needed number of people on the land.

Our philosophy with respect to Government programs for agriculture is summarized in the following extracts from the policy resolutions adopted by the elected voting delegates from member State organizations at our most recent annual meeting (December 1960).

The fundamental basis for farm prosperity includes factors outside agriculture which affect the farmer's cost of operation; availability of free competitive markets for his products; his freedom and opportunity to make the best possible use of his individual resources; and the real value of his income dollar.

In order for farmers to prosper and keep pace with other groups in a changing world, we must have national policies that will contribute to:

1. High employment and rising productivity throughout the economy to provide the basis for rising living standards and a high level domestic demand for farm products.

2. A relatively stable general price level in order to avoid the painful economic and social disruptions that inevitably result from inflation and depression.

3. Effective and widespread competition as a means of promoting individual incentive and the efficient use of scarce resources. This means that no group—whether it be business, labor, agriculture, or the Government itself—should be permitted to exercise monopolistic powers.

4. The expansion of trade with other nations on the basis of mutual advantage. This is essential to our continued economic growth.

Recognizing the need to determine the appropriate role of the Federal Government in agriculture, we need to establish a yardstick by which proposed Government policies for agriculture can be measured.

Government programs for agriculture should: Aid farmers in solving their own problems; promote efficiency in farming; be consistent with the law of supply and demand; provide economic opportunity for farm people; preserve the competitive principle; insure ample research; stimulate market expansion; insure our ability to feed an increasing population.

Government programs should not: Stimulate excessive production; permit development of monopolies; freeze historical production patterns; open the way to price fixing; erode individual freedom; impede orderly marketing; shift adjustment burdens from one group of producers to another.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recent discussions of farm problems has tended to obscure the fact that farmers have been hurt more by rising costs than by falling prices. The alltime high for net farm income was \$17.3 billion in 1947, when gross income was \$34.4 billion. In 1960 gross income totaled an estimated \$37.7 billion—\$3.3 billion above 1947 and the second highest on record—but higher costs pulled net income down to \$11.4 billion. Thus, gross farm income has gone up \$3.3 billion since 1947, but production expenses have gone up \$9.2 billion and net farm income has dropped \$5.9 billion. The upward trend in farm production costs is primarily a result of inflation, which has reduced the purchasing power of the dollar, and the ever-increasing use of purchased supplies.

Our first recommendation is that the Government take effective steps to stabilize the value of the dollar, and that possible effects on farm costs be taken into consideration in connection with all Government policy decisions.

The need for new farm program legislation varies considerably from commodity to commodity.

Although imperfect in some ways, the Agricultural Act of 1958 has resulted in a substantial improvement in the cotton and rice situations. In the case of cotton (1) domestic consumption and exports have increased; (2) the carryover has been reduced from an alltime high of 14.4 million bales on August 1, 1956, to a prospective 7 million bales or less for August 1, 1961; (3) the upward trend in foreign production has leveled off; (4) domestic consumption of rayon has declined; (5) the export subsidy rate has been reduced; and (6) the national acreage allotment has been increased.

In the case of rice, the carryover has been reduced from 34.6 million hundredweight on

August 1, 1956, to a prospective 9.1 million hundredweight for August 1, 1961. It should be noted, however, that export subsidies under the payment-in-kind program have been relatively higher for rice than for any other commodity.

In view of the progress that has been made under the 1958 act, there is no need for new legislation on either cotton or rice. The important need is to administer the existing law so as to continue the progress that has been made.

The announced 1961 cotton allotment represents increases of 13.2 percent over the 1960 allotment as originally issued, and 5.3 percent over the 1960 allotment as revised to include the additional acreage allocated under the choice B program. We believe that this allotment should be allowed to stand without change. There remains, however, the question of the 1961 support price for cotton.

A support price which forced an increase in domestic cotton prices would tend to encourage the use of synthetics, to increase the subsidy cost of maintaining a high level of cotton exports and to create new surpluses. In view of this, we recommend that the support price be above 70 percent, but not more than 75 percent of the parity price—that is, somewhere between the legal minimum for 1961 and the percentage applicable to choice A cotton of the 1960 crop.

The 1961 rice allotment has been set at the legal minimum which means that it is the same as in each of the preceding 5 years. In view of the progress that has been made in reducing the carryover, we believe that it would be appropriate to raise the national allotment somewhat as an offset to the reduction in price support authorized by the act of 1958. This would make it possible to continue the present level of rice exports without increasing the cost of the special programs needed to move rice abroad.

Compromise legislation was enacted on tobacco last year, and we do not wish to recommend any important changes in the tobacco program at this time. We want, however, to make it clear that we regard the tobacco program as a special case and not as a model that should be copied for other crops.

We recommend no change at this time in the peanut program.

New legislation will be needed for sugar and wool; however, time will not permit discussion of the special problems faced by the producers of these commodities whose production is less than domestic requirements.

The supply-demand situation in the dairy industry has been favorable in recent years. Government stocks have been reduced from the peak levels of a few years ago, and are still low; however, recent developments suggest that this favorable condition may change. The rate of decline in cow numbers has slowed while production per cow has continued to increase. Support prices for manufacturing milk and butterfat were raised in September 1960, for the period ending March 31, 1961, and this is likely to encourage greater production.

To provide assurance that dairy farmers will not again be confronted with surplus stocks, we urge that the present price support program be replaced by one that will keep the dairy industry on a sound basis.

We recommend that the basis for price supports on manufactured dairy products be shifted to a percentage of average market prices during the immediately preceding 3 years.

We oppose the use of production controls in the dairy industry. Analysis of proposed quota plans indicates that they would lead to reduced efficiency, limited opportunity, increased costs, lowered farm incomes, and the prevention of desirable changes in production and marketing.

Such plans would impose undue hardship on young farmers, other new producers, and those desiring to enlarge their size of business to increase efficiency.

We also are opposed to plans for the Government to transfer income from some dairy farmers to other dairy farmers by taxing or penalizing the production of dairy products.

There are no Government price support or production adjustment programs in effect for poultry, hogs, beef cattle, or fruits and vegetables. None is wanted, and none is needed. Producers of these commodities have demonstrated that they can and will adjust production in response to changes in market prices. The increase in hog prices from \$11.30 per hundredweight in December 1959 to \$16.20 per hundredweight in December 1960 illustrates the point, as does the increase in egg prices from 31 cents per dozen in December 1959 to 44 cents per dozen in December 1960.

The soybean situation is also favorable. Prices are above the support level and have been rising in recent weeks. The soybean program is an excellent example of what can be accomplished when price supports are used to facilitate orderly marketing rather than to fix prices at an artificial level. It would be a serious mistake to raise the support price, as this would encourage excessive production. It is not safe to raise a support price merely because market prices are above the support level. A guarantee encourages expansion by reducing risk.

Legislation is urgently needed to help farmers correct the unsatisfactory conditions that have developed in wheat and feed grains. The wheat program is a classic example of the difficulties involved in any attempt to fix prices and control production legislatively. The feed situation has been seriously aggravated by programs that have diverted millions of acres from controlled crops to feed grains, oilseeds, and forage.

The feed-grain surplus did not result from the elimination of corn allotments under the Agricultural Act of 1958—85 percent of the 1960 corn carryover was accumulated before the present corn program became effective. The corn allotment program did not restrict total grain production—it merely encouraged farmers to shift from corn to other feed grains and oilseeds.

It makes no sense at all to restrict production of one grain and let producers plant their diverted acres to another grain. We must face up to our surplus capacity problem on an over-all basis.

Farm Bureau's recommendations for doing this are set forth in the following policy resolutions entitled "Cropland Adjustment Program":

In order to assist growers of feed grains, wheat, soybeans, and flax in adjusting production to market needs and provide for an orderly liquidation of Government surpluses, we reaffirm our support of a properly designed and administered program to adjust production through land retirement.

Specifically, we recommend a temporary program which provides that:

1. The Secretary of Agriculture shall determine annually the overall acreage adjust-

ment of feed grains, wheat, soybeans, and flax necessary to bring production in line with anticipated disappearance. The Secretary shall also establish annually the percentage of cropland which must be placed under contract to qualify for price support on these commodities.

2. To be eligible for price supports on wheat, feed grains, soybeans, and flax, producers must participate in the cropland adjustment program. Cropland already in a retirement program shall be counted in determining compliance with this requirement. Producers of other commodities may also participate. (Whole farm participation should be encouraged.) Any cropland retired under the program in excess of the minimum requirement for price support must be placed under contract for at least 3 years.

3. Cropland adjustment payments shall be made at a level which will encourage sufficient voluntary participation to attain the desired adjustment.

4. Adjustment payments may be made in cash or in kind. Emphasis should be placed on payment in kind, with care to minimize disturbance of the market price structure for grain.

5. Cropland retired under this program must be in addition to land normally left idle or fallowed.

6. Acreage retired under the program may not be harvested or grazed.

7. A maximum limit shall be placed on the percentage of cropland acreage that may be retired in any county after allowing for the minimum acreage required for price support. Acreage retired under previous programs shall not prevent participation in the annual adjustment programs.

8. Wheat acreage allotments shall be terminated.

9. The price support level on corn shall be related to the acreage price received by farmers during the immediately preceding 3 years. The support levels for other feed grains and wheat shall be comparable to the level for corn with adjustments for differences in weight, nutritive value, buyer preference, and supply-demand conditions.

10. Adequate measures shall be taken to protect farmers from the competition of Commodity Credit Corporation sales from accumulated stocks.

The cropland adjustment program outlined above proposes to remove a basic cause of continuing low farm income by starting an immediate reduction of the agricultural productive plant to a size which will better fit farm output to market needs and open the way to orderly liquidation of accumulated Government stocks. It provides for voluntary participation by producers of all crops but requires producers who wish to qualify for price support on wheat, feed grains, soybeans, and flax to participate. Greatest emphasis is placed on the retirement of land from wheat and feed grains as these crops are in most serious surplus difficulty. The exact extent of acreage reduction necessary to bring forth the desired cut in output is very difficult to determine.

Table I shows the output-use picture of wheat and feed grains in recent years and current carryovers.

TABLE I.—Average output, disappearance, and carryover of wheat and feed grains, 5 crop years, 1956-60

Crop	Average production	Average use ¹	Production as percentage of use	Estimated 1961 carryover	Estimated 1961 carryover as percentage of 1960-61 use
Wheat.....million bushels..	1,181	1,091	108	1,526	132
Corn.....do.....	3,862	3,678	105	2,094	52
Sorghum grain.....do.....	521	402	130	675	124
4 feed grains ²million tons..	152.5	144.8	105	85.6	54

¹ Including exports.

² Includes corn, sorghum grain, oats, and barley.

Assuming that market growth over the next few years will be at least proportional to output growth due to improving yields per acre, a reduction in output of 5 to 7.5 percent will just about balance current production with current market needs. Any output reduction in excess of this amount will provide opportunity to start liquidation of Government stocks; however, experience with past land retirement efforts, indicates that the percentage cut in acreage would have to be substantially larger than the indicated percentage reduction in output in order to balance supplies with demand.

Table II shows approximate cropland acreage nationally, how the acreage is currently being used, and what the status of land devoted to specified crops would be under the proposed adjustment program.

TABLE II.—U.S. cropland acreage by principal uses

[In thousands]	
Cropland, grouped by principal use	Planted acreage
Group A—To be supported (without acreage controls):^{1,2}	
Corn (all).....	82,906
Wheat (all ?).....	55,633
Oats, barley, rye.....	52,177
Sorghum (for grain).....	15,444
Soybeans (for beans).....	23,516
Flax (all).....	3,527
Subtotal, group A.....	233,203
Group B—To be supported (with acreage controls):^{1,4}	
Cotton.....	16,068
Rice.....	1,614
Peanuts.....	1,579
Tobacco.....	1,144
Subtotal, group B.....	20,405
Group C—Other crops and uses:⁵	
Conservation reserve.....	4,28,432
Hay, cropland pasture, other crops, fallow, idle, failure, etc.....	177,609
Total cropland, all uses.....	459,649

¹ Planted acreage for 1960 as reported by USDA.

² Producers of these commodities desiring price support must participate in the proposed cropland adjustment program.

³ Currently supported and controlled, but controls to be terminated under Farm Bureau proposal.

⁴ Participation in the proposed cropland adjustment program is not required for price support on these commodities.

⁵ 1954 U.S. Census of Agriculture; data now used by USDA in land retirement computations. New census data to be available in about 6 months.

⁶ Under contract in 1960.

Under the Farm Bureau proposal all land listed in table II under groups A, B, and C—except for an amount in group C equal to that which is customarily summer fallowed or left idle—would be eligible for the land-retirement program on a voluntary basis.

The acreage allotment applicable to crops listed in group B would not be affected by the cropland adjustment program; however, farmers entering the program to qualify for price supports on a grain or oilseed crop would be required to retire a designated percentage of their total cropland. For example, if producers should be required to retire 15 percent of their cropland to qualify for price supports on a grain or oilseed crop, a producer with 200 acres of cropland would be required to retire 30 acres even though he might have a 25-acre cotton allotment. If such a producer wished to ignore the program he could still get price support on his cotton by complying with his cotton allotment, but he would be ineligible for support on grain and oilseed crops.

The proposed cropland-adjustment program includes a new wheat price-support plan whereby the national level of support for wheat would be comparable to the national level for corn after adjustment for differences in weight per bushel, nutritive

value, buyer preference, and supply-demand conditions. Under a relatively free market system there is, of course, normally a considerable range between market prices of the lower and higher grades of wheat.

In order to insure that market prices of all commodities affected by this program reflect the full value as determined by the current year's production relative to demand, the proposal calls for steps to minimize competition from CCC surplus holdings. A major need in this area is to increase the margin between support prices and the prices at which the CCC can sell accumulated stocks for unrestricted use.

One of the more frequent questions regarding provisions of our proposal is: "Won't the termination of wheat allotments result in a big increase in wheat production?" Obviously, this question cannot be answered positively; however, a few points to consider are:

1. Total cropland acreage will be reduced substantially by the program. Payments should be sufficiently high to attract considerable wheat land into the program.

2. While an expansion of wheat acreage is to be expected in the traditional wheat country, average yields are lower in that area than in the newer wheat-growing areas where acreage is likely to decline.

3. Any increase in wheat acreage will, for the most part, mean at least a comparable reduction in the acreage of some other crop—principally barley and sorghum.

4. The lower Government price guarantee for wheat will tend to expand wheat markets and reduce the incentive to increase yields by greater use of fertilizer, irrigation, and other expensive yield-improving practices.

5. Many farmers who are now growing wheat in higher cost areas under the 15-acre quota exemption will likely find it more profitable to shift to the production of alternative crops as the support level on wheat is adjusted downward.

Farm Bureau's cropland adjustment program is a package proposal. It is designed to achieve needed adjustments in grain production on a basis consistent with individual choice in a market system. While we have proposed that participation in the cropland adjustment program be made a condition of eligibility for price support on wheat, feed grains and oilseeds, major emphasis is placed on the use of cropland adjustment payments to encourage voluntary participation on the part of producers of all commodities in a land retirement program.

Under such an approach it is essential that the price support program be made consistent with production objectives. This means that price supports should facilitate orderly marketing rather than fix prices at artificial levels. By encouraging voluntary adjustments in land use the cropland adjustment program will get adjustments in the areas and on the farms where it is most needed. The provision for the voluntary retirement of whole farms will make it possible for some individual farmers to retire or shift to off-farm work. At the same time it will reduce the amount of cropland other farmers will have to retire as a condition of eligibility for price support.

Some may suggest that the solution to our problems is to raise support prices, set quotas in terms of volume and force farmers who wish price supports to retire a percentage of their cropland without direct compensation. This alternative is unacceptable to Farm Bureau. The point at issue is not simply a question of the means to be used in retiring cropland; it is a matter of ultimate goals and objectives. A program of higher price supports and greater compulsion means increased Government control of individual farming operations, reduced efficiency, smaller markets, increased export program costs and the capitalization of program benefits. Farm Bureau's cropland ad-

justment program moves in the opposite direction.

In order to solve the total grain problem, wheat must be placed on a comparable basis with corn and other feed grains. Wheat producers have a right to compete for a share of the feed market; but only if they are willing to compete on a fair basis. We cannot agree to a multiple price program which would have the effect of dumping surplus wheat into the feed market on an unfair, subsidized basis—thus adversely affecting the incomes of all producers of feed grains and livestock, dairy and poultry products.

We also are opposed to compensatory payments, and the various proposals for comprehensive supply control—or supply management, if you prefer the latter term.

The compensatory, or direct production, payment approach is unsound and dangerous to our economic and political system.

Regardless of the form in which it is presented, a direct payment program would be fantastically expensive. It would stimulate production, increase average costs, depress market prices, and make farmers dependent on congressional appropriations for their net farm income and a part of their production costs as well.

The payment approach carries a "cheap food" philosophy; however, in actual practice it would encourage inefficiency and thereby result in high food and fiber costs. Limitations on payments to individuals are inevitable. Such limitations would place a ceiling on opportunity in agriculture and level individual farm incomes downward.

There is no magic in the supply management approach. It is simply another effort to fix prices at artificial levels and to ration the right to produce farm products. Production cannot be controlled effectively by legislation as long as producers are guaranteed attractive prices.

The difficulties of making controls work cannot be solved by turning the development of farm programs over to producer committees. It is fallacious to assume that the producers of a commodity are the only people interested in programs for that commodity. Congress should retain responsibility for determining major provisions of commodity programs as it is the only body where all of the affected people are represented.

Under existing law marketing quotas are subject to producer referendums. It is frequently inferred that objections to new control programs could be removed by submitting them to similar referendums. This is not necessarily true. The first question that arises is "who is to vote?" It is customary to restrict voting to producers of the commodity in question, but they are not the only ones who are affected by the outcome. Producers of feed grains, livestock, poultry, and dairy products, and other uncontrolled commodities have been adversely affected by the diversion of acreage from the quota crops. Producers of feed grains, livestock, poultry, and dairy products certainly should be permitted to vote on any proposal to dump surplus wheat in the feed market.

Aside from the question of "who votes?" it should be clear that nothing can be solved by a referendum unless producers are given realistic alternatives. Bad programs will not work any better simply because they have been approved in a producer referendum. The wheat program has gotten into serious trouble even though it has been repeatedly approved in referendums where voting eligibility is restricted to producers who expect to plant 15 acres or more.

NONFARM IMPLICATIONS

The cropland adjustment program is designed to help farmers solve the problems of overcapacity, accumulated stocks, and low farm income. It would benefit consumers by causing farmers to produce for the market

rather than for Government storage; by conserving land and water resources for future needs; and by reducing the tax cost of Government farm programs.

It is not designed, or intended, to solve the problems of depressed areas, or needy persons. It would, however, contribute to the development of the internal economy of the United States by encouraging a better allocation of the resources now devoted to agriculture.

The cropland adjustment program would improve our relations with other agricultural exporting countries by reducing the basis for the charge that our export programs constitute unfair competition. It would permit the use of farm products to promote economic development in other countries to the extent that this is practical and in the national interest. CCC stocks would continue to be available for some time to come. If the policy of making farm products available to underdeveloped countries on concessional terms is to be continued after existing stocks are liquidated, the Government should buy needed quantities on the open market.

"Food for Peace" is an attractive slogan; but it calls for a realistic approach. The fact is that the United States has programed over \$11 billion worth of agricultural surpluses to foreign countries since 1954. We have an obligation to use our surpluses constructively; however, it would be a disservice to underdeveloped countries to encourage them to become dependent on concessional sales of surplus farm products. We also have an obligation to avoid disrupting the commercial markets of friendly nations that produce for world markets.

It would be most unwise to relinquish control of large quantities of our agricultural surpluses for distribution by an international organization. We should recognize that other countries do not all share our interest in the preservation of commercial markets.

In conclusion I want to emphasize our belief that a change in the direction of agricultural policy is long overdue. The cropland adjustment program is a practical approach to the solution of problems that have been aggravated by past programs. It is a voluntary program. It moves away from the detailed regulation of individual farming operations. It seeks to reduce total production—not just to shift the surplus problem from one group of producers to another. It will reduce export program costs immediately, and total program costs as production is brought into a better balance with effective market demand.

The adoption of such a program would be a real step forward in agricultural policy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on January 26, 1961, Mr. Charles Shuman, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, appeared before the Farm conference called by the Secretary of Agriculture in Washington, and urged a 10-point temporary program, which included cropland retirement, and stated that—

Whole farm participation should be encouraged.

If we were to have a massive land retirement program, I am quite certain that that would be consonant with the recommendations of the task force.

On January 30, 1961—and I address this statement particularly to the esteemed Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]—the Feed Grain Study Committee submitted a report for release by the President. I have that report here also, and I ask unanimous consent that

it may be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

REPORT OF THE FEED-GRAIN STUDY COMMITTEE

The feed grain situation confronting the Nation is critical. Government holdings of feed grains under the price-support program—owned and under loan—stood at about 70 million tons on January 1, 1961. These holdings were valued at \$3.6 billion. The investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in feed grains is now at an all-time high, and is greater than that of any other crop.

Under a continuation of existing programs it is estimated that the total carryover of feed grains will increase to 84 million tons by October 1, 1961; this is almost double the size of the carryover in 1956. At the present rate of buildup, the carryover by October 1, 1962, could run well over 90 million tons. In the context of this buildup of stocks in all positions, Government holdings under the price-support program could increase to about 85 million tons by January 1, 1962.

The large and sustained increases in feed grain production that are giving rise to the increased carryovers and Government holdings is also going to give rise to a critical storage problem in 1961-62. It is estimated that we will be short of off-farm storage space for 250 million bushels of all grain (exclusive of grain sorghums) in the summer and fall of 1961. And we could be short of storage space for some 400 to 500 million bushels off the farm in the next 18 months. In short, the storage problem will be extremely difficult and possibly disastrous under a continuation of existing programs.

Uncontrolled production with a modest level of price support has resulted in more feed grains being produced than were utilized (including the distribution of feed grains outside commercial channels under Public Law 480 and other programs) in each of the past several years. Uncontrolled production has led to a sustained buildup of grain stocks in all positions and in Government hands; and uncontrolled production in 1961 can lead to a disastrous situation in terms of storage space and storage costs.

Faced with this situation the Feed Grain Study Committee believes that a positive program to deal with the worsening situation in 1961 is absolutely necessary. But time is short. The time is too short to place in operation any program with mandatory features in 1961. Thus, the Committee has recommended an emergency program of a voluntary type. The program recommended by the Committee would cost no more than a continuation of the existing program but it would (1) increase the incomes of feed-grain producers and (2) bring to an end the buildup of feed-grain stocks.

The main features of this voluntary program recommended by the Feed Grain Study Committee include:

1. Some increase in the level of price support, where this guarantee of price support is limited to farmers who participate in the program.
2. The retirement of a percentage of each producer's feed grain acreage into a non-productive, soil-conserving practice.
3. The payment to producers of a conservation practice payment to induce farmers to participate in the voluntary program.
4. The provision of a payments-in-kind feature for those program participants who wish to cut back more than that required by those farmers eligible for price support.

The recommended level of price support, size of conservation practice payments, and the percentage cutbacks for feed-grain acreages, all of which are directly interrelated, will be announced later. But various combinations of prices, payments, and acreage

reductions can be specified which result in the achievement of the twin goals of this feed-grain program: (1) increased producer incomes and (2) a cessation of the buildup of feed-grain stocks.

In the opinion of the Committee, an effective program for feed grains can be developed and announced in the next 6 weeks which will significantly increase the incomes of feed-grain producers in 1961, and combat the mounting surplus stock problem. But to do so, we must act forcefully and expeditiously at all levels—the administration, in the Congress, and among farm groups. And we must so act, for to fail means to contribute to further buildup of Government holdings, a needless and wasteful increase in storage costs, and an acute shortage of storage space in 1961 and 1962.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that report recommended a temporary voluntary program which included price support increases for cooperators, acreage retirement to nonproductive purposes, conservation payments, and payments in kind to producers who were willing to cut back more acreage than that which is required to qualify for price supports.

Seventeen days later, on February 16, the President transmitted a letter, a bill, and a memorandum from the Secretary of Agriculture, covering a special emergency feed grain program applicable only to the 1961 crop.

Mr. President, it is too bad it is so late in the afternoon, because I thought I might detain the Senate for a few hours and draw a little on recollection and remembrance, because as I envision and seek to evaluate these various programs, I go back to 1933. Certainly, we had a depression. Certainly, farm prices were almost at an alltime low. So two approaches were made to relieve the situation. One was how to get purchasing power into the hands of the people, so that they could purchase the commodities which were piling up. The second was to energize the economy in the hope of raising farm prices.

To accomplish the first purpose, we set in motion all manner of projects: The Civil Works Administration, the Works Progress Administration, the Public Works Administration, and any number of items. We even had an artists and writers project, as I remember. We gathered those artists and painters who were unemployed at the time and set them to the employment of their imagination and talent to turn out enough artwork to fill a warehouse.

I went down there once and tried to pick out something. I think I picked out one oil painting from the whole lot. I still have it, and it is a sort of memento to those earlier days. But that project was designed to create purchasing power.

Then there were dramatic companies traveling throughout the country. The Senators from Michigan will remember a celebrated student by the name of Avery Hopwood, who got into the dramatic field. He used to do such airy and fancy things as "Getting Gertie's Garter" and "Up in Mabel's Room." Those were plays which were in great vogue, and they played all over the country. I remember when one of those dramatic companies came out to Peoria to play "Up in Mabel's Room." All the taxpayers were wondering whether they

were paying for it; and certainly they were. But those activities employed the unemployed artists, and that contributed to the purchasing power. That was one approach.

Another was to energize the prices of agricultural commodities. How was that done? By bringing supply into balance with demand. Various things can be done to supply. One way is to consume it. Another is to destroy it. So we started out on a big destruction program. Under that celebrated Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wallace, we threw 15 million little pigs into the fertilizer bags. Then we plowed under the hog population, trying to teach them a little birth control. [Laughter.]

I am one of 11 children in our family. I am glad I came along before Henry Wallace. I might have got plowed under. [Laughter.] But that is the way we diminished the supply.

We did that with potatoes. Remember when we had too many potatoes? I am sure the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] will remember that in New England kerosene was poured on them. Then we had mashed potatoes when we ran the tractors over them. For fear people would gather up the potatoes and "discomberate" the supply and demand picture, kerosene was poured on them so that they would be easily recognized.

I recall when I was holding meetings with soldiers in Europe—we were at Heidelberg, Frankfurt, and elsewhere—and from the Stars and Stripes they had pictures of the tractors going over the potatoes. O how furious they were. They said, "Is this true?" Of course it was true; everyone knew it was true.

But my basic point is this: 28 years ago we were approaching this thing from almost the same standpoint—first, how to build up purchasing power in the hands of consumers; second, how to destroy or how to bring into balance supply and demand, either through destruction or through giveaways.

And we had a food stamp plan. Today, we hear all about a food stamp plan. But at that time we had a Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation. One of the greatest and keenest men I ever knew, Milo Perkins, came into the Government and approached that program and tried to handle it well. He got fired for his pains and his capacity; he was fired by Franklin D. Roosevelt. But Milo Perkins was one of the ablest men who ever came into the Government. We had orange stamps and we had blue stamps; and then we stacked food all over the country.

I remember that a factory owner in my hometown, who dismantled his plant, came to me one day, and said, "This plant is for rent." I said, "Why don't you lease it to Uncle Sam?" He said, "Who shall I write to?" I said, "Write to the Department of Agriculture."

When I got back there, the next time, his plant—a block long—was filled with sacks and barrels and boxes of stuff that was surplus, and it would be taken out of there and dispensed under the food stamp plan. So you see, Mr. President, the food stamp plan that they are de-

veloping now and are trying to get into operation or effect is nothing new; it is old stuff, around here.

I mention that fact because we see that in connection with their "platform of hope and the rights of man," those on the other side talk about "the unimaginative Republicans." Why, Mr. President, it took those on the other side 28 years to catch up with our imagination in that field. As a matter of fact, we did not do too badly.

But when one summarizes just about everything that was done, the total is about as follows: First, crop cutting. They did that by taking acreage out of production. Second, crop upping—not crop cutting—because I never saw a moment when the Government did not continue to spend money for research as regards greater efficiency in the farm plant. For years, I served on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, and for a time I was chairman of that subcommittee. There was a great procession of ideas and functions, all of which were articulated in terms of long green dough out of the Treasury, in order to get them done. The whole idea was greater efficiency and even greater efficiency.

So we have had better hybrid corn seed, and we have had better wheat, and we have had better oats, and we have had better barley, and we have had better tillage, and we have had better fertilization, and we have had better soil practices—always upping at the same time that they were always cutting.

So item No. 1 was to cut. Item No. 2 was to spend public money in order to "poosh up," as Tony said. And item No. 3 was price upping.

Mr. President, do you know how we went about that? I think my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana, was here then. We devalued the dollar. And today we have a gold problem, and the air is full of balance of payments and the gold flow; and the gold is going out because short-term securities abroad bring a better interest rate than they do here. So money goes out, and it becomes a potential tax or levy upon what is left of our gold reserve. You see, Mr. President, that is not new. We did that under Franklin D. Roosevelt, when we squeezed enough grains of gold out of the American dollar to debase it; and they did that by just pushing up the price of gold to \$35 an ounce. Before that it was \$21 and a fraction an ounce. But they pushed it up to \$35, and thus they cheapened the dollar; and then it took more of the cheaper dollars to buy the same hat or the same amount of round steak or the same amount of flour or the same amount of bread. So, Mr. President, you see that was a way to "poosh up."

Some say that prices went up. That is one way to express it. The more accurate way to express it is to say that the value of the dollar went down; and we did that by legislative fiat in 1934. And, Mr. President, I was there, and I voted on it; and I voted for it, with a heavy heart. I said, "This is a chilly day for me," because I wondered what was going to happen.

Of course, by that means we took the country off the gold standard, and put it on a managed-currency basis; and from that day to this we have had headaches, first in one field, and then in another; and, if anything, the problems at this moment are more aggravated than were the problems in June 1934, when, as the clerk intoned the roll, by my vote I helped take this country off the gold standard.

But what should I—a country Congressman—have known about the complexities and the intricacies of gold and its relationship to all the factors that operate in the domestic market and in the international market? I did not know much about it, and I confessed the fact; and I do not suppose most of the rest of them did, either. I had a lot of company over in the House at that time.

But of course, Mr. President, as you see, our difficulties then were—and I point this out to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota—something like our difficulties now.

Today, the other side has so many "Frontiersmen" sitting over here.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Over where?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Over on your side. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I knew which way was north, I would say east, west, or south. [Laughter.] But that was the difficulty we had then, because when we returned, we had only 117 minority Members on our side, and the other side had all the rest of the 435. So we could not do very much, because we did not have the votes or the power.

But, you see, Mr. President, in the light of hindsight I can lift my voice now, because there is no 5-minute rule in the Senate—although perhaps there should be. [Laughter.]

But I point out what happened here more than a quarter of a century ago: Push them up; cut down the acreage—in other words, you see, going in two directions at once—and up the price—which we did by silver purchase and by raising the gold valuation. And then we propped the prices; and that is where we got into price supports, the Commodity Credit Corporation, surpluses, warehouse certificates, food stamps, and all the rest.

Now I point out—and this is the distressing thing, and I shall never let those on the other side forget it—I do not dare [laughter]; it is simply this—and now I refer to the period from 1929 to 1941: In 1929, the gross farm income was \$14 billion. In 1933 it went down to \$7 billion. It was cut in half. So we had from 1933 to 1941 to experiment. In 8 years of experimentation, we still only got them up \$3 billion, from \$7 billion to between \$10 billion and \$11 billion.

In 8 years there was not solution. Finally a solution came; and what a tragic thing it was. When we talk about crops, crop cutting, and crop control, we move into the farmer's greatest crop, his children, his sons. The solution that came was the solution of blood; and we will have to admit that no solution of the farm problem was found.

The distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and

Forestry is a very candid person, and every once in awhile he wonders, in his heart of hearts, whether any kind of solution can be found. But the solution that was tried was the solution of blood. "Beat the soil. Food will win the war. Sustain the armies of our allies. Sustain their civilian populations. Sustain our own men in uniform. Sustain the people on the home front. Produce and produce and produce, and push up the crops." We did, and we certainly disconnected the agriculture of the country. But I do not believe anybody will have the temerity to say that blood is a solution for this problem.

Yet we have had to meet that argument, and I mean to meet it, because I was here. I helped vote the country into war, and I saw prosperity proliferate over the country; but, oh, with what pain I heard people say, "I never had it so good." God save the mark. I heard fathers say it whose boys were in uniform, and some of whom did not come back. But will anyone contend it was a solution? No.

There were 8 years of experimentation, with no solution. Then came the intrusion of war, and dead youngsters, as an everlasting monument to the fact that the solution was not found under the New Deal.

It was not found under the Fair Deal, either, I suppose; but, as I think of the blood and inflation and prosperity, we exported one out of every three bushels of wheat, one out of every three bales of cotton, one out of every three tons of rice; one out of every four tons of tobacco. Farmers helped to produce those crops, and to pay for all this at the same time.

But the war ended. We worked with this problem all over again. Finally, came Ezra Benson. He suffered a great deal of abuse. I thought he was a man with great courage and discernment, who did his noble best, and did not back down under vilification and abuse, no matter where it came from. He was a gentle and forbearing person.

Here we are, around the Horn. Here are the reports of the task forces. One says, "Do not increase price supports on corn and wheat." Another says, "Do increase price supports on corn and wheat." What is anyone like me to do when experts talk that way and cannot come to an agreement? Yet those were the men who were engaged for the purpose of examining into this whole problem and making a report.

One report says, in substance, that we have on hand 70 million tons of feed grains, at \$6.3 billion invested. It is expected to go up to 84 million in 1961. It is said it may go to 90 million in 1962. It is said storage may be short by 500 million bushels within a space of 18 months. Then the experts use the word the President used in his message. They say the program might end in disaster.

Mr. President, that is what bothers me. I would be the last man to invite disaster. When the experts talk about lack of storage space, it could well be. And yet I do not feel that this bill would do much good. What is a livestock producer to say? One does not wave a

wand and suddenly produce a 1,000-pound steer. It takes months. When a producer has a yearling to feed, he must look down the road and wait until it is ready for the market. We say we cannot help him. This proposal is for 1 year. As of now, we do not know what we are going to do at the end of the year. We are told there is to be a long-range program pretty soon. Does not that add up to uncertainty? It certainly does in my book. I am greatly concerned.

Here is a 75-percent price support. That is a far cry from the pledges that were made when emotionalism was high and we were engaged in a presidential campaign.

What about it? Is this the way we are to meet the problem? We are saying to the farmer, "Participate or you are out." That is what this bill says.

I do not think our farmers like that. I thought it was said that the farmers were to be consulted. I do not know how much consultation there was, but certainly they have a stake in this business. If that assurance was given, I wonder why it was not kept.

I think this is a situation in which Government actually bids against itself. First, up come price supports to induce cooperation; but when 20 or 30 percent of the acreage is taken out of production, what is a farmer to do?

I think my friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] will agree that he would do exactly as I would do. I would get the best 5-10-5 fertilizer I could get, and, if there is anything better than that, I would get it, and put it on the acres; and where previously I had produced 60 or 70 bushels, I would produce 100 bushels.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont would buy 8-16-16 fertilizer. It is more economical.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Fine. I will remember that when I next buy fertilizer.

It is alleged that this program would save \$500 million. I want this for the RECORD. Then I will tear it out of the RECORD and put it in my notebook. I ask the chairman of the committee if he really believes this program would save \$500 million for the crop year 1961?

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to the Senator, in reply, that it depends on compliance. If there is as much as 70-percent compliance, from the figures given to us, there will be a saving of \$500 million.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it is purely an estimate?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, it is. We cannot tell whether or not the farmers are going to comply; but I think the bill presented is attractive enough to at least induce the corn farmers to participate. It is my hope that they will participate. If they do not, it will be an indication to me as to whether or not they want any kind of program in the future, because, as the Senator well knows, we cannot continue to produce at the present rate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator bears out exactly what I have said. We started on this turntable 25 years ago. We

have gone around the "Horn," and we are back where we were before.

Mr. ELLENDER. I say to my good friend from Illinois, what has brought us the trouble has been, in my opinion, the most recent act which was passed, in 1958, wherein we gave to the corn producer and to the feed grain producer a support price without acreage allotments. That has been the difficulty. Corn was the only basic commodity put in that category.

It strikes me that any corn producer who desires a support price should be willing to control his acreage the same as the cotton producer, the tobacco producer, the rice producer, the peanut producer, the producers of the other basic commodities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But is it not true that we would reward the same fellow who has not cooperated heretofore? If a farmer did not cooperate and kept building up his corn base in 1959 and 1960, that is going to be the base against which the program will be measured. Therefore, if the farmer did not cooperate we will say to him, in effect, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant. Because you expanded your acreage we are going to reward you now."

I ask my distinguished friend from Vermont, am I correct or am I not correct? [Laughter.]

Mr. AIKEN. I take the fifth amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He pleads the fifth amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. AIKEN. No. As a matter of fact, there have been no acreage allotments in the last 2 years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is true.

Mr. AIKEN. It is true that the corn grower who has plunged the last 2 years, hoping to do well, would probably have an advantage over a grower who had carried out the even tenor of his agricultural ways.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He would have an advantage over the grower who rotated, who put part of his land in legumes and part of it in pasture. The one who built up his acreage and built up his yield would be rewarded.

Mr. AIKEN. One farmer may have planted his whole farm, hoping to make a killing in 1959 or 1960, and he will get his reward.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He will get a reward now.

Mr. AIKEN. He will get it on earth.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. In 1956 or 1957 we had the first attempt at the soil bank, and some 5 million acres of cornland were taken out of production. At the end of that time there were 200 million more bushels of corn produced for the year than in the preceding year, which is the point the Senator from Illinois made a little while ago when he spoke about the fertilizer used by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have little more to say about the subject, except to confess my concern and my bewilderment.

One task force says, "Go in this direction," and the other task force says to go in another direction.

The first bill which comes along is like the five and dime, only the percentages are different. There is 20 percent and then a voluntary 20 percent on top, but now we have combined it to make it a 30 percent provision. I do not know what will come out of conference.

Another thing which disturbed me very much was that provision which would let the Commodity Credit Corporation, in order to make the hoard manageable, slug the market, if necessary, at the market price without any limitation. Of course, I cannot think of a greater weapon in the hands of Government to "lobber" a farmer than that kind of weapon.

I am going to ask the chairman of the committee, in all kindness and in all earnestness, a question. The House retained the Commodity Credit Corporation authority to sell. The chairman did a good job when the committee deleted that provision from the Senate bill. What is going to happen when the bill comes back to the Senate from the conference committee? Will the Senate yield on that point? Of course, the Senator can speak only for himself as one conferee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can speak for myself, and I believe I can speak for the other Senate conferees. I would say we will stand pat and insist it be taken out. In other words, we will stick so long as we can to our approach. So far as I am concerned, I would rather have no bill at all than to have a bill with section 3 in it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Perhaps this is not quite fair, yet it is dictated by absolute sincerity. Would the chairman be willing to state now to the Senate that before he capitulated to the House in conference on that item he would return to the Senate without a conference report and ask for an instruction from the Senate?

Mr. ELLENDER. I certainly will. I will agree to do that because I know the sentiment of the Senate and I know the sentiment of the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Our farmers out home, insofar as I can tell, are not happy about the bill. They think this is a gesture. There are some who are for it, I recognize, but I would say the preponderant majority are against even the bill, because the farmers think of it in terms of an entering wedge which will ultimately add up to farm control and to the destruction of agriculture as a sort of free and untrammelled way of life.

I commend the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. He has certainly improved the bill very measurably compared to the bill which came to the Senate from the Secretary of Agriculture. I think the Senator from Louisiana deserves the gratitude of the Senate.

I am still unhappy. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the committee feels that under the circumstances this is the best which can be done. I do not know, I say frankly, at this moment, when the roll is called after

a while, how I shall vote. I frankly do not know.

I think this is something of a gesture. I do not believe it will save the money it is estimated to save, because a figure was simply picked out of the air. I do not think this bill will do the job which needs to be done. I do not think a 1-year land retirement program under any circumstances can be practicable. I think it may possibly manufacture problems instead of diminishing problems.

There is a disparity of interest as between the feed deficit areas, the dairy and poultry and feeding areas, and the consumers on the one hand and, of course, the producers of feed grains in the Middle West or the West on the other hand.

It is a puzzle. One needs the wisdom of a Solomon to ever fight through and come up with a satisfactory answer.

Mr. President, my sole purpose in trespassing upon the grace and forbearance of the Senate today was to show that this is where I started in 1933, with the Agricultural Adjustment Act. That is when I first heard about the little pigs. That is when I first heard about plowing under every third row of cotton. That is when I first heard about destruction in order to bring supply and demand into balance. There was the PWA, the WPA, the gold reserve and the silver purchase, and all the other things, to try to help the cause. Now we are still struggling, with 70 million tons of feed grains and an emergency program.

That is all, Mr. President. I simply wanted to go full tilt around the circle. I could almost say, "This is where I came in."

I yield the floor.

Mr. KEATING and Mr. LAUSCHE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Don Wickham, the New York State Commissioner of Agriculture, had something to say about feed grains a few days ago. I think it is quite interesting. He referred not to government but, in a press release, to "giverment" as the root of this dilemma. It may have been a typographical error, but it strikes me that he put his finger on the problem.

I add that Commissioner Wickham never did correct his apparently Freudian typographical slip of the keyboard, so it still stands in his press release as "giverment."

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I will say to the Senator from New York that that is a very common pronunciation of the word in the mountains of Kentucky.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure we all speak the same language on this bill, because the Senator has indicated he is opposed to it, and so am I.

Mr. COOPER. No. I am for the bill.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator is for it now?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. I have been for it all along.

Mr. KEATING. Things change on this floor. It is very difficult to keep up with them from time to time.

I know the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky was agreed to. I congratulate him on his achievement. I think his amendment improved the bill. But I must say that it strikes me as another shortcut, makeshift proposal to deal with the entire farm problem.

Mr. COOPER. Is the Senator from New York speaking of my amendment, or the bill?

Mr. KEATING. The bill—not the amendment. I know the amendment improved the bill. The Senator from Kentucky is constantly improving bills by the splendid amendments he offers so frequently.

It will involve more stringent controls upon the farmer and it will add huge new costs to our overall farm programs.

Mr. President, I am also very much concerned about the impact which this legislation will have upon the prices paid by consumers and upon a very important section of our agricultural industry; namely, the production of livestock, dairy goods and poultry products.

The costs of feed grains will undoubtedly go up. Poultry and dairy producers will pay more for feed, while at the same time they will not be able to directly increase prices to consumers because of the rigidity of existing marketing order arrangements, although I am happy to hear the Secretary of Agriculture, at this fortuitous moment, is about to announce an increase in the dairy support prices.

The producer is caught in the middle. What if he does even further increase prices? Then, it is the consumer who takes it on the nose, and this is not good either.

Mr. President, I repeat, this is not the answer. It is discriminatory and, furthermore, it takes into account only one crop, thereby ignoring the broad dimensions of our Nation's overall farm problem.

It is my intention to vote against the bill unless the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] before we finish, offers a great many additional amendments in his typically helpful fashion which will make the bill more palatable.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate not supporting the bill which is now before the Senate, for several reasons:

First, I do not subscribe to it because it is a stopgap remedy of a problem that has been confronting farmers, taxpayers, and the consumers of the United States for the past 30 years. When stopgap programs are adopted, they are usually the device through which a delay is achieved in coming to grips with the problem. My fear is that if a stopgap bill such as the one before the Senate is adopted, tackling of the real problem will not be reached in this Congress, and, as the years go by, we shall still be talking about the failure to solve the problem and we shall still be passing stopgap measures.

Second, the passage of the bill admittedly will have an adverse impact

upon those of our own agriculture economy who are engaged in cattle and poultry producing. Their costs will undoubtedly increase. Such effect is manifested by the fact that, according to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], this afternoon, the Secretary of Agriculture announced an increase in the price of dairy products. One of our Senators stated that such action was a coincidence. It may be a coincidence, but I believe there is justification for the inference that this price guarantee on dairy products will be announced today because of its possible influence on the votes that will be cast in the Senate.

Third, I cannot subscribe to the bill because it definitely will give a premium to those farmers who, in the last several years, have devoted their acreage to feed grains and have indulged in bad farm practices, resulting in depletion of soil; and otherwise under the bill the prudent producer will be penalized, the unprudent rewarded.

Fourth, I shall not support the bill because I am convinced that if it is passed by the Senate the prospects of the House bill becoming law will be increased, and I respectfully submit to my colleagues that if the House bill becomes law we shall have an instance of where the Government will enter into artificial and controlled management of the farm segment of our economy.

I pointed out earlier today that in the House bill declarations are made that it is a voluntary program. The Secretary of Agriculture in his statement to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry said it is a voluntary program. The American farmer will be free, he said. He will participate if his volition so dictates. He will reject if his judgment is to the contrary. But then the testimony shows that there is the device of persuasion and encouragement. What is that device? The device is that if the farmer does not participate the Commodity Credit Corporation will dump into the market the surplus feed grains, force down the price, and force the farmer to enter the program with the Department of Agriculture.

On the one hand the declaration is made that freedom will be accorded to the farmer; on the other, if he does not not participate the Department will drive down his price and he will regret his decision.

I make my fifth point. I have already spoken on it. We must come to grips with this problem. For 30 years there has been talk about it. The Senator from Illinois has pointed out that the only periods in which there has been a solution have been in the periods of war. Otherwise, there has been talk of the need of producing a solution year after year with the condition getting worse all of the time.

My sixth point is that I see in the provisions of the bill a purpose, in a subtle way, for the elimination of surpluses at a great cost to the taxpayers.

In the House, when the bill was passed, it was said that we will not permit the sale of surplus feed products at a price which is less than 83 percent of the controlled price. That would mean

83 percent of \$1.20. I ask the Senator from Louisiana now whether any of our surplus feed grains have been bought at a price over \$1.20.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand there are some feed grains in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation which were purchased as long as 4 or 5 years ago. Basing my answer to the Senator's question on that belief, there would be some corn for which the support price is as much as \$1.50.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, the support price is \$1.50. Under the provisions of the House bill authorization would be given to sell it at 83 percent of \$1.20. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So that the loss would be from a buying price of \$1.50 to a selling price of \$1.20, and then a 17-percent deduction from the \$1.20. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course there has been quite an accumulation of storage charges that would have to be added to that amount. However, the amount involved is not very great. Altogether it may be 150 million bushels.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In any event, the corn for which we pay \$1.50, and to the purchase price of which must be added the cost of storage and the interest, under the House bill could be sold at about \$1.05?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. A little less than \$1.05. About a dollar.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I reluctantly make this statement, but it has been my judgment that we have been frantically looking for methods to get rid of the surplus. Many people who recognize the hugeness of that surplus feel greatly pained when they recognize the fact that the bins all over the Nation—and I would say especially in Ohio—are being viewed by the taxpayers.

Various proposals have been made today about how to get rid of the surplus. I have no objection to providing it to help needy people in foreign countries, in places where catastrophes have occurred, but I cannot subscribe to what I believe is an artificial method of getting rid of it at an inordinately low price without any reasonable justification.

In conclusion, if we adopt the House bill, which will put the farmer under a managed control, his income will be dependent on the volume of his products times price less cost of production. However, we, as the Government, will say to him, "We will determine what your volume of production will be, and especially will we determine what the price will be that you will get for your goods, and we will determine your price by manipulating the market through the flowing into it of surplus goods."

My inquiry is, if we manage the farm economy, how are we eventually going to escape managing the industrial economy? Are we to live in a nation where the economy is free, or are we going to adopt a course where the farmer and the worker and the industrialist will be subject to whims of the Congress? My fear is that if we enter into this program, as proposed in the House bill—not as pro-

posed in the bill pending before the Senate—it will be one step in that direction.

In the enthusiasm—I would say in the frenzy—to solve the problem, we have the sad spectacle of a proposal being made that there be a harnessing and a shackling of the farmer, so that he shall be completely managed by the Government.

It is on that basis that I will vote against the bill pending before the Senate. My view is that we must tackle the problem on a long-range, permanent basis, not in a stopgap fashion.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, if there is any justification for the passage of the pending measure, it is that the bill is an emergency measure, calculated to deal with a situation which is bad and which is steadily getting worse.

I suppose two questions would present themselves in attempting to analyze this situation. First, what is the nature of the emergency, and why do we have it?

Second, whether the measure will be as effective as claimed. Will it actually do anything to reduce production? Will it actually reduce the quantity of the farm products being placed in storage?

I am puzzled about the element of emergency. After all, I recall last July 15 when a former colleague of ours, who now occupies the White House, addressed the delegates to the Democratic National Convention. The Presiding Officer, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], perhaps was present when the delegates were addressed by our former colleague.

According to a news story:

Senator John F. Kennedy has promised to introduce in Congress next month an emergency farm bill to attack what he called the No. 1 domestic issue.

He asserted that January, when a new administration takes office, was too late to write legislation aimed at bolstering falling farm income and farm prices.

Speaking to North Dakota delegates to the Democratic National Convention, he said his staff already was at work on a farm bill that would guarantee farmers full parity income.

He gave no details, but he supported the farm plank in the party platform submitted to the Democratic National Convention.

All of us recall those long weeks of August 1960, when instead of being out on the hustings, we spent most of our hours in this Chamber. We did not find any farm bill which had been worked on by the staff of the man who was then a Senator from Massachusetts. None was introduced. None was even talked about. In fact, there was very little talk at that time on the subject of the Democratic platform on the subject of farm legislation.

Not only that, but January went by without the introduction of any farm bill. Of course, it takes time to prepare a bill. But considering a situation in which the staff of one of our colleagues was engaged in writing a bill, and that his party was in charge of both Houses of Congress, not only in July, but in January, too, by a margin of virtually 2 to 1, it seems strange that nothing was done until now. Most people can have misgivings as to whether an emergency exists which is alleged by those now in charge of the Government.

If so, I wonder if it is not in a situation of a self-imposed emergency: The bill must be passed this week in order to be ready by March 15, for the planting season is upon us. This emergency which has been talked about seems pretty much self-invited in that light.

There are many things about the bill which are not satisfactory. It does contain some things, however, concerning which I should like to commend the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and particularly its distinguished chairman. I was most happy to hear the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] announce to the Chamber a little while ago that in the conference which will be held on the bill, there will be no yielding, on his part, permitting the insert of section 3, or its equivalent, into the Senate bill. I commend the chairman. I commend his committee, too, for having deleted section 3 from the bill currently before the Senate. Section 3 is a harmful section. It is a vicious section. It has been revised and then deleted, of course, but it gave the Secretary of Agriculture power to sell in the open market for virtually whatever he wants. That would be a power not granted previously to any other Secretary of Agriculture. Among other things, it could destroy or seriously impair the marketplace whenever exercised.

I agree fully with the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] that it would be a prelude to the extension of absolute power in the Department of Agriculture, over other commodities.

One of the things so objectionable about the bill—and I am dwelling on it to give whatever support I can to the Senator from Louisiana when he goes to conference—is section 3. There is considerable opposition to that section in this body. Certainly if that section finds its way into the bill, the Senator from Nebraska would propose to vote against it and to resist it with all the powers at his command. Section 3 repudiates the original basic concept of price supports, namely, that price supports are to be the floor. The Commodity Credit Corporation price release should be above the floor, taking into consideration the carrying charges and other factors.

The object, of course, would be to have the market above the price support and have the interplay of market forces function with ease and effectiveness.

I think it would take quite a stretch of the imagination to call this a voluntary program if section 3 is effective at all, because there would not be anything voluntary about it. The program would be highly coercive in every sense of the word.

In addition to deleting section 3, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry also deleted a portion of the proposal by the Secretary of Agriculture which would establish a price support of \$2.30 on soybeans. For that, also, I believe they should be commended.

Another consequence of section 3 action would be the disruption of the livestock, poultry, and dairy industries through political manipulation of Government stocks of feed grains. What

feeder would like to gamble upon the whim or fancy of the Secretary of Agriculture to dump a lot of commodities on the market? It simply would not make sense for any feeder to lay in any considerable stock of feed grains with a threat like that hanging over the market.

The bill does, unfortunately, bring back to us a discredited concept—that of acreage allotments. Corn farmers voted against acreage allotments overwhelmingly in 1958. Acreage allotments did not work. At the time the vote was taken, I believe something like 14 percent of the corn farmers, by acreage, were complying with the acreage allotment program. That certainly is good indication of the disrepute into which the program had fallen.

A little while ago I mentioned this statistic. I repeat it.

In 1956 or 1957, when the soil bank program was first enacted, there was a reduction in acreage of some 5 million acres. Yet the production of corn at the end of that crop year increased by 200 million bushels, rather than experienced any reduction.

One is entitled to have some misgivings as to the effectiveness of the pending measure. One is entitled to wonder whether even the 70-percent compliance, which is considered necessary for the program to be effective, will result in a reduction of production.

Another feature which is very undesirable is the proposal of a land retirement program for only 1 year. It is not practical. In order to be effective at all, a land retirement program must be in existence for a term of years.

For example, if one has 60 acres planted in corn, has 15 acres which need building up, the 15 acres are retired and the next year, when they have a higher productivity, they will be returned to the program and the next less productive land will be placed in the land retirement program.

Except for the fact that there is a so-called emergency; except for the fact that here is a possibility that some progress can be made to reduce production, the bill could not be justified on any ground which the Senator from Nebraska can conceive. The only ground upon which it is justified would be that perhaps, with the optimism which springs eternal in the mind and in the breast of the Committee on Agriculture, particularly the chairman, we can make some progress along the indicated lines toward the desired goal. If so, that will be all to the good.

There is one other factor upon which I wish to comment in closing. We are told that this is an emergency program. Yet there is a long-range bill held in readiness. It is reposing in the White House. It has not been sent to Congress. It is understood it will not be sent here until after we have disposed of the pending bill.

It would be helpful to the Members of this body if we had access to the text of the bill, not for the purpose of passing judgment on it, not for the purpose of offering it as a substitute, but for the purpose of ascertaining whether the bill

we are now considering will form the basis of that long-range program.

Obviously, if we are disposed to vote for this bill, and then we are presented with a bill similar to it, except that it is for a period longer than 1 year, some of us will be placed at a disadvantage to say we will not approve the long-range bill after we have approved this bill for 1 year.

It seems to me that the administration would have been a little more candid and cooperative in connection with this matter if it had let us know what its long-range plan was. But that will have to await a release from the administration.

In the meantime, I suppose we shall have to set our sights on the action taken by the conference committee; but if the report from that committee should be one of compromise on section 3 or on its equivalent, it certainly would meet with widespread resistance on the part of the Senate.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERCALF in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am very much in accord with what the Senator from Nebraska has said. Those of us from the Western States, which have a very great variety of problems in this particular area, are concerned not only with this bill, but also with future legislation in this field.

As the Senator has said, it does no good to say we shall pass this bill for 1 year, when thereby we may have committed ourselves—at least by inference—to a course of action which would take us much further along a road which could only bring havoc to important segments of our agricultural economy.

In considering this matter, as the Senator from Nebraska knows, we have to think, not alone of our grain producers, but also of our livestock producers and also of the disruptive influence these things may have upon the livestock industry—whether the cattle industry or the sheep industry or the hog industry. When we couple all this with the fact that presently we are unaware of what may be done in regard to wheat, in conjunction with this grain bill, that places even more question marks about the proposal, and raises even more serious questions as to whether it is advisable.

I join completely with the Senator from Nebraska in stating that, for many of us, it would be intolerable even to think of supporting the bill if section 3 were in it.

A question of real importance is whether even by this means—in other words, by voting for this bill—we shall be disrupting portions of our agricultural economy more greatly than if we voted against it, and then waited for the long-range bill and waited for another year or so, so that we could plan a whole long-range program, one looking to the future, and also looking to what may be proposed by way of a wheat bill, later this year.

Mr. HRUSKA. I should like to say to the Senator from Colorado that a vote for this bill for 1 year would not be a vote for the philosophy or for the contents of a bill for a period of time longer than 1 year. I repudiate any suggestion that a vote for this bill will necessarily require, later, a vote for the expected long-range bill. Certainly it would not be my intent to be bound for a period of more than 1 year. Like the Senator from Colorado, I represent a State in which there are many livestock raisers. A program of this kind, if put into effect for more than 1 year, could conceivably wreak a great deal of havoc in that industry.

However, I do not see how we could possibly be committed to voting for a bill of this type as a permanent measure, by voting for this bill on a 1-year basis.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk. I should like to have consent to withdraw that amendment, and then to call up the amendment which I send to the desk at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, it is proposed to strike out lines 20 through 24; on page 5, it is proposed to strike out lines 1 through 8; and it is proposed to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) Feed grains shall be eligible for price support only if—

(1) In the case of corn and grain sorghums the total acreage on the farm devoted to the 1961 crops of all feed grains does not exceed the average on the farm devoted to such commodities in 1959 and 1960, less 30 per centum thereof;

(2) In the case of oats, rye, and barley, the total acreage on the farm devoted to the 1961 crops of corn and grain sorghums and such other feed grains as the Secretary may designate does not exceed the average acreage on the farm devoted to such commodities for harvest in 1959 and 1960 less 30 per centum thereof.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, first of all, I should like to say that I recognize that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and particularly its distinguished chairman, has given a great deal of time and conscientious study to this problem, and I recognize that the bill has been given very serious consideration by all the other members of the committee.

One point in this bill gives me a great amount of concern: It is whether there will be sufficient compliance by farmers, particularly the highly productive farmers, to achieve the objective of the bill.

It seems to me that one of the major difficulties is the inherent discrimination in the bill as between farmers who have been practicing sound crop rotation methods and farmers who, on the other hand, have been overplanting their land.

We know that some farmers have thrown corn on their land to the maximum extent, and other farmers have

planted some corn, some oats, some soybeans, and some alfalfa, in accordance with sound agricultural practices.

Under this bill, by taking the 1959-60 base of corn production, a farmer who has overplanted his land will have a windfall; and the many farmers—in fact, I would say most farmers—who have not been overplanting their land will find that they should have been overplanting their land in 1959 and in 1960. Their reaction is very likely to be that they are not going to come into this program. Instead, they are going to retaliate by overplanting their acreage so the year 1961 will give them a very high base for future programs. I think that the result of that would be disastrous.

First of all, we would not have sufficient compliance, which is the objective of the bill. Secondly, it would aggravate the surpluses of corn.

This amendment is designed to avoid that situation. My amendment provides that there is to be a cutback by 30 percent of feed grain acreage. In other words, on a farm of 160 acres, let us say that 10 acres is pasturage, leaving 150 as crop acres. In the case of a farmer practicing sound conservation and rotation methods, he might have 50 acres in corn, 50 acres in beans, and 50 acres in oats. He would be permitted to take the 50 acres of corn and 50 acres of oats, or 100 acres, minus 30 percent, and have 70 acres to plant to feed grains. Whereas in the previous years he had only 50 acres in corn, theoretically he could go up to 70 acres under my proposal. But that does not mean he will. In any event, he is going to have to cut back some feed grains—oats, at least.

On the other hand, under the bill, the most corn he could plant would be 35 acres for price supports.

That situation can be compared with the situation of his neighbor down the road who has 150 acres of corn on the same size farm which, minus 45 acres, would leave him 105 acres under price supports, as against 35 the farmer practicing sound conservation and rotation methods. I say that with that situation we are not going to get compliance.

Under my amendment, there will be a reduction of feed grains, and certainly on the part of the large producer, there will be a reduction in corn, and I think people will be encouraged to come into this program who otherwise would not.

That is all there is to this amendment.

I want to repeat, I realize this bill calls for a 1-year program; but it is very important that the farmers be favorably impressed by such a program so they will come into future programs.

I also want to repeat that I realize how desirous the chairman and his committee are of coming up with a good bill. I am trying to improve the objectives of this bill by a slight amendment, which, hypothetically, could result in additional corn acreage in certain cases; but, as a practical matter, will not; and will bring more average farmers into the program, which, of course, is the objective we want to achieve.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hesitate to oppose the amendment of the distinguished Senator, but this amendment would mean an increase, as I see it, in the production of corn and sorghums; and that is what we are trying to prevent.

This amendment would permit a corn or grain sorghums producer to increase his corn acreage and still be eligible for price support and payments so long as his total acreage of feed grains in 1961 did not exceed 70 percent of his 1959-60 average acreage of all feed grains.

For instance, if he had 100 acres of corn and 100 acres of oats in 1959 and 1960, he could plant 130 acres of corn and get payments for taking 70 acres out of oats.

One acre of corn produces about as much feed as 2 acres of oats, so the 30-acre increase in corn would just about balance the 70-acre reduction in oats. In other words, when the Senator refers to feed grains, he takes into consideration not only the land that is planted to corn, but also that which is planted to barley, oats, and other feed grains. So that it would be possible, under this amendment, for the farmer to comply by merely cutting 30 percent of his feed grains, which might be oats, and planting the rest of his feed grain acreage in corn. And that is what we are trying to prevent.

In my humble judgment, if this amendment is adopted, it will mean a greater production on many farms of corn and sorghums, which we are trying to prevent.

I hope the amendment is voted down.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true also that, in the example used, where there were 100 acres, 50 acres in corn and 50 acres in oats, and 30 percent were taken off that total base, if the producer put 70 acres in corn, and took 30 acres out of oats, the oats having much less feed value than corn, actually there would not be taken out of production as much feed value as there would if corn acreage were taken out?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I am trying to state. In other words, in order to arrive at the proper proportion, we would have to take out the feed value of two acres of oats, which is equivalent to about one acre of corn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, if 60 acres of oats were taken out of production, instead of 30 acres of corn, we would come out about equal with respect to the feeding value of the corn?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think when we put the measure on the feed grain basis, we are opening the measure up to the wildest violations, not only in terms of bushels, but of feed grain value; and the two high feed grain values are in corn and sorghums.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that is what we are trying to prevent particularly. So far as the production of the other crops are concerned, we leave quite a leeway in which the Secretary of Agriculture can handle the problem. This amendment would simply mean that land planted to

oats could be planted to corn, and thereby increase the amount of feed a great deal.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the distinguished Senator from Iowa has put his finger on a very difficult situation that exists not only in this area, but in all farm legislation. The farmer who tries to comply with a constructive soil-building program is the one who is usually penalized. But I agree with the analysis the chairman of the committee has made so far as this bill is concerned. However, I think it is something that ought to have consideration in farm legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I sympathize with what the Senator is trying to do, but it strikes me it will aggravate the situation if the amendment is adopted, and I ask that it be voted down.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the objective of the bill is to reduce corn production, or is it really the objective to reduce feed-grain production?

Mr. ELLENDER. We want to reduce the two main feed grains, corn and sorghums, because we have those products in overabundance. It strikes me that what we ought to do is to enact legislation, if we pass any bill at all, to curtail the production of those two commodities, as I have just stated. I did not misstate the case; did I?

Mr. MILLER. No; not at all. Granted that, there is some surplus in these other grains; is there not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes, but not as much as we have in sorghums and grains.

Mr. MILLER. I recognize that.

Mr. ELLENDER. In my humble judgment, this amendment would really aggravate the situation, because the feeding value of oats is so much lower than corn. As a matter of fact, it might be possible that the farmer who has his farm planted only to oats, or half oats and half barley, could comply with the measure by cutting 30 percent of his acreage and planting it all in corn.

Mr. MILLER. I think the point made about feeding value is very pertinent here, particularly in the example where half the acres were planted in corn and half in barley and oats. Let us take the example of 50 acres in corn and 50 acres in oats. Under this amendment, the farmer would have to cut his production to 70 acres of feed grains. He could go from 50 acres of corn into 70 acres of corn. That is an increase of 20 acres of corn.

The farmer has to cut back 50 acres of oats, which would be the equivalent of cutting back 25 acres of corn. Therefore, we would end up with a net reduction, at least. This would be true under even the hypothetical, which I suggest is a very hypothetical situation.

Anyway we look at it, I believe we are going to have a reduction. I grant that if the hypothetical should prove out we will not have as great a reduction as we desire.

I would hate to have the amendment voted on with the understanding that it will, even under a hypothetical case, bring about an increase in feed value.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think it will. I do not think there is any question about it. The Senator admits himself that land planted to oats would be planted to corn, and corn has a greater feed value than oats. Therefore, if the farmer produced more corn he would certainly aggravate the situation.

Mr. MILLER. I believe the Senator was interrupted when I gave the example. I should like to repeat it.

The farmer has 50 acres of cornland and 50 acres of oatland. He reduces his acreage 30 percent. That leaves 70 acres which can be planted to corn. That would result in a net increase of 20 acres which could be planted to corn, but the farmer would have to cut back 50 acres of land planted to oats, which would give a net reduction equivalent to 25 acres of corn.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has stated a good example, but there may be many other examples of instances such as a farmer having three-fourths of his land planted to oats. I do not know that that is true, but it may be the case. The farmer may have only one-fourth of his acreage planted to corn. The farmer could comply by taking out of production 30 percent of the land planted to oats, and then plant all of the remaining land to corn or to sorghums. That is the weakness of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MILLER. We could state a lot of hypotheticals, but I do not know of any farm on which there has been a planting of 25 percent corn and 75 percent oats.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator does not?

Mr. MILLER. Ordinarily it is the other way around.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There are lots of good farms in Dodge County, Minn., with that type of planting.

Mr. MILLER. I am sure the Senator knows more about Minnesota than I, but I have not observed that situation anywhere else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, after line 6, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 3. Not later than ninety days after the effective date of this Act the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a detailed report setting forth but not limited to the number and per centum of cooperatives under this Act, the acreage retired from production by States, the cash payments made, the quantity and kind of feed grains made available under the payment-in-kind provisions of the Act and the value thereof, the overall cost of the program, the estimated savings compared with the program in effect before this Act

became effective, and such other information as will indicate the progress cost, and reduction of surpluses under this Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I certainly do not have any objection to the amendment, but I wonder if we could not get the information by letter, instead of putting the language in the bill. We can certainly obtain the information, in my opinion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is much more satisfactory to have a statutory requirement.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, from my viewpoint and my position it is rather important, I think, that I explain my attitude on the bill and my impressions with respect to the proposed legislation.

Without doubt my State is one of the most important feed grain States in the Union, if not the most important such State, so any legislation which affects feed grains or any program which has to do with feed grains is of vital importance to the farmers of my State as well as to the farmers of the United States. Indeed, it is important to the entire economy of this country.

Mr. President, perhaps from my standpoint as a Republican and as one who disagrees with the basic philosophy of the proposed legislation, it would be a very easy thing for me to say, "This is a bill requested by the administration, which controls not only the executive branch but also both Houses of Congress. Therefore, let them have it. Let them hang themselves with this proposed legislation, and take political advantage of the failure of it to accomplish the purposes which they allege it will accomplish as an emergency measure."

Mr. President, I do not believe that is a proper attitude to take from my standpoint, because I think the connotation, the direction, and the form of the bill are morally and economically wrong for the feed grain producers of this country. I think it would act to their detriment if it were to become a law. The temptation from a political standpoint may be great to say, "Let them have what they propose. They control both the executive and the Congress. Let them have it. Let them hang themselves." However, I do not believe that is a justifiable position to take. I am not certain that the bill will necessarily "hang" the administration, but I think it will not accomplish the purposes they claim it will accomplish.

Not necessarily in order of importance, I wish to categorize certain points in a few minutes, to state some of the things which are wrong with the proposed legislation.

First, it does not take into account the problems with respect to wheat, which are troubling us equally as much if not more than the problems with respect to corn. It does not touch that great surplus problem.

Second, it is an attempt and a direct proposal to reestablish quota systems in the feed grain categories, and those quota systems have not worked in the past and will not work in the future.

Third, it is a direct movement toward the control of agriculture rather than the freedom of agriculture, because it proposes not only to fix the bottom of, but also the top of, the prices which the farmer will get for his feed grains. If that is not controlled agriculture in a controlled economy, I do not know what it could be called.

The bill is diametrically opposed to what many of us have worked for agriculture, which is the unshackling of agriculture to provide fair prices in a free market. It is opposed to the basic principles for which I, at least, stand in agriculture.

Next, it would establish an admitted and declared purpose on the part of the administration to coerce the American farmer into compliance, to force him into compliance with what his government says. In a great degree it is taken out of the voluntary category.

I know the bill is a voluntary bill, and I know it is said, "One can come in or stay out as one wishes," but the coercion and the plans and the policies testified to by the Secretary of Agriculture and by his adviser, Dr. Cochrane, are involved. It is their purpose—although it is not in the pending bill, since we took it out—to follow the principles of that notorious section 3 of the bill, which would permit the dumping of surpluses now in storage on the market at the market price, which could have no other result than a steady and gradual pounding down of the prices of farm commodities, and the American farmer would be directly affected by that. That is not in this particular bill, but it is in the bill which the House passed yesterday.

It is the principle which the Secretary of Agriculture earnestly proposes, and it is direct coercion on the farmer by knocking down the price of farm products in the marketplace. It opposes the basic objectives of free, unshackled agriculture with a fair price in the marketplace.

Most important is a subject that the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] was trying to reach with his amendment a moment ago. The bill definitely penalizes the efficient farmer who has husbanded his land according to the best practices, the farmer who has not in the last 2 years planted from fence row to fence row throughout his farm. Under the bill the farmer who has disregarded good land conservation practices, and who has reduced his corn acreage voluntarily and put it into other land conserving crops, will have a very low base if he wishes to take advantage of this program; and the man who has violated good conservation practices and has planted his land to corn in the past 2 years will have a wide base and will be rewarded for disregarding good farm practices. The man who has tried to conserve his land will be penalized under the bill.

That is another reason why it is a bad bill in principle, and a bad bill from the standpoint of agricultural morale.

I do not wish unduly to prolong this discussion, so I am hurrying along. However, another item is a definite intent of the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the support price on soybeans from \$1.85 to \$2.30 a bushel. The office of the Secretary of Agriculture openly states that the purpose of that increase in the support price is to induce more farmers to plant soybeans. On the one hand they present a bill, which is an emergency bill, to cut down feed grain supplies. In another breath they say, "We are going to increase support prices on soybeans and increase the yield of soybeans."

Let us review what has happened, from the standpoint of agricultural and moral philosophy. We have heard much on the Senate floor, and we have heard much in the committees, about the freedom of agriculture, and of how agriculture operates in a free economy. Agriculture must have Government help, if we get to that point. I am not saying we should abandon all agriculture programs. In other words, we should have a good agriculture program. I shall discuss that subject in a moment. But here is one crop—soybeans—on which the support price is \$1.85. The futures price of soybeans, as was pointed out a while ago, is \$3.05. The market price in Chicago today is somewhere around \$2.87—almost \$2.90. There is a crop which is taking care of itself in the free market, and is not dependent now upon any Government support or Government storage. It is a perfect example of a crop that is caring for itself. The experts now want to tinker with soybeans—to increase production—which in turn can have only one result. If we have a normal growing year, and we increase acreage, we shall fill more storage facilities with soybeans, thus bringing them under Government control.

If such result occurs, we shall not have soybeans selling at \$2.85 or \$2.87 on the market. Because of the surplus, soybeans will be selling at exactly the support price, and the support price will become the ceiling and the floor on soybeans. The Government will then control the soybean market, to the detriment of the farmer.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The junior Senator from South Dakota is not interested in a program which would establish a support figure and help to create a surplus. However, I am wondering whether the proposed increase from \$1.85 to \$2.30 as support for soybeans would be done under some provision of the bill, or whether it would be done under a provision of existing law.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It would be done under the provisions of existing law. The Secretary of Agriculture already has the right to take that action. It is not necessary to put such a provision in the bill.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry took a definite stand. I do not know whether there was objection to this position in the committee or not. I

know of none. There may have been. I shall not make a categorical statement along that line. But it was understood and agreed by the committee that we would insert a strong statement in the report objecting to this very program of the Secretary of Agriculture and for this very reason. Yet today on the floor of the Senate the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is a close friend and associate of his former Governor, the Secretary of Agriculture, stated flatly that it was the Secretary's intention still, in spite of what is said in the report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to raise the support price of soybeans to \$2.30.

On the one hand, we are attempting to reduce surpluses; on the other hand, admittedly, according to the testimony, which I shall not take time to read, the Department of Agriculture wishes to increase the production of soybeans. There is an incompatible situation that is hard to rationalize, at least from my standpoint.

Another point to which I wish to invite the attention of Senators is one of the points raised by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] a moment ago. This is the 10th day of March. Agriculture programs were discussed during the political campaign of last summer and fall. This administration has been in power. There is reason to believe that the long-range agriculture bill of this administration has been prepared for some little time in the Department and it is being held there. We do not know what the long-range proposal will be. We do not know what the details of the administration's approach to agriculture problems may be. We have been confronted with a bill denominated an emergency bill. But we are without any guidance, and we have the refusal—and I am not necessarily taking umbrage at this refusal—of the Secretary of Agriculture even to discuss the details of his permanent long-range approach to the problems of agriculture before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at the time of the hearing.

Yet I believe that bill is sitting over in the Department of Agriculture awaiting action on the present bill. After action on the pending bill, we shall receive a long-range bill.

I raise the question of whether it is part of the desire of the Department to commit Senators on this kind of legislation, and when a permanent bill is introduced, if it follows the same philosophy of control and coercion on the American farmer, confront such Senators with the fact that they are not being consistent if they do not vote for the bill establishing permanent programs, because they voted for the emergency bill on the floor of the Senate. That question is another item that we must consider in connection with the bill. Without doubt we can assume that the direction to be taken by the permanent long-range bill which is to be sent over is indicated by the direction taken in the emergency bill that we are asked to act on today, and that the general philosophies contained in the emergency bill may well be expected to be contained in the long-range bill.

I do not know. However, I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that it is unfortunate that we do not have on our desks the administration's proposal for its long-range bill at the time we are asked to consider this proposed emergency legislation.

There is another possibility. There is much talk which has been heard about what this would do to price. All we have to do in that connection is to turn to the hearings held by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There we find it repeated time and time again that it is the purpose and intention of the Department of Agriculture to keep corn prices down. That is repeated in the hearings time and time again, that it would be proposed to dump the storage surplus on the market at market price in order to keep the price of farm products down. I asked Mr. Freeman the direct question if he expected that the price of corn under the proposed program would under any circumstances go above \$1.20. Perhaps I had better read the colloquy. I do not wish to misquote anyone or quote anything out of context.

I asked the Secretary:

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Well now, is it your desire to get corn higher than \$1.20?

Secretary FREEMAN. If I might be permitted, there will be a time in the next month when I will submit to this committee a permanent wheat and feed grain program, and think in terms of our total relationship and where we go. This is an emergency program, and we have the midnight oil burning, and we are grinding away at that question, and I do not really think I can answer it.

He was not prepared to say at that time whether the price of corn would go over \$1.20 so far as the return to the farmer was concerned.

I wish to call attention to another possibility. They say they do not want corn to go below \$1.05. Well, we have seen examples in the past where participation in these programs has not been nearly so great as had been anticipated. I do not believe that participation in this program will be anywhere so great as they estimate. They frankly say that if it is not up to their hoped-for estimate of some 70-percent participation, the program will in varying degrees below that fail to accomplish its purpose.

However, let us take this assumption. Based upon the Secretary's own statement that he hopes to use some of these devices, such as putting corn on the market at market price to keep the price down, what is to keep a farmer who complies from getting payment for his retired land, getting \$1.20, storing his corn in Government storehouses, and then going on the market, as it has happened before, and buying corn at \$1.05, if the Department of Agriculture is going to keep the price down? If they keep their intention, as they have expressed it, that is what they want to do. They say they want to keep the price down for the noncomplier. They would do that in order not to punish the complier. So they will keep the market price down. There is nothing in the proposed legislation which provides that a man cannot grow corn for the Government, store it at \$1.20, go out on the market and buy

it at \$1.05, and let Uncle Sam keep the corn in the bins.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will not find that provision in the bill before the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Oh, no. I did not say that there was such a specific provision in the bill. What is to keep a farmer from growing corn, going into the program, getting the \$1.20 support for the corn, receive his pay for the retired acres, and then go out on the market, if he needs corn, to buy corn at \$1.05?

Mr. ELLENDER. Who would sell it for that amount?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. On the market, I said.

Mr. ELLENDER. But would the farmer want to sell it at \$1.05 when he could get \$1.20. I cannot follow the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I call attention to the fact that we have had these allocations before. A very small percentage of the corn growers have gone into the program. I believe 18 percent is the highest percentage that have ever signed up for the acreage allotment. Perhaps 20 percent has been the highest. It has averaged about 12 or 13 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have already stated to the Senate that there was a lack of compliance by the corn growers, and I said I thought it was wrong. Does not the Senator feel that something must be done in order to curtail the huge surpluses that we have on hand?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do, indeed.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out for the record, the corn carryover has risen from 1958 when it was 1,470 million bushels, to about 2 billion bushels. If that keeps on, and we keep adding to this enormous surplus, we will simply get the corn producer deeper and deeper into the hole.

I have stated yesterday and again today that just as soon as we can do so, we will begin hearings on a program for corn and other feed grains, as well as wheat.

I do not have in mind the so-called long-range program to which the Senator has made reference. I do not know what that is, or what it will be. It strikes me, as I have stated on several occasions, that before we go into a long-range program, which the Senator has discussed, we ought at least to deal with wheat, corn, and feed grains, and get the corn and feed producer as well as the wheat grower in about the desirable position that the producers of cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts are.

The Senator well knows that corn is the only basic commodity with respect to which the producer has never received marketing penalties for overplanting. On the contrary, he has been given a price support for noncompliance. He has been put in a category which I believe is far different from the producers of any other commodity. It strikes me that when this proposal is enacted into law—and I hope it will be—that if the corn farmers do not follow through with it and try to help decrease the surplus, it

will be an indication to me, as chairman of the committee, whether the corn producer does want any kind of bill to curtail production of corn and other feed grains.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Louisiana is as dedicated and devoted to the solution of the agricultural problems facing our country as any other Member of Congress or any other citizen of the United States. He devotes tremendous time and impartial effort to this subject. I have vast respect for the Senator's integrity of approach and for his tremendous work and labor that he puts in as the chairman of the committee and as a Member of the Senate in attempting to solve the problem.

Wheat is not mentioned in the bill. Wheat is one of the troublesome items. It is not a part of the bill. Wheat cannot be touched in the so-called emergency legislation. The bill relates only to feed grains. I do not know exactly what the Senator's opinion might be, but my own opinion is that the bill will not materially or substantially decrease the supply of feed grains. I do not believe it will achieve that purpose, but it will establish controls.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator mentioned the wheat program. I am sure that the Senator, as a member of the committee, well remembers that we tried to deal with wheat at the same time we sought to deal with cotton, corn, and rice. But when it was felt that we could not get Senators representing the wheat States to agree, we proceeded to consider programs for the other commodities. We dealt only with cotton, rice, and feed grains.

We tried to get a wheat bill again the following year—that is, 2 years ago. We succeeded in passing a bill which, as the Senator knows, was vetoed.

If the bill which was acted upon had not been vetoed, it would have been possible to decrease the minimum number of acres to be planted in wheat by about 14 million acres. But somehow we could not get the President to sign that bill.

Aside from the proposed reduction in the minimum national acreage allotment for wheat, we sought to close a number of loopholes which we felt should be eliminated. But all that went by the wayside.

If the Senator will permit me to do so, I shall repeat what I said earlier: It is my considered judgment that this very year we must take some action to deal with the wheat problem. Unless we do so, the problem will continue to be aggravated, and together with the condition that faces us in corn, our whole program of price supports will be in jeopardy.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thoroughly agree with the statement of the Senator from Louisiana that it is imperative that we take action on the wheat program and arrive at an economic, sound, equitable solution of that problem, just as it is necessary that we reach an equitable, sound solution of the feed grain problem.

So far as feed grains are concerned, I submit that the problem is not related solely to corn; it is not related solely to sorghums; it is not related to any other particular crop. It is the feed unit production in this country that swamps us. I think there are approaches whereby that problem can be solved; but so long as we approach the problem piecemeal, we will continue to stay in trouble.

Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana made a suggestion a moment ago as to the kind of program we should adopt. The record is clear that Senators who may vote against the bill will not vote against it in order to defeat a bill which is for the good of agriculture. We shall vote against a bill which we think would be harmful basically to the economic well-being of agriculture in the feed and grain area.

So far as my program or proposal is concerned—and I have proposed it repeatedly—there is now on file with the Senate a bill containing proposals which I support and which I think are sound.

Basically, those proposals are that the only way to attack the agricultural problem which faces the country, the problem of unmanageable surpluses, is to attack it at the point of production, and retire very substantial numbers of acres of productive land. My proposal is to attack the problem at the point of production rather than at the point of storage, after the grain has been grown, handled, and stored.

The exact number of acres which should be retired should be a matter for calculation by experts. However, I venture to say, based upon the advice of persons who have much more knowledge or ability to calculate these things than I have, that between 70 and 80 million acres productive land ought to be retired. Thereafter, the remaining land would be sufficient to raise what is needed in this country. Perhaps it might not be quite enough for current needs, but enough could be raised so that with gradual withdrawals from surplus and from stored commodities, we would be meeting our needs at a decent price to the farmer, and could begin the essential reduction of surpluses in our bins.

I shall not discuss all the details of that basic program, but I shall state that year before last the farmers of this country voted down quotas. However, at this time it is proposed that the Senate vote to impose quotas on them. In a referendum, the corn farmers of the country refused to give their support to the corn quota system for their acreage. But that is what Senators are trying to provide by means of this bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to ask a question. Twenty-eight million acres have been retired. The proposal of the Senator from Iowa contemplates bringing those 28 million acres up to approximately 70 or 80 million acres in the conservation reserve does it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. On this point I should like to be corrected by counsel for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. However, I believe that out of those 28 million acres, 11 or 12 million are producing acres, although

perhaps some of them are marginal, and there are approximately 14 or 15 million acres in permanent timber or in land of that kind.

Let me ask whether the Senator from Louisiana has those figures available.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The question is how many acres have been retired under the reserve.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the total is approximately 28 million. But the major portion of that is timberland, and for the remaining 11 or 12 million acres the contracts begin to expire, or I believe some of them started to expire last fall, or are beginning to expire this year. So in the next 2 years, those 11 million acres will be back in production, unless the contracts are renewed or unless the land is again retired to the reserve.

I favor a program to prevent the production of these surpluses; and thus we shall get away from the problem of trying to handle the surpluses that are unmanageable at the point of storage.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I say that perhaps the line of least resistance for those of us on this side of the aisle would be to say that the Democrats have not only the Presidency and the administration, but also the Congress, and that this bill is what they say they want, and that although we do not believe it is a good bill, we shall let them have it, and therefore we shall vote for it; and that if it embarrasses them, we shall be jubilant about that.

But I do not think we should treat the economies of the farm problem in that way; and that is why I take this stand. I do so because I think the objective of this bill is a direct reversal of a sound program directed toward betterment of the economy of the farmer. That is why I must oppose programs of this kind, which I believe will not serve a free and a free-moving economy in agriculture.

I do not wish to vote for a bill of this kind, at this time, merely on the basis of saying, "Let them have it; let them have what they want," and then next week or the week after that, when we are confronted with a so-called permanent farm bill, which I apprehend will be along the same general line or philosophy of control and of quota and of dictation and of ceiling and floor, be accused of inconsistency, if I vote against that bill.

On this floor we have heard a great deal in the past few days about consistency. I think sometimes we have seen some evidences that there might have been some inconsistency on this floor. But what we do in this particular field is extremely important to my area and, in view of my dedication and the dedication of the others of us who come from my part of the country, is extremely important in terms of a program of genuine benefit to the farmers and in terms of a program which will be genuinely sound, and not be a piecemeal palliative that treats the symptoms, but does not treat the disease, and that in the long run will not provide the emergency relief that is desired, but, instead, will set a pattern for agriculture, and will move in a direction toward control, allocation, and regimentation of agriculture, that will be offensive and will be diametrically

opposed to a program of unshackling agriculture and of proceeding on a basis of programs which basically will attack these problems at the point of origin, rather than at the point of storage.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not my purpose to discuss the proposal the Senator has at the desk; but I wish to refer to the acreage reserve program. It was advocated, and its proponents thought it would result in a decrease in production.

But, for instance, in 1956, although 5.3 million acres of corn-producing land were retired from production, and although that program cost the Government \$179 million, nevertheless the farmers produced on the remaining land—that remaining after the 5.3 million acres had been retired—an additional 225 million bushels of corn.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assume that is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, it is correct; I know it from the record.

And in 1957, with a curtailment of 5.2 million acres of cornland, there was a reduction of only 33 million bushels, and the cost to the Government was \$196,400,000.

And in 1958, although there were 6.7 million acres in the reserve program, and although that cost the Government \$282,300,000, the farmers produced 379 million more bushels of corn.

So in the 3 years I have just mentioned, with a curtailment of approximately 17 million acres—which cost the Government \$658 million—the corn farmers produced approximately 571 million more bushels of corn.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. First, let me make a brief comment; and then I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, I am sure those statistics are accurate, and that there was an increased production on less acreage. Of course that increase has been ascribed to increased use of fertilizer, better conservation methods, better treatment of the soil, and so forth. But, by the same token, if we cut the acreage 30 percent now, what is to keep them from putting more fertilizer on the remaining acres, and repeating the same thing, and thus defeating the purpose of this bill?

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me say that when the Senator from Louisiana argues that in these several years the reduction of acreage did not produce a reduction of crops, that argument must be applied to the bill now before us. It would lead to the conclusion that if, in 4 years' reduction in acreage, there was not produced any reduction in crops, in 1 year a reduction in acreage by 30 percent would not reduce acreage in crops.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that in this case where a cut of 30 percent is required for price support, it is expected about 27 million acres of land will be retired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with that statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me also say that the farmers, of course, have learned a good deal about better ways and means of growing corn. I do not believe in this case they will be able to increase yields materially, because I do not think they can do this in only 1 year. Therefore, I say we are able to have 30 percent of the acreage cut, we are likely to reduce the production of corn and feed grains, according to the estimate made, by 500 million to 700 million bushels.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would mean that while, in the past we have not cut enough acreage, if we do cut enough we will eventually reduce production to the point where it will have some reasonable relationship to consumption. I think that is what the proposal of the Senator from Iowa contemplates. He argues that the 28 million acres placed in the conservation reserve have not been adequate, and if that number is increased up to the point of 80 million, production will be obtained at the point desired.

Mr. ELLENDER. He would not do that on corn production.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would be effective on the crops overall.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The bill before us contemplates cutting the acreage now in the production of corn and other feed grains by 30 percent, which would retire about 27 million acres, as I indicated a moment ago.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If I thought for one moment that this bill would give us a reduction of feed grain acreage in this country of 30 percent, that would certainly be a horse of a different color. In my opinion, I think it will not; and I think we have to look at the history of compliance, and the small percentage of compliance in these programs, at really attractive prices, in the past. That is the only thing that can guide us. I do not think we can count on what is anticipated.

Manifestly, if we could take out of production 30 percent of the acreage, there would be a different picture. I do not think we can anticipate it. While I do not have a crystal ball that will tell me how many acres will be taken out of production in this program, I point out that in many parts of the country farmers have been planting, that plans have been made, and it is rather difficult for farmers to change their plans.

To the small feed producer who has small acreage, this proposal is not going to be very attractive. The producer who has 40 or 60 or 80 acres, with only a part of it producing feed grains, is not going to take out of production 4 or 6 or 8 acres. In general, he will say, "I will not pay any attention to the program," and he will produce a little more, with the hope that the price will go up.

I do not think this proposal would bring about the compliance anticipated or projected by the Department, and I do not think it would have any success in solving the emergent problem. I agree there is an emergency before us, but I do not believe control of agriculture or price fixing—and this is price fixing, both ceiling and floor—is the way to approach the problem.

During the delivery of Mr. HICKENLOOPER'S speech,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Perhaps the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from Louisiana, or the Senator from Minnesota can help me. I have received telegrams from barley growers in my State who grow a special barley for malt purposes. One telegram reads as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., March 9, 1961.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We are farmers of 1,500 acres land producing malting Hanchen barley and have customers who deliver malting barley to our elevators from an additional 5,000 acres, and my home is in Merrill, Oreg. Therefore, strongly urge you closely follow current feed grain bill 993 which understand includes barley at discretion of Secretary of Agriculture. If passed in present form and Secretary of Agriculture eventually includes barley resulting in acreage reduction would be harmful to Oregon producers malting barley produced in Klamath Falls area sold at premium prices and supply normally only sufficient needs of processors.

IVAN KANDRA,

Manager, Minema Elevators, Inc.

My first question is: Would the Secretary of Agriculture, under the bill, have the discretion to include barley?

The second question is: Have we any assurance that the Secretary would not make that great mistake and thus bring this special producer group under the regulations of the act, when malting barley should really not be considered as a part of the feed grain program?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If I may be permitted to do so, I should like to yield to the chairman of the committee and his legal counsel for advice on that particular subject. The Senator's question refers to barley and malting barley. Having no particular interest in malt or malting barley, except from an economic standpoint. I would rather have the Senator from Louisiana answer that question. I do not feel capable of answering it.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have indicated on the floor of the Senate several times, we are trying to deal primarily with corn and grain sorghum. The Secretary of Agriculture has wide discretion with respect to dealing with barley, oats, and rye. I feel confident that if the Senator is referring to barley used for beer-making purposes—

Mr. MORSE. Yes; for malting purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I doubt that the bill would be effective at all if that is not a feed grain. We are dealing here with feed grains.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Louisiana think it would be possible, before we vote, to have a member of the staff communicate with the Secretary of Agriculture and at least get an understanding or an assurance from him that he will regulate only the barley used for feed grain purposes, and not barley used for malting purposes, for human consumption?

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Malting barley is not, as such, a feed grain. It is a special-use grain. It is not in surplus. It is of high market value. I am sure that the fact that its control is at the discretion of the Secretary would indicate that he is supposed to have enough sense not to move into it. I think he has that sense; in fact, I know he has.

Mr. MORSE. Do not put me on that kind of spot. I have great respect for the Secretary of Agriculture. However, I think he also would have the good sense to give us some assurance about this matter before we vote, if he expects to follow the course which the Senator from Minnesota indicates he will follow. I should like to have a member of the staff see if he can get a statement from the Secretary of Agriculture which would make it possible for me to vote for the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the close of the remarks of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], my colloquy with the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Minnesota and the telegrams I have received on this subject matter.

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

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

McMINNVILLE, OREG., March 10, 1961.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are concerned about possible effect feed grain bill 993. As we interpret bill includes barley at discretion of Secretary of Agriculture. If barley were included and bill passed this would be extremely bad for our producers. First, barley is not in surplus here. Second, would seriously affect price of malting barley produced in Willamette Valley and Klamath Falls area and 90 percent barley produced these areas is produced for malting purposes at premium prices and only enough to meet demand of malsters. This area sure does not need anything to further reduce producers income.

BUCHANANCELLERS GRAIN CO.

PORTLAND, OREG., March 9, 1961.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly advise you closely follow current feed grain bill No. 993 which understand includes barley at discretion of Secretary of Agriculture. If passed in present form and Secretary of Agriculture eventually includes barley resulting in acreage reduction would be extremely harmful to Oregon producers malting barley produced in Willamette Valley, Grand Ronde Valley, and Klamath Falls area which raise approximately 90 percent malting barley sold at premium prices and normally supply only sufficient needs of processors.

ARCHER DANIELS MIDLAND Co.,
H. W. COLLINS, Vice President.

PORTLAND, OREG., March 9, 1961.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge you closely follow current feed grain bill No. 993 which understand includes barley at designation of Secretary of Agriculture. If passed in present form and Secretary of Agriculture eventually includes barley resulting in acreage reduction

this would be extremely harmful Oregon producers; namely, (1) barley in general not in surplus supply in Western States; (2) would seriously affect malting barley producers in Willamette Valley and Klamath Falls area who raise 90 percent malting quality sold at premium prices and normally supply only sufficient cover needs of processors

PORTLAND GRAIN EXCHANGE,
W. C. MIKKELSEN,
Vice President.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close, with the Senator's permission, by saying only this: All I need is to have the Secretary of Agriculture send us a message that it is his intention to regulate barley only in respect to its feed grain uses, and not in respect to its human uses, in relation to the making of beer. I say that as a teetotaler.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Oregon for not being able to answer his question concisely. I hope he has received a satisfactory answer. While he was speaking, I was discussing a matter with another Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Up to the present time, I have received an answer from the Senator from Louisiana in reference to the question, but I am hopeful that the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to enlighten us further.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I take it the Senator's constituents are interested in the spiritous quality of barley.

Mr. MORSE. I think the economic income from it is what they are interested in.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not want to let the debate close without stating again that I expect to support the pending legislation. I support it with misgivings, but I wish to place in the RECORD a letter I have received from Walter C. Peirce, president of the Kansas Farm Bureau, of Manhattan, Kans. I read one paragraph:

I note that the Senate Agriculture Committee has eliminated section 3 of the feed grains bill. This certainly takes care of the most objectionable feature of the administration's proposal. I hope you will vigorously oppose this feature of giving the Secretary of Agriculture power to break the market price of feed grains by sale of CCC stocks.

I wish to commend the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for eliminating that provision. I sincerely trust that action will be sustained when the bill comes back from conference between the Senate and the House. If that is not done, I shall be obligated to vote against the bill on final passage.

Mr. President, there are two other paragraphs in the letter which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

We have been saying that the Farm Bureau cropland adjustment program would look better when we could compare it to a specific bill. It now looks much better and would be simpler to administer. It also ties wheat and feed grains together. The commodity by commodity approach that we have had in the past allowed the wheat farmers in Kansas to grow feed grains and the corn-

growers of the East to raise more wheat. It would seem unwise to rush through legislation for feed grains and then find a wheat bill that did not fit in.

The idea of retiring some land from production is a good one but the administration bill is much too similar to the discredited acreage reserve program of a few years ago. High payments for taking land out of production for 1 year will put some money in circulation but we will reap more public disaster than we have yet seen. As you know it is now quite serious.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I also have a resolution from the legislative committee for Hamilton County Farmers Union, and I ask unanimous consent that it also be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

Whereas the farmers net income has decreased to a disastrous low; and

Whereas farmers are aware that excess production has contributed immeasurably to depressed farm commodity prices to farmers; and

Whereas farmers in general, regardless of some farm organizations policies, do believe that agriculture must manage its supplies in order to receive an equitable income from the farm; and

Whereas farmers do believe that referendums in regards to supply management and prices of various commodities should be held; and

Whereas farmers have generally agreed that bargaining cannot be attained without control of supply by quotas or other methods; and

Whereas this Nation's economy shall not remain healthy with a contagiously sick agriculture in its midst; and

Whereas farmers are being forced from the land not because of inefficiency but because of economic distress to join the jobless laborers in the city: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress and the Senate of the United States support this administration in its drive to bolster farm income during this session of the Congress by whatever legislative devices, tools, and mechanisms necessary to attain an income for farmers as the Congress so righteously has done for this Nation's industry and labor.

A. C. Westeman, Syracuse, Kans.; Murlin Carter, Syracuse, Kans.; Fred Westeman, Syracuse, Kans.; Marion Wickerly, Syracuse, Kans.; Gene Schwerdfeger, Coolidge, Kans.; I. L. Nickerson, Syracuse, Kans.; Mrs. I. L. Nickerson, Syracuse, Kans.; Walter Westeman, Syracuse, Kans.; E. L. Hatcher, Syracuse, Kans.; L. J. Eddy, Coolidge, Kans.; Arthur E. Carter, Syracuse, Kans.; Charles Van Eddy, Coolidge, Kans.; H. A. Forbes, Syracuse, Kans.; Mrs. Murlin Carter, Syracuse, Kans.; Roy H. Dunagan, Syracuse, Kans.; Basil W. Crist, Syracuse, Kans.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words. Some legislation on the problem of surplus feed grains is a "must" at this time. We cannot ignore the fact that there has been a far sharper build-up in feed grains than even in wheat. The Government owns 2,700 million bushels of feed grains. There will be a carryover of 3 billion bushels. The situation will be worse after this crop year if nothing is done.

The bill before the Senate is not a perfect one, but I do not know how anyone can ignore the fact that something must

be done. I think the measure represents a pretty good compromise between the Democratic and Republican policies. If this is impossible, then I think nothing is possible.

Our problem in the last several years has been that people and organizations have not been willing to compromise. Unless they got everything they wanted, they wanted nothing at all. That is the reason why surpluses have been going up year after year.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am no stranger to the problems of farmers. I was brought up on a farm, and spent my early years in agricultural work, and I am well aware of the hard work, the problems, and the disappointments, and on the other side of the ledger, the vast pleasures of farm living. So I am most sympathetic to the farmers and to the problems which they face.

But, being sympathetic to farmers, in my view, does not involve putting around their necks the yoke of a huge Government bureaucracy dictating when the farmer is to plant, how much he is to plant, how much to throw away and how much to harvest. We have saddled the farmer with this bureaucracy in recent years, and I submit that this bill will merely add to the already complicated farm situation. Should there be sufficient votes for passage of S. 993, I fear that we will be taking a giant step in the direction of the ultimate abolishment of the free farm.

We have gone so far in this direction already that it does not take too much imagination to foresee an agricultural system which is completely Government controlled.

I am opposed to this bill.

There have been many claims as to what the bill would do for the farmers. I am more concerned what it will do to them. As the senior Senator from New Hampshire, I would be remiss in my duties if I were not to take a long look at the effects of this bill on a deficit feed area. After all, the entire Northeast finds itself in this category. Our farmers must purchase most of their grain in order to produce milk, dairy products, eggs, and poultry.

Raise the price of corn from \$1.06 to \$1.20 per bushel, as this bill contemplates, and we raise the price to all of the dairy and poultry farmers of the Northeast. We all know, I am sure, that farmers will try not to absorb this added cost. Instead, they will seek higher prices for dairy and poultry products, and these higher prices will involve all the consumers.

I want to make the record clear for my part. I am not in favor of raising prices for anything by Government order. I firmly believe in the competitive market. I know of no adequate substitute for a fair market price. I refuse to believe for one second that the farmers of this Nation—they who have been intelligent and resourceful enough to become the most efficient producers of food and fiber in the history of the world—honestly want their prosperity to come at the expense of the American taxpayers. Let us take a broader look at the bill.

The principal architect is not the Secretary of Agriculture, but Willard Cochrane, former professor of agricultural economics at the University of Minnesota.

Professor Cochrane long has been an advocate of Government control in agriculture, both as to production and to marketing. His position is set forth most clearly—it leaves no doubt—in a paper submitted to the Joint Congressional Economic Committee in 1957.

In this paper he said agriculture should be regarded as a "giant public utility composed of many, many small producing units acting in concert with the aid and consent of Government to produce the quantities of food and fiber required by consumers at a fair return to the producers involved."

I continue his quotation:

In this view, Government establishes the institutional machinery for and grants the power to agriculture to enable the many, many producers involved to produce those quantities of farm products demanded by consumers at a fair price. For this grant of market power, Government reserves to itself, as in the case of any enfranchised public utility—e.g., the railroads, telephone companies, and gas and electric companies—the right to determine and fix rates and prices; hence, the right to determine fair returns to the producers involved.

I did not dream up this language. It was written by Mr. Cochrane, the architect of this bill now before us. Translated—and translation is simple—it means an agriculture completely controlled by the Government, and agriculture in which the farmer has no freedom and in which the marketing system as we have known it over the years is completely destroyed.

This is not the last time we will be confronted with a Government control theory for agriculture. It will recur again and again in proposals sent to this Congress. It will manifest itself until we make it plain that we do not want a collectivist agriculture, and we emphasize that we do not propose to destroy this country's marketing system for farm products.

I am not insensible to the fact that many farmers are in difficulty, but the farmers are not completely alone in this connection. There are many small businesses, indeed entire industries, which are experiencing serious problems at this time, but I will be the last to advocate that the Government step in to assist by controlling production, distribution and prices.

The bulk of the correspondence which I have received regarding the farm program consists of appeals for less Government interference rather than more. These protests against Government control over agriculture indicate to me a healthy condition. I hope the day will never come when, instead of deploring Government intervention in private enterprise, letterwriters will be extolling its virtues and asking it to be expanded to their particular line of endeavor.

I submit that the bill has far-reaching ramifications. I shall vote against it, and I hope a majority of my colleagues will do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4510.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 4510), to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4510) to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to strike out everything after the enacting clause and to substitute therefor the language of Senate bill 993, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the yeas and nays were ordered on passage of the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is correct to say that in view of the displacement which has taken place there is a negation of the order for the yeas and nays, and that it is once again in order to ask for the yeas and nays on passage of H.R. 4510?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill, H.R. 4510.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 4510) was read the third time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have listened very carefully to the argument and have examined my own conscience in regard to the bill. What confronts us is substantially this: We have heard a Macedonian cry from the President and from the Secretary of Agriculture.

In their message they have asked for help. They have said, "Here is looming disaster because of a lack of shortage, for one thing, and the danger of an aggravated feed grain glut over and above what we have at the present time." That seems to be the difficulty.

Coupled with their cry was a request for a weapon, in the form of power to be given to the Commodity Credit Corporation to manage the surpluses by selling in the market whenever it was felt to be necessary.

I am delighted that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry saw fit to take that weapon from the bill, and I express my concern that the Senate conferees will not yield on that point when they go to conference on the bill.

The House has already adjourned. The bill cannot be sent to conference with the House of Representatives until Monday, but we have assurance, given by the distinguished chairman of the committee in open Senate, that if a difficulty ensues with respect to section 3 he will return to the parent body for an instruction. We could not ask for more, and I think that is a generous concession on his part.

Finally, the Senator from Louisiana saw fit to accept an amendment requiring that 90 days after the effective date of the bill there shall be a detailed report on the number and percentage of cooperators, the amount of grain in kind which may have been sold under the so-called payment in kind provisions, and other details, which would reach us by the middle of July and be timely for the purpose of considering a long-range agricultural program.

Under those circumstances, I shall support the bill. When I do, Mr. President, I shall not for a moment share any feeling any Member of the Senate may have that I am setting a precedent or that I am committed to a course which I cannot reverse. If it is a Macedonian cry, if there is a looming disaster, I do not wish to stand in the way, but it is not going to charge my conscience not to do what I must do when the emergency is no longer before us and we are ready to consider a long-range agricultural program, which I presume will be before us in a short time.

With those considerations in mind, I shall support the bill in the hope that it will meet the expectations of its sponsors, even though I have grave doubts on that subject myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JORDAN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. KEATING (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOFIELD], who is absent on official business. If he were present, he

would you vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mrs. NEUBERGER (when her name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SMATHERS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. PASTORE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If he were present, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are necessarily absent.

I further announced that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The pair of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has been previously announced by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] is absent on official business, and his pair has been previously announced by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 26, as follows:

[No. 8]

YEAS—52

Allott	Gruening	Morse
Bartlett	Hart	Morton
Bible	Hartke	Mundt
Burdick	Hayden	Muskie
Cannon	Hill	Proxmire
Carlson	Hruska	Randolph
Carroll	Humphrey	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Smith, Mass.
Chavez	Johnston	Sparkman
Church	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Clark	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Cooper	Magnuson	Talmadge
Curtis	Mansfield	Wiley
Dirksen	McCarthy	Yarborough
Douglas	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	McGee	Young, Ohio
Engle	McNamara	
Ervin	Metcalf	

NAYS—26

Alken	Byrd, W. Va.	Lausche
Anderson	Case, N.J.	Miller
Beall	Cotton	Pell
Bennett	Dodd	Saltonstall
Boggs	Dwornshak	Scott
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Bush	Holland	Williams, N.J.
Butler	Javits	Williams, Del.
Byrd, Va.	Kuchel	

NOT VOTING—22

Blakley	Jordan	Pastore
Capehart	Keating	Prouty
Eastland	Kefauver	Robertson
Fong	Kerr	Schoepel
Fulbright	Long, La.	Smathers
Goldwater	Monroney	Thurmond
Gore	Moss	
Hickey	Neuberger	

So the bill (H.R. 4510), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, S. 993 will be postponed indefinitely.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the bill be printed with the Senate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I voted against passage of the bill just passed because I believe it cannot accomplish the good results which undoubtedly have motivated those who have drafted and supported it. Particularly have I been unwilling to be too active in my opposition, because it is an emergency, 1-year bill, and because the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of our committee, worked so hard to improve the bill as it came to our committee and did improve it greatly. I wish the RECORD to show, however, that no citizen of my

State—not one single citizen—has asked me to support the bill. To the contrary, the Farm Bureau Federation, the largest organization of farm people in my State, is strongly opposed to it. The cattle people likewise are opposed to it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point three telegrams which I received yesterday. One is from the president of the State Poultry Producers Association of my State, the second is from the president of the State Dairymen's Association, and the third is from the president of the Florida Hatchery & Breeders' Association. All of them are vigorously opposed to the bill.

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

TAMPA, FLA., March 9, 1961.

Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The Florida State Poultry Producers Association goes on record as opposing Senate bill 993.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. HARVEY,

President, Florida State Poultry Producers Association.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., March 9, 1961.

Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

As purchasers of millions of dollars worth of dairy green feeds annually we urge your opposition to Senate bill 993 which it appears would further increase the prices we pay for these feeds.

JOHN ADKINSON,

President, Florida State Dairymen's Association.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., March 9, 1961.

Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Urge your opposition to Senate bill 993. Raised feed grain supports make profitable poultry and egg production difficult without similar supports.

JOHN P. WALLACE,

President, Florida Hatchery and Breeders Association.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Florida on his statement and to say that, like him, I voted "no" on passage of the bill. I also wish, however, to join him in complimenting the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who brought to the floor of the Senate a far better bill than the House bill. While it does not follow some of the ideas that we have, I know that the Senator from Louisiana has worked hard to improve on the emergency situation. I compliment him on it.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Senate bill 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader about the schedule for next week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The pending bill is the only bill under general orders on the calendar at the present time. As the Senator knows, unanimous consent agreement was entered into earlier, under which 2 hours of debate has been allocated to any amendment, and 7 hours to the bill itself, beginning at the conclusion of the morning hour on Tuesday next.

I anticipate that we shall probably spend Tuesday and perhaps a part of Wednesday, at least, on the consideration of the depressed areas bill.

Then it is my hope that we will follow the consideration of that bill by consideration of the OECD Treaty, and perhaps the Columbia River Basin Treaty, which probably will have been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations by that time.

Then, if the Committee on Finance reports the extension of unemployment compensation bill, that bill likewise will be taken up next week.

There will be no further votes tonight, and, so far as I can foresee at the present time, there will be no votes on Monday. However, from Tuesday on every Senator should be on notice to be present.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, through the proposed legislation before us we seek to provide means whereby economically depressed communities and areas might take appropriate actions for redevelopment in order to provide more job opportunities and to improve their economy.

West Virginia has been much in the news and under discussion as a State with an inordinately high percentage of unemployment and the misery which accompanies persistent joblessness.

Our State is literally honeycombed with areas of chronic labor surplus.

I regret the necessity of verifying that the situation not only has failed to improve, but, in fact, has worsened since we considered similar proposed legislation in the 86th Congress.

Within the past few hours I have received from the director of the West Virginia Department of Employment Security the latest report—for the week ending March 4, 1961—concerning the unemployment situation in our State.

Not only do the chronic labor surplus areas retain the "chronic" label—the "substantial and persistently chronic" label—but, in fact, the report for March

4, 1961, reveals that initial claims for unemployment compensation were 23.7 percent higher than a year ago, the number of continued claims were 55.8 percent higher, and the total of all claims increased by 50.7 percent over the total for the same period in 1960.

Even the most sanguine of us, Mr. President, will not, I am sure, subscribe to a belief that this type of an area redevelopment measure—or any similar legislation—will solve all of the economic problems of West Virginia or any other State; nor will it fashion the means by which all of the unemployed will be provided with job opportunities.

It is important for me at this point to state that, insofar as chronic labor surpluses are concerned, I conceive this bill to be the foundation—or at least the cornerstone of the foundation—on which economic rebuilding must proceed. Unless these communities, represented on the charts and maps, which have been presented to the Senate by my esteemed colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRN], are provided the tools offered by this proposal, there cannot be any substantial refurbishing of the economic structure as the required first step toward establishing a basis for new jobs and new growth.

The 85th and the 86th Congresses established the principle that area redevelopment legislation is a necessary part of the arsenal of means which must be available to our Government in this era of rapid and even revolutionary technological change.

I say in the presence of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who has led the fight, and I say it in the presence of other Senators on the floor, that only through the dedicated service such as we have had from the Senator from Illinois has this legislation progressed so satisfactorily. The task force has assisted. Members of Congress have worked with him, and we come again today pleading our cause.

The 87th Congress must and will reaffirm this principle and provide the means which, we are certain, will not this time be denied our people by the stroke of the Executive pen.

Congress has acted affirmatively. We know that this bill will not be killed by Presidential action in the form of a veto. The present Chief Executive is vigorous in his support of this type of legislation.

Mr. President, one of the arguments registered against the proposed measure—by some spokesmen of industry, as well as by Members of this body—has been generated by a concern for the bill as a possible instrument for luring or "pirating" industry from one region of the country to another. Though evidence and questioning during committee hearings on this measure, and the language embodied in the bill as it has been presented, indicate safeguards against its use for any such purpose, I shall make my own position on the matter definite and clear.

The Senator from Illinois has recognized this problem in his understanding manner.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Section 6(a) states: Such financial assistance shall not be extended (1) for working capital or (2) to assist establishments relocating from one area to another.

Is not that a direct prohibition against pirating?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct. I appreciate confirmation of this provision of the bill which, of course, is important.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.
Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to have the Senator from West Virginia know that I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator from Washington. I know he will vigorously support the proposed legislation.

In addressing this point during the committee hearings, Secretary Hodges referred to his own philosophy as Governor of North Carolina when he was so highly successful in bringing new industries to that State. He formulated his position, and that of the State of North Carolina at that time, in the following words:

We don't want anybody to move anything they have got to North Carolina. We don't want anybody to come down for low wages under any conditions. The country is growing. We want whatever part we deserve of the expansions that you are going to have in this growing economy.

Mr. President, Secretary Hodges is to be commended, as Secretary and as the former Governor of North Carolina, for his forthright position on this issue. And speaking as a West Virginian, I concur most heartily in the Secretary's statement. Our concern for the proposed legislation is motivated by no desire to benefit the State of West Virginia by losses to another State or region. Our experience with the ravages of unemployment has been too long and too severe for us to desire to have any part in extending the problem to others. And I emphatically add, in view of some of the recent unfortunate differences of opinion that have arisen between my section and another, that the assurances I have just expressed are offered with particular reference to my honored colleagues from New England.

Mr. President, as an avid advocate of legislation of this type, as one who feels very keenly the need for it, I believe it is incumbent upon me to discuss briefly, at least, two general features of the proposed measure as it has been reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The first of these is the question of a unified administrative authority for area redevelopment. The importance of this factor and the concern for it on the part of the proponents of the bill are evidenced by its frequent recurrence in the hearings before the Subcommittee on Stabilization.

On no less than four occasions, during the testimony of Secretaries Freeman, Goldberg, and Hodges, the issue was raised, not only by the astute chairman

of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], but also by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER]. It was our regard for this need that led the author of the measure and those of us who cosponsored the Douglas-Cooper bill in the 86th Congress to press for an independent Area Redevelopment Administration. However, the views of the administration and of a majority of the members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee were opposed to this, and their views have apparently prevailed.

Yet the problem of assuring unity and coherence in the administration of area redevelopment activities still persists; and, speaking for myself, at least, I must confess that my anxiety on this point has not wholly been alleviated by reading the testimony of Secretary Hodges. On this issue and on the administrative structure proposed by the Secretary of Commerce, the chairman of the subcommittee posed the following question during the hearings:

Suppose you get an area such as the northern or western Appalachians or the southern or eastern Appalachians, where you have a whole area involved, and you need an area plan which will involve some community facilities, such as industrial water, industrial parks, which will involve a farm program, which will involve a retraining program, which will involve the bringing in of manufacturing concerns or possibly other industries, is there not a danger of excessive fragmentation * * *? You would be farming these projects out, and where would you get coherence and a balance between these plans? Would not, under this system of fragmentation, the applicants run themselves quite dizzy running around from one place to another?

This inquiry, Mr. President, goes to the very core of the issue. I say with some regret, but with every respect for the integrity and the capability of Secretary Hodges, that his answer to the question posed by the senior Senator from Illinois was somewhat less than reassuring. In the last analysis, it appears, the Secretary of Commerce would have the authority to veto conflicting decisions taken by other participant executive agencies—that is, by the Department of Agriculture, the Labor Department, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and others. But an untutored applicant—and we must remember such applicants—might wear thin his shoe leather when shuttling from one agency to another, before the Department of Commerce resolved the problems which inevitably will be inherent in most community project applications which will come from the areas of chronic unemployment.

I say this with no reflection upon the highly capable and conscientious executives who recently have been placed at the head of the respective departments and agencies that would be involved in the administration of area redevelopment activities as interpreted by the Secretary of Commerce.

On the contrary, I believe that the very measure which we are considering will create what may become—and I weigh my words—a hydra-headed crea-

ture of irresolution and conflicting authority, despite the best of intent and purpose on the part of participants involved. It is asking much, Mr. President, to expect three or four executive departments and two or three agencies to function promptly, harmoniously, and effectively in administering a single, unified, and coherent policy. It may be done, and I hope that it will be done. But if it is, I suspect that it will be an event unique in the annals of the history of the Federal bureaucracy.

I want the RECORD to show my skepticism on this point, Mr. President, and my belief that the pending measure places an extremely heavy burden upon the future Administrator of this program. We often hear the cliché that ours is a Government of laws, not of men. But ours is, in fact, a government of men who are administering laws. And when the Congress passes inadequate, ineffective, or cumbersome laws, it places an additional burden upon the executives whose responsibility it is to administer them. The American people have been exceptionally fortunate in the high quality of the executive personnel who have been drawn to President Kennedy's New Frontiers. But we have not always been so fortunate, and we may not assume that in the future we shall always have such good fortune.

Too much time already has been lost in connection with the process of bringing legislation of this type into being as a statute. We should already have behind us 2 years of experience with such a statute, and we would have had this degree of experience if the Douglas-Payne bill of 1958 had not been subjected to a pocket veto. Hence, I would not wish to cause further delay in our progress on this legislation, by engaging in a frontal attack upon its provisions for administration. But I frankly note for the RECORD the fact that I would deplore a fragmentation of the administration of the various facets of the program embraced by this measure.

Mr. President, I feel that the results of the enactment of the bill will, in the main, be most productive. I do not believe that any miracle will be wrought; but this bill is a meaningful measure, and I believe its prompt enactment will bring into being forces which will benefit the areas of the country in which chronic unemployment has cut so deeply into the lives of our people.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to thank the Senator from West Virginia for his very understanding address. No one has been a stronger supporter of the general purpose of this measure than has the Senator from West Virginia. He was a consultant to the economic task force and was of tremendous help.

I, too, would have preferred a separate administration; but out of a desire to reach a moderate compromise, if that was possible, we agreed to put the administration in the Department of Commerce, but under a separate administrator appointed by the President. I had hoped that this attempt at compromise would be satisfactory to all groups.

I was deeply surprised and pained, therefore, when the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] objected to this compromise and insisted on having the whole administration in the Department of Commerce, subject to the Secretary of Commerce, and with only delegated powers given to the administrator. I am afraid that this action will lead to cross purposes, and that we shall have the Department of Commerce passing on agricultural projects, on housing and home finance projects, and on Department of Labor projects.

So I hope very much that this sincere effort at moderation and compromise can be maintained when we come to a vote next Tuesday, and I want to thank the Senator from West Virginia for his very understanding comments.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I delay the Senate only a minute to say that I share the concern of the Senator from Illinois. I also commend him for what I am sure are his successful efforts in compromise. I hope my words are not negative, because sometimes it takes as much courage to compromise as it does to stand for a certain position and not alter that position.

I know that what the Senator from Illinois and his colleagues on the committee made real effort to reach at least some area of understanding, with mutual respect and appreciation of the problems, so we can move forward to passage of this bill, hoping and believing it will be helpful, and knowing that any errors which creep into its administration we shall later move to correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so I may ask the Senator from Illinois a question?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if the bill he has reported to the floor of the Senate is, in his opinion, a bill which is in line with the President's program in regard to this matter, including his views.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe so. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] made a statement last night that it was his understanding that, so far as the administrative features of it were concerned, they were not unsatisfactory to the President.

Mr. MORSE. So far as I am concerned, that factor is a major one with me. I intend to support the bill as reported by the committee, because, in my judgment, it is in line with the President's original proposal in this field. What we are doing is adopting a bill here which seeks to carry out what the President has said over and over again is one of the "must" measures that he thinks should be adopted in his administration.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I shall not labor the point. The objective of the President is reached in the bill, and it is a measure I support. I do believe we would have provided for a more effective administration of the bill if it were placed under an independent agency, rather than tied into the Secretary of Commerce and the other agencies of government. That is the only reason why I have brought it to the attention of the Senate. I certainly hope my fears are unfounded. The task is so vital, the need

is so real, the challenge is so pressing, that I sincerely trust no failures of administration of the act will weaken the purpose which is sought by its proponents.

PREVENTION OF SERVICE OR CONSUMPTION OF HARD LIQUOR ABOARD COMMERCIAL PASSENGER AIRCRAFT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which was published in the Washington Evening Star of March 8, 1961.

The events related in the article give added emphasis to the need for passage of S. 887, introduced on February 9 by Senator THURMOND and cosponsored by Senator HUMPHREY, Senator CARLSON, and myself. The bill is designed to prevent the service or consumption of hard liquor aboard commercial passenger aircraft. In view of the difficulties experienced on this flight mentioned in the article, I respectfully request that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee schedule early action on the proposed measure.

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

GREENSBORO, N.C., March 8.—A plane made an emergency stop here yesterday so medical attention could be given to a passenger from Washington.

While the plane was on the ground, someone thought the passenger—who later was charged with public drunkenness—said, "There's a bomb under my seat."

Passengers were unloaded and baggage searched, but nothing was found amiss. And the passenger, identified as Charles Edward Turner, 39, of the 800 block of L Street N.W., said that what he had told sheriff's deputies was, "There's a bottle under my seat."

CUT WRIST ACCIDENTALLY

The Delta Air Lines DC-6, enroute from Washington to Dallas, was not scheduled to land at the Greensboro-High Point Airport. It did so not because of any bomb scare in flight, but because passengers and a stewardess had noticed blood dripping from Mr. Turner's left wrist.

Mr. Turner, a pressman, was quoted as saying that while crushing out a cigarette in the plane's restroom he had accidentally cut himself with a razor blade left on a shelf.

The pilot, Capt. Francis McDowell, of Atlanta, said there was no mention of a bomb while the plane was in flight, and he landed so Mr. Turner could get medical attention. A doctor at the airport said the cut was superficial.

Deputies said Mr. Turner told them he had taken a few drinks before leaving Washington to visit his ailing mother in Charlotte. They also said he told them he had just been discharged from a tuberculosis hospital in Maryland.

LUGGAGE ON EASTERN PLANE

Neither a bottle nor his luggage was found on the plane. It was discovered later that his luggage had been put on an Eastern Air Lines plane in Washington and that he had had an Eastern ticket—but exchanged it for the Delta economy flight. A sherry wine bottle was found in his luggage when it was searched at Charlotte.

The plane, which had a two-man flight crew and two stewardesses, continued on after a delay of an hour and a half here.

An FBI agent who questioned Mr. Turner said it was a case for Greensboro authorities. They arrested him on the drunk charge and held him until they completed their investigation.

PROTESTS AGAINST PRESENCE OF DELEGATE FROM COMMUNIST CUBA ON INTER-AMERICAN DEFENSE BOARD

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, yesterday a group of nine brave women performed what I consider to be a service to the Government of the United States by calling attention to a situation so ridiculous as to be almost unbelievable.

Today's Washington Post, in a story on page A6, tells how these women protested the presence on the Inter-American Defense Board of a delegate from Communist Cuba.

This Inter-American Defense Board is a military planning body for the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

What is the common enemy? What are we defending against? Why do we plan to spend \$43 billion this year for military and defense needs?

Almost any American schoolchild can answer this question. The common enemy is communism as practiced in Communist Russia, Communist China and, as even the most adamant defender of the Cuban revolution must know by now, Communist Cuba.

I am sure that all will agree that we could not give Russia a part in NATO, and allow them to assist in planning the defenses of Europe. Nor could we tolerate the presence of Red China in SEATO, helping to map that organization's military strategy in case of attack.

Yet a representative of the Communist government of Fidel Castro is a duly recognized member of the Inter-American Defense Board which does the military planning for defense of the Western Hemisphere under the Organization of American States.

Since October, Argentina has had a resolution before the council of delegates of the Inter-American Defense Board, asking that the Cuban delegate be ejected as a menace to the Board's security.

If ever a resolution made plain commonsense to me, this Argentinian resolution does.

I compliment these women for the courage they demonstrated. They hid their faces from photographers because they feared reprisals against their families still in Cuba, but they went to the meeting anyway because they were so concerned over the situation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Washington Post account of their action.

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

HEMISPHERE DEFENSE TAKES RECESS AS WOMEN PROTEST CUBAN ON BOARD

(By Phil Casey)

Nine women armed with pluck and resounding tongues invaded the Inter-American Defense Board building at 2600 16th Street N.W., yesterday and stopped 60 men in their tracks.

As a result, a Board meeting never got started.

The women, eight of them Cuban refugees from the Fidel Castro regime, were there to protest the membership of Jose Meleon, Castro's delegate to the Board. They argued that he was a Communist leak of Inter-American defense plans.

The delegates from 21 nations and the Board staff didn't say yes or no. They simply tried to get the women to quit the premises.

HARD TO CONVINCED

There is an Argentine resolution awaiting action by the member nations for the ejection of the Cuban delegate as a menace to the security of the Inter-American Defense Board. The delegates themselves have no power to act. It's up to the member governments, they told the Cuban women, but it took them nearly 6 hours—from 10:15 a.m. to shortly after 4 p.m.—to convince the women.

When the meeting broke up, the moisture was terrific. The women were in tears and some of the men seemed notably morose.

The women began the day bravely, with no attempt at subterfuge. They walked in—"like a wedge," someone said—and they trooped up the stairs to the Board meeting.

There, in loud, fast, and excited Spanish, they told Meleon what they thought of him.

OPINIONS MADE CLEAR

Even to those who couldn't understand Spanish, it was clear the women didn't think much of him. They called him things and said he had no right to be a Board member because of Cuba's Communist ties.

One of them, a District native and no refugee, reported later that Meleon told them he was glad his children would have a chance to be educated in Russia. He sat at his desk while the women raged and the other delegates slowly fled out. It was 2 hours before he left, and when he did, he went like a burly, bearded arrow to the Cuban Embassy, about 50 yards up the street, and refused comment.

Whether the meeting will be reconvened, or whether the delegates will wait until the next ordinary meeting, later this month, could not be determined. One Board member indicated there might not be much public information forthcoming on this.

Staff officers tried to feed the women, they asked them to at least have some coffee. The women, who insisted they were going on a hunger strike, refused. Negotiations went on constantly, but the women remained steadfast until 4 p.m.

THEY CONSENT TO LEAVE

Then, told that they had accomplished their purpose—"to open the eyes of the Latin American Presidents" to their protest—they finally consented to leave.

Some broke into tears. One young woman—they were all in the twenties or early thirties—broke down, saying, "I feel so useless, that I can do nothing." Others murmured, "How many Cubans must die before we act?" And all were sad.

Staff officers encouraged them, saying they had done what they set out to do.

"I'm glad," said one staff member, "that we handled it the way we did. This is an important and dramatic thing to them."

And he didn't look too happy himself.

SIGNIFICANCE OF NATURAL RESOURCES PROGRAM TO PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the message on natural resources sent to Congress by President Kennedy on February 23 is of vast significance to the

Pacific Northwest. It represents a reversal of the policies of the last administration and a return to the principles of Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman.

The economy of the Pacific Northwest is largely dependent upon its limited resources of land, water, minerals, and trees. The conservation, preservation, or development of these resources in a balanced program is essential to the economic health of our region.

The Eisenhower policies were bad for the Pacific Northwest—and for the Nation. The doctrines of “no new starts” and “partnership” crippled comprehensive river basin development in the public interest and resulted in giveaways such as that at Hells Canyon. Political budgets and Presidential vetoes killed productive investment in reforestation, soil conservation, flood control, anti-pollution projects, and irrigation. Administrative manipulation distorted Federal power marketing programs and rural electrification.

President Kennedy's natural resource program rejects this negative philosophy. It recognizes these resources as a basic element of national strength.

OREGON'S STAKE IN THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on February 2, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], on behalf of himself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], introduced S. 785, a bill to provide a program of grants to States for development of the arts. I have the privilege of being a cosponsor of the proposed legislation.

In the material accompanying that bill there was a State-by-State analysis of support for artistic and cultural activities—that is, almost State by State. When I found there was no report from my State of Oregon, I was astonished, and I wish to correct an impression that might be abroad in the land that Oregon is lacking in these activities.

The replies from 46 States covered museums of art, historical societies, museums of science and industry, State boards of architects, symphony orchestras, State fairs, community theaters, and sites of historical interest. All of these are admirably represented in Oregon. It is unnecessary for me to call attention to the great natural attractions of my State. However, lest some think we live in the middle of vast forests, yet our souls starve for lack of the finer things of life, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Mr. Hilmar Grondahl, music critic of the Portland Oregonian.

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

OREGON'S STAKE IN THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

(By Hilmar Grondahl)

If it is the intention of the U.S. Government to construct a National Cultural Center and thereby make evident the artistic aspects of life in America, then Oregon should make its contribution taxwise to the construction

of a center such as architects have planned for a place on the Potomac River Basin.

If it is the intention of the U.S. Government to create artistic entities in the cultural field which can properly represent America's artistic image to the world, then Oregon can make its direct contributions through talented members of its cultural population.

For instance: Were there to be established a National Ballet to be made up of the best dancers in this land and to be shown to the Russians, the Danes and the British as our member in the field of ballet, then we would offer Oregon's Janet Reed, who for some years has been prima ballerina of the New York City Ballet. There are other native young men and women who have been well trained who could compete for positions in the corps de ballet.

Were there to be a National Opera Company based at the Cultural Center, Oregon could offer Frances Yeend, now a leading soprano at the Metropolitan, and Donald Drain who sang last season with the San Francisco Opera Company; other young singers of talent are developing all along every State.

Were there to be a national string quartet, it could be a transfer in name to the Juilliard String Quartet whose first violinist, Robert Mann, is a native Portlander. This quartet, young, vigorous, and top rated has already made tours of Russia and Western Europe which have shown America as among the finest in this field.

Were there to be a National Symphony Orchestra to be shown to the world (whether led by Howard Mitchell, or not) there are candidates for membership in Oregon waiting to be tested for some such virtuoso ensemble. Currently three Portlanders are playing in Washington, D.C.'s National Symphony.

Were there to be programs in the National Capitol that represented America musically, those programs would inevitably contain works by Oregon's late great Ernest Bloch, whose prizewinning choral symphony “America” might be just the kind of score to use in representing America to the peoples of other lands. There are other and younger composers here whose contribution to the national cultural picture would be notable.

All in all, the idea of concentrating our money and talents on some national musical organizations would be valuable in creating a cultural impact on peoples of other countries. It would serve an additionally valuable service of focusing the eyes of our own citizens upon culture as a respected and even admirable adjunct of national policy.

IMPORTATION OF RUSSIAN CRABMEAT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in the New York Times for today, under the byline of Richard E. Mooney, there was printed an article, beginning on page 1, stating, among other things, that the existing U.S. prohibition against the importation into this country of crabmeat from Russia would soon be lifted.

Reliable sources were quoted as being the authority for the statement made in the article.

The ban now in existence was imposed, Mr. President, 10 years ago, when the Treasury Department made a finding to the effect that Russian crabmeat was being produced by slave labor in Russia, and therefore, could not be brought into this country. The article to which I have referred said that this determination, and its implementation during the years, has “irritated the Russians.”

Mr. President, I am gravely concerned at the apparent determination to lift the

existing ban. I am concerned for several reasons. I can well comprehend that there are considerations which might make it advisable for us to accommodate the Russians in this respect; but I doubt very much if they are in operation in this particular instance. I do not know what our Government hopes, or expects, to obtain from the Russian Government in return for the privilege of allowing the Soviets to ship this product into the United States. What I do know, and know positively, of my personal knowledge, is that grave hurt is going to be done to an American industry at a time when it is just beginning to get on its feet. And I know, too, if the prohibition against importation is rescinded, the Russians will have a powerful assist from us at a time when I do not believe they should have.

What is the situation, Mr. President, in respect to the source of canned crabmeat consumed in the United States? In 1959, the last year for which records are available, it is disclosed that the U.S. pack of this product amounted to 2,942,000 pounds, while we imported from unspecified sources, but certainly not including Russia, 7,304,000 pounds. In other words, our own producers were able to supply 28.7 percent of the Nation's needs.

Other sources accounted for 71.3 percent of the needs.

Mr. President, within the past year there has been an occurrence of much concern to all those who are interested in the tremendously rich North Pacific Fishery. For the first time the Russian fishing fleet has moved to those waters in numbers.

The Russian fleet, consisting of some of the newest and most modern vessels to be found anywhere in the world, has been intensively engaged in taking crabmeat from the Bering Sea and processing it on mother ships.

Not long ago the Russians disclosed that their exploratory operations not only would be continued but also would be intensified and expanded, for they informed the world at a west coast meeting that their next excursion will be to the waters of the Gulf of Alaska. We do not know what they propose to do there. What we fear is that they may, in a massive way, move in to the halibut banks which have been fished almost exclusively for a long time by Canadian and American fishermen.

What all this portends for the future of the North Pacific Fishery no one can predict. We know, however, that experts in this field have expressed the gravest concern since the Russians have started to pack crab in the Bering Sea.

The Japanese people have always been the biggest takers of crab in those waters and the largest packers of crab from those waters. The fear has been expressed that 3-nation rivalry may come to the fore and, without any regulations or rules to control, there may be such intensive raids upon the crab fishery, the full extent of which is not known to anyone, that it may be wiped out.

The American participation in this industry is relatively new, but it is growing and it is meaningful.

As recently as 1951 only 56 cases of king crab were packed by U.S. firms, valued at only \$1,344. In 1960 the pack was 91,818 cases, with a value of \$2,846,358.

American ingenuity, American merchandising methods, and American efficiency have caused king crab to be a desirable product on the American mass market. The housewife who goes to her grocery store knows that when she buys king crab packed by Americans she is obtaining a product which not only is excellent in every way but also has been packed under the most sanitary conditions.

With reference to Soviet intentions and Soviet activities in the north Pacific Ocean, I desire to quote from the international yearbook number of the Pacific Fisherman, dated January 25, 1961. The Pacific Fisherman had this to say:

However, at the end of April 1960, the operations of the U.S.S.R. in Bering Sea took on new character. Where the Soviets had been trawling in eastern Bering Sea continuously since 1959, and with incredible intensity, determination, and hardihood, at the end of April a new expedition appeared on the king crab grounds about 30 miles offshore due north of Amak Island on the Aleutian chain. This was in direct contradiction of the previous declarations by officers of the Russian trawling fleet to the effect that they had no intention of exploiting the king crab resource. Thus a new, heavy, and aggressive exploitation fell on the Bering Sea king crab resources, under the hammer and sickle.

These are international waters. The Russians under international law have every right to fish there, despite the fact that there and elsewhere off the coast of Alaska American fishermen have, or ought to be construed to have, under the rules of the game, certain historic rights based upon initial discoveries and continued fishing operations.

Mr. President, over the past decade the value of fishery products of all kind imported into the United States increased 85 percent.

As I stated, approximately 71 percent of all the canned crab consumed in this country is imported.

I think it would be a grievous error for our Government now to make an arrangement to permit the Soviets to ship crabmeat into this country. I know that in other departments of our Government this decision—if that is what it is—is going to cause very real concern, for technical experts on fisheries in these departments have shared with the American fishing industry and with those of us in public life who have such a lively interest in the subject an apprehension over what may be the Russian intentions.

Mr. President, Russia is now fishing on the seven seas. Russia is fishing, as I indicated, with the most modern fleet in the world, and has every intention, according to quotations of what the Russians have said, of possessing the largest fleet within a comparatively short time. The Russians are well on the way to accomplishing this goal.

At the very time when the Russians have entered fishing grounds which were previously exploited only by Americans

and Japanese with respect to king crab operations, when the Russians have informed us publicly that they are going to move their fishing vessels to other waters off the Alaska coast, we apparently propose to make their job much easier by permitting them to ship the crab they catch and process off the Alaska coast directly to this country. I think such a course of action would be an error of the first magnitude.

I think the decision if made ought to be reversed. It will not only hurt an American industry, which has had so much trouble, financial and otherwise, in establishing itself, but I suggest it will also take away from us bargaining power that otherwise we would possess as the Russian fishing endeavor spreads south and east.

I know no more about this decision than was recorded in the New York Times this morning. I can only express the hope that the reliable sources quoted in that issue will turn out to be not so reliable after all. But if they are reliable, I hope that another look will be taken at this situation and that we do not, at this time at least, enter into an accommodating arrangement, hurtful to our own people and helpful only to the Russians. I yield the floor.

FEED GRAINS PROGRAM FOR 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a few moments before the vote on the feed grains bill I read to the Senate a telegram I had received from one of the large barley growers of my State raising so-called malting barley, and I inserted in the RECORD a series of similar wires in which the growers expressed concern over the fact that the feed grain bill would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to exercise discretion in respect to barley. I asked the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Democratic whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] if in their opinion the bill would give such discretionary power to the Secretary of Agriculture, and they advised me that it would.

Then I asked if one of them would get in touch with the Secretary of Agriculture and get his advice and opinion as to whether or not he intended to exercise that discretion in respect to malt barley which would be sold for human consumption in the malt industry, and the Senator from Minnesota, in his gracious manner, assumed that responsibility in behalf of both himself and the Senator from Louisiana. The information did not come back until the yea-and-nay vote was being taken. Therefore I could not make the statement prior to the yea-and-nay vote.

I wish now to make the statement for the information of the malt barley growers in my State that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] reported to me that in his conversation with the Secretary of Agriculture he received assurance that the Secretary had no intention of applying the provisions of the bill which would permit of his exercise of discretion in the matter to malt barley; that the intention was to

apply it to feed grains and not to grains that were being used in the malt industry.

Upon receipt of that information I voted as I indicated I would when I sought the information for the bill, because in my judgment the bill in other respects would be very helpful to the grain industry of my State, although some in my State do not agree. So I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a wire that I received from my State in opposition to the bill, and another wire that I received from my State in support of the bill.

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

NORTH POWDER, OREG.,
March 6, 1961.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator, State of Oregon,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We have reviewed H.R. 5410 and we respectfully request that you vote against it. We are especially adamant against section 3. Oregon and particularly Blue Mountain area producers will be badly hurt by a compulsory reduction in feed grain acreage. We do not now have an overabundance of barley and oats which are the feed grains raised in this section. Importation of feed stuff is not economical, therefore, neither producer nor consumer will be benefited by passage of this legislation.

NORTH POWDER M. & M. Co.

SALEM, OREG.,
March 1, 1961.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We favor No. 4510, feed grains bill. Any efforts in support of this bill appreciated. We recommend it do pass.

OREGON WASHINGTON FARMERS
UNION,
ROBERT J. ELKINS, President.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN OREGON

Mr. MORSE. I received from the Honorable Harry D. Boivin, president of the Senate of the Oregon State Legislature, the following letter:

THE SENATE, STATE OF OREGON,
March 3, 1961.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: Pursuant to the provisions of Enrolled Senate Joint Memorial 6, adopted by the 51st Legislative Assembly of Oregon in regular session, I have the honor of transmitting to you a copy of this memorial.

Sincerely,

HARRY D. BOIVIN,
President of the Senate.

Ordinarily I would only ask unanimous consent to have the memorial printed in the RECORD. Because this memorial deals with a subject of such great importance at the present time to the economic welfare of my State, I am going to read it. I am particularly pleased to read it in the presence of my good friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], because the memorial deals with a problem we have in Oregon in relation to California and Washington, but I wish to assure the Senator from California, as I would the Senators from Washington if they were

present, that it is not the position of the Senator from Oregon that anything should be taken away from California or Washington, but that something ought to be made available for Oregon, and the memorial speaks for itself.

I wish to read it also because it involves a problem that I presented to the new President of the United States, when he was still President-elect, in a letter I sent to him under date of December 9, 1960.

I wish to say from the floor of the Senate today to the President of the United States that things are not any better. I still think it is important that his administration give heed to the economic problems which confront Oregon, one of the most seriously depressed areas in this country. As to the requests I have made to date to this administration for assistance in Oregon under the food stamp program, and the requests that I made for assistance in connection with other emergency programs that could be applied in part to the State of Oregon, the result has been nil.

It is certainly my intention to cooperate with this administration. But I wish to serve notice on the administration that I expect some cooperation on behalf of the people of my State, and I want this administration to know that Oregon is in need of some attention to relieve the economic emergency that confronts the State.

Lumber mill after lumber mill after lumber mill is down. The last statistics I was able to obtain from the Department of Labor showed that unemployment in the State of Oregon is among the two or three highest in the whole Nation. I want to help all other States. On the floor of the Senate I am going to continue to assist every Senator in a depressed State to get some help to relieve human suffering.

But Oregon is entitled to some assistance, too. The people of my State are entitled to it, and, although we are far removed from Washington, D.C., I sincerely hope that the President of the United States will see to it that some instructions get down to his departments. The President should not have to do this himself, because those whom he has put in charge of the emergency programs should be doing it without any further instructions.

I speak respectfully. Although the printed language may not indicate it, I do speak in a very kindly mood. The pressures under which the administration is functioning are evident. No one can expect it to do everything overnight. The fact is this critical situation in Oregon is very serious.

I had hoped it would not be necessary to make this type of speech again in order to get some expediting of procedures which are necessary in the various departments of the Government to give some attention to the distressed situation in the State of Oregon.

The President knows that he can count on me to give my undivided support to his great housing program, and to get that passed. That will be a great help to my State, because it will help get construction started. The distressed area

bill, now pending before the Senate, will be of help.

However, there are some things that can be done administratively by the executive branch prior to the passage of these pieces of proposed legislation. There is a considerable amount of criticism in my State that it was not seen fit to include my State in the food stamp program and in some of the other emergency measures which the President quite properly in his Executive Order No. 1 has made available elsewhere in the country.

I hope that this kindly intended advice to the administration will be heeded. Senators know that I shall not remain silent if it is not heeded. The people of my State deserve an equal break in whatever relief can be made available to them under the policies of the President.

I now read to the Senate the resolution which was adopted by both houses of the legislature of my State:

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent that:

Whereas there are presently 20 U.S. naval installations in the State of California, 8 U.S. naval installations in the State of Washington, and 1 U.S. naval installation in the State of Oregon; and

Whereas the one U.S. naval installation in the State of Oregon is presently being deactivated; and

Whereas there were awarded, in the year 1960, approximately \$4,800 million in military prime contracts to contractors in the State of California (representing 23.7 percent of the total military prime contracts awarded); \$715,087,000 in military prime contracts to contractors in the State of Washington (representing 3.5 percent of the total military prime contracts awarded); and \$23,963,000 in military prime contracts to contractors in the State of Oregon (representing 0.1 percent of the total military prime contracts awarded; and

Whereas the economic and social welfare of this State and of this Nation is in large measure dependent upon the just and equitable utilization of the resources of this Nation by the Federal Government as well as the just and equitable exercise of Federal power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring):

1. The Congress and the Federal Government are memorialized to take immediate action to insure that the resources of this State are properly and equitably utilized by the Federal Government in its planning and preparation of the defenses of this Nation.

2. Copies of this memorial shall be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

The naval installation which is located in my State at Tongue Point, outside the city of Astoria, Oreg., is an exceedingly small installation. It is an installation, however, which was of great assistance to this country in World War II. I have never taken the position, and do not intend to take it now, that any installation in my State must be kept activated, if the best interests of my country as a whole call for its deactivation. I have not taken that position in regard to the

naval station at Tongue Point. Perhaps there is justification for deactivating it as a naval station. I am waiting for that proof. None has been received which in my judgment justifies the Defense Department's proposal to deactivate that station.

Let us assume that it can produce that proof.

Then we have no right to insist upon its being continued in the same use to which it has been put in the past.

However, deactivating it as a naval base does not mean that there is any justification for abandoning it as a facility for other uses.

In view of the fact that Oregon is such a serious depressed area at the present time, and in view of the further fact, as I have said before in this speech, that Oregon has been discriminated against for a long time in respect to both Federal installations in the State and the expenditure of Federal funds on a per capita basis, I respectfully call to the attention of the President and the various agencies of the executive branch of Government, that favorable consideration should be given to using the Tongue Point naval facilities for some other Federal functions or services.

The President has pointed out the need for a speedup in an oceanography program. Tongue Point is a facility located on the shores of the Pacific. I recommend its consideration as an excellent location for the headquarters for a Federal oceanography program. I am advised that it would make an excellent headquarters for such a Federal facility. There are many other Federal uses to which the installation could be put. For example, I understand that there is going to be a need for the establishment of a missile training base, a submarine training base, an Air Force training base, and possibly other defense training programs.

There are undoubtedly other Federal facilities for which the administration will be asking for appropriations in the near future to which use this facility could be put. Therefore, I respectfully ask the administration in this speech today to have its various departments give consideration to the Tongue Point naval installation in my State before any request is made for appropriations for new construction anywhere else, at least in connection with which this particular facility at Tongue Point might be used.

As I have indicated in this speech, and as is well illustrated by the memorial passed by the Oregon Legislature, the people of the State of Oregon are very much upset over the unfair discrimination that has been practiced on the State of Oregon in the expenditure of Federal funds for a good many years.

For example, there is now pending the controversy over the moving of the regional post office from Portland to Seattle. This was started under the Summerfield administration in the Post Office. The record of this controversy leaves no room for doubt that it was initiated as a political move on the part of former Postmaster General Summerfield.

It was through the intervention of the Senator from South Carolina [OLIN JOHNSTON], that we were able to stop the move prior to the November election. Senator JOHNSTON, in a wire to Postmaster General Summerfield, requested that the Postmaster General not proceed with the move of the regional post office from Portland to Seattle until the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service could investigate the matter and hold hearings on it.

Summerfield acceded to Senator JOHNSTON's request until after the election. However, shortly after the elections, Summerfield ordered the move to start again and further protests from Senator JOHNSTON and the members of the Oregon delegation were of no avail.

The new administration in the Post Office is now conducting an investigation into the matter upon the request of the Oregon delegation. We are satisfied that the move never should have been started in the first place, and that it certainly should not be completed. In fact, it is the position of the Oregon delegation that those divisions of the post office which have already been moved to Seattle, should be moved back to Portland.

This is but another example of the unfair treatment which Oregon is receiving in comparison with the favorable treatment which California and the State of Washington have been receiving for some time in respect to the location of Federal installations and the expenditure of Federal funds.

Oregon is at the bottom of the totem pole, so to speak, in comparison with other Western States in the expenditure of Federal funds.

A big part of my job is to see to it that the people of the State of Oregon get equitable and fair treatment. I have been protesting this situation for the past 8 years. I say most respectfully that I had reason to assume that under a new administration the wrongs of the past would be ended.

So this evening I raise the question as to whether the same policy of discrimination against the State of Oregon in respect to the expenditure of Federal funds is to continue under a Democratic administration.

It will be a great surprise to me if that is the policy. It will be a great disappointment to the people of my State. But the people of my State are political activists. I am sure the administration understands the meaning of that phrase. They will insist upon political action, if we continue to fill up a record which is unquestionably one of discrimination against the State of Oregon.

So I rise today to make this plea in behalf of the people of my State. The various agencies of the Government under this Democratic administration might be very wise if they got a map of the western area of the country and placed it on their office walls, with a circle around the area which lies between the State of California and the State of Washington. That area is Oregon.

If the people in these departments do not know their geography, perhaps a map on their office wall will give them a

constant reminder that the people of my State belong to the Union too and that we are entitled—only entitled—to fair and equitable treatment in regard to the expenditure of Federal funds. We are entitled to that consideration now weeks overdue in respect to putting emergency programs to work in order that work can be brought to the unemployed of my State, and that food can be brought to those in my State who are in need of food.

I shall speak periodically, with increasing length and vigor, on this subject matter until justice is given to the people of my State.

HYDROELECTRIC RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT FOR PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., published an excellent article entitled "Hydro Key to New Jobs," written by Mr. Ivan Bloch, one of Oregon's outstanding industrial consultants. The statements in Mr. Bloch's article deserve serious consideration by the Senate.

The text of the article is exactly as it appeared in the Oregonian of February 27, 1961, except that one line, which was inadvertently omitted in the newspaper article, reading "about 20 million new kilo—" has been inserted in the text of the article as it will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

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

HYDRO KEY TO NEW JOBS (By Ivan Bloch)

It is indisputable that the Pacific Northwest economy is lagging seriously. To what extent will the new kilowatts to be provided by Canadian storage and development on the Columbia River, on which treaty ratification is pending, and other yet undeveloped hydro resources, bring about a vigorous resurgence of our area's industrial and economic growth?

Examination of the region's traditional industries—forest and agriculture—shows that these can only provide a portion of the new jobs required by present and increasing population. The desired development of new manufacturers as in the field of electronics and space devices and those to meet the needs of a somewhat small even though growing regional market will continue at a relatively slow rate.

On the other hand, the remaining hydro resources of the region, including the great benefits of Canadian storage, can provide a broadening base for new jobs through the expansion of an electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries such as aluminum, elemental phosphorus, chlorine, and others. These industries are doubly important to our region in that many of them are oriented to imports of offshore materials, thus providing an important stimulus toward the maintenance and expansion of the area's waterborne coastal and export trade. This in itself would consolidate and open up the area's markets for traditional and new products.

If 1½ to 3 million kilowatts were to be made available in the Northwest for such new electroprocess industry expansion and establishment, the resulting direct, indirect,

and stimulated employment in all segments of the region's economy would be on the order of between 125,000 to 250,000 new jobs exclusive of construction and related employment for new plants and facilities, etc. This would, indeed, be of tremendous importance to the Pacific Northwest.

Although many areas of the free world appear to have ideal combinations of enormous hydro potentials and appropriate raw materials, it is not sure that these areas can contribute a major or continuing portion of the U.S. requirements for electrochemicals and electrometals.

To begin with, many such significant potentials as those of Africa are clouded with political unrest. In addition, the demands for electroprocess materials in many of those otherwise interesting areas are likely to absorb a very large portion of planned and anticipated production, leaving an uncertain amount which might be available for U.S. needs. Thus, prudent analysis leads to the conclusion that U.S. demands must rely as much as possible on production to be achieved in the Nation, utilizing its own power resources, and those which it can develop in collaboration with Canada.

Translated into power requirements, this means that about 20 million new kilowatts will have to be provided during the next 2 decades in the Nation for the electroprocess industry alone, representing about a doubling of power capacity used by that present industry. This presents a major problem to the power systems of the Nation.

During the past decade or so, there has been a shift in the center of production of electroproducts to the gulf coast natural gas area and the eastern coal regions based on large powerplants using these fuels. The Rocky Mountain coal area has also been under consideration. It appears, however, that it will not be possible to provide a very large portion of the additional 20 million kilowatts for new electroprocess industry in these areas.

For example, natural gas supplies are being preempted for pipeline transmission for small industrial, commercial, and domestic purposes, and for the chemical industry.

In the eastern coal areas, a number of factors make difficult the development of large power supplies suitable for electroprocessing; on the one hand, there are physical and economic factors which will restrict really low cost power production, and on the other hand, power demands for other uses are in priority for additional generation.

The vast solid fuel reserves of the Rocky Mountain area also present problems which will tend to restrict development for very low cost power production. Further, the freight rate structure in that area must be reckoned with for most plant establishments of the electroprocess variety.

By contrast, the Pacific Northwest and North Pacific regions (including British Columbia, Yukon, and Alaska) still possess around 30 million undeveloped kilowatts of large-scale hydro as well as enormous reserves of the fossil fuels. It appears that a major portion of this potential can provide power at a cost per kilowatt-hour which will be attractive for competitive large-scale electro industries.

Hearings are to commence on the ratification of the treaty between the United States and Canada on the harnessing of the Canadian upper Columbia. The benefits to both nations are tremendous in terms of actual kilowatts and kilowatt-hours, and in the low cost of development. The kilowatt-hours resulting of this development will make possible the maintenance of attractive power rates for electroprocess industries. However, in view of the need to provide a basic tool for the development of new industries on both sides of the border, immediate action is required as it will take time for engineering and construction of the

projects, and before this energy can be put to work.

Hydroelectric power has always been a major resource of the Pacific Northwest and the North Pacific country. However, its rate of development has not been commensurate in recent years with potential utilization for the development of employment and wealth. The job of catching up is of immediate urgency.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, March 13.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 13, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, March 10, 1961:

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, secs. 3284, 3306, and 3307.

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Thomas Jahn Sands, O17521, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Carson Bullock, O17635, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Francis Regis Seitz, O17734, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Barksdale Hamlett O18143, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Hugh Mackintosh, O17716, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Orlando Collette Troxel, Jr., O18487, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert John Fleming, Jr., O17095, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Charles Granville Dodge, O18072, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Edward Beauchamp, O18238, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Hiram Dudley Ives, O29509, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Frederick Cassidy, O18354, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. August Schomburg, O18422, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Breckinridge Duff, O18438, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Earle Fremont Cook, O18450, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be major general, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Carl Willard Tempel, O18284, Medical Corps (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. John Joseph Davis, O18530, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Tabb Snodgrass, O29670, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Wilson Power, O18691, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Harrison Alan Gerhardt, O18697, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ashton Herbert Manhart, O18773, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Ramsey Pugh, O18790, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles John Timmes, O29777, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Irvin Louia Allen, O29810, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Aiden Kingsland Sibley, O18964, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, O18968, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Thomas Honeycutt, O18975, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Gardner Shinkle, O18979, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Alvin Charles Welling, O18983, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. David Warren Gray, O18988, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Francis Joseph McMorro, O18995, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Theodore John Conway, O19015, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Chester Arthur Dahlen, O19020, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, O19028, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Henry Chase, O19095, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edgar Collins Doleman, O19131, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frederick Robert Zierath, O19211, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Graydon Casper Essman, O19242, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Ralph Yancey, O42256, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Gines Perez, O30126, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, O19402, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frank Willoughby Moorman, O19444, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Berton Everett Spivy, Jr., O19479, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Louis Alfred Walsh, Jr., O19567, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Alexander Cunningham 3d, O19579, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Achilles Lacy Tynes, O18916, Medical Corps (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Chaplain

Chaplain (Brig. Gen.) William Joseph Moran, O29195, U.S. Army (colonel, Chaplain, U.S. Army).

U.S. NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named person for commands and other duties determined by the Presi-

dent to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving.

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Charles B. Martell, U.S. Navy.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Charles E. Alexander, Jr., to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, and ending Julius P. Kish III, to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate on March 2, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 10, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

John 14: 27: *Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you.*

Almighty God, who art the source of all that is great and good in human life, may we always be eager to accept the overtures of Thy grace and love.

Grant that in our high vocation to build in our day a better and more blessed world we may match every opportunity with wholehearted devotion.

Inspire us to look with eyes of sympathy and to extend our hands in service and brotherhood to all who are tempted to become bitter and resentful toward Thee and life itself because of long waiting and hopes deferred.

Show us how we may minister unto the troubled souls of men and help them in their anxiety and agony to lay hold on Thee more firmly and find the way of renewed confidence and hope.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour who bequeathed unto mankind His peace and joy. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 289. Joint resolution relating to the time for filing a report on renegotiation by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

MARCH 8, 1961.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
U.S. Capitol Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy for the year 1961: Hon. GEORGE P. MIL-