Mr. President, in view of the great benefit to the entire Nation, certainly it will be a shame if this proposal, which has the very-hard-earned approval of the Bureau of the Budget, is knocked out.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, under the previous order of the Senate, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 7, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 6, 1961:

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Ernest Morgan, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Texas for the term of 4 years, vice Russell B. Wine.

Harold Barefoot Sanders, Jr., of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Texas for the term of 4 years, vice William B. West III.

William W. Justice, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Texas for the term of 4 years, vice James Crawford, Jr.

Woodrow B. Seals, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Texas for the term of 4 years, vice William B. Butler.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

From the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew 5: 16: *Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven.*

Eternal God, who alone can give worth and meaning to our life, may we have the insight to see what is vital and the will and the courage to pursue whatsoever is of highest value.

Make us more responsive to the needs of all who are walking the cold and wintry way of doubt and disillusionment and show us how we may lead them into the warmth and light of a vivid and victorious faith.

May we daily feel the urge, by kind words and good works, to identify ourselves more personally and sympathetically with humanity, with its hopes and aspirations, its struggles and sorrows, and may we pour the healing balm of love into hearts that are bruised and broken.

Give us a clearer vision of our opportunities and a keener sense of our obligation to be generous and charitable in behalf of those countries and people who know the bitterness of hunger and want.

Hear us in the name of the Master who being Lord of all was willing for the sake of a needy world to become the Servant of all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REPORT ON RENEGOTIATION, JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 437) relating to the time for filing a report on renegotiation by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(b)(2) of Public Law 86-89, July 13, 1959, extending the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, is further amended by striking out "June 30, 1961", relating to the time for filing a report on renegotiation by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1962".

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDENCE HOSPITAL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 325) and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Providence Hospital, the oldest general hospital in continuous service in the District of Columbia, was founded on June 10, 1861, by Sister Mary Sarah Carroll, Sister Clothilda O'Neill, Sister Mary Vincent Foley, and Sister Mary Alfonsa, of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, of Emmitsburg, Maryland; and

Whereas Providence Hospital was incorporated by a special Act of the Congress approved April 8, 1864; and

Whereas Providence Hospital was the only nonmilitary hospital in the District of Columbia during the Civil War and provided hospital care for casualties of the Union and Confederate forces as well as for the civilian population; and

Whereas Providence Hospital during its existence has received financial assistance from the United States through appropriations by the Congress to assist it in carrying out its purpose of providing care for the sick regardless of their means; and

Whereas Providence Hospital, during the period when Alexandria and Georgetown were thriving ports-of-call for merchant vessels, afforded facilities for the care and treatment of sick and injured merchant seamen from ships docking at such ports under the supervision of surgeons of the United States Marine Hospital Service (now the United States Public Health Service); and

Whereas today employees of the United States with service-connected illnesses or injuries are cared for at Providence Hospital under the supervision of officers of the United States Public Health Service; and

Whereas in 1898, at the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and assisted by an appropriation by the Congress, facilities for the treatment of contagious diseases were constructed as part of Providence Hospital, which was the first contagious disease hospital in the District of Columbia and until 1931 the only hospital of such type in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas many wounded and disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War I were brought back from the battlefronts and received treatment and rehabilitation at Providence Hospital; and

Whereas the facilities of Providence Hospital on Capitol Hill by the end of World War II were taxed beyond their capacity and with the assistance of the Federal Government new facilities for Providence Hospital were constructed at 12th and Varnum Streets, North East, in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas these new facilities, which were first occupied by Providence Hospital on April 5, 1956, received for that year the award of Hospital of the Year of the National Association of Architects; and

Whereas Providence Hospital continues to be administered by the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul on a nondenominational basis without regard to financial status: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul and the advisory board, officers, staff, and personnel of Providence Hospital, Washington, District of Columbia, on the occasion of the centennial of the founding of Providence Hospital.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDENCE HOSPITAL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the English poets once wrote that we live in deeds, not years. Surely this is true of institutions, for the history of Providence Hospital has always been closely linked with the life of this community through the deeds of compassion and courage of the Sisters of Charity who established this institution. So today, in celebrating this centennial, we are commemorating a century of service, not merely the passage of time in the life of a distinguished institution.

The Government had moved to Washington in 1799, but in 1861 it was still a small country town. The only general hospital in the city in that fateful year was the Washington Infirmary. On August 29, 1842, Congress had appropriated $10,000 for the renovation of an old jail on Judiciary Square as an insane asylum and hospital. However, after the repairs were completed, the asylum and hospital were not used by

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the Government. On June 15, 1844, Congress passed an act directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to permit the medical faculty of Columbian College—now George Washington—to occupy the insane hospital for the purpose of an infirmary for medical instructions and for scientific purposes. This became known as the Washington Infirmary and was the first real hospital in Washington. In April 1861, shortly after the declaration of war, the Government requested the return of the property for use as a military hospital. It was operated by Sisters of Charity until it burned in November of that year.

Upon the preemption of the Washington Infirmary, it had become evident that a new hospital open to the public would have to be established and a group of physicians, headed by Dr. Joseph M. Toner, approached the Sisters of Charity of Emmitsburg, asking them to take charge of such an institution. This order of Sisters had been in Washington since 1825 when they founded St. Vincent's Orphanage and School. Many leading physicians of the city, colleagues of Dr. Toner, knew and were friends of the Sisters and were impressed by their work. It is probable that the Sisters of the orphanage acted as intermediaries between the soliciting doctors and the nuns at Emmitsburg. In fact, Sister Anne Simeon, the head of the order, had been stationed at St. Vincent's Orphanage for some time and personally knew most of the physicians in the District of Columbia. Sister Lucy Gwynn, Superior of St. Vincent's in 1861, according to old records, aided in the negotiations. In any event, the atmosphere was most cordial and the Sisters soon agreed to start a new hospital. When these negotiations were settled, the Sisters and physicians began a search for a suitable piece of property, which was found on Capitol Hill. The daughters of Daniel Carroll of Duddington, distant cousins of Charles Carroll of Carrolltown, were friends of the Sisters of Charity since the days of Mother Seton and had been students at their school, St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg, Md. These ladies, owners of the Nicholson house at the corner of Second and D Streets, SE., willingly rented this house to the Sisters in May 1861. After some slight alterations and renovations, the establishment of the new hospital was announced in the National Intelligencer on June 8, 1861, as follows:

> In the course of a few days a hospital under the charge and direction of the Sisters of Charity will be opened for the reception of patients. The site chosen for the institution is Nicholson Park, formerly the residence of the late Major Nicholson, on Second Street, East, opposite the well known Carroll Mansion. The house is large and airy and the location high and healthy. The sisters who will preside over the institution are experienced nurses. They devote themselves to the attention of the sick, not for the sake of compensation but as a religious duty.

On June 10, 1861, the hospital was formally opened and in a few days the hospital received its first patient, a good Irishman named Lawrence O'Toole. Sister Mary Carroll—no relative of the owners of the property—was in charge, assisted by Sister Mary O'Neill, Sister Mary Vincent Foley, and Mary Alfonza Groell.

The hospital had been in operation only 6 weeks when the First Battle of Bull Run was fought on July 21, 1861. The casualties from this battle were brought back to Washington and Capitol Hill became known as Bloody Hill and was covered with tents for soldiers wounded in battle. The facilities of the hospital were small and the number of casualties so great that the Sisters often had to leave the hospital and care for the wounded in the surrounding tents. The records of the hospital state that one of the first soldiers wounded at Bull Run was admitted to the hospital on July 22, 1861, the day after the battle. The records also reveal that the first soldier to receive a pension for Civil War injuries was treated at Providence in July 1861. Later in the war the first person of Jewish faith to be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, Leopold Karpeles, was hospitalized at Providence for wounds incurred in the Battle of the Wilderness. Throughout the Civil War the hospital provided care for casualties of the North and the South, and the civilian population.

They set up their hospital in a rented house which looked up toward the Capitol and in 3 weeks they admitted their first patient. Less than 1 month later their hospital was filled with the wounded and dying soldiers from the Battle of Bull Run.

The Sisters slaved day and night in service to this community which was then facing the worst crisis in its history. For 3 days and nights there was a continuous procession of ambulances into the city as the steamers brought the wounded to the wharves of the Potomac. But the Sisters were equal to the crisis. Their hospital was well stocked with bandages, medicines, instruments, and they themselves were prepared with skill, courage, and compassion. For, as Cardinal Gibbons once said, "In every Sister of Charity you find a Florence Nightingale. They move silently, effacing their own names. Their courage is sublime."

Their courage and devotion was such that they were not content to limit their service to the Nation's Capitol, but went in bands out into the camps of Richmond and Petersburg, Va., Philadelphia, Gettysburg, and New Orleans to bring their nursing skill to the battlefield.

The qualities which the Sisters of Charity had then have remained unchanged throughout the years and the story of Providence Hospital reflects the character of those who have been associated with it these past 100 years.

When hostilities broke out with Spain, Providence Hospital became the distributing center for nursing sisters. Again, the Sisters of Charity extended their services to the battlefield and later brought many of the wounded back to Providence Hospital for convalescent care. And when World War I began, this institution was one of the first large general hospitals to offer its services to the Government when 20 members of the medical staff and 75 graduate nurses volunteered for active service.

The building of 83 large military hospitals in the city removed much of the original load of caring for the military and the Sisters and the physicians of the staff were able to care for the civilian population. However, many Sisters of Charity were sent to Washington to work strictly in the military hospitals, particularly the 2,500 bed Lincoln Hospital. This is one of the reasons why the work done at Providence has sometimes been confused with these military hospitals. Providence was the only nonmilitary hospital in Washington during the Civil War, and is the only private hospital that has remained in continuous operation since that time.

With the requisition by the military of the Washington Infirmary in April 1861, no facilities were present in the District of Columbia to care for residents or transients. Some attention was given to the city poor at the infirmary attached to the city poorhouse, but this was not adequate. In 1862, Congress appropriated $6,000 to Providence Hospital "for the support, care and medical treatment of 40 transient paupers, medical, and surgical patients." This was the main financial support of the new hospital. This appropriation was continued for 3 years but failed in 1865, only to be raised to $12,000 on April 7, 1866. The number of patients to be treated was also raised from 40 to 60. The hospital at this time found a powerful and persistent friend in the Honorable Thaddeus Stevens who later was joined by the Honorable Sam Randall and the Honorable James A. Garfield. These men aided the newly formed hospital for many years and helped to obtain an annual appropriation. In 1864 Providence bought the Nicholson house that it had rented for its first 3 years of existence and gradually thereafter acquired property on square 764, lot by lot, until in 1897 it finally owned the entire square.

The hospital was incorporated by a special act of Congress approved April 8, 1864. The act of April 7, 1866, which appropriated $12,000 for the operation of the hospital also included $30,000 for the erection of an additional building. Two years later, in 1868, a further $30,000 was appropriated for the completion of the hospital. This enabled the center and east wing to be completed by 1872.

At the time it was provided that all such expenditures authorized by Congress should be made under the direction of the Surgeon General of the Army. This relationship of the hospital to the Surgeon General of the Army must have been satisfactory for it continued until 1920. On numerous occasions the Surgeon Generals and particularly Surgeon General Sternberg testified before Congress to the excellent care given by Providence to the poor of the District of Columbia.

Another type of medical care which Providence in its early days provided was for the sick and injured merchant sailors from the then busy ports of Alex-

andria and Georgetown. These sailors were placed in Providence by the Collector of the Ports and put under the care of surgeons of the Marine Hospital Service. The agreement between Providence and the U.S. Health Service—which grew out of the Marine Hospital Service—has continued to this day. Employees of the U.S. Government with service-connected illnesses or injuries are cared for at Providence by surgeons of the U.S. Public Health Service. With the development of other hospitals in the District of Columbia and the founding of Gallinger Hospital—now District General—Providence gradually shared the medical care of the indigent.

The early bulletins of Providence show that the physicians on its staff were among the most prominent of their time in the Nation's Capital. Dr. Joseph M. Toner, one of the founders of the hospital, was the house physician and surgeon. He had the foresight to advise that the hospital be opened to all physicians, so that any qualified doctor of the District of Columbia might send his patient to the hospital and to care for him there. This was a radical departure from the usual hospital procedures of the time. Most hospitals in this country were closed-staff hospitals and only physicians on the staff could care for patients admitted to their institution. The principle of open-staff hospitals in the District of Columbia has continued to this day.

Dr. Toner, a man of many talents, was a historian as well as a leader of his profession. His connections with the establishment and founding of many of the hospitals and charitable institutions of the District of Columbia are facts of history. In 1874 he was president of the American Medical Association and in 1884 was president of the Medical Society of the District of Columbia. His oration delivered before the medical society on September 26, 1866, is the basis of many facts concerning the early medical history of the District of Columbia. In 1882 he presented his valuable library of 2,800 books and 1,800 pamphlets to the U.S. Government. It is now known as the Toner Collection in the Library of Congress.

Three physicians connected with the hospital in the early days, Drs. Noble Young, Johnson Eliot, and Flodoardo Howard, were among the four founders of Georgetown Medical School in 1849. The connection between Georgetown Medical School and Providence dates from the founding of the hospital. The wards, amphitheater, and dispensaries were used exclusively by the teachers of Georgetown for clinical demonstrations to their students. Students from Howard University and Columbian Medical School were also invited as guests to demonstrations in the hospital. In 1899 Georgetown University built its own hospital, yet the relationship between the two institutions continued for almost a century. Many physicians on the active staff of Providence today are members of the teaching faculty at Georgetown. Two deans of Georgetown have been interns of the hospital and many departmental heads received their hospital training at Providence. The old amphitheater at Providence built in 1881 was erected for the sole purpose of teaching students and nurses. The archives of Georgetown show that Sister Beatrice, the superintendent, erected it upon request of the teachers of Georgetown, members at that time of the active staff of the hospital.

Before the turn of the century, the District Commissioners had been looking for some time for a site for a hospital to care for contagious diseases other than smallpox. No site could be obtained until Sister Beatrice, administrator, offered the use of the hospital land for this purpose. In the year 1898, at the request of the District Commissioners and by an appropriation of Congress, a large contagious building containing 37 beds was erected on the hospital grounds. This unit was the first contagious disease hospital of the District and was used until 1931 when these cases were hospitalized at Gallinger Hospital. Thereafter, this old building lay vacant for almost 10 years. In 1939, Congress appropriated $50,000 for renovation of this building for use as an outpatient department. Hon. Ross Collins, Congressman from Mississippi, chairman of the District Committee, and Hon. Joseph P. Tumulty, former secretary of Woodrow Wilson, were very helpful in seeking this needed improvement. After the building had been renovated an additional $15,000 was appropriated by Congress for equipping and furnishing the building. Thus the outpatient department which had originally been in the basement of the main building and had long since been outmoded was moved to a separate building. This made possible the handling of an even greater volume of indigent cases than in the past. In a typical year of 1949 23,706 patients were treated in the outpatient department and 16,101 were treated in the emergency room. In that same year 2,021 needy were aided by the social service department.

Until the end of the century there was still a large area of the property, purchased in the previous years, not built on. This was used as a walking garden for the patients. It soon became evident, however, that the hospital would have to be expanded and the Sisters with congressional approval, in 1900 borrowed $200,000 from the Philadelphia Savings Fund Society, of Philadelphia, Pa. In July 1901 a new wing on the Third Street side was started, but before the building was finished the total cost had amounted to $530,629.67. This large debt was staggering. Some civic-minded members of the board, notably Mr. N. H. Shea, loaned the Sisters $30,000 at reduced interest rates and also some other friends endorsed the note of the hospital to the Citizens National Bank allowing them to borrow another $50,000. Costs were greatly increased when it was found that the original building was in a bad state of decay and had to be repaired along with the construction of the new building. The deficit incurred in this construction amounted to $130,626.67. Finally, in the fiscal year of 1907, Congress, in recognition of the vital work that Providence was doing in the care of the poor, appropriated this money to help the Sisters settle their longstanding debt. The central tower that became a landmark on Capitol Hill, second only to the Capitol dome, was built at this time.

There were those, however, who questioned the propriety of congressional appropriations in aid of a hospital operated by a religious order. When Congress authorized Government funds for the isolation building, a citizen named Bradfield challenged the right of Congress to do so, claiming that such payments violated the first amendment of the Constitution as a "law respecting an establishment of religion." But the Supreme Court in the case of *Bradfield* v. *Roberts*, 175 U.S. 295, held that Providence was essentially a charitable corporation and that an appropriation of public funds for the purpose of aiding its hospital service to the community did not conflict with the first amendment merely because the members of the corporation as chartered by Congress belonged to a monastic order or sisterhood of the Catholic Church.

One of the unusual activities of the old hospital was the alcoholic or topers ward. Sister Regis, who in her early days as a Daughter of Charity had gone to Cuba with the Army in 1898, was in charge of the ward for many years. It was said that her gentle care and wise counsel to many men of prominence, in business and government, who had imbibed too long or freely and then had spent a few days in her ward were never forgotten. Later when the hospital needed help some of these men are reported to have been the first to volunteer their services. The park across the street from the hospital was established, with the aid of some of these friends in Congress, so that the front of the fine hospital building would not be obscured by other buildings.

Around the turn of the century the board of visitors contained many of the most outstanding local and national names, including: Gen. Joseph C. Breckenridge of Civil War fame; Hon. N. N. Parker; Edward B. McLean, the founder and owner of the Washington Post; Thomas F. Walsh, father of Evelyn Walsh McLean, who had struck it rich in Comstock Lode; Hon. Joseph C. Cannon, Speaker of the House; Gifford Pinchot, Cabinet member of Theodore Roosevelt and later Governor of Pennsylvania; Hon. J. H. Gallinger, in whose honor Gallinger Hospital was named; Peter Goelet Gerry, the financier and Senator from Rhode Island, and Joseph Leiter, another prominent Washingtonian. These men not only aided Providence by their prestige, but on many occasions were called on to help the struggling hospital by contributing funds. No one knows how much they contributed to help the hospital continue to take care of the poor and the sick of the District of Columbia. They should not be forgotten.

The Spanish American War and World War I both threw additional burdens on the hospital and because of the wise construction it was possible to

expand facilities to meet the need. Following the Spanish American and during the First World War, many wounded and disabled veterans were brought back from the battlefronts and rehabilitated at Providence. World War II brought a tremendous increase in population in Washington and the facilities were taxed beyond belief. Every conceivable space was fitted with beds and the operating room would run a daily schedule of from 25 to 30 operations.

Before the end of World War II, it became evident that the once modern buildings and equipment were completely worn out and that only an entirely new building would answer. A lay advisory board, organized in 1945. under the brilliant and untiring leadership of John A. Reilly, president of the Second National Bank, undertook to help the Sisters obtain the facilities essential to the continuance of their great work.

Not only was the old site too small for a modern hospital, but tearing down the old buildings and replacing them would have deprived the city of an indispensable asset for at least 3 years. There fore, a new and suitable location was sought and finally in 1947 obtained from the Catholic Sisters College on a high elevation in Northeast Washington.

Meanwhile, House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, sponsored an amendment to the District of Columbia Hospital Center Act to authorize the General Services Administration to make incentive grants to the nonprofit hospitals not included in the Center for rebuilding their obsolete and outworn plants. Senators Pastore, of Rhode Island, Butler, of Maryland, McMahon, of Connecticut, Taft, of Ohio, and like-minded colleagues who realized the vital part which such private hospitals played in meeting the community needs, were strong supporters of the legislation. General Services Administration, under this law, was directed to make such grants as it deemed in the public interest to the qualifying hospitals up to one-half of the cost of the proposed new buildings and equipment. This constructive legislation and the several appropriations bills which Congressman MCCORMACK introduced for its implementation were responsible for the fine new hospital buildings or additions constructed at Providence, Children's, Sibley, Columbia, Casualty, and Georgetown Hospitals. It is not too much to say that all the voluntary hospitals in the District of Columbia—with the exception of the three already provided for in the original Hospital Center Act—trace their rebuilding programs and their present modern status to this legislative measure and the generous interest of the men in Congress who sponsored it.

Providence was the first hospital to present plans under this program to General Services Administration and to raise the matching funds necessary to qualify for the grant in aid. The estimated cost of the new air-conditioned and completely modern hospital building and nurses' home planned for the 12th and Varnum Street site was approximately $8 million. The Sisters of Charity were able to raise a total of $3 million, so it was necessary, for the first time in its 90 year life, for the hospital to make a general appeal to the public for the $1 million to make up the full $4 million to match the Government grant of $4 million. This campaign of funds, headed by John A. Reilly and given invaluable help by the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, was long and arduous but ended in a complete success.

Meanwhile the architectural firm of Faulkner, Kingsbury and Stenhouse, with the active advice of Sister Celeste, administrator, and Sister Eleanor, then secretary of the corporation, were engaged in designing a completely modern air-conditioned 350-bed hospital and nurses' home to provide the finest medical, surgical, and nursing care possible. The success of their efforts was later attested when the new Providence won the Hospital of the Year Award of the National Association of Architects Association in the year of its completion.

In designing and constructing the new hospital, close collaboration with the Public Buildings Administrator of the General Services Administration, Mr. W. E. Reynolds, was necessary because of the public interest in the large expenditure of Federal and District funds. Competitive bidding resulted in an award of the construction contract to the Charles H. Tompkins Co.

Ground was broken by Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle on February 12, 1954, and a little over 2 years later the hospital and nurses' home were completely finished and equipped and ready for occupancy. Dedication ceremonies were held on March 25, 1956, the transfer of patients from the old hospital was speedily effected, and the active functioning of the new hospital began on April 5.

The first 5 years in the new hospital have surpassed all expectations. The large daily patient census, the excellent performance of the operating rooms and equipment, and the efficient integration of all the facilities attest to the careful planning, design and construction that have combined to make the new Providence an outstanding success in keeping with its noble tradition.

No history of Providence would be complete without mentioning some of the superiors who directed the activities of the hospital over these many years. The first superior was Sister Mary Carroll, who came to Washington with three other nuns and ran the hospital during the Civil War years. In 1866 Sister Loretta O'Reilly, who had served at the Lincoln Hospital, was appointed superior and remained so until 1870 when Sister Beaurice Duffy was appointed. Sister Beatrice had also served in the military hospitals in Washington during the war and was quite familiar with the District of Columbia. She obtained all additional property needed for the construction of the east wing, the nurses' home, the powerhouse, and the contagious disease building, and under her wise guidance the hospital expanded and progressed. She died on September 25, 1899, having served the hospital and her country for 30 years. At the time of her death the medical board adopted the following resolution:

> Viewed from any standpoint, Sister Beatrice must be graded as a woman of unusual power in her day and generation.

Among other notable superiors were Sister Berchmans Beltzhoover who served the hospital from 1906 to 1927; Sister Rosa McGhee, Sister Marie Daly, and Sister Celeste Cummings, who was administrator of the hospital when plans for the new Providence were started and the first administrator of the newly occupied building. Sister Eleanor McNabb, as Sister Celeste's assistant, aided greatly in planning the new hospital and has been administrator since 1957.

The 100 years of this Washington medical institution has resulted in many firsts, some have been mentioned and others are briefly noted here in closing. Many nursing schools in this area, including Providence, were organized around 1892 and 1893. Providence was the first hospital to organize a 3-year school in 1896 in the United States. The first social service department was organized in 1919. The first interns trained in Providence Hospital were Dr. Joseph Repetti in 1896, followed by Dr. Joseph Wall in 1897. The first house physician from Washington to be killed during World War II, Dr. Edward Stone, left Providence in 1940 to join the British Army and was killed in action in north Africa. Providence was the first hospital in this area to be approved for training by the Cadet Nurse Corps of the U.S. Army during the Second World War. Providence Hospital was among the first in the District of Columbia to be approved for a 4-year training program for surgical residency by both the American College of Surgeons and the American Medical Association.

The story of a hospital such as Providence is the history of medicine during the last 100 years. It is the history of the days before antisepsis; the beginning of modern cellular pathology; the advent of local anesthesia, first advocated by Halstead; and the use of insulin in the treatment of diabetes. It witnessed the gradual eradication of all great epidemics, such as: typhoid, dysentary, measles, mumps, and the control of poliomyelitis. It is the history of the gradual evolution of the socioeconomics aspects of the medical education in the city of Washington from the old days of the doctor's apprentice to the emergence of the residency training program and the clinical clerkship of the highly educated students of today. Yet, 100 years is still short enough for the present generation to have talked with parents and grandparents who remember the early days of Providence and the dedicated men and women, whose sacrifices made possible the development of our modern community hospital serving so well the demands of the world today.

We cannot speak of Providence Hospital without mentioning "firsts" for its century of service is filled with many such examples. It was the first general hospital in the city and is, therefore, the oldest general hospital in Washington.

In 1882 an amphitheatre was built so that students and surgeons could watch operations. It was the first operating room of its kind in this country. In 1895 it was the first hospital school of nursing in the city to adopt a 3-year course of nurses training. Later, in 1942, Providence Hospital was the first hospital in the United States to be approved for the installation of a Cadet Nurses Corps.

The Sisters of Charity have not confined their efforts in this instance either, for they have gone out in this community and enriched its life with their social service. They were instrumental, for example, in the opening of Washington's first soup kitchen for the unemployed. Another "first" came in 1909 when they opened a day nursery for the children of working mothers. Their hospital was also the first to recognize the necessity of a social service department to call upon patients and their families at home.

I express my appreciations to Dr. John A. Long, M.D., Dr. Philip A. Caulfield, M.D., Miss Rose Martin, and Mr. Daniel M. O'Donoghue, for their cooperation with me in preparing these remarks which convey in part the wonderful history and achievements of the first 100 years of Providence Hospital.

All of us take pride in the tradition which has made Providence a great hospital and a credit to the city of Washington. And today, we still rely on this hospital to meet our crises—just as others did 100 years ago. We find today, just as others did a century ago, that Providence Hospital and the Sisters of Charity are equal to the task. Their hospital possesses equipment and facilities second to none. But, most important, we find that there is still a Florence Nightingale in every Sister of Charity and her courage is sublime. And Providence Hospital, young in spirit and vitality, is making plans and looking forward to its next 100 years of service to God, mankind, and country.

CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a group:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am very grateful for your appointment as a delegate to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group. I regret, however, that previous commitments prevent my serving as a delegate and I must therefore respectfully submit my resignation.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–42, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in the District of Columbia, commencing on June 8, 1961, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

BILL DANIEL, GOVERNOR OF GUAM

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to inform the House, from information received firsthand from the fiscal consultant of the Legislature of Guam, that the new Governor of that farflung unincorporated territory in the distant Pacific already has won the hearts of the people.

Like his fellow Texan, Vice President JOHNSON, in his recent good-will mission to the Far East, he has made stuffed-shirtism a thing of the past. His first executive order came as a pleasant departure. There were to be no frills of fancy nomenclature. The official signature was to be just plain down-to-earth "Bill Daniel, Governor of Guam."

My correspondent tells of a scene at a farewell to someone departing on a trip. He continued:

> Deep in the middle, not perched out in front, of the aloha singing crowd of several hundred was white-suited, white-haired Bill Daniel singing as loud as anyone else. Several rows behind him in Texas sombrero and Philippine shirt, lustily singing, was 19-year-old Bill, Jr. You can tell everybody in Washington that Bill Daniel surely has taken Guam by storm.

I venture the suggestion that with more of this sort of thing, more human touch and heart and less dignity of pretense, it will not be long before the old image of Uncle Sam is restored the world around.

My congratulations to Speaker Won Pat of the Legislature of Guam, so well and affectionately known on Capitol Hill, and the other members of the Guam Legislature, in having the pleasure of working with a Governor of the same democratic mold as themselves.

No matter how high his office, whether elective or appointive, and regardless of whether he serves in continental United States, in the States or territories not contiguous or in foreign lands, a public official is a public servant. Public servants as well as others do not make friends for their country by throwing their weight around. The true dignity of office is shown in integrity, industry, humility, and dedication, and of these humility is not the least.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

WORTHINGTON OIL REFINERS, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1414) for the relief of the Worthington Oil Refiners, Inc.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

LOUIS J. ROSENSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2686) for the relief of Louis J. Rosenstein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $7,500 to Louis J. Rosenstein, of 1916 Sixty-fifth Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents compensation for personal injuries sustained as the result of an accident on March 21, 1946, near Lyon, France, involving a United States Army vehicle: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MAURICIA REYES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3843) for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JAMES H. McMURRAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4872) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James H. McMurray.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. James H. McMurray, Two hundred and seventy-eight Eighteenth Avenue, Paterson, New Jersey, the sum of $10,000 in full settlement of their claims against the United States for the death of their son, Airman Second Class Joseph A. McMurray, which occurred on March 7, 1957, as a result of an accident involving a United States Air Force jet aircraft at an airfield at Manston, England: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERICA BARTH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 277) for the relief of Erica Barth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Erica Barth shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, after the words "visa fee." strike out the remainder of bill and substitute the following: "Upon the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall reduce by one number the number of refugees who may be paroled into the United States pursuant to sections 1 and 2(a) of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORLD GAMES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1687) for the relief of World Games, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the outstanding success of the 1959 Games of the Modern Pentathlon in promoting international good will toward the United States of America, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the World Games, Incorporated, a Pennsylvania corporation, the sum of $41,567, to enable the corporation to discharge the obligations incurred by the corporation in connection with the 1959 Games of the Modern Pentathlon held at Hershey, Pennsylvania, September 26–30, 1959. Such sum shall be paid only on condition that the corporation shall use such sum to discharge such obligations: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JOSEFA PIDLAOAN AND DAUGHTER, ANNABELLE PIDLAOAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1399) for the relief of Mrs. Josefa Pidlaoan and daughter, Annabelle Pidlaoan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Josefa Pidlaoan and daughter, Annabelle Pidlaoan, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "fee" and substitute "fees".

Page 1, line 11, strike out the words "one number" and substitute "two numbers".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISS ELSIE ROBEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6224) for the relief of Miss Elsie Robey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Miss Elsie Robey, of Breckenridge, Michigan, the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all the claims of Miss Elsie Robey against the United States arising out of an accident in Saginaw, Michigan, on May 31, 1943, in which she was struck by a United States Post Office truck and received severe and permanent injuries: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAX BLEIER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1353) for the relief of Max Bleier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Max Bleier may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANSUREH RINEHART

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1477) for the relief of Mansureh Rinehart.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mansureh Rinehart shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN FIL CHUNG, IN AE CHUNG, IN SOOK CHUNG, AND IN JA CHUNG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 546) for the relief of In Fil Chung, In Ae Chung, In Sook Chung, and In Ja Chung.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, In Fil Chung, In Ae Chung, In Sook Chung and In Ja Chung, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Bussmann, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural father of the beneficiaries, by virtue of such parentage, shall not be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL PISAR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1064) for the relief of Samuel Pisar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for

the purposes of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Samuel Pisar (A-10022768), admitted to the United States for permanent residence on October 29, 1956, shall be held to have complied with the residential and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KEJEN PI CORSA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1620) for the relief of Kejen Pi Corsa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Kejen Pi Corsa shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Captain and Mrs. Richard T. Corsa.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACK KONKO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1626) for the relief of Wladislaw Konko (Jack Konko).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Wladislaw Konko (Jack Konko), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mendel and Shirley Prengler, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out the names "Wladislaw Konko (Jack Konko)" and substitute the name "Jack Konko".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill for the relief of Jack Konko."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICAREDO BERNABE DELA CENA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1911) for the relief of Ricaredo Bernabe Dela Cena.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ricaredo Bernabe Dela Cena shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 2, 1954, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SODE HATTA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1915) for the relief of Mrs. Sode Hatta.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Sode Hatta shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Sode Hatta. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Sode Hatta shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. TAKAMOTO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2360) for the relief of Mrs. Tome Takamoto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Tome Takamoto shall be held to be classifiable as a nonquota returning resident under the provisions of section 101(a)(27)(B) of that Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENNIS CRAFT McLAREN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 215) for the relief of Ennis Craft McLaren.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Ennis Craft McLaren, boatswain's mate, first class, United States Navy, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of $750, representing the amount paid to him for travel allowances in connection with his transfer from Yukosuka, Japan, to Boston, Massachusetts, in September 1956, for humanitarian reasons, the payment of such amount having occurred as a result of administrative error.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Ennis Craft McLaren, the sum of any payments received or withheld from him on account of the administrative error referred to in the first section of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN G. TIEDEMANN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 949) for the relief of John G. Tiedemann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That John G. Tiedemann of Washington, District of Columbia, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the District of Columbia government the sum of $1,160.67, representing unauthorized payments of salary paid to him for services which he rendered as an employee of the public schools of the District of Columbia during the periods from June 17, 1957, through June 30, 1957, and from July 1, 1959, through August 31, 1959, such payments having been received by the said John G. Tiedemann in good faith.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said John G. Tiedemann, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM J. STEVENS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1891) for the relief of Engineman First Class William J. Stevens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That William J. Stevens, Engineman First Class, United States Navy (serial number 3868239), is hereby relieved of liability to repay to the United States the sum of $1,876.52, which represents the aggregate amount erroneously

paid to him by the United States because of an administrative error in granting him credit for pay purposes for service in the United States Naval Reserve from April 12, 1946, through April 12, 1951. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to pay, out of current appropriations for the payment of basic pay to members of the naval service, to the said William J. Stevens the aggregate amount paid to the United States by the said William J. Stevens, or withheld by the United States from amounts due the said William J. Stevens from the United States, on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount paid under this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5: strike out "$1,876.52" and insert "$1,526.52".

Page 1, line 9: strike out "12" and insert "13".

Page 1, line 10: strike out "12" and insert "23".

Page 2, lines 11–12: strike out "in excess of 10 percentum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTHONY ROBERT LOWRY (ANTONIO PIANTADOSI)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2973) for the relief of Anthony Robert Lowry (Antonio Piantadosi).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anthony Robert Lowry (Antonio Piantadosi) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, after the word "fee", strike out the period and the remainder of the bill and substitute in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID RILEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3101) for the relief of David Riley, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to David Riley, lieutenant colonel, United States Marine Corps, First Marine Air Wing in Japan, the sum of $8,553.98 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 2732, as amended, for household and personal effects destroyed or damaged in June 1960 when the CM and L Moving and Storage Company warehouse in which such effects were stored in Brooklyn, New York, was inundated by a fire: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$8,553.98" and insert "$3,783.32".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANUEL MARTINEZ-LOPEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4557) for the relief of Manuel Martinez-Lopez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Manuel Martinez-Lopez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORA M. HAMMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4565) for the relief of Nora M. Hammond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Nora M. Hammond, Trotwood, Ohio, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States a sum of $323.14, which was erroneously paid to her by the Department of the Air Force as salary between October 30, 1955, and May 24, 1959.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, any amounts refunded by reason of the liability referred to in section 1 of this Act by the said Nora M. Hammond, or any amounts withheld by the United States from money otherwise due her. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAR ADM. CARL H. COTTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4639) for the relief of Rear Adm. Carl H. Cotter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Rear Admiral Carl H. Cotter, United States Navy, retired, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $27,917.94, which amount represents the total of overpayments of retired pay during the period beginning May 1, 1956, and ending July 31, 1959, while the said Carl H. Cotter was president of the Capitol Construction Company and that company was engaged in certain contract work for the United States. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rear Admiral Carl H. Cotter, United States Navy, retired, the amount certified to him by the Secretary of the Navy as the sum of the amounts withheld from him by the United States on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Carl H. Cotter against the United States for amounts withheld from his retired pay on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NISSIM S. TAWIL AND FAMILY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6452) for the relief of Nissim S. Tawil, Esther Tawil (nee Goldman), Solomn Tawil, Isaac Tawil, Kathy Tawil, Jacqueline Tawil, and Sarina Goldman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Nissim S. Tawil, of Brooklyn, New York, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 231,307, issued April 8, 1949; and that Esther Tawil (nee Goldman), his wife, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 229,618, issued October 1, 1948; and that Solomn Tawil, his son, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 231,308, issued April 8, 1949; and that Kathy Tawil, his daughter, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 229,621, issued October 1, 1948; and that Jacqueline Tawil, his daughter, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 229,620, issued October 1, 1948; and that Sarina Goldman, his daughter by adoption, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 231,309, issued October 1, 1948; and that Isaac Tawil, his son, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 229,619, issued October 1, 1948; and that each of said bonds is canceled as of the date of its execution.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EARL GUPTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6453) for the relief of Earl Gupton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Earl Gupton, in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents compensation for injuries sustained as the result of an accident while working in institution laundry on May 11, 1956, while an inmate of the United States prison, Atlanta, Georgia: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,277.34".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES H. STYPE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6767) for the relief of Charles H. Stype.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles H. Stype, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, an employee of the postal field service, the sum of $99. Such sum is the amount which the said Charles H. Stype was required to repay to the United States on account of the loss, on or about March 20, 1957, without fault on his part, of an equal amount which was in a contingent fund for expenses of Motor Vehicle Service employees under his custody as administrative assistant, motor vehicle facility, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor and all subcommittees thereof may be permitted to sit during general debate this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 68]

Adair	Evins	Harsha
Bailey	Fallon	Hébert
Bennett, Mich.	Fino	Hosmer
Blitch	Fogarty	Jones, Ala.
Boggs	Grant	Kee
Cahill	Gray	Kilburn
Cramer	Green, Oreg.	Knox
Daniels	Green, Pa.	Mason
Davis, Tenn.	Hall	Merrow
Dominick	Halleck	Miller,
Dwyer	Hardy	George P.
O'Hara, Mich.	Roberts	Teague, Tex.
O'Konski	St. Germain	Thompson, La.
O'Neill	Schadeberg	Utt
Pilcher	Shelley	Walter
Pirnie	Sikes	Westland
Powell	Spence	Willis
Rains	Taber	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit today and tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7444) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN], and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7444, with Mr. KILDAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may take.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, once again it is my privilege

to bring to you, as chairman of the committee handling agricultural appropriations, the annual Appropriation Act for the Department of Agriculture. May I say that I hope the Members will read the report that we have prepared. While these funds are identified as being funds which the Federal Government spends for agriculture, in reality these represent the funds which are spent in providing for the American people the basic necessities of life. Whatever we may learn and whatever we may do and however we may prosper, food, clothing, and shelter remain basic.

Mr. Chairman, in recent years we have heard much about our surpluses, and we have had large productions which are surplus to our domestic need. There are real reasons in regard to some of these commodities for us bringing together supply and demand. But, when we study the countries of the world and see how much more fortunate we are than they, when we see that the one place that Russia has not been able to touch us at all, it is in the production of agricultural crops. Truly, in spite of the high costs which we have had in recent years, because of overproduction in some areas, this wonderful job that American agriculture does and has done and can continue to do represents one of our chief strengths in these trying times.

For those of you who have looked at the report, you will see that this year for the first time we have tried to identify in our report and in our bill the various aspects of the appropriations which we make. We identify those appropriatons which necessitate our committee having to pick up the tab after the funds have been expended under legislation which authorizes such expenditures. We attempt to show what has been done in the field of price support activities, and we show what part is storage, what part is transportation, and what part is interest, and so forth. So, as large as the amount of money in this bill may be, we have tried to let each program and fund stand on its own bottom by identifying the sums in this bill for what they really are.

One of the things that we face, those of us that handle agricultural appropriations and those on the legislative committees that have to deal with agriculture, is the fact that so frequently people fail to recognize that many, many things are carried in the Department of Agriculture bill which, in effect, are a part of our foreign policy and many sums are spent under legislation which authorized it, where, again, we just have to appropriate money after the fact.

With the enactment of the first farm price support program in 1933, Congress created the Commodity Credit Corporation. At that time it provided the Corporation with capital funds to enable it to make loans, buy and sell commodities, and conduct the normal business activities in connection therewith. These capital funds have been increased from time to time by the Congress to meet the needs of the various price support programs enacted through the years.

Price support is mandatory for the basic commodities and other commodities specifically designated by law. It is imperative, therefore, because of the unpredictable nature of the operations under the various price support programs, that the Commodity Credit Corporation have flexibility in the use of funds and adequate resources available at all times to meet the needs of the price support programs.

The financial ability of the Corporation to take supplies of a commodity off the market in whatever quantity necessary makes the price support program effective in encouraging orderly marketing. It removes the necessity for farmers to rush their crops to market when prices are unfavorable.

If there were doubt of the ability of the Corporation to finance required operations, the price-support program would not prove effective in stabilizing prices and markets. Also, the inability of the Corporation to meet its financial obligations would adversely affect the willingness of banks, warehousemen, processors, and others to cooperate in price-support operations.

Over the years, Congress has recognized that flexibility in the Corporation's operations is indispensable to the proper conduct of the price-support programs for which the Congress established the Corporation and directed that it be so employed. Such flexibility is not only desirable but absolutely essential to successful operation of these programs.

However, in recent years the ability of the Corporation to fully use its financial resources for its primary purpose of price support has been seriously limited by charging the Corporation with the financing of special activities not originally contemplated to be within its functions.

With the passage of the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, the Corporation was called upon to finance this special program, subject to later reimbursement through appropriation action. Then in 1954, with the passage of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (Public Law 480), Congress directed the Corporation to finance the oversea exportation of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies and for emergency relief assistance, leaving the Corporation dependent upon reimbursement from subsequent appropriations. The financing of this program has had large amounts of Corporation funds tied up each year.

Further, legislation adopted in 1956 authorized the Corporation to transfer bartered materials acquired in exchange for agricultural commodities to the supplemental stockpile. It further provided for appropriations to reimburse for value of materials so transferred. Also the special milk program, which is now costing about $90 million a year, is being financed by this Corporation in accord with basic law.

It is expected that by June 30, of this year, the Corporation will have available for price-support operations only $815 million or less. If an unusual volume of price-support activities should develop suddenly, or if some new program should be undertaken, this balance would be entirely inadequate to meet the price-support demands which would result. In the opinion of a majority of the members of the committee, it is most unwise to attempt to operate this huge Corporation on this narrow margin, for the law requires price supports—but it prohibits expending funds where the capital assets are exhausted.

To help correct this situation, the 1962 budget proposed funds to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for the 1961 fiscal year costs of these various special programs which are not related to price-support operations. It also included funds to finance "in advance" the cost of these programs during fiscal year 1962. This is a "doubling up" of appropriations in the appropriation bill for next year to place these programs on a pay-as-you-go basis and to relieve the capital funds of the Corporation of this heavy financial load next year.

The committee does not feel that these special programs should be allowed to jeopardize the Corporation's ability to carry out its primary functions of price support. Also, the committee is concerned about the tendency of many people to consider these programs as a part of the price-support program and to charge them to American agriculture. Financing these foreign assistance and special programs through separate appropriations in advance appears advisable for these reasons.

The committee, therefore, has included funds in the bill for 1962 to accomplish the purposes intended by the budget estimates. It has included in title II the sum of $1,600 million to finance the estimated fiscal year 1962 costs of Public Law 480, the International Wheat Agreement, and bartered materials for the supplemental stockpile. In addition, it has included in title III of the bill the sum of $1,951,915,000 to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for the 1961 costs of these programs. It is expected that future appropriation bills will carry funds for each ensuing fiscal year, on the same basis as for other programs of the Department.

This proposal to provide separate appropriations for 1962 on a pay-as-you-go basis is made for the following reasons:

First. The primary function of the Commodity Credit Corporation is to carry out the price-support programs authorized by law. Its capital funds should be left entirely free to finance these primary functions.

Second. Funds required to finance the many unrelated programs of various types, which have been financed through Commodity Credit Corporation at the direction of Congress as a matter of convenience, should be provided through separate appropriations for the specific purposes. They should be provided in advance in the usual manner, so as not to tie up the operating funds of the Corporation needed for regular purposes.

Third. Appropriations for these large programs with international implications should be provided on their own merits and should be separated from regular Commodity Credit Corporation funds in all budgets and appropriation bills.

Fourth. The tendency of the general public and the press to charge the cost of these multibillion-dollar programs to the Department of Agriculture, and to American agriculture, is unfortunate. The fact that these programs are important instruments of our international relations, and are controlled largely by departments of the Federal Government other than the Department of Agriculture, is not generally understood. It is hoped this proposal will be the first step in making a clear distinction between Commodity Credit Corporation price-support operations and foreign assistance programs financed through the Corporation as a matter of convenience.

Mr. Chairman, only about 10 percent of the American people are on the farm. That 10 percent has lost its political influence to a great degree because of its constantly decreasing number. We find many, many people saying, "Well, since it is only 10 percent of the people that are involved, why worry about it?" But may I say that for every farmer who has left the farm, there has been a constantly increasing amount of cash that the farmer who is on the farm has to invest. When I first came to Congress, when I first went on the committee handling appropriations for agriculture, it took a farmer about 10 years under adverse circumstances to lose his land. Today, because he has had to substitute high-priced machinery, high-cost insecticides, and all the other things that go with farming today, a farmer can lose his farm in less than 2 years if he has crop failures. In other words, the cash investment required, the risk incurred has greatly increased as the number of farmers has decreased.

Because farming efficiency has increased rapidly, food costs during the past 10 years have risen much less than the cost of most other consumer items in the market. Few of the Nation's consumers are aware of the great savings and benefits that have come to them as a result of agriculture's contribution to the national welfare. Food is one of today's best bargains.

Mr. Chairman, in the committee report I repeat a statement that I made in speaking to the National Agricultural Chemical Association in California last year, to this effect:

> It now takes so few of us to produce the food, clothing, and shelter for the rest of us, that the rest of us can provide the highest standard of living ever known for all of us.

It is 10 percent who produce the food, clothing, and shelter for us, and that leaves 90 percent to produce the refrigerators and air conditioners and automobiles and the thousand and one things which make up our high standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, for those who may feel that agriculture has lost its importance because of the decreasing number of farmers, may I point out some significant facts, to those who come from city districts, those who represent the 90 percent, that they frequently overlook. And that is the importance of agriculture to them. In addition to providing food, clothing, and shelter, which is the best buy and the best bargain that our American people have today, agriculture is still the most basic factor in our national existence. Agriculture is still the mainstay of our economy. It is the principal source of new wealth. It is the main provider of basic raw materials which support all segments of business and industry. Reliable estimates indicate that each dollar of wealth taken from the soil generates $7 of income throughout the rest of our economy.

Agriculture is still our largest industry. Today, in spite of the decreasing number, over 7 million people are employed on our farms and ranches. This is 12 times the number of people in the steel industry. It is nine times the number in the automobile industry, and is twice the number in our transportation and public utilities industries combined.

Agriculture is still our largest market for the products of industry. It uses more steel in a year than is used for a year's output of passenger cars. It uses more petroleum products than any other industry in the country. It uses more rubber each year than is required to produce tires for 6 million automobiles. It is one of the Nation's largest users of electrical power. Its inventory of machinery and equipment exceeds the assets of the steel industry, and is five times that of the automobile industry.

I mention this so you may know that agriculture is a big part of our economy and as it goes so in the long run will the Nation go. There is no way from the standpoint of economics that you can have a prosperous industry, a prosperous labor, and an unprosperous agriculture, with agriculture pulling the other two down. You may hide it for a few years, it may take a few years for it to be felt, but any time the biggest market for industry in this country has to quit buying you have invited a depression, which has followed every time that the purchasing power has gone down.

I was more a lawyer than farmer when I came here. I have worked with this problem and with this subject matter through the years, and I have given to it what legal training and legal background I possess. It has been a revelation to me as a lawyer to sit there and review with the Department of Agriculture representatives some of the very basic problems we have in this country and of which so many of us are unaware.

A former Secretary of Agriculture once pointed out that life is a contest between man and insects. Truly as you sit on this committee you learn that there is hardly a thing in this country that is not threatened by a variety of insects and diseases.

During our hearings this year, the committee received voluminous testimony from Department of Agriculture officials, Members of Congress and representatives of various private organizations concerning this problem. The information received indicates that, despite excellent research results and improved control techniques, the threat from insects and diseases continues to become a greater and greater element of cost to our farmers and consumers.

A review of the hearing records will indicate the many and varied threats to nearly every type of commodity grown in the United States. An example of the problem is the recent invasion of "pear decline" in the major pear producing States of the west coast, where a disease which was first recognized in 1959 is threatening to destroy the entire industry in that area in a very few years.

Tuberculosis, hog cholera, brucellosis, airsacculitis of poultry, fowl typhoid, swine erysipelas, and many other diseases of animals—some of which affect humans—are plaguing the livestock and poultry producers of the country.

Witchweed, nematodes, gypsy moth, boll weevil, Japanese beetle, pink bollworm, European chafer, citrus blackfly, Mexican fruit fly, khapra beetle, sweetpotato weevil and white fringed beetles continue to cost the Nation billions of dollars annually in production losses and control costs.

The threat from insects and diseases is further complicated by the increased speed and volume of travel between all areas of the world. Nearly 5 million more persons entered the United States during fiscal year 1960 than in 1959. The number of planes requiring inspection in 1960 was 140,000, about double the number in 1954. Automobiles and trucks crossing from Mexico reached 25 million last year, an increase of 10 million over 1955.

The opening of additional ports along the St. Lawrence Seaway and increased nonstop overseas air flights to airports in the interior of the country are also increasing the threat of introduction of new pests from abroad.

A total of 314,367 unauthorized plant materials was intercepted by the foreign quarantine inspections in fiscal year 1960, including 30,230 containing dangerous plant pests. This is an increase of 19.5 percent over the preceding year. The insects intercepted included many of the world's most destructive pests of food, fiber and forestry crops.

It has been estimated by agricultural experts that the damage to crops by the more than 600 different kinds of major destructive plant insects in the United States amount to nearly $4 billion each year. Cotton insects account for nearly $600 million annually, cereal and forage insects account for some $400 million annually, and stored grain and household insects cause annual damage of over $1 billion. It is further estimated that annual losses caused by plant diseases total $2.5 billion, and that livestock losses due to diseases and parasites exceed $2 billion per year.

If foot-and-mouth disease should become established in this country, it is estimated that annual losses would be

in the billions of dollars. It is further predicted that the introduction of fowl pest in this country could virtually eliminate the poultry industry. The introduction of rinderpest would cost the Nation $1 billion annually.

To fully appreciate the effects of these destructive diseases and pests, it is necessary only to look to other parts of the world where food production is subject to their ravages. In the Middle East, desert locusts have been sweeping the semiarid lands for centuries, leaving ruin to crops and starvation in their wake. In Pakistan, severe locust, caterpillar, and cricket outbreaks have caused losses as high as 80 percent in some areas. It is almost impossible to maintain supplies of grain in storage in India because of the ravages of weevils, bran beetles, and the world's worst pest of stored grain—the khapra beetle.

Stored-grain pests are so bad in tropical areas of the world that the race to eat the grain before insects devour it results in frequent periods of starvation. The people compete with the pests for survival. Their low standard of living thus becomes understandable.

The distribution of cattle in Africa is determined primarily by the presence or absence of the tsetse fly. This is a major reason why an African child, once weaned, may never again taste milk. The cattle tick and the human warble or torsalo fly cause tremendous losses to hides, beef, and milk production in Central and South America. Mortality among calves may be as high as 70 percent in some of the more heavily infested areas.

A recent report from Argentina indicates that 50,000 calves succumbed in 1 year's time to screwworm—the same one found in this country. The Argentines have no effective means of dealing with this pest.

It is estimated by officials of the Department of Agriculture that failure to meet these increasing insect and disease threats could double the cost and reduce the quality of food to the American consumer in 5 years. It is further estimated that in 10 to 15 years this Nation could be short of essential foods.

Food is an outstanding bargain in the United States today. It is usual for people in most areas of the world to spend one-third to one-half or more of their income for food. United Nations figures for 1958 show the percentage of income spent for food in certain areas as follows: Italy, 46 percent; Japan, 51 percent; Ceylon, 57 percent; Nigeria, 71 percent. In the United States, food costs take 20 percent or less of the disposable income.

American consumers also enjoy the greatest variety and the finest quality of food available anywhere in the world. Further, such food is the most wholesome and healthful in the world.

In the Middle East, it is common to find insect larvae in the fresh fruit placed on tables in the best hotels. The average consumer in America wouldn't consider buying the rusty, scrubby, pitted fruit offered in the public markets of that area.

American agriculture has made many contributions to human health and well-being, in addition to providing wholesome foods for the family table. Agricultural scientists developed commercial methods of making penicillin. They also produced dextran, a blood plasma substitute, a starch sponge for medical and surgical use, and dicoumerol, a blood thinner of great medical significance.

Through its research in the field of human nutrition, the Department of Agriculture is developing very significant information on the health aspects of fats in our diets, fat metabolism, and cholesterol in the blood.

One of the moving forces behind the amazing evolution in American agriculture has been our progress in agricultural science and technology. Many of these advances have begun with the agricultural research carried on cooperatively by the Department of Agriculture and the State experiment stations, supplemented by industrial research.

The committee has supported the research programs of the Department. It has provided funds each year as fully as could be justified within the financial limits of the Federal Treasury. Funds provided for such research through the years have proved to be a sound investment. It is estimated by agricultural experts that, if farmers today were still using the practices of only 20 years ago, it would cost an additional $13 billion a year to produce our food and fiber. The additional annual food bill to the American consumer would be much larger.

One of the major problems of the research programs of the Department is to keep ahead of research needs. The research programs must anticipate future problems and devise ways to solve them before they emerge. Much of the research being done today will not begin to influence agriculture for another 10 to 15 years. Research administrators must foresee what future conditions will be—judging from present information—and develop answers that will be needed in the future.

This is particularly true for the diseases and pests of livestock and crops discussed earlier. For example, the Department is conducting research overseas on African swine fever, which has recently swept out of Africa into other areas of the world. This work is insurance for our hog producers, should the disease appear in this country.

Similarly, the Department went abroad recently to study hoja blanca, because its appearance in tropical American areas posed a real threat to rice production in the United States.

The Department was well prepared for the Mediterranean fruit fly when it invaded Florida in 1956 and threatened the Nation's fruit industry. Eight years of work in California and Hawaii had produced a great deal of basic information a swell as attractants and sprays that helped eradicate this pest within a year and a half.

To meet the needs of Agriculture, the Department must be in a position to take effective research action at once when a serious problem arises. It should have a source of funds from which to draw immediately, without having to negotiate a transfer of funds from other work.

For instance, the spotted alfalfa aphid invaded the Southwest in 1954 and spread throughout the Western States in the next 2 or 3 years. The Department shifted about $40,000 from other work to develop chemical controls, look for parasites and predators, and develop resistant varieties. An adequate contingency fund would have enabled the scientists to save at least a year in the period required for eradication—at a time when the spotted alfalfa aphid was costing growers $30 to $40 million annually.

Another invader has been the face fly, which came into New England from Canada some years ago. Suddenly, in 1959, it threatened to become a serious menace to our livestock. Again, the emergency was met by shifting $30,000 to $40,000 from other programs. This worrisome pest has now spread across the country as far west as Nebraska. Department entomologists feel that they lost valuable time in bringing this threat under control due to the lack of a contingency fund from which to draw.

To enable the Department to move in on such problems quickly, the committee has established for the first time a contingency research fund of $1 million for fiscal year 1962. The fund will be available to the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service to expedite work on research problems and to meet special research needs as they arise.

Such a fund will also be available to give increased emphasis to some of the many special problems presented to the committee by Members of Congress and other witnesses this year, including basic research on wheat and grains, research on the improved digestibility of dry edible beans, barley and malt research, research on pear decline, forage and range research, soybean research, poultry research—particularly with reference to airsacculitis—soil and water conservation research, and others. In many of these areas, the work might best be done through contracts with qualified research institutions.

As in previous years, many persons appeared before the committee in support of additional funds for various projects, many of which were not included in the 1962 budget. Several hundred witnesses presented requests for additions to the budget totaling about $500 million.

Proponents of many of these programs offered sound and persuasive evidence to support their requests. However, the committee is faced with a larger than usual budget this year. It is also faced with the fact that two Presidents have considered and approved the present budget. This makes it virtually impossible to add funds for all of these many proposals.

In most cases, the proposed research projects are what the committee had hoped the Advisory Committee would urge the Department to undertake by shifts in emphasis within present funds. The committee is somewhat disappointed

that the Advisory Committee system has not been more effective in screening these proposals and in getting the Department, to the greatest extent possible, to transfer personnel and shift its facilities to meet these urgent problems.

The committee has called on the specialists of the Department to review these many special requests and give them careful consideration. In most cases, it appears that further detailed findings by the Department are necessary and further consideration should be given to them in the preparation of future budgets.

Further, some of the more urgent research needs presented to the committee should be given consideration by the Research Administrator in the allocation of the contingency research fund discussed above, where a shift of emphasis will not meet the need fully.

Remarkable progress has been made in soil and water conservation in the United States in the last 25 years, but the biggest part of the job still lies ahead. The United States continues to suffer heavy soil erosion losses. Some 120 million acres are being endangered seriously. Only about a third of our land is safeguarded adequately.

More than half the estimated $1.2 billion average annual floodwater and sediment damage in the United States occurs on the headwater streams and small tributaries. And sediment causes costly damage to the Nation's 10,000 major water storage reservoirs.

Increased farm production resulting from tremendous advances in science and technology, and surpluses of some farm crops, tends to obscure the fact that, to meet food and fiber needs of 15 years hence, this country will need the production equivalent of over 200 million more acres, based on current yields. Since we do not have 200 million more acres of cropland, this production must come largely from increased yields on existing cropland. This is in the face of continuing annual losses of some 400,000 acres of cropland because of erosion, and 3 times that amount each year through conversion of good farming land to urban and industrial uses.

Nearly one-fourth of the people of the Nation face problems of water shortage, poor water, or both. The rate of water use predicted for 1980 is nearly twice what it was in 1955.

Since three-fourths of our land area is in private ownership and 60 percent is in farms and ranches, it follows that our farmers and ranchers are the principal managers of the Nation's soil and water resources for all the people. How our farmers and ranchers manage the lands under their stewardship for the benefit of us all determines whether we shall have soil conservation or soil erosion, whether we shall have the right quality and quantity of water or poor water and not enough of it, not only for agriculture but for cities and industry.

It is essential that we recognize the national scope of the problem and put forth extra effort on programs that will conserve and most effectively utilize the soil and water resources of our country. It is imperative that we intensify our national programs to protect and improve our soil and water resources.

In his special message on natural resources presented on February 23, 1961, the President again emphasized the importance of our soil and water resources to the future of this Nation. The majority of the members of the committee agree with this belief and feel that adequate funds must be provided for all programs which contribute to soil and water conservation, including the Soil Conservation Service, conservation research, watershed protection and flood prevention, and the agricultural conservation program.

Through the years, the agricultural conservation program has been the Federal Government's principal economic stimulus to farmers and ranchers to voluntarily apply needed conservation measures. It is used in all agricultural counties in the 50 States, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Conservation practices were carried out under this program in 1959 on over a million farms and ranches, covering 388 million acres.

This program has served the Nation well for a quarter of a century. It has helped to meet the public responsibility for protecting and conserving the soil, water, and woodland resources of the Nation. The accomplishments of this program have been significant. From 1936 through 1959, stripcropping has been established on over 104 million acres of cropland, and contour farming has been installed on over 138 million acres. Nearly 25 million acres have been terraced and 762 million acres of vegetative cover have been installed. Over 1.6 million storage dams and reservoirs of various types and sizes have been built, and over 38 million acres have been drained for conservation purposes.

During this period, this program has stimulated twice as much economic activity as the amount of Federal funds spent, since the farmer puts up about half the cost of the practices, plus his labor. The per capita annual cost is about $1.40, and the investment per acre of farmland is 54 cents.

This committee has opposed efforts through the years to cripple this vital program. Nearly every year, it has had to fight efforts to reduce the program below the traditional level of $250 million per year. Since 1953, it has had to restore proposed budget cuts in all but 3 years.

In view of the importance of this program to our broad national efforts in the soil and water conservation field, the committee recommends the continuation of the $250 million program authorization for the coming year. The majority of the members feel strongly that any reduction below this level will seriously impair future conservation programs throughout all areas of the country.

Flood prevention work on the 11 original watersheds was initiated by the Flood Control Act of 1944. Work has been in process under the supervision of the Department since that time. This committee has frequently provided more funds than requested for this purpose and has consistently urged the Department to speed up construction to prevent continued loss of soil and water and to save money in view of steadily increasing construction costs.

Recognizing the value of this upstream watershed approach to our conservation efforts, and realizing the need for such work throughout the entire United States, the committee initiated the watershed protection program in 1954 by adding $5 million not requested in the budget to initiate conservation work on about 60 pilot demonstration projects in various areas of the country. This program was so well received and proved so successful that Public Law 566 was adopted the following year to establish a permanent upstream watershed program on a nationwide basis.

Funds for this watershed protection program have grown rapidly in view of its great acceptance and the large local demand for Federal assistance. This appropriation has grown from the original $5 million in 1954 to $36.8 million in 1961 and to a recommended $53,787,000 for 1962.

The committee has actively supported this program and the appropriation increases needed. It has included in the bill for 1962 the full increase of $9,562,000 recommended by President Eisenhower which was further increased to $17,062,000 by President Kennedy. It recognizes that only 650 of the 1400 communities which have applied for watershed planning have received Federal help to date. It is estimated that more than 8,000 small watersheds need the type of conservation assistance provided by this program.

The committee also recognizes the urgent need to accelerate the work on the 11 major watersheds initiated in 1944. At that time, it was estimated that these projects would be completed in 15 years. In 1961, some 17 years later, the work on these projects is estimated to be only 33.4 percent complete. On one of the major watersheds the work is only 17.5 percent complete.

Testimony presented to the committee indicates that the local sponsors of these projects are anxious to move ahead at a much faster rate. In some cases, delays in obtaining local easements and funds have been overcome and the local organizations are fully equipped to proceed.

There is an urgent need to move ahead at a faster rate. In view of the evidence that local interests are prepared to proceed more rapidly, the committee has increased the funds in this bill for the 11 major watersheds to $25 million, an increase of $5,537,000 over the budget. This should permit work in these watersheds to proceed at the same accelerated rate as the new budget has provided for watershed protection work in the rest of the country.

The committee recommends $76,558,000 for the research programs of this agency during fiscal year 1962, which is $616,000 less than the budget estimates. The increase of $5,325,000 over funds appropriated for 1961 includes $2 million for staffing the new Animal Disease Laboratory which will be ready for operation about July 1, 1961; $935,000 for

staffing other research laboratories constructed with funds included in previous bills and now ready for operation; $250,000 for staffing North Central hydrology research watershed at Columbia, Mo.; $205,000 to expand and strengthen research on tobacco quality and production; $60,000 to intensify research on pear decline and other rootstock problems; $600,000 for utilization research on fibers, fruits and vegetables, oilseeds, cereal and forage crops, and new and special plants; $275,000 for research on human nutrition; and $1 million for the contingency fund for research discussed earlier in this report.

The committee has provided what it considers to be adequate funds for staffing the new Ames Laboratory. Based on prior experience and the inevitable delays in getting a new facility in operation, and the difficulties of recruiting additional staff, it is unlikely that the full funds requested will be required for the first year.

In the implementation of research projects at the new Ames Laboratory, the Department is urged to give special attention to the airsacculitis disease of chickens and turkeys. The Committee has received considerable testimony as to the seriousness of this problem to the poultry producers of the Nation. The statistics on condemnations by the poultry inspection service of the Department due to this disease are alarming. It is understood that the Department is now spending nearly $300,000 for research on this problem and expects to increase the funds for fiscal year 1962. It is recommended that, of the funds provided in this bill for fiscal year 1962, a minimum of $387,800 be used for this work. If additional funds for this purpose should become necessary, the new contingency research fund could be used to meet the need.

The additional $935,000 for staffing new laboratories covers staffing and first year operating costs of the cotton insect research laboratory at Mississippi State University and the two grain insect research facilities at Brookings, S. Dak., and Tifton, Ga. Of this amount, $50,000 should be used to restore the original level of operation at the conservation research laboratory at Morris, Minn., which was curtailed to provide $25,000 each for two subsidiary research facilities at Madison, S. Dak., and Crookston, Minn. The purpose of the north central hydrology research watershed is to gain basic information on precipitation-runoff relationships, sedimentation, and channel stability in one of the most highly developed agricultural areas in the United States. The area, over 110 million acres in extent, includes large portions of the central clay pan and the Iowa-Minnesota Till Plain as well as an extensive portion of the Upper Mississippi loess drift and the Missouri Valley deep loess soils. Those areas are under intensive land use, ranging between 60 and 80 percent in cultivation and grassland. An additional $250,000 is provided for this project.

Tobacco production requires a greater amount of labor per dollar value to the grower than any other field crop. The need to mechanize is great, but the end product of mechanized production must be of high quality to meet the specific demands of discriminating consumers. Variations in quality brought about by changed production and handling practices, or by the use of filters and reconstituted tobacco, affect both domestic and export markets. Research is urgently needed on the laborsaving and cost-reducing potentialities of mechanization and on improved cultural and management practices. The committee recommends the budget increase of $205,000 for this purpose.

One of the most urgent needs for additional research results from the recent appearance of pear decline in the Nation's pear-producing areas on the west coast. This disease has spread alarmingly in the commercial pear growing areas of Washington, Oregon, and California. It threatens to destroy a very substantial portion of the pear trees in these three States which produce 87 percent of the commercial crop of quality pears. Affected trees fail to make normal growth, do not set or mature normal fruit, and become progressively weaker until they die. Slow development of the disorder causes death of the tree in 1 or 2 years, but, in many cases, vigorous and apparently healthy trees may develop quick wilting and die within a week. The committee has included the budget increase of $60,000 for the study of this and other root stock problems. This will make about $100,000 available for fiscal year 1962. If additional amounts become necessary during the year, the use of funds in the contingency research fund might be considered by the research administrator.

The additional $600,000 for utilization research will assist the Department to serve the farmer by finding new and larger uses for his products, just as industrial utilization research serves the chemical industries. If the farmer's traditional markets are to be protected and if he is to share in large future markets, agricultural utilization research must be as vigorous and progressive as that of its competitors.

With the additional $275,000 provided for human nutrition research, it is expected that work will be expanded on the biological value of food, on fats differing in fatty acid composition, on foods important for protein, such as meats and dairy products, and on selected foods important for other nutrients, such as cereals and certain vegetables. Research is needed to determine the range in levels of consumption of these products that will yield the greatest nutritional effect without risking imbalances in metabolism and to determine and evaluate food consumption patterns of individuals in different population groups. Findings of the Department in this area are used widely by medical and health agencies.

The many and varied problems of agriculture, as well as many consumer problems relative to food and home economics, continue to increase the need for additional research beyond the funds that can be provided to meet them. Year after year, the research budgets of the Department increase. And each year, the committee is approached by many individuals and groups requesting additional funds for special research projects in nearly every phase of agriculture. As pointed out earlier in this report, nearly 200 persons not connected with the Department appeared before the committee this year, most of them proposing new and additional research projects.

Since the financial limitations under which the budget is prepared and approved are so stringent, it appears necessary that some new approach to this problem be found. The Department is directed, therefore, to make a thorough review during the coming year of research by private organizations, State experiment stations, and agencies of the Department to determine: (1) The importance of research now being conducted as compared to the additional research needs which have not yet been met; and (2) how more of these additional research needs can be met on a cooperative basis with the many private research agencies in the field of agriculture.

Further, unavailability of labor for farming operations has greatly increased the need for additional research on mechanization of practices and procedures which can be adapted by virtue of size and cost to smaller farms. Such problems as weed control, pest control, cultivation, and harvesting, all of which require labor which is not available, should have special attention.

The Department is also requested to make a careful reevaluation of the priority position of the facility proposed to study soil-water-plant relationships. There seems to be considerable interest in locating this faciilty at Cornell University, because of the many advantages this institution has to offer. The committee believes the same review should be made of the mechanics of erosion laboratory in which many representatives from North Carolina have expressed deep interest.

For plant and animal disease and pest control, the sum of $55,165,000 is recommended for the coming fiscal year, an increase of $1,195,000 over fiscal year 1961 and a decrease of $225,000 in the budget estimate. The amount proposed includes increases of $450,000 to staff the control and regulatory activities at the new Ames Laboratory, $400,000 for additional plant quarantine inspectors, and $345,000 to meet mandatory salary increases due to a recent reclassification of all veterinarians in the regulatory, control, and inspection programs of the Department.

The increase of $400,000 for plant quarantine work will permit the employment of 35 additional inspectors to strengthen staffs at existing ports of entry and to staff new ports of entry where traffic volume requires full-time inspection personnel. The growing volume of foreign traffic means that new ports of entry must be opened, and that established ports must enlarge their

facilities to take care of increased traffic. Further, the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and increased nonstop oversea airflights into the interior of the United States has increased the inspection load. Many destructive pests and diseases, such as the Mediterranean fruit fly, oriental fruit fly, khapra beetle, citrus canker, and others, formerly established in limited areas of the world, are now spreading among other countries as international traffic increases—thus adding to potential sources of entry into the United States.

In the fall of 1960, the Civil Service Commission began a study of veterinary positions in the Department in view of the increasing responsibilities and educational requirements of this type of work. As a result of this study, the Commission is preparing to issue revised standards which will result in the upgrading of about 60 percent of the people involved. It is mandatory that the Department pay the additional salary costs required. An increase of $345,000 is included in this paragraph of the bill for this purpose.

The committee believes that a more effective and economical program for the control and eradication of brucellosis and tuberculosis of cattle could be conducted by closer coordination of the two programs. It is recommended, therefore, that the Department combine the personnel and facilities of these two activities into a single operation. It is further recommended that the funds for the two programs be handled as a single item in order to provide flexibility in handling personnel assignments.

The bill includes $24,216,000 for meat inspection for fiscal year 1962. This is an increase of $1,090,000 over funds for 1961. The increase provides $675,000 for the employment of 108 additional meat inspectors to meet increased workloads. It also includes $415,000 to meet mandatory salary increases due to reclassifications, as discussed under the preceding heading.

The most important factor in the inspection workload increase is the ever-growing number of establishments requiring Federal inspection, as well as the number of cities and towns in which they are located. Since 1959 the number of cities and towns has increased from 546 to 624—14.3 percent—and the number of meatpacking establishments has increased from 1,334 to 1,484—11.2 percent.

For the foreign currency program, the committee recommends the budget estimate of $5,265,000 for fiscal year 1962, a decrease of $9,866,000 below 1960 appropriations. This amount will permit continuation of essential oversea research in those countries where foreign currencies generated under Public Law 480 are excess to normal U.S. requirements.

The program includes research in the fields of crop production and diseases, human nutrition, marketing and forestry. This research supplements the work done under the regular research programs of the Department, using foreign currencies generated abroad through Public Law 480. Since these currencies generally must be spent in the countries in which earned, this appears to be a productive use for them.

The sum of $800,000 is included in this portion of the bill for construction of facilities, a reduction of $6,950,000 below funds for 1961 and an increase of $250,000 in the budget. The amount recommended includes $425,000 for the construction of a facility for research on biological control of insects through use of parasites, predators, and diseases as a means of avoiding residues and other hazards.

This item also includes $375,000 for a soil and water conservation research laboratory at Florence, S.C., to conduct research on soil and water resource problems in the upper and middle coastal plains of the Mid-Atlantic States, an area characterized by a flat to rolling topography. The 30 million acres of the Coastal Plain soils constitute a major agricultural area. The soils are highly susceptible to surface crusting and compaction, conditions which limit infiltration and movement of water through the soil. These problems also influence surface runoff and erosion, reduce irrigation efficiency and affect the efficiency of ground water recharge.

An appropriation of $34,803,000 is provided for grants to State experiment stations for fiscal year 1962. This includes $34,553,000 for payments to States and $250,000 for penalty mail costs. The increase of $2 million will provide funds to pay salary increases where needed and to expand the research programs of the State institutions. The committee is informed that a major portion of this increase will be used for increased salaries to compete with those paid in similar organizations.

The committee believes in this program and has consistently supported adequate funds for this purpose. It recognizes that there are many problems which differ from one State to another, that can be solved only through research findings of these local institutions. It agrees that funds must be provided to continue the research programs of each of these facilities to meet this need.

At the same time, however, it is aware that many of our most pressing problems are national in scope, requiring a more centralized approach to their solution. The regional research program of this organization has provided a logical and effective approach to this matter. However, there is still a great need for further centralization of research work where an urgent areawide or nationwide problem arises. The committee recommends that the Department give further study to the most effective means of, first, preventing duplication in research efforts and, second, centralizing research activities to bring about the most satisfactory research results where required on a broad basis.

The sum of $58,790,000 has been included in the bill for 1962 for payments to States and Puerto Rico, an increase of $2,212,000 over funds provided for fiscal year 1961.

This increase provides additional funds to strengthen State and county extension work and to expand marketing educational work designed to assist farmers, consumers, and marketing firms to adjust to the changes taking place in the entire marketing process.

The need to maintain competitive salary levels is also a problem for this organization. It is expected that much of the increase for this program will be used for salary increases for county extension agents and home demonstration workers, where essential to maintain salaries at competitive levels.

The Federal Extension Service provides for leadership counsel and assistance to the 50 States and Puerto Rico. An appropriation of $2,452,000 is proposed for fiscal year 1962, a reduction of $48,000 in the budget estimate. The increase of $50,000 over fiscal year 1961 will permit the employment of several new specialists in the Washington office to provide leadership in rural development, community development, agricultural chemicals, and related subjects. The complexities of modern-day agriculture make further specialized leadership of this type necessary.

During the current fiscal year, soil conservation assistance has been provided for 20 new districts which have come into existence. It is expected that an additional 18 districts will be organized in fiscal year 1962, which will bring the total to 2,905 districts by June 30, 1962.

The committee recommends the full budget estimate of $89,725,000 for the soil conservation operations, an increase of $1,121,000 over the 1961 appropriation. This amount will provide an additional $496,000 to staff the 18 new districts expected to be organized next year. It also includes $25,000 for additional space needed at field locations.

Last year's bill authorized the Department to carry forward $600,000 of unused 1960 funds to employ conservation aids and other nonprofessional personnel on a part-time or contract basis to meet the increasing workload of this organization. The pending bill includes a direct appropriation of $600,000, in lieu of the carryover provision in last year's bill, to continue this arrangement in 1962.

For watershed protection, the bill carries an appropriation for 1962 of $53,787,000—the full budget estimate. This is an increase of $17,062,000 over the appropriation for fiscal year 1961. However, when the carryover of over $5 million from 1960 into 1961 is considered, the actual increase is about $12 million.

The amount recommended includes $5,500,000 for investigations and planning, an increase of $296,000 over 1961. The committee agrees, however, that an additional $1 million of the increase for watershed improvements may be made available for further planning parties, if found necessary during the year.

As discussed earlier, the need for this program and the demand from localities for participation are growing at a tremendous rate each year. Additional applications are being received at almost twice the rate that work plans are being completed. The backlog of unserviced applications on hand amounts to about

4½ years' work at the present level of planning assistance.

It is estimated that there will be 338 Public Law 566 watershed projects at the beginning of the fiscal year 1962 in which works of improvement will be in process of installation. About 158 of these will be receiving advance engineering and technical assistance only, which is a prerequisite before the projects can be advanced to the construction stage. An estimated 80 are expected to be advanced to the construction stage during 1962 and about 100 additional projects will be approved for advanced engineering and technical assistance.

The same type of watershed treatment in certain important areas of the Nation is carried out under the flood prevention program, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. For this work in these 11 major watersheds during fiscal year 1962, the committee has included an appropriation of $25 million in the bill. This is an increase of $5,537,000 over the 1961 appropriation, which will enable the Department to speed up works of improvement in these areas in line with the rate requested by the President's budget for other regions.

As pointed out earlier, the work on these 11 major watersheds is lagging far behind the program envisioned when this program was initiated in 1944. At that time, it was estimated that these projects would be completed in 15 years. It is now 17 years later and the overall program is only about 33 percent complete. It was also pointed out earlier that information given to the committee shows that the local sponsors of these projects are now able to proceed at a much faster rate than funds have been made available heretofore, which indicates the need for additional funds to finance the Federal portion of the projects at an accelerated rate.

The bill carries an appropriation for this organizational unit of $9,049,000 for fiscal year 1962, a reduction of $484,000 in the budget estimate. The committee has held this recently organized service to the 1961 level of operation, feeling that it should complete its realinement of functions and reevaluation of activities and financial needs within present limits of funds.

The committee recommends a appropriation of $8,688,000 for the coming year, a reduction of $34,000 in the budget estimate. The increase of $500,000 over 1961 is provided to extend to additional States and commodities basic improvements in the crop and livestock estimates program. This is the second year's installment of a 3- or 4-year program to modernize this service and improve the accuracy of these estimates. The committee feels that this modernization effort should continue.

In developing these improvements, consideration should be given to the advisability of establishing objective crop estimates of grapes and lemons in cooperation with the State of California. The need for more frequent reports on inventories of potatoes and other commodities should also be given further review.

An appropriation of $37,702,000 is recommended for marketing research and service, including $4,515,000 for marketing research and $33,187,000 for marketing services. The amounts proposed are $108,000 less than the budget estimate and are $3,789,900 over the 1961 appropriation.

The increase of $297,800 for marketing research is provided for marketing research at Clemson, S.C., to improve the spinning, weaving, and finishing qualities of cotton. This work was started in 1961 with Commodity Credit Corporation funds. It is proposed to carry this work forward and expand it slightly in 1962 from funds included in this appropriation item.

Increasing mechanization in cotton production and harvesting methods and in drying and cleaning cotton during ginning appears to have resulted in serious problems in the spinning, weaving, and finishing qualities of cotton. These problems are being reported by domestic and foreign users of American cotton to such an extent that it is of mounting concern to the cotton industry. More data is needed to determine what processes and practices damage cotton fiber and to develop corrective measures.

The increase for marketing services provides $59,000 for additions to the leased wire service for the market news service, $75,100 for more effective administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, $25,000 for the rental of additional space needed for the various activities of this agency, $500,000 to meet salary increases due to the reclassification of poultry inspectors—along with other veterinarians as discussed earlier—and $20,000 for a special study of the possibility of coordinating weather reports and market news service broadcasts.

The funds recommended also include $2,813,000 for grading and classing activities of this organization. Heretofore, these functions have been financed on a reimbursable basis through Commodity Credit Corporation. Inclusion of these funds for 1962 as part of marketing services is part of the general proposal to provide separate funds in advance for these various special programs.

Several years ago, the Appropriations Committee provided for the establishment of a special weather reporting and forecasting system in the Mississippi Delta to disseminate weather information in a manner best suited for agricultural purposes. This project has proved very valuable and we now consider this a permanent installation. It is estimated that the savings to the farmers of the area due to better weather information exceeded $1 million last year. The committee has urged that this service be extended to adjacent areas. It believes that the same type of service would also be valuable to certain other areas of the country. Such service is now provided by the Weather Bureau under the Department of Commerce.

The committee recommends that both the Department of Agriculture and the Weather Bureau make a survey of the need for this type of weather information in other sections of the United States. It is believed that if the Weather Bureau would provide such information where needed, the Department of Agriculture could assist greatly in its dissemination. The Department now has an extensive network for market news reporting purposes which should be coordinated with Weather Bureau facilities more closely to provide more detailed weather information and weather forecasts. The sum of $20,000 has been included in the bill for 1962 to enable the Department to make a full study of this matter in cooperation with the Weather Bureau.

The Department should also consider the feasibility of including market news information on other commodities not now covered, where they are of sufficient importance. The need for additional information on truck unloadings of fruits and vegetables should also be given further review in this connection.

The sum of $1,400,000 is provided for fiscal year 1962 for payments to States and possessions, an increase of $205,000 over 1961 and the budget estimate for 1962. This increase is provided to meet an urgent need for improving agricultural market facilities at a number of major cities and to enable some States to participate to a larger extent. Since a large part of the retail cost of food is incurred after agricultural commodities reach the marketplace, these improvements should be of real benefit to the consumers of the Nation.

As a result of recent legislation, urban redevelopment programs are expanding and moving forward in many places. Usually the antiquated market areas in the major cities are directly involved in such redevelopment plans. As a result, many cities are now seeking Federal assistance in planning the relocation of their large wholesale and retail markets. Requests have been received from many places including Boston, Chicago, Oakland, San Diego, Huntington, Jersey City, and Miami.

By making funds in this appropriation available for "Marketing research," the committee believes the Department might well proceed with the city of Boston, which is now undertaking plans to redevelop the blighted areas of the city. In some of these areas are located the market facilities used by wholesalers, processors, and storers of fruits and vegetables and other food products. Federal assistance at this time to help in the planning and location of the new markets could be exceedingly valuable to all concerned. Plans for additional cities should be considered in preparing the budget for next year.

Also several States which have not been participating in this program in the past are now ready to provide the matching funds and enter into this cooperative marketing improvement program with the Department. States such as Missouri, which have had only a nominal program, now have funds in hand and are ready to proceed on a much larger basis as soon as Federal funds are available.

For the school lunch program, the committee recommends $125 million for fiscal year 1962. This is an increase of $15 million over the 1961 appropriation and is $5 million over the 1962 budget request. In addition, the bill provides for the transfer of $45 million from section 32 funds to be used to purchase meats and other foods needed to provide balanced school lunches. This transfer authority is the same as provided for 1961 and as requested in the budget for 1962.

Of the increase, $10 million is included to provide special assistance to help particularly needy schools defray the cost of serving lunches to needy children. Language is included in the bill to authorize the Secretary to allocate this money to areas of greatest need and to prescribe standards and criteria under which the funds will be used.

The balance of the increase, $5 million, will be distributed to all States in the usual manner. This increase is included to partially offset the steadily decreasing rate of Federal assistance, due to the constantly increasing student participation in the program.

The number of schools enrolled in the program has increased from a peak of 61,442 in fiscal year 1959 to 62,975 in fiscal year 1960. The number of children receiving lunches has increased from a peak of 12 million in 1959 to 12.8 million in 1960—and further substantial increases have occurred during the present school year.

Since 1947, the first year under the School Lunch Act, the number of meals served has nearly tripled, while funds for Federal cash payments have increased about 50 percent. As a result, the average rate of Federal cash assistance per meal has declined from an average of 8.7 cents in 1947 to about 4 cents in the current year. In States where participation has increased faster than school population, the rate of Federal assistance has fallen substantially below the national average—as low as 1.5 cents in one State. It is hoped that the additional funds in this bill will help to correct this situation.

During fiscal year 1960, over $1 billion was expended under this program, including appropriations and contributions from all sources. Federal contributions, including donated commodities and the special milk program totaled $304 million, State and local contributions were in excess of $220 million, and payments by participating children exceeded $555 million. While Federal funds represent the smaller portion of the total funds involved, they are highly important since they serve as the financial foundation for the entire program.

The budget estimate provides a total of $15,877,000 for the Foreign Agricultural Service during the coming fiscal year. Of this amount $12,760,000 is requested as a direct appropriation and $3,117,000 is requested as a transfer from section 32 funds.

The committee recommends the full transfer of $3,117,000 for 1962, plus a direct appropriation of $12,457,000. The appropriation figure represents a decrease of $2,818,300 below 1961 and $303,000 in the 1962 budget request.

Two increases are provided within the amount allowed: $300,000 to open three new attaché posts and increase the number of marketing specialists abroad and $74,500 for studies of the competitive position of major U.S. farm commodities in leading foreign markets and for expanding reports to the U.S. trade. These increases are more than offset by a reduction in market development activities, leaving the net decrease set forth above.

Attaché posts at Addis Ababa, Beirut, and San Salvador are proposed to provide more adequate information on market prospects for U.S. agricultural commodities and to permit better support of commercial agricultural trade operations.

With agricultural exports from Ethiopia to the United States running so much higher than agricultural imports from the United States, greater efforts are needed to increase the exports of U.S. agricultural commodities to Ethiopia. There is also a need to intensify agricultural representation in Lebanon in order to keep abreast of marketing developments and to take advantage of expected opportunities for further U.S. participation in international trade in this area. Also, Central America is of vital importance to the United States as a market and source of supply. It is an expanding market for a significant variety and volume of U.S. agricultural exports.

The budget estimate of $3,444,000 is recommended for the coming fiscal year for market development activities under section 104(a), through the use of foreign currencies generated by the sale of U.S. agricultural commodities abroad under Public Law 480. The program to be financed under this appropriation will be conducted primarily in those countries where the United States has an excess supply of local currencies to its credit.

The market development work financed with these funds includes promotion of the sale abroad of various U.S. products. These include cotton, dairy and poultry products, fats and oils, grain and feed, livestock and meat products, and tobacco, all of which require substantial foreign markets to support a healthy domestic economy for producers of these commodities. Through cooperative projects the Department furnishes foreign currencies and overall guidance, including assistance by the agricultural attachés abroad. The cooperator carries out the work, either directly or in cooperation with foreign groups. In all projects, however, U.S. trade and agricultural groups cooperate directly or indirectly, to the maximum extent possible.

Since all commodities sold, donated, and bartered under Public Law 480 are paid for and charged to the Department of Agriculture and to American Agriculture in the public mind, all sales agreements under this program should contain provisions, as authorized by the act, to set aside for market development purposes the maximum amount of foreign currencies which can be efficiently and effectively used. Such agreements should also provide for the maximum convertibility of the foreign currencies for use in other areas where this work can be productive.

For acreage allotments and marketing quotas, an appropriation of $44,098,000 is included in the bill for 1962, an increase of $500,000 over 1961 and a decrease of $735,000 in the 1962 budget estimates.

The additional funds are provided for checking compliance on an increased number of cotton acres, due to an increase in the national acreage allotment for the 1961 crop. On October 13, 1960, a national acreage allotment of 18,398,424 acres was proclaimed for the 1961 crop of upland cotton. In addition, 60,000 of the 310,000-acre national acreage reserve was used to take care of minimum farm allotments, making a total of 18,458,424 acres available for allotment to cotton farms. Since a total of 660,000 cotton acres are in the Conservation Reserve, this leaves 17,798,424 acres for measurement under this appropriation. This is an increase of 930,544 acres over the 1960 crop. When marketing quotas are in effect, compliance with acreage allotments is mandatory. Only the production from the allotted acres can be sold without penalty. Compliance checking must be done as quickly as possible when seasonal development of the crop and weather conditions permit, so that within-quota marketing cards may be issued before the beginning of the marketing year on August 1.

For the Sugar Act program, the committee recommends the sum of $78 million for fiscal year 1962, an increase of $3,500,000 over 1961 and a decrease of $3,314,000 in the 1962 budget. This increase over 1961 funds for mandatory payments to sugar producers is based on a projected increase of sugar production in 1961 over 1960 production. The decrease in the budget request has been made since recent estimates of sugar production are somewhat lower than those upon which the budget was based.

Payments are made to domestic producers of sugarbeets and sugarcane who comply with certain special requirements. To finance these payments, a tax of 50 cents per hundred pounds is imposed on all beet and cane sugar processed in or imported into the continental United States for direct consumption.

During the period 1938–60 collection from excise taxes and imports have exceeded payments by $428.1 million.

The purposes of the agricultural conservation program include restoring and improving soil fertility, reducing erosion caused by water and wind, and conserving water on the land. To effectuate these purposes, the agricultural conservation program offers cost-sharing assistance to individual farmers and ranchers for carrying out approved soil building and soil and water conserving practices on their farms. The Federal assistance represents only a part of the cost of performing the practice. The farmer bears the balance of the cost—50

percent on the average—and in addition often supplies the labor necessary to carry out the practice.

An appropriation of $238 million is included in the 1962 appropriation bill for payments earned under the program authorized in the 1961 Appropriation Act. The committee also has restored the authorization for the 1962 program to the $250 million level.

As has been pointed out earlier, this program provides the primary financial support for the entire conservation effort of the Department. The program has over 1 million participants each year, which represents nearly 25 percent of all farming units in the United States.

The act of March 22, 1961—Public Law 87–5—provides for a special agricultural conservation program for feed grains. Under this program, conservation payments, in amounts specified in the act, will be made to farmers who divert acreage from the production of corn and grain sorghums to an approved conservation use and increase their average acreage devoted in 1959 and 1960 to designated soil-conserving crops or practices by an equal amount.

This appropriation provides funds for the administrative costs of the agricultural conservation portion of the program. It assumes that approximately 1,500,000 farmers in areas throughout the United States producing corn and grain sorghums will participate in the 1961 feed-grain program. The program will be administered in the field by ASC State and county committees.

The bill for 1962 includes $15 million for this purpose, a decrease of $5,500,000 in the budget estimate.

An appropriation of $300 million is provided to pay off obligations incurred under 1960 and prior year conservation reserve program. This is a reduction of $30 million in the budget estimate. It is the same amount below the 1961 appropriation.

Based on past experience, the committee feels that the amount recommended for 1962 will be adequate. Of course, the Government will be required to meet its commitments under this program for some years to come, regardless of the size of annual appropriations. Authority to enter into new contracts expired at the end of the 1960 program year. Unless the program is reactivated, future appropriations will be limited to amounts needed to liquidate existing contracts.

The 1962 bill carries an appropriation for the Crop Insurance Program of $6,561,000, which is the same amount as was provided for the current fiscal year. In addition, authority is provided for the Corporation to spend $2,830,000 from its premium income for administrative costs in fiscal year 1962. This provides an increase over 1961 of $200,000.

The program is operating in 895 counties in fiscal year 1961 and is expected to be extended to 939 counties in 1962. The program for 1962 contemplates 415,000 crops insured as compared to 390,000 in 1961. During the 12 years that the program has been operating on a limited experimental basis, premiums have exceeded indemnities by about $6.4 million.

The committee believes that this program, which now appears to have gone beyond the experimental stage, should be made available on a much broader basis as rapidly as sound insurance practice will permit. It feels that the program should now be offered throughout the country and should be undertaken where local interest is high and where signups are sufficient to make the program actuarily sound.

The 1962 budget proposed authorizations of $195 million for electrification loans and $150 million for telephone loans under REA. The committee has included these amounts in the bill. However, it has placed a portion of each item in a contingency reserve, in accord with the practice it has followed for a number of years.

The amount approved for electrification loans includes a direct authorization of $125 million plus a contingency fund reserve of $70 million, making a total of $195 million. For telephone loans, the direct authorization approved is $120 million plus a reserve of $30 million, a total of $150 million.

The amount recommended will provide a total of $225 million for electrification loans for fiscal year 1962, including a carryover of about $30 million. The amount included in the bill will provide a telephone loan program of $151 million for 1962, including $1 million to be carried over from 1961. These amounts appear to be adequate to meet the loan applications expected during the year.

In connection with new loans, the REA should determine a proper level of reserve for each applicant, should set up proper criteria for granting new loans, and should make certain that funds are used for the purposes for which they are made available.

For the lending programs of the Farmers' Home Administration, the bill includes total loan authorizations of $284,900,000. This includes $31,900,000 for farm ownership loans, $250 million for farm operating loans, and $3 million for soil and water conservation loans. Of the amount for farm operating loans, $25 million has been placed in a contingency reserve to be drawn upon when and as needed.

The need for agricultural credit has been increasing greatly in recent years in most areas of the country. The full contingency of $40 million provided for fiscal year 1961 has been used and reports indicate that operating loan funds have been completely exhausted in many areas for several months. Many farmers are in urgent need of credit to plant their crops during this season of the year. Should such a situation develop next year, the contingency fund of $25 million will be available to meet the need.

It came to the attention of the committee last year that two sets of standards were being used for housing loans. One set was established for counties participating in the rural development program, and another set was used for other counties of the Nation. The committee disapproved of this policy in its report last year. It has been informed that necessary changes have been made since January. It is expected that all regions will continue to be treated on the same basis.

The repayment record under this program has been excellent through the years. Repayments of both principal and interest continue to exceed the face value of loans due and repayable. Also, annual collections are beginning to approximate amounts loaned each year.

Again, there is lots of money in this bill. But may I say to you that the main difference between agriculture and other segments is that labor can pass on any increase in wages it gets by bargaining, by the minimum wage laws, and such, as a part of the retail price. I do not know how to estimate what the increased income may be to industry by reason of its markup. I do not know, and you do not know. However, if labor does not prosper agriculture cannot, if labor does not prosper industry cannot, neither can we have a prosperous labor or industry unless agriculture is prosperous. One of the chief differences between what we do by law for other segments and what we do for agriculture is that agriculture is identifiable, it sticks out, you can see it. The other is there equally as much if you analyze it.

In this bill we have divided the amount in half and each half into three parts, like Gaul, but we did that because we want you to see what the money has gone for so that we may let each tub stand on its own bottom.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. I should like to ask a couple of questions.

First of all, I want to compliment the gentleman for a very forthright analysis of this agricultural appropriation bill. Certainly I think the gentleman should be commended for putting into proper perspective, or at least making a diligent effort to put into proper perspective the relationship between the expenditures that are probably for agriculture and the expenditures that get into a far different category.

The first question I should like to ask is this: I notice the appropriation for the International Wheat Agreement for 1960 was $32 million, the budget for 1961 is $88,790,000, an increase of some $56 million.

Can the gentleman explain to me this item, and I am not criticizing, I am just seeking information.

Mr. WHITTEN. The International Wheat Agreement commits us to certain payments. Whatever is handled under the International Wheat Agreement, the Commodity Credit Corporation is committed to. The Corporation has already spent the money. So what you see here is the money spent under that agreement. Since it has been spent, there is nothing else for us to do but pick up the tab.

Mr. SHORT. This is our contribution to the cost of maintaining the International Wheat Agreement; is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is the cost to us of participation in the International Wheat Agreement, with all of its ramifications.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman for that information. And, I seek a little further information, and would like to ask one more question. In regard to the appropriation for the Foreign Agricultural Service, first of all I would like to commend the Foreign Agricultural Service for the job that they are doing around the world. I think they have some extremely able people; I think they have some realistic people who are doing a real good job in furthering the marketing of American agricultural products all over the world. Again I would like to ask, Do we utilize to the greatest possible extent the foreign currencies that are generated in foreign countries under Public Law 480 in defraying the cost of maintaining not only our Foreign Agricultural Service representatives but, I might ask, in defraying the cost of all our foreign installations in foreign countries?

Mr. WHITTEN. We certainly do. Unfortunately, we generate most of these currencies in countries where we do not have much use for them. In those countries where we really could use them, we do not generate many currencies. But, to the fullest extent possible, we do use them.

Again I say, foreign currencies are not subject to complete control by our subcommittee or the Committee on Appropriations. The basic act provides that only a small percent is available for U.S. uses. Not only that, but the executive department down through the years has taken currencies generated by agriculture, for which we have to pick up the tab, and used them for other governmental purposes. Many of us feel that the agricultural problem should be met first, and our committee says so in the report and in the bill. Of course, there again we do not control anything, only do the best we can.

Mr. SHORT. It just seems to be practical, sound, commonsense, wherever in those cases it is possible, to use these foreign currencies to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. WHITTEN. A lot of it is used to promote new markets, and a lot of it is used for research on diseases that we do not happen to have here but which are a threat all the time. So to the fullest extent possible they are being used.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. In the present fiscal year there has been some difficulty in the meat processing plants because of lack of funds for inspectors. Can the gentleman say whether there are sufficient funds in the bill this year to take care of the inspectors in the plants in the next fiscal year?

Mr. WHITTEN. The committee feels that there are. We have gone along with the full amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget, and they have made their recommendation after a thorough study of the situation.

Mr. BOW. The processing plants have been practically or partially shut down because of lack of inspectors.

Mr. WHITTEN. The problem is supposed to have been met.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. What I consider to be my greatest privilege as a Member of this Congress is the privilege of serving on the Committee on Agricultural Appropriations under the most able chairmanship of the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. JAMIE WHITTEN.

As the gentleman from Mississippi mentioned in his remarks, he has had legal training, but coupled with that legal training he has one of the best agricultural minds of anyone in the United States. JAMIE WHITTEN'S understanding of the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, enabled us to force the export sales program. He clearly initiated the watershed protection in the Democratic platform of 1952 and later when our subcommittee set up the pilot plant program which led to Public Law 566. We initiated the construction of laboratories for research on many problems facing us. I want to say that the people of this country and particularly the farmers of this country are extremely fortunate that the gentleman from Mississippi is the chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, FRED MARSHALL. Knowing of his knowledge, interest in, and contributions to agriculture, I doubly appreciate his statement.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I cannot let this opportunity go by but to concur in what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] has stated about our good chairman. I have served with the gentleman from Mississippi for about 18 years on the Committee on Appropriations, and I think that the farmers of America owe to the gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN, a real debt of gratitude. He has done much more for the farmer than the average Congressman comprehends, as far as agriculture is concerned. He has done much to persuade the Commodity Credit Corporation to lower the huge stocks of cotton and sell them in the markets abroad. His work on soil conservation and things of that nature has not been exceeded by any Member of this Congress.

I am so very well pleased, as the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, that I have the opportunity to serve under a gentleman such as the gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his very kind remarks. He and I have worked together for agriculture. Many members say we have worked so closely that seldom if ever do our views differ.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I, too, wish to join my colleagues in complimenting the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] on an outstanding job. I realize the problems he has, particularly in this area, with the number of attacks that are made upon our various farm programs.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman about testimony of the Department with reference to soil and water conservation loans under the Farmers Home Administration. I think the gentleman probably will remember that I spoke to him about this and also corresponded with him on it. I was curious to know, in view of the fact that there was no increase—I believe the bill calls for $3 million, which is the same amount as was appropriated last year. The appropriation last year was used up in the first 45 days of the year. Of course, there was no money available throughout the balance of the year. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would explain to me what the Department's position was on this and to what extent he discussed with them what might be done, if anything, to make this money available, because it seems to me now that it represents a delusion, to some extent, suffered by our farmers.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that the Department supported the budget figure as being what they could well use under present conditions.

I do not know how much money could be spent in the general area of flood control and watershed protection. I guess the whole national budget could well be used; it is that big and there is that much interest in it. All that we are trying to do is to go along with the Department and its planners.

May I say again that in this watershed protection field there is over $22 million more in this bill than there was last year.

Mr. SISK. May I clarify the point I was trying to make? I was referring to the soil and water conservation loans under the Farmers Home Administration. This has nothing to do with watershed protection.

Mr. WHITTEN. The overall problem is what I was trying to address myself to.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate that. May I ask the gentleman one further question; as to whether or not his committee has given any thought to the idea of permitting—I realize, of course, that probably this would come under the jurisdiction of another committee—but of permitting interest rates to go up, or of permitting Farmers Home Administration to

insure loans at a higher rate of interest than at present. What we are concerned with now is that local banks will not participate in the matter of insuring loans under the present interest ceiling. So as a result, in this program, we do have some real shortcomings. I am speaking specifically with reference to the money provided the Farmers Home Administration for loans to farmers for the deepening of wells or the digging of new wells, and so forth, separate and apart from watershed legislation.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that when you have a bill that carries as much as this bill does, it is mighty hard to come here with an increase in the budget. I just hope that the gentleman will take this matter up with the Department for consideration in the next budget. I realize the soundness of the gentleman's proposal, but there is just so much a horse can carry, and we have done about all we can in this particular bill.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman for yielding. We have had long and interesting discussions with the Department on this subject.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I want to compliment the chairman and subcommittee on this bill. However, the hearings on this bill were closed before we knew to what extent the farmers would participate in the new feed grain program. Since the hearings have closed, we know there is going to be a much broader participation than most had expected. The money needed to check compliance will therefore be increased in comparison to the amount estimated at the time of the hearings. I understand the updated figures and requests will be submitted to the Senate. Consequently, I should like to know if the gentleman thinks there might have to be a revision in conference in the figure for this program.

Mr. WHITTEN. The funds required will have to be provided. The Department picked its figure out of the air, and we substituted our own, which was arrived at in somewhat the same way. But if this program takes additional money, we will be right there to provide it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman has mentioned that the amount of the bill is about $6 billion. That is a terrific amount of money. Not long ago I heard a statement made that what agriculture needs is a better public relations job, that some of the people of the United States might believe that this $6 billion is all going to agriculture. I repeat what I have said before, that some day, somehow, some differentiation must be made as to what benefits agriculture and what benefits the entire economy.

Mr. WHITTEN. You are absolutely correct. In our report last year we attempted to show how much of the annual appropriations in the agriculture bill have direct benefits to the general public. That analysis showed that over 54 percent of the funds were spent for programs which benefit the general public as well as the farmer.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I notice on page 27 dealing with rural electrification there is a paragraph that aroused my curiosity. It reads:

> In connection with new loans, the REA should determine a proper level of reserve for each applicant, should set up proper criteria for granting new loans, and should make certain that funds are used for the purposes for which they are made available.

The implication is made that some funds have been used for purposes other than those for which they have been made available. Has it come to the attention of the committee that any such thing has happened?

Mr. WHITTEN. The committee had some question as to whether the Department had ever made a determination as to what an adequate reserve was. For the last several years they have testified they were considering it and working on it. There have been rumors and reports, about which I have no specific information. What we included in the report we think is adequate.

Mr. NELSEN. There has been some criticism that has come to my attention. I believe this language is well taken.

Mr. WHITTEN. Without specific information we did not want to set out an indictment or anything of the sort. What we have said we think is sound business. The representatives of REA indicated they meant to do that, but we thought we might repeat our position again.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to express my personal appreciation to the gentleman and the members of the subcommittee for establishing a contingency reserve fund of $1 million and for the sympathetic consideration you gave to many of us who appeared before your subcommittee on the problem of pear decline in the Pacific States. We appreciate the action you have taken in the bill on this problem.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BREEDING. I, too, want to join my colleagues in congratulating the gentleman from Mississippi on his wonderful work on this committee in reporting out this bill. I come from an area that grows a great deal of wheat and we are interested in markets and market development. I notice in your report here on page 23 with reference to the foreign agricultural service that the committee recommended a direct appropriation of $12,457,000. I want to ask the gentleman these questions.

First. The initial budget estimate indicated that $8,893,000 of the dollar appropriation requested for the foreign agricultural service would be for agricultural market development abroad. How much of the $12,457,000 recommended in your bill, which is now under consideration, is supposed to be for market development abroad?

Second. Since the use of the $3,444,000 of Public Law 480 foreign currencies recommended for the Foreign Agricultural Service in the bill under consideration is specified for agricultural market development abroad, it is assumed that these currencies can only be used for such purposes. However, is the same true in respect to the dollars intended for agricultural market development and included in the appropriation recommended for the Foreign Agricultural Service in the bill under consideration?

Third. Since Public Law 480 specifies that not less than 5 percent of the proceeds from title I sales and loan repayments shall be made available in advance for agricultural market development, abroad, why is the amount of foreign currencies recommended for market development abroad so low in the bill under consideration? If such currencies are not used for market development abroad, what will they be used for? Why was not the maximum use of Public Law 480 foreign currencies specified for agricultural market development abroad? Where possible, why was not conversion of such currencies required in order to generate funds for use for market development purposes in those countries which are or offer reasonable potential of becoming dollar markets? Would not the use of Public Law 480 foreign currencies instead of dollars assist in correcting the balance-of-payments problem which the United States has been experiencing?

Fourth. Why has agricultural market development abroad been given such low priority in the allocation of foreign currencies accruing under title I of Public Law 480 when the legislative history of the act so clearly indicates that Congress intends that priority be given to this important activity?

Fifth. Carrying out market development abroad through private trade and industry groups has proven to be a sound basis for developing export markets for American agricultural products. Will the funds for market development which are included in the dollar and foreign currency appropriations recommended for the Foreign Agricultural Service in the bill under consideration be used in collaboration with private trade and industry groups?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that we have gone along with the Department's recommendations in this matter. The market development funds in both appropriations are intended to be used to purchase local currency as fully as possible for market development purposes in cooperation with trade and industry groups.

I counseled personally with our former colleague, Congressman Hope, who, as the gentleman knows, represents some of

the wheat interests. I have talked with the gentleman from Kansas himself. We have gone all out to bring about cooperation in providing markets to the fullest extent possible.

There is language in the bill tying down foreign currency to the fullest extent possible in line with basic law, which came from the Committee on Agriculture. But again this is a matter that is beyond our control. Other agencies of Government also have a voice in the handling of these funds.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to close without expressing my sincere appreciation to my colleagues on this subcommittee for their gracious statements and their cooperation. Let me say that each one of them has contributed greatly to the welfare of agriculture. This bill has been a committee effort.

BILL NATCHER, from the tobacco country of Kentucky, is an able member of the subcommittee. FRED SANTANGELO, of New York City, has done so much for his country and has added so much to this committee. JOHN SLACK, of West Virginia, is serving his first term on the committee. He is an able and effective member and his interest and counsel are invaluable.

The interest of both CARL ANDERSEN and WALT HORAN and their efforts for agriculture through the years have been unsurpassed. BOB MICHEL, from Illinois, happens to have different views on some matters than my own, but no one can question his deep interest and efforts for American agriculture.

I am proud to serve with each of them.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a pleasure to serve with these gentleman on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture. I regret losing the close association on the subcommittee with my very good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. I also want to pay tribute to Mr. HORAN, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. SANTANGELO, Mr. SLACK, and our capable chairman, Mr. WHITTEN, for the splendid job they are doing for the farmers of America. Again, I repeat, it is a pleasure to serve with gentlemen of such stature.

Mr. Chairman, the agricultural appropriation bill has been discussed, at least the major portions of it, and I intend to use a few minutes this afternoon to touch upon basic agricultural legislation. We on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture can only really act after the deed is done, so to speak. We have throughout the years influenced the trend of legislation, as has been pointed out by the chairman, when the Andersen-Hope pilot watershed program was first enacted; when we on the subcommittee were responsible for transferring the Foreign Agricultural Service from the Department of State to the Department of Agriculture; and when the conservation reserve had its beginning in this particular subcommittee through the efforts of Mr. MARSHALL and myself.

In my 23 years in the House of Representatives I have been a stanch supporter of farm legislation. I have always sought to set aside completely any partisan, sectional, or such considerations in my approach to a solution of the farm problem, as evidenced by the fact that I recently voted for the feed-grain program on the floor of the House when only three other Republicans did so. I personally stand ready to support any bill by any author which contains the basic, essential provisions necessary for solving the economic and supply problems which now plague American agriculture, so long as such bill is in the best interests of all Americans.

Thomas Jefferson warned of the pitfalls awaiting us if we ever departed from our basic philosophy when he said:

> Arm not the magistrate with too much power lest you be taxed in your eat, your meat, your drink, and your recreation and your freedom be lost.

I have carefully analyzed H.R. 6400, the Freeman omnibus farm bill, and am forced to conclude that the proposal is a legislative monstrosity. It would give the Secretary of Agriculture, an appointed official, and his successors unprecedented powers over American agriculture—powers to undertake any type of program for setting farm prices and controlling production and marketing that he saw fit—regardless of cost. It would include the power to set base periods; the power to establish minimum allotments; the power to grant exemptions; the power to make direct payments; the power to limit payments to individuals; the power to provide for the transfer and sale of farm marketing allotments and quotas; the power to establish conditions of eligibility for price supports; the power to hand-pick the farmer advisory committees; the power to disregard their advice; the power to terminate their services, and the power to develop marketing quotas for any agricultural commodity including all grains, dry beans, hogs, cattle, lambs, chickens, turkeys, whole milk, and butterfat.

The supporters of this unprecedented bill accuse those who are opposed to it, of letting their imagination run away with them in being unduly disturbed by the concentration of power in the hands of one man. But no one has explained away the fact that Congress would—by the enactment of this bill—abdicate to an appointed official, its constitutional prerogative to develop legislative policy, retaining only the right of veto and even that right is somewhat beclouded.

As I have said, I am a strong advocate of farm programs. We all know that we must have farm legislation of some type. But why must we have programs which involve such mountainous volume of detail and the unnecessarily huge amount of paperwork and the ever increasing army of personnel? The costs for the administration of a separate program for each and every commodity would be staggering.

There has been a great deal of misunderstanding and confusion at the Washington level and at the State, county, and farm levels in the administration of the feed-grain program, and that involved only two commodities—corn and grain sorghum—for which acres and yields had to be determined. Can you then visualize the cost, the manpower and the confusion that would result from the administration of a separate program for each individual commodity, each such program supposedly written by the producers of that particular commodity?

By comparison, let us look at the simplicity and the economical provisions of the green acres program which I introduced last year and which was the only major farm amendment approved by the House of Representatives last year. This green acres bill was reintroduced at the opening session of Congress this year as H.R. 40.

The cornerstone of the green acres farm program is the requirement, after approval in a single nationwide farmer referendum, that every farmer producing price-supported crops such as wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseeds, in order to qualify for the benefits under the bill must have a minimum of 20 percent of his cropland in green acres, that is, grass, hay, or tame pasture.

Farmers who already have 20 percent or more of their cropland under green cover would be immediately eligible for the green acres benefits. They are farming their land now as it should be farmed.

To liquidate the price-depressing surpluses now stored at huge cost, additional payment-in-kind is provided equal to 80 percent of the farmer's average yield for additional cropland taken completely out of production, not to exceed one-half of the total cropland.

In addition to the green acres, the bill provides that participating farmers could produce any and all of these grains, and receive a price support of 80 percent of parity during the first 2 years, 85 percent the next 2 years, and 90 percent of parity thereafter. This can be done because 32 million acres of cropland are retired without cost to the taxpayers. The farmer has balanced production with consumption and his remaining production justifies an increased price level, at very little cost to the consumer, but providing a tremendous shot in the arm of our Nation's economy.

With no surplus production, this price support schedule will cost the taxpayer very little, since commodities on hand are used in lieu of cash outlay. Most of the county ASC offices have the history and acreage record for every farm in their respective county, hence administration costs will be as low as any possible program can be.

The green acres program as proposed contains numerous provisions previously advanced by other able and distinguished Members of Congress. The payment-in-kind feature, for example, may be found in several bills including the feed-grain bill, where it is now in use. The idea of payments-in-kind has long been advocated by such able colleagues as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN],

along with his colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], the distinguished chairman of my Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. The latter gentleman and I were the original authors of the present conservation reserve.

I personally discussed the green acres proposal with more than 400 farmers, ASC committeemen, county agents, conservationists, livestock men, and others representing a cross section of Midwest agriculture. As a result of these discussions, the initial idea was considerably modified and several very valuable improvements were made. The green acres program is the result of the combined thinking of a cross section of farm people and the leaders, and I want to acknowledge their help and express my personal appreciation for their contributions. It is a program which requires only one administrative verification—and that is, the proper measurement of the 20 percent of retired green acres. This 20 percent can be rotated in order to make sure that the Government gets the average—not the poorest—of the farmland.

Section 2 of H.R. 40 provides for a nationwide referendum to permit farmers to determine for themselves whether or not they want this program to go into operation. Since every farmer in the United States who produced wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed would be immediately affected, all of those producers who produced one or more of these commodities in at least 3 of the last 5 years would be eligible to vote in the referendum. If two-thirds or more of the producers voting in the referendum favored the program presented to them, it would be in effect for 1962 and thereafter unless the Congress authorized and the Secretary of Agriculture conducted another referendum on this or a modified program.

Section 3 covers the green acres provision and is the cornerstone of the entire proposal. Beginning with the 1962 crop, all producers of the commodities enumerated earlier would be required to put at least 20 percent of their total cropland under green cover. Farmers would receive no direct compensation for so doing, and they would be free to do anything they wanted to with these green acres other than the production of price-supported crops. They could graze it, cut hay off of it, put it into wildlife cover, and so forth. The principal stipulation would be that it must be under green cover and not in the production of nonconserving crops. This is mandatory after two-thirds of the Nation's producers have so voted. This is the only compulsion or control in this bill.

Everyone we discussed this with advised us that it must be absolutely enforcible. To make it effective we have put some real teeth into it by providing a penalty of 50 percent of the total production on any farm not in compliance with the green acres provision. This penalty would be in the amount of one-half the value of the violator's total production the year of his noncompliance and we believe there would be little or no noncompliance.

Section 4 provides a vital incentive insofar as farmers and our rural economy are concerned. Under this section price supports on all the commodities listed would be set at 80 percent of parity the first 2 years, at 85 percent the next 2 years, and at 90 percent of parity thereafter. The reduction in surpluses will make this possible at less cost—far less than the present feed-grain program.

Section 5 contains the provisions for the liquidation of present surpluses; the maintenance of an adequate supply for the protection of consumers, world markets, and food-for-peace programs; and the balancing of farm production in the future. We provide for that balance by regulating the amount of green acres needed. The payment-in-kind program is to be entirely optional with the producer, but we have purposely set the rate at 80 percent of average yields to make it attractive to producers. We must use up on the farm the bulk of our present commodity holdings. In addition, we have set a maximum of 50 percent of any farm which may be temporarily retired from production in the best interests of farm families and the local economies. Mr. MARSHALL and I had always urged this step in relation to the conservation reserve. The previous Secretary of Agriculture decided otherwise.

There is also another payment-in-kind feature in this section relative to the green acres retired from cropland under section 3. To protect the livestock economy against a flood of cheap hay, we authorize an optional 25 percent of normal yield payment-in-kind for the complete retirement of this cropland. Please note that all payments come directly out of taxpayer-owned commodity credit stocks.

Section 6 provides that the acreage diverted either into green acres or by payment-in-kind shall be in addition to any acreage already in the conservation reserve. The present 27 million acres under conservation reserve are to run their course.

Section 7 assures producers eligibility for ACP cost-share payments on their farms, including the green acres and land diverted under payment-in-kind.

Section 8 provides that the program shall be administered by the farmer-elected committees which are already in existence. This is the most effective known form of administration for farm programs.

Section 9 directs the Secretary of Agriculture to transmit annual reports to the Congress in order that the operations of the green acres program may be constantly reviewed. In addition, it provides that any increase in the percentage of cropland required under the green acres provision shall first be approved by Congress and then submitted to producers in another nationwide referendum.

Section 10 guarantees to cotton, peanut, rice, tobacco and wheat producers that no terms of this measure shall in any way affect their present programs of acreage allotments, marketing quotas or price supports except for the 80 percent of parity price support floor under wheat.

That, Mr. Chairman, is a section-by-section summary of the bill.

I would like to emphasize the fact that the entire program proposed in this bill will cost the taxpayers little or nothing more than the costs of administration and the release of surplus CCC stocks which are now actually costing us about $600 million a year to store. The savings in total costs would be enormous, not to mention the nationwide benefits that would accrue from a prosperous and healthy farm economy.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, H.R. 7444, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies and for other purposes. Before commenting on the contents of this appropriation bill, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. JAMIE WHITTEN, for the efficiency and completeness of the hearings and the solicitude he has shown to me and the members of this subcommittee. I want to commend my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], for the constant aid, advice, and assistance he gave me throughout the hearings. I have derived a great deal of pleasure from my association with Representatives CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, WALT HORAN, of Washington, ROBERT MICHEL, of Illinois, and the new addition to the committee, Representative JOHN SLACK, from West Virginia. My recent trips to the farmlands of the United States in Texas, Puerto Rico, California, Arkansas, and Asia, have not only been arduous and pleasant, but also have given me a keen insight into the agricultural problems which beset farmers and the American people.

I would like to make a few general observations about this bill and about agriculture. In the race to reach outer space, the planets, and to get out of this world, some people seem to forget that the most basic factor in our national existence on earth is agriculture. We should never forget the moral of the legend of the semigod, Hercules, wrestling with the giant, Antaeus, that the further away from the land we go the weaker we become, and the closer to the soil we stay the stronger we get.

Agriculture is still the mainstay of our economy. It provides the basic necessities of life, food and fiber. The farms of our country feed not only the 180 million people of these United States, but serve the needs of additional millions throughout the world. They accomplish this result with fewer farmers, but with superior technological skill and with improved machinery. Agriculture provides basic raw materials which support all segments of business and industry. Reliable estimates indicate that each dollar of wealth taken from the soil generates $7 of income throughout the

rest of our country. Certain programs which ostensibly benefit farmers and farms also carry with them tremendous benefits to the urban dweller and the residents of suburbia. If I seem to be an apologist for farm programs, it is because during my inspection trips I have seen and observed, and during the hearings I have listened. Also, because as a consumer, I recognize that without the produce and the fruits of the farms we in the cities, despite hydroponic developments, could not last very long. As a consequence, I believe that despite many abuses and weaknesses in the farm program that the interests of farmers and city folk dovetail, and we are mutually dependent. Our independence as groups, and as persons, rests on the basis that we are dependent on each other.

Recently, in February of this year in Dallas, Tex., I had the opportunity to speak before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association national convention, which was attended by approximately 8,000 members from all over the United States. In my talk I detailed the reciprocal benefits of the REA program to the city resident and farmer. I stated at that time my observations, which are still valid today: that, if we in the cities feel that we paid taxes to underwrite and finance the original REA funds and loans, history has demonstrated that because of this program we in the cities have been repaid manyfold by increased business, by better food, and by increased employment. The report of the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Benson, described the benefits to the farmer in the terms of human needs, but it omitted to set forth the benefits which are correlative and which have been and are being generated by the increased use and consumption of electric power. I believe that these benefits and the relationship between the rural resident and the city dweller are interdependent and go hand in glove. They should not be overlooked but should be emphasized.

To the farmer and his family, rural electrification means many things and has provided many advantages. To the farmer, rural electrification has meant a radio and television set, warning of an oncoming frost in Georgia or a late market report in Iowa or the price of cotton futures to the Texans. It means a pleasant evening at home, a political debate between candidates or educational programs for the family. In 1959 the farmer's new gadgets benefited the city man by opening up a market for the sale of 3,200,000 television sets with the attendant employment for the tradesmen, the electricians, the mechanics, the Charlie Chaplin-type automatons. It means advertising fees for the merchants of discontent and Madison Avenue advertisers, a market for the television broadcasters and their networks which span the Nation. It means the illegal loot for quiz showmen, diskjockeys, and quack pundits answering the $64,000 question.

The rural electrification program means now that the farmer has light to read by on a dark night. On the other hand, the farmer's enjoyment in reading gives a reciprocal benefit to a city person and businessman. It means a sale of books and magazines, book-of-the-month club, and the production of electric bulbs. It means greater circulation for Time, Look, Life, Reader's Digest, and the Atlantic Monthly, as well as the Sears Roebuck catalog.

Rural electrification to the rural housewife means ironing without stoking a range red hot to heat a flatiron. This benefit to the rural woman means sales by the city merchant, increased production, and consequently, increased employment.

To a rural youth, the benefits of rural electrification means changing his mind about seeking his fortune in the city and making plans to stay on the ranch after graduation. To the city folk, administrators, and officials, it means that the boy who stays on the farm, represents one less misguided juvenile delinquent in the city streets, and one less person congesting youth houses and living in our overcrowded cities.

To the rural farmer, rural electrification means refrigeration—modern freezers and refrigerators—without the inconvenience of lugging ice into the icebox or the tedious chores of preserving ice in a icehouse covered with sawdust. To both the city folk and the rural farmer, refrigeration means better food all year round, less harmful bacteria in the food supply, in milk, and less contamination and potentially lower consumer prices of milk, meat, and Mozzorelle—cheese. To the city manufacturer in the year 1959, refrigeration meant the sale of 2,030,000 electric freezers, 3,780,000 electric refrigerators, with the concomitant employment in production and in trade. To the housewife, electric washing machines, and electric dishwashers mean less drudgery, cleaner garments, and more leisure time. To the city people, it means employment, sales, of numerous detergents, such as Fab, Comet, Ajax, Tide, Clean, Lux, and Duz, with their TV-doggerels and limericks. Summed up, it means that rural electrification has brought about a greater self-respect for millions of American families. It means comfort in the home, greater efficiency on the farm, and dignity to the individual, and a train of benefits to its fellow urbanites.

This farm program, the REA, for which we make appropriations in this bill, upon a survey was found to have generated a billion dollars of business annually in appliance sales and that over 4,200,000 have purchased many of these appliances because of the availability of electric power. Other areas exist in which interest between the rural communities and the city sections can be spelled out. In the garment and textile industries, I believe, a survey would be informative to see how much of an increase in the sale of clothing has been brought about as a result of the raising of the standard of living of people residing in the rural communities. If these relationships, the interdependency between the city and the farm people, are fully developed and explored, and the results publicized, I am confident that rural folks would not feel antagonistic, estranged, or indifferent to city problems, and we who live in the city and read about soil-bank payments and farm subsidies might be more sympathetic to the rural problems and farm programs.

Because of the widespread notion that the farm program contains features which are wasteful and which are give-always, the committee in its report has sought to identify the recipients of America's bounty and to earmark the objects of several appropriations. There are appropriations for agriculture's regular activities, appropriations restoring the Commodity Credit Corporation capital impairment, and appropriations for foreign assistance. Some of these should not be changed in logic nor in fairness to farmers, inasmuch as they serve our foreign policy, our unemployed, our children and oftentimes our consumers. Fairness and equity dictate that those who benefit directly or indirectly should be made aware of their obligations and should acknowledge their participation in these farm benefits.

This bill recommends a total appropriation of $5,948,566,000 a decrease of over $140,000,000 from the budget request. This bill recommends for regular activities for fiscal year 1962, the sum of $1,379,006,000; for reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation for fiscal year 1960, this bill recommends $1,017,610,000.

The committee also recommends a reimbursement for the foreign assistance and special activities expenditures made by CCC in fiscal year 1961, the sum of $1,951,915,000. To put the foreign assistance programs on a pay-as-you-go basis, the committee has recommended an appropriation of $1,600 million. This bill recommends $345 million in loan authorizations for REA and RTA.

The committee report from pages 12 to 15 details the regular activities of the Department of Agriculture. These include agricultural research services which do a tremendous job in preventing and eradicating disease in livestock, in animals, and in poultry. It has had great success in the prevention and eradication of tuberculosis, hog cholera, brucellosis, and airsacculitis of poultry. This research helps mankind to control insects which if left unchecked would destroy agriculture's produce both in food and in fiber. While the farmer is aided in his endeavors to preserve his production, the consumer is also protected in the type of food he eats and the clothes he wears.

In connection with the price support programs which I know city Representatives and the country are concerned with and critical of, I direct your attention to page 33 of the committee report wherein the price support costs for fiscal year 1959 and 1960 are listed.

These figures show that while less than half of the 1960 costs was due to loss on commodities under price support operations, that payments to nonfarm groups exceeded payments to farmers.

These figures of losses show that the taxpayer in 1960 subsidized farmers to the extent of approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars, and that nonfarm groups received in 1960 over $850 million for storage, transportation, interest and administrative expense. These are expenditures which should be cut down and can be reduced if the farm groups and other ancillary organizations cooperate.

I would like to mention one other item in the appropriation bill which city residents appreciate, and that is the school lunch program. The bill provides $125 million for fiscal year 1962 in cash payments for school lunches. This sum represents $5 million more than the budgets of President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have provided and it is $15 million more than last year's budget. Of this $15 million, $10 million is included to provide special assistance to help particularly needy schools defray the cost of serving luncheons to needy children. Language is included to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to allocate money to areas of the greatest need and to prescribe standards and criteria under which the fund will be used. The school lunch program serves the farmer by providing outlets for the consumption of his products, it helps develop stronger bodies among our schoolchildren, and it encourages and develops new tastes and a greater consumption of our food supply.

During the year 1960, 62,975 schools participated. In 1960, 12,800,000 children received school lunches and further substantial increases have occurred in the present school year. We are hopeful that with these additional $15 million, together with the $44 million authorized to be used from section 32 funds—that is the customs receipts—to purchase red meats and other foods needed to provide a balanced diet for schoolchildren, and we are hopeful that these appropriations will help correct some of the imbalance which has developed between the rate of Federal assistance and the rate of schoolchildren participation in this program.

This bill deserves your support and I trust that it will be passed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wish to say to the gentleman from New York that I appreciate very much, and I am sure the membership does, the speech he is making here. I want to say for the record that the gentleman from New York has made a great contribution to all America in his service on this committee, in seeing how these programs fit together and in seeing that the moneys are handled in the best way possible. Since he has been on this committee, the gentleman's contributions to the school lunch program have been immeasurable. I wish to say again the gentleman from New York has rendered and is rendering outstanding service, and I want the RECORD to show we all appreciate it very much.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman for his generous remarks.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I had the privilege to go out through the country to look into some agricultural problems with the gentleman from New York. I would like to say the gentleman from New York has made a great contribution not only to people in the agricultural areas of the Nation, but to the people of New York City as well by bringing about a better understanding between the people of the city of New York and the people of the country at large. Every time we met with any group to discuss the problems of agriculture, the gentleman from New York did a marvelous job of public relations. I would like to say for the record that I have gotten over the feeling that New York was a city that did not care anything about the rest of the Nation because through my association with the gentleman from New York, I have learned that our colleague from New York is concerned for all the people and he has a great heart for all the people of the United States and he has made a splendid contribution toward better understanding between the people of cities like New York and the country as a whole.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. My colleague has been very helpful to me in my efforts to have a better understanding of these problems.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. First I want to say that this is one of the very best speeches I have heard in this House in the years of my service here. The gentleman from New York has been able to do that because he has studied the subject matter, not only attending all the hearings of our committee but also having gotten hearings of other committees and studying them. I think we owe a great debt of gratitude to the gentleman from New York for the information he has brought us.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman from Iowa, and I might say that as a result of information we received in Des Moines, Iowa, we were able to save the people of the United States $72 million last year in storage costs alone by reason of a reduction in storage charges. This came about as a result of the work of the gentleman from Iowa and the Committee on Agriculture and the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the gentleman from New York for the fine statement he has just made in the field of agriculture, and the part he has played in bringing the consumer and the masses of our people together in this program and this problem. He has made a fine contribution as a member of the committee. I know of his particular interest in a project which I regret to say I find no funds for in this bill. I am referring to the so-ealled research facility for soil-water-plant relationship at Cornell University in New York State.

The gentleman knows that this facility is listed as a desirable means to make a study, particularly with regard to soil-water-plant relationship. I regret that the committee has not seen fit to include funds for this project in the bill. However, I do want to call attention to the fact that the committee has made reference to this project on page 14 of the report. I note particularly that your committee in this report asks the Department of Agriculture to make a careful reevaluation of the priority position of this project, and assuming that if the Department could or would give this project a better position by way of importance the committee would see fit to provide funds.

Will the gentleman enlighten me about that?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. As the Members of the House know, the Senate has set out a list of priorities which perhaps may or may not have any validity today. The program to which the gentleman referred has a low priority. Some of us feel it should have a higher priority. We have called upon the Department of Agriculture to reevaluate these programs and turn to the present need with relationship to their efficacy and the contribution to the whole economy of the United States.

Secondly, in regard to the soil-water-plant research program I can say that we considered and we discussed it. We had hearings, there was testimony, the gentleman from New York testified and made a wonderful presentation. Last year the gentleman was instrumental in obtaining one-half million dollars for soil-water research. We have asked the Department of Agriculture to reevaluate these priorities which were lumped together in Senate Document No. 59 to determine whether the research program in which the gentleman and New York are so keenly interested should not have a higher priority.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Has the gentleman's committee any estimate as to when the Department might come up with a reevaluation of this project so that money could be provided? Not this year, perhaps.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I will refer to the chairman of the subcommittee to answer that question if he desires. We did refer this matter to the Department of Agriculture. I know of no commitments or any indication on their part as to when they will come up with a reevaluation. I assume that after they read our report, which was brought out only last week, that they have had little time to give it consideration and we will hear from them in the near future.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my sentiments to those just expressed by my good friend and colleague, Representative HAROLD OSTERTAG.

Research in the field of soil-water-plant relationships is of vital importance to the farmers of the Northeastern United States and, for that matter, to farmers throughout the country. For this reason, I am disappointed that funds were not requested by Agriculture Secretary Freeman or made available by the committee for a soil-water-plant relationships laboratory at Cornell University.

However, I am encouraged to note in the committee report that the members of the committee have taken cognizance of the need for additional study in this area and have requested the Department of Agriculture to make a careful reevaluation of the priority position of the proposed soil-water-plant relationships facility.

I hope and trust that this reevaluation will be completed at an early date, that the Department will recognize the importance of assigning a high priority to this project and that the Congress will move expeditiously to make the necessary funds available.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BREEDING. I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York on the wonderful speech he has just made. It is real heartening to find one standing before the microphone in support of agriculture being a Member from the State of New York. It is not often that a Member from a metropolitan area stands up and speaks in favor of agriculture, as the gentleman from New York has just done.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice to the fact that I am from a great metropolitan area also, namely, Los Angeles County, and I stand for agriculture needs as presented in this bill by the committee. I compliment the gentleman from New York on his splendid statement.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I appreciate the affection you folks all have for our colleague from New York, but I do rise at this time to inquire if the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] is not from one of the biggest dairy areas in the United States?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes; and I am very proud of it.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Now that we have spilled some milk, let us proceed with consideration of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, being considered by the House of Representatives today, includes a new approach to helping meet the always serious need for additional agriculture research.

This is the establishment for the first time of a contingency research fund for $1 million, available to the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service to expedite work on research problems and to meet special research needs as they arise.

Members will note that the report on this bill states in the final paragraph on page 8: Such a fund will also be available to give increased emphasis to some of the many special problems presented to the committee by Members of Congress and other witnesses this year, including basic research on wheat and grains, research on the improved digestibility of dry edible beans, barley and malt research, research on pear decline, forage and range research, soybean research, poultry research—particularly with reference to airsacculitis—soil and water conservation research, and others.

I would like to state, Mr. Chairman, that there is indeed a serious need for additional attention to research in these fields, as I testified before the Agriculture Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations.

As an example, the problem of pear decline, which renders pear trees nonproductive, has become alarmingly serious in the west coast States of Washington, Oregon, and California. The problem is so serious as to threaten the very existence of the west coast industry from which 95 percent of the Nation's Bartlett pears originate. The congressional delegations from the three States worked closely with the Department of Agriculture, land-grant college research people, and the industry to develop a crash research plan, the only ray of hope to stem this unsolved problem before the industry is rendered nonexistent. The three-State cooperative program, in which the industry and the States will share cost responsibility, requires a Federal effort in fiscal year 1962 of $180,000, a modest sum considering the urgency and gravity of the problem. The committee, in the agricultural appropriations bill, has allowed $90,200 specific effort to this end in fiscal year 1962, but has stated that the contingency research fund may be used for further pear decline research during the fiscal year.

Other specific research areas where the contingency research fund may be used, and in which there is specific need in the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington, include soil and water conservation, hops, dodder, mint wilt, sugarbeets, and dry edible beans.

The distinguished chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee discussed such a contingency research fund with me earlier in this session, and at that time I expressed to him a keen interest in such a plan as an effective method of administration of additional research by the Agricultural Research Service. I am, therefore, pleased to note that the committee has, in the legislation and report before us, made provision for the establishment of the plan.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington concerning their subcommittee hearings with respect to the progress being made in the four regional research laboratories sponsored by the USDA, and what significant progress they are making, if any, in the field of research for greater utilization of our present surplus commodities.

Mr. HORAN. I would much prefer that the gentleman from Mississippi answer that question.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Would the gentleman from Mississippi care to comment on that?

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman would repeat his question, I would appreciate it.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I was asking concerning the progress report from the regional research laboratories particularly in regard to the utilization of our present surplus commodities.

Mr. WHITTEN. Progress is being made, as the gentleman knows. An example is in the use of animal fats in plastics, and the hearings cite quite a number of illustrations of successes and of development. I refer the gentleman to the hearings, because they are spelled out in considerable degree in the hearings.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Does there appear to be any significant breakthrough in any special area at this time?

Mr. WHITTEN. The one thing mentioned was the use of animal fats in plastics as a tremendous breakthrough. Animal fat is the one thing which has little, if any, market and of which we have a tremendous surplus. By the same token, plastics are becoming quite a big consumer item. So, tying the two together, I would say that the development that they have had there has probably in itself been worth all the money that we have spent in this activity.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. There seems to have been some sentiment in the past that too much money was being spent on personnel and that too much of the funds have been used in the field of pure research and not enough in the field of utilization. Would the gentleman care to comment on that phase of the problem?

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, I would say it all depends on who you talk to. Those

that are primarily interested in utilization research think they are getting too little and the others think they are getting too much. Actually we are doing a lot of research and trying to get the best results possible.

Mr. HORAN. If I may comment on this—and I do not want to consume all of my time on this phase—we are doing some very good work in utilization. Now, it is true that we can make industrial alcohol out of wheat, but we cannot make it economically out of wheat at $2 a bushel. However, some of our utilization research is in the better preparation of wheat products for consumption by the human individual, and that is a utilization, I think, in the right direction.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. In the bill itself there is an item of $600,000 to press this matter of utilization research, particularly at the laboratories at Peoria, Ill., and Albany, Calif., where they are developing a high grade of starch used in the making of fine grades of paper. I think that is an accomplishment.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, it is the way we set our sails that determines our course. I make this observation as we here in the month of June 1961, consider the funds needed to implement our Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1962, which begins some 3 weeks from now. The late and beloved Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, once said, and it was hardly original, that everyone was entitled to his own opinion, when he found himself in conflict with the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Now, on this particular part of our national budget which is before us today, I beg leave to express some opinions of my own.

In a very great sense, we who serve on the Appropriations Committee are your servants. We have a duty to perform for the entire Congress. We try diligently to review the work that has been done by the various departments. We have in our mind the tax burdens—Federal, State, and local—which our people shoulder today. We know that the dollar, 100 cents in 1939 is 43.9 cents today. We also note whether the estimates before us involve increases over the previous year and we delve into the requests for additional personnel. It concerns me that almost every revised budget request does this. If we are to maintain fiscal sanity in this country, it is incumbent upon us that we do this. Incidentally, it is my intention to have more to say about this phase when our subcommittee has the Commerce appropriations bill before you here in a week or so from now.

There are those among our adversaries in the East who are convinced that the United States is headed for some dismal years of fiscal instability. Hence, our work takes on an added importance. Not only should we think of our children and our children's children, who will be called upon to shoulder the costs of our current efforts, but I do feel that the fiscal stability of the United States is of vast importance to all our allies in the West and other friendly nations. These projects and programs which we annually consider are largely the result of legislation passed by the Congress. We do try to find out if these programs and projects are getting things done constructively, or if they are "halt and lame." If the latter, I think we have a duty to express our opinion and tell you so. Therefore, today, in expressing my brief opinions, I want to steer wide and clear from any placing of particular blame. My opinions and observations, I hope, will be construed as in the direction of constructiveness. I have served on this subcommittee during the services of five Secretaries of Agriculture. Every one of them was dedicated to what he thought was in the best interests of the American farmer. Personally, I think we lose sight of the principles that need debate and discussion when we dip to criticism of individuals and the creation of horrid images for political purposes. These certainly obscure the issue and fail to solve the problems of American agriculture. Every one of these five Secretaries of Agriculture has served during periods of great change. Technological revolution after technological revolution has visited our American farms during the last score of years. What was new in 1942 was obsolete a decade later, and what was new in 1952 is often antique as we consider the budget items here before us. When I observed that it is the way we set our sails that determines our course, I had reference to the fact that basically the sails under which our ship of Agriculture is now sailing were set in 1938.

At that time we had visions of an ever-normal granary. And, we gave life to a program that would encourage our producers of basic crops to grow more. They did. And do not let anyone tell you that American agriculture failed in its task of winning the war. I think our bounty today is the greatest asset we have for finally winning the peace and ending the cold war. But the ever-normal granary idea also had a sort of anchor to leeward called marketing quotas and acreage allotments. This troublesome addition to the 1938 program just did not come out from under the political rocks until 1952. Meanwhile, under various colors and garbs, we were helping to rebuild the devastated world. Our help then and now is going everywhere, as from a Christian-Judaeo nation, it should. We retooled such able competitors as West Germany and Japan. For a while we helped the always competent British to recoup. And, of course, we helped others to rebuild their industrial commerce. You know all about that. We always set forth to aid the so-called underdeveloped countries, and we have. But most of these countries are agricultural and their progress adds to the world's supply of farm products which concerns us here at home.

In the last 10 years, while we have reduced cotton acreages in the United States by well over 10 million acres, the total world acreage has actually increased. While we have reduced wheat by 9 million acres, world acreage has increased by 64½ million acres. We have cut rice acres here at home, but world acreages have increased by 50½ million acres. We have cut tobacco at home, but world acreage has increased by 1¾ million acres. Only soybeans and corn have increased in acreage here at home during the last 10 years. But meanwhile, worldwide, corn has increased by 48½ million acres while soybeans have increased by nearly 18 million acres. I mention these brief facts because I think it is time we stopped and thought about our domestic problems in terms of the total world. At this point, Mr. Chairman, under privilege previously granted to me, I would like to insert some tables and comments which briefly set forth in more detail the facts that I have just mentioned.

World acreage of selected crops, 1950 and 1960

	1950	1960	Increase or decrease
Cotton	88,315,000	80,900,000	−7,415,000
Corn	219,000,000	267,500,000	+48,500,000
Wheat	424,200,000	488,800,000	+64,600,000
Rice	237,967,000	288,630,000	+50,663,000
Soybeans	36,015,000	53,995,000	+17,980,000
Tobacco	7,743,000	9,479,000	+1,736,000
Total	1,013,240,000	1,189,304,000	[1] +176,064,000

[1] Net.

NOTE.—Although cotton acreage was reduced 7,415 acres, total acreage increased 176,064,000 acres.

U.S. acreage of selected crops, 1950 and 1960

	1950	1960	Increase or decrease
Cotton	26,949,000	15,316,000	−11,633,000
Corn	81,800,000	82,100,000	+300,000
Wheat	61,600,000	52,600,000	−9,000,000
Rice	1,637,000	1,595,000	−42,000
Soybeans	13,807,000	23,516,000	+9,709,000
Tobacco	1,599,000	1,144,000	−455,000
Total	187,392,000	176,271,000	[1] −11,121,000

[1] Net.

NOTE.—U.S. acreages of all crops except corn and soybeans were reduced. Total acreage for the 10-year period was reduced by 11,121,000 acres. Thus, while acreage on a worldwide basis was increased by 176,064,000 acres, the United States reduced its total acreage by 11,121,000 acres.

COTTON

In 1950, 26,949,000 acres of cotton were harvested with a yield of 15,149,000 bales in the United States. In 1960, 15,316,000 acres were harvested with a yield of 14,309,000 bales.

The world production and yield for the same period is as follows: In 1950, 88,315,000 acres of cotton were harvested with a yield of 39,295,000 bales. In 1960, 80,900,000 acres were harvested with a yield of 46,995,000 bales. Thus, while worldwide area in cotton has only decreased about 7,415,000 acres during the last 10 years, the United States has reduced its area by 11,633,000 acres.

India, with the second largest cotton acreage, harvested 14,556,000 acres in 1950 and increased their harvested area to 18,700,000 acres in 1960. Their production was increased from 2,720,000 acres in 1960. Their production was increased from 2,720,000 bales to 4,400,000 bales during this same period.

China has the third largest area and, according to the best information we can obtain, harvested 10 million acres in 1950; 14 million acres in 1960. Their production was 3,650,000 bales in 1950 and 7,500,000 bales in 1960.

The only countries to reduce their acreages in cotton during the 10-year period 1950–60 were: United States by 11,633,000; Brazil, by 300,000; Congo, by 215,000; Egypt, by 106,000; U.S.S.R., by 350,000.

It should be further noted that although acreages were reduced in the above countries, the total production from 1950 to 1960 increased in every country with the exception of the United States and the Congo. Russia, although reducing acreage by 350,000, increased her production from 5,500,000 bales in 1950 to 6,800,000 bales in 1960.

CORN

All countries increased corn acreage during the period 1950–60.

Of the total world corn acreage of 219 million in 1950, the United States had 81.8 million acres. Of the total world corn acreage of 267.5 million in 1960, the United States had 82.1 million acres.

In 1950, the total world corn production was 5,385 million bushels. The United States produced 3,075 million bushels of this total. In 1960, the total world corn production was 8,100 million bushels. The United States produced 4,353 million bushels of this total.

Russia's acreage totaled 11.9 million in 1950; 29.5 million in 1960. Russia's production totaled 250 million bushels in 1950 and 590 million bushels in 1960.

Thus, the United States increased its corn acreage three-tenths of a million from 1950 to 1960. It raised its production of corn by 1,278 million bushels.

The rest of the world increased its corn acreage 48.2 million from 1950 to 1960. They raised production of corn by 1,437 million bushels.

Despite the fact that the United States, Canada, Argentina, Italy, France, England, and Japan decreased their overall wheat acreage between 1950 and 1960 by 19 million acres, worldwide production during this 10-year period increased 1,840 million bushels.

This is due to many reasons. Russia, for example, increased its acreage from 95 million acres in 1950 to 148.5 million acres in 1960. Its production was increased from 1,020 million bushels to 1,700 million bushels.

Likewise, India, Turkey, Australia, Pakistan, and Spain—all planting 10 million or more wheat acres—increased their total acreage during the 1950–60 period and, thus, their total production.

Almost all other wheat-producing nations, whether reducing their acreages or not, increased their production.

The United States decreased its acreage during the 10-year period from 61.6 million acres to 52.6 million acres. Production, however, increased from 1,019 million bushels to 1,363 million bushels. Canada also reduced its total acreage by 4.1 million acres but increased production from 467 million bushels in 1950 to 490 million bushels in 1960.

The total wheat acreage—worldwide—in 1950 was 424.2 million acres. The total wheat acreage—worldwide—in 1960 was 488.8 million acres. Total increases of 64.6 million acres. Russia's increase of 53.5 million acres accounted for most of this increase.

The total production in 1950 amounted to 6,340 million bushels. The total production in 1960 amounted to 8,180 million bushels. Total increase of 1,840 million bushels.

RICE

Despite the fact that the United States, Egypt, and Italy reduced their total acreage of rice during the period 1950–60, worldwide rice acreage and production increased sharply.

Total rice acreage in 1950 amounted to 237,967,000 acres; in 1960 the figure rose to 288,630,000 acres. Total rice production increased from 337,850 million pounds in 1950 to 487,560 million pounds in 1960.

The United States decreased its acreage from 1,637,000 acres in 1950 to 1,595,000 acres in 1960. However, its production was increased from 3,882 million pounds in 1950 to 5,440 million pounds in 1960.

India, Communist China, Pakistan, Indonesia, Thailand, and Burma, on the other hand, all increased their acreages substantially and, thus their production.

India, for example, increased its acreage from 76,135,000 acres in 1950 to 82,500,000 acres in 1960—an increase of 6,365,000 acres during this period.

SOYBEANS

All soybean-producing nations increased their total acreages during the 1950–60 period. In 1950, a total of 36,015,000 acres were planted throughout the world. In 1960, the figure rose to 53,995,000 acres.

Production rose from 645,257,000 bushels in 1950 to 976,850,000 bushels in 1960—an increase of 51 percent during the 10-year period.

The United States increased its acreage from 13,807,000 in 1950 to 23,516,000 acres in 1960. Production rose from 299,249,000 bushels in 1950 to 588,778,000 bushels in 1960, a production increase of 87 percent.

China, the second ranking soybean producing nation, increased its production 17 percent—from 298,530,000 bushels in 1950 to 350 million bushels in 1960.

TOBACCO

All tobacco producing countries except the United States, Belgium, France, West Germany, Algeria, Iran, and Burma increased their acreage.

Worldwide production increased during the period from 7,122 million to 8,895 million pounds. Worldwide acreage increased from 7,743,000 acres in 1950 to 9,479,000 acres in 1960.

The United States decreased its acreage from 1,599,000 acres in 1950 to 1,144,000 acres in 1960. Its production was also decreased from 2,030 million pounds to 1,960 million pounds. Of the total 1960 worldwide tobacco production of 8,895 million pounds, the United States produced 1,960 million pounds.

One might add also that we have for at least 12 years been shipping American know-how abroad to encourage new acres and to show them how to grow more per square inch. There is no question but what in terms of proper diet, there is a food deficit in the world. Now, these things that we have been doing for the free world are all good. What we have been doing is a glowing testimonial to our leadership of an enlightened Western civilization. All that remains to be done is, of course, to ease out political corruption abroad, assist in the development of well-paid middle classes wherever possible and embark upon a new era of commercial exchange that will make us all happy with per capita income sufficient to make paying customers in every country. But Rome was not built in a day. And, the purchasing power of too many of the billions on this earth does not make them very good customers. They can be in time, impossible as it may now seem.

One of the big items in this bill to which I heartily subscribe is the work we are doing under Public Law 480. Under that law, we are sending bread to the hungry and to the very areas where the Communist East is sending the stones of political promise and the sabers of fear. In my opinion, it is the finest missile in our international arsenal. It is a true belly blow to our adversaries. Daily reports reach us of crop failures and food shortages in both China and Russia. Daily we know of some of the difficulties that have attended land reforms and efforts to step up production behind the Iron Curtain. Meanwhile, back at the ranch, we are prone to consider farm legislation as though the political, economic and space boundaries were the same today as they were in 1938.

True, we have considered, and we have enacted certain laws affecting agriculture. Most of them, to me, at least, and, remember, I am merely expressing my own opinion, have been the mere adding on of sails in a blind and stubborn effort to continue sailing in the direction of an ever-rising sun that worked so well until 1952. In the face of increasing world production, we try to make painless the removal from production of acres here at home. To me, the answer is spelled out in those programs in the bill before you that would increase consumption. That is, of course, the main purpose of production. There are many such items in this bill—research, the work of the Foreign Agricultural Service, an activity that I am particularly happy to have had a hand in creating, the various marketing services in our economic divisions. In fact, throughout the bill there are programs that can help in the needed purpose of consuming at home and abroad what we produce instead of endless and expensive storage.

We may and we should debate the food stamp plan, but I must remind you that it is now an actuality. We may discuss the relative responsibilities that attend the more than a billion dollars that we annually expend as a nation for school lunches. We may inquire into the donations of our bounty to CARE and other groups who so nobly help the needy. But, we can at least take comfort in the thought that in these programs we are doing that which nature meant when

water, sunlight and soil gave us food. Balanced nutrition is a problem in every country.

As this point, I also want to remind you that under the continued insistence of the gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable JAMIE WHITTEN, we finally, a few years ago, established a sales office for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Imagine the world's largest corporation without a sales office. The result of the setting up of this office has been reflected in a proper reduction of commodities held by that corporation.

And, so, in my opinion, we should reset our sails in terms of the factual winds of today. Whether they be commercial, political, economic, or social. Why should we ever consider the shackling of the great American farmer when those of other lands are goaded with our aid to unleash their latent powers to produce. Why should we consider, even by common consent, the imposing of further acreage reductions at home upon the finest agrarian community that was ever developed unless we also can effectively reduce production elsewhere. In my mind, either consideration is repugnant since everyone in the world does not have the advantage of a square meal.

The Congress is now considering a farm bill. I think there are good things in that bill. But I cannot go along with title I. I like the commodity approach but I cannot for the life of me assume that there will be wholesome agreement among our national producers of any crop. The result of attempting to achieve commodity agreement on a national basis could be frustrating, disheartening, and destructive. In the end, the final responsibilities of any program to further control acreage allotments here at home would have to reside in the office of the Secretary. And, that is an awesome responsibility that I do not want my friend and neighbor, Orville Freeman, to have to assume.

As I close, let me urge this great Committee of the Whole House to consider helping to set our sails anew. The shibboleths of 1938 are out of date. Food is produced to make whole the bodies of men everywhere, not to be stored in Pharaoh's bins. Fiber is produced to cover folks against the elements and shelter is needed in every climate. In a word, let us bend our efforts for consumption of our produce; deny the advocates of acreage restrictions here at home.

Any course we set our sails for will not be pleasant sailing, but we can at least be reassured that we are sailing in the right direction. Let us do what is right, as facts and conscience tell us in today's terms.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mrs. MAY. I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Washington, with whom I am very proud to share representation of our great agricultural area, for a wonderful statement, in particular the very significant point he brings out in any plan that this agricultural administration might bring up that would result in the cutting back of agricultural production at a time when we are asking for increased production of these same things abroad.

In this connection, I know the gentleman shares my interest, and our interest, in the wheat marketing plan. I wonder if he has seen the recent study issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture entitled "How Wheat Farmers Would Adjust to Different Programs," which compares the effect of various wheat programs on producer income and on total grain production.

Mr. HORAN. I have. I want to say to my colleague from Washington, I have studied that. I think it is a worthwhile study produced by Warren Bailey and Ronald Aines of the USDA for a commodity group which is national in scope, and one reason for getting permission this morning to include additional matter in my speech was to include their studies, which I believe cover this, if I am correct, studies in different parts of the United States. If we are serious about this commodity approach to the solution of our farm problems I think this study that has been made by the Department in the interests of the National Wheat Producers' Association would be a valuable contribution for the RECORD at this point.

(The matter referred to follows:)

HOW WHEAT FARMERS WOULD ADJUST TO DIFFERENT PROGRAMS

(By Warren R. Bailey and Ronald O. Aines, agricultural economists)

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The study reported here was undertaken to see how representative wheat farmers in specialized producing areas would adjust most profitably to different wheat programs. What changes would occur in the acreage and production of wheat and other crops? How would the income opportunities of programs compare?

Six different programs were studied on representative farms, otherwise identified as study farms, in eight specialized wheat-producing areas in the Great Plains and the Pacific Northwest. Study farms are located in Kansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Montana, Washington, and Oregon. These farms represent major producing situations in each area. As the figures are not area averages, they do not reflect average incomes among areas, although comparisons are valid between programs on the same farm.

Program features used include modifications of the present acreage-allotment and price-support program; marketing allotments and stratified wheat prices; and no controls or price supports. "Prototype programs" constructed around each feature specify the price of wheat and other crops and either the maximum acreage of wheat, or the maximum quantity that could be marketed. Many other combinations might have been developed, but these combinations include the major features of programs under discussion at the time the study was made.

To determine the adjustments that would maximize incomes on the study farms with the programs, budgets were prepared for each farm. A charge for all labor at hired wages per hour is included in expenses, but no charge is made for management and invested capital. Crop yields are the average that operators of the study farms can expect with average weather and present practices. Crops other than wheat could be grown under each program without restriction for sale at the following assumed prices (U.S. average):

Grain sorghum, bushel	$1.01
Barley, bushel	.90
Dry peas (Washington farm), hundredweight	3.60

Effects of each specified program on wheat acreage, total grain production, and net income to management and invested capital of study farms are compared with effects of program A (1960 acreage allotments and price supports). These comparisons are summarized in table 1.

Smaller acreage allotments (program B): With wheat prices raised to 85 percent of parity and acreage allotments decreased 25 percent from the 1960 level, net income to management and investment capital would be slightly higher on most study farms. It would equal the income under program A on the north-central Montana farm and would be 2 percent below the income under program A on the northeastern Montana and eastern Washington farms. Wheat production on each farm would decrease 25 percent, but total grain production would change very little except that it would increase 11 percent on the northwestern Kansas farm and 16 percent on the Colorado farm.

Larger acreage allotments (program C): With wheat prices lowered to 65 percent of parity and acreage allotments increased 20 percent, net incomes would be reduced 8 to 25 percent. Wheat production would increase about 20 percent, but total grain production would change very little. On the Colorado farm, the reduction would be 8 percent.

Food and export allotment and land reserve (program D): This program would include a marketing allotment on food wheat, export wheat priced at 65 percent of parity and other wheat at a feed price, 80 cents a bushel payment on food-wheat quota, and 20 percent of the wheat base acreage in a land reserve, at the 1960 rate of payment. With this program, net incomes would increase on all study farms. The increase would be 15 percent or less on the Kansas farms, 20 to 25 percent on the Colorado and northeastern Montana farms, and 34 to 39 percent on the Oklahoma, north-central Montana, Washington, and Oregon farms. Wheat production would decrease on the northwestern Kansas and Colorado farms and increase on the other farms. The Kansas farms would produce only marketing-allotment wheat. Operators of other study farms would find it profitable to produce all wheat and no feed grains except as a catch crop on wheat seedings that fail. Operators of all study farms would place land in a reserve to earn the special food-wheat payment. Total grain production would decrease.

Food allotment (program E): With marketing allotments on food wheat priced at 90 percent of parity, other wheat at a U.S. price of $1.25, and no land-reserve requirement, net incomes would decrease 2 to 11 percent on the Colorado and Kansas farms and would increase 5 to 19 percent on the others. Operators of the Kansas farms would maximize income by producing only marketing-allotment wheat, but operators of the other farms would produce all wheat and no feed grains. Total grain production would increase 8 to 10 percent on the northwestern Kansas and Washington farms. It would decrease 5 to 11 percent on the Oklahoma and Colorado farms but would change little on other farms.

No controls (program F): With no production controls and no price supports, net incomes would decrease on all study farms. Incomes would decrease least (19 percent) on the Washington farm, and most (66 percent) on the Oklahoma farm. Wheat production would increase on all study farms

except the northwestern Kansas farm (−1 percent). Total grain production would change about the same as with program E.

The impact of each program would vary on the different farms. A program restricting wheat production (such as the restricted acreage-allotment program) would favor the farms with a profitable alternative crop, such as grain sorghum in the Southern Plains. Conversely, programs permitting production of additional wheat for sale at a nonsupported or feed price would favor farms with a less profitable alternative crop, such as barley in the Northern Plains and the Pacific Northwest.

Net returns from a land reserve at 1960 rates of payment would be higher than from wheat at a feed price on the Kansas and northcentral Montana farms; higher than wheat at the nonsupported price on the Colorado, northeastern Montana and Oregon farms; higher than wheat at 65 percent of parity on the Oklahoma farm. Net returns from the reserve would be higher than grain sorghum on the northwestern Kansas, Oklahoma and Colorado farms; and higher than barley on the Montana and Oregon farm.

Conclusions drawn from the study would seem to warrant generalizations to cash grain farms other than study farms in specialized wheat-producing areas.

When acreage allotments are in effect, operators of specialized wheat farms grow the allotted acreages even though wheat prices are supported at prices as low as 65 percent of parity.

Even at a feed price, wheat is a more profitable crop than barley on specialized wheat farms in Montana, Washington, and Oregon. With no production restrictions, specialized wheatgrowers in these areas would produce maximum acreages of wheat and little or no barley at the assumed prices. In Kansas and Colorado, however, grain sorghum is more profitable than wheat at a feed-equivalent price. With no wheat acreage base to protect and with unallotted wheat selling at a feed price, farmers in these areas would grow all the grain sorghum they could safely grow and still control erosion.

The best income-producing crops other than wheat are feed grains on specialized wheat farms in both the Great Plains and the Pacific Northwest. Forage might be relatively more profitable on livestock farms, but these farms were not included in the study.

Wheat production would not decline but would continue for some time at least on specialized farms in the Northern Plains and the Pacific Northwest, even if the price of wheat were lower than any level now seriously considered. Income would cover the direct expenses of production although return to invested capital would be reduced.

TABLE 1.—*Effects of specified programs on wheat acreage, grain production, and income, study farms*

Item	1960 acreage allotment program (program A)	Percentage change with— Smaller acreage allotment (program B)	Larger acreage allotment (program C)	Food and export allotment (program D)	Food allotment (program E)	No controls (program F)
Acreage of wheat:	*Acres*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
West central Kansas	280	−25	20	4	7	22
Northwestern Kansas	270	−25	20	−23	−16	−1
Northwestern Oklahoma [1]	473	−25	20	25	55	55
Eastern Colorado	550	−25	20	−3	16	16
Northeastern Montana	405	−25	20	14	43	43
North central Montana	405	−25	20	14	43	43
Eastern Washington	166	−25	20	73	98	98
Columbia Basin, Oreg	520	−25	20	23	54	54
Production of all grain:	*Tons*					
West central Kansas	215	0	0	−28	3	0
Northwestern Kansas	246	11	1	−21	8	9
Northwestern Oklahoma [1]	314	1	−3	−21	−5	−5
Eastern Colorado	368	16	−8	−25	−11	−11
Production of all grain—Con.	*Tons*					
Northeastern Montana	260	1	−1	−22	−2	−2
North central Montana	370	1	−1	−22	−2	−2
Eastern Washington	434	−1	1	−4	10	10
Columbia Basin, Oreg	734	0	1	−19	−2	−2
Net income: [2]	*Dollars*					
West central Kansas	4,675	7	−22	15	−4	−52
Northwestern Kansas	5,755	5	−22	4	−11	−49
Northwestern Oklahoma [1]	5,748	6	−25	39	5	−66
Eastern Colorado	10,513	9	−15	20	−2	−47
Northeastern Montana	6,022	−2	−13	38	14	−42
North central Montana	9,756	0	−14	25	11	−35
Eastern Washington	12,175	−2	−8	34	19	−19
Columbia Basin, Oreg	17,812	2	−13	37	9	−44

[1] Excludes panhandle counties.

[2] Return to management and invested capital. Computation explained in section on "Budget Analysis."

Although income from feed grains is smaller than that from wheat on most farms, the income from feed grains is important to the specialized wheat farmer when wheat acreage is restricted. If the farm is to remain efficient, all of its resources must be used productively.

Total grain production on specialized wheat farms changes very little whether wheat or a feed grain or a combination of the two is produced.

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. wheat industry has operated under essentially the same production-control and price-support program for 6 years. During that time, surplus stocks of wheat have accumulated, and public expenditures for storage have mounted. The situation that has developed needs no documentation here. Almost everyone agrees that changes in the wheat program are needed, but general agreement as to what the new program should be has not been reached.

Views differ as to the role of wheat prices. Should prices chiefly regulate supply and demand or should they assure farm income? Some persons believe that it would be best to discontinue production-control programs and price supports, to let supply and demand be equated at a free market price. Others think this might work if enough wheat land were retired from farming by some other means.

Some persons believe production controls and supported prices should apply only to the wheat needed for food in the United States and possibly for commercial exports. Let farmers produce additional wheat for other uses if they wish, but in competition with other grains used largely for feed. Still others would prefer a combination of programs that would include some production-control features, some price supports, and some land retirement. Perhaps most of them would agree that the wheat industry needs help in making adjustments.

Views on proposed wheat programs differ because some people focus on the aggregative problem of surpluses, while others stress the income problem of wheat farmers. Information is lacking as to how various program features would affect the production and returns on representative farms. We need to consider such effects in the choice of alternative programs. Knowledge of the impact of alternative programs on individual farms is necessary to determine whether a program would in fact solve the problem.

This report describes the impact of different programs on the production and income of representative wheat farms in specialized wheat-producing areas. The features examined are of four kinds: (1) modifications of the present acreage-allotment program; (2) marketing allotments in bushels and stratified wheat prices; (3) no production controls or price supports; and (4) land retirement alone or in conjunction with each of the other programs. Around each feature is constructed an example, or prototype, program which specifies the price of wheat and other crops and in some instances, the maximum acreage or quantity of wheat to be produced.

Since the study was made, legislation has been enacted providing an emergency program for feed grains. This program was not included among those studied.

The analysis deals with the effects of specified programs on individual wheat farms, without regard to the aggregative effects. In fact, some, perhaps all, of the programs tested may not be "equilibrium programs" in that they might not balance supply and demand of wheat or feed grains at the assumed prices. To ascertain the aggregative effect of the different programs and to test them for equilibrium would require study of many additional farm situations in many areas. Such a study in major wheat-producing areas is now underway as western regional research project W–54. This report is based in part on some of the preliminary analyses and on data from a few selected situations under study in projects contributing to the regional effort.

FARMS STUDIED

The farms selected for study are representative of cash grain farming in eight specialized wheat-producing areas. Six are in the Great Plains and two are in the Pacific Northwest. Five are in areas in which wheat is usually grown biannually, alternating with fallow. In the three remaining areas, wheat is customarily grown annually, after wheat or another crop, but fallow may be used when rainfall is low. The farms studied are in areas that produce three classes of wheat. Soft White Winter wheat is produced in Washington and Oregon, Hard Red Spring wheat in the Northern Plains, and Hard Red Winter wheat in the Northern, Central, and Southern Plains.

Although study farms represent a major production situation in each area, we do not

imply that response would be the same on all farms in each area. Farms of another size or with different resources might find it profitable to respond differently. A study farm is not necessarily an average of all farms in the area; usually it represents a central model size group. Obviously, the study farms do not reflect relative incomes per farm among areas, although comparisons are valid between programs on the same farm. General characteristics of the farms studied are shown in table 2.

BUDGET ANALYSIS

The analysis presented here is based on farm budgets of the study farms, in which production, income, expenses, and net returns are computed. Budgeting determines the most profitable use of land and other resources of the farm under each program, considering program and other restrictions incidental to the practical operation of the farm. Several budgets or partial budgets may be required to determine the most profitable production plan under each program. Budgets also permit comparison of the economic advantage of different programs on the same farm—within the limits of the specified assumptions. Comparability between study farms of adjustments to the same program is achieved to a degree by using uniform program assumuptions and a common set of prices, adjusted for area and regional differences. Comparability is not achieved completely, however, in that study farms may not represent their respective areas equally well.

The budgets are simplified to the extent that they focus on crops, the chief concern of the analysis. Livestock enterprises found on grain farms are not included. Budgets are simplified also in that minor feed grain crops are converted, when feasible, to the major feed grain crop on the farm—grain sorghum in the Central and Southern Plains and barley in the Northern Plains and the Pacific Northwest. These simplifications do not affect the essential validity of the results.

TABLE 2.—*Description of study farms*

Study farm	Acreage in—			Alternative crop	Method of growing—	
	Farm	Crops	Wheat base		Wheat	Alternative crop
	Acres	*Acres*	*Acres*			
West central Kansas	640	540	440	Grain sorghum	Continuous cropping	Chiefly continuous cropping.
Northwestern Kansas	960	770	417	do	Chiefly fallow	Do.
Northwestern Oklahoma	960	735	718	do	Chiefly continuous cropping	Do.
Eastern Colorado	1,920	1,800	803	do	Chiefly fallow	Do.
Northeastern Montana	1,200	1,156	578	Barley	All on fallow	On fallow.
North central Montana	1,200	1,156	578	do	do	Do.
Eastern Washington	540	520	255	Barley, peas	Chiefly continuous cropping	Both ways.
Columbia Basin, Oreg	1,650	1,600	800	Barley	All on fallow	On fallow.

In the main, budgets depict the most profitable adjustments on the farm to each program situation, with consideration given to good farming practices and farmers' demonstrated preferences. For example, grain sorghum on fallow increases the hazard of wind erosion, hence it is to be avoided when possible. Again, some farmers may prefer to grow all wheat even though another crop might pay slightly better than feed wheat. Farmers might grow wheat exclusively rather than provide storage for two kinds of grain.

Crop yields used in the analysis are average yields—those that farmers operating similar farms can expect in the future. Yields vary under different programs as influenced by the crop sequence. For example, the yield of wheat following wheat differs from the yield of wheat following fallow. The yield of sorghum differs when the sorghum follows sorghum, wheat, or fallow, or is seeded on abandoned wheatland. Wheat yields vary also because farmers tend to select the better land when acreage is restricted and they have a choice of land. The production shown in the tables excludes seed requirements.

Expenses in the budget analysis were computed at the 1959 cost rates per unit. Expenses include the usual inputs of motor fuel and lubricants, repairs, treatment of seed, fertilizer and chemicals at common rates of application, property taxes, insurance, motor licenses, custom hire (as applicable), depreciation, hired labor, and a charge for operator labor at the hired wage rate per hour. With all labor included, the farm incomes under the programs have greater comparability. Not included is a charge for the use of capital, or for management.

Commodity prices used in the analysis are assumed to be at the farm level. All prices were adjusted for prevailing regional and area differences; they are for the average grade of product marketed in the area. In programs under which wheat prices are supported, the U.S. average price was computed relative to parity, then adjusted to the area. Nonsupported wheat prices and prices of other commodities summarized in table 3 are those assumed for purposes of the study. None of the prices are necessarily equilibrium prices in the aggregate sense, that is, they might not equilibrate aggregate supply and demand if the adjustments induced by the various programs were widely adopted. As estimates of equilibrium prices were not available, the prices used are approximations judged to be the best available for this analysis. Even though these prices are not based on supply-demand analysis, they serve the purposes of comparability among programs.

Net farm income in the budget analysis is gross income minus expenses as defined. It is the return to management and to capital investment in the farm including equipment.

The budget analysis is based on full ownership of the farm. No appraisal was made of the income effects of the programs to tenant operators. Moreover, the analysis does not consider problems that might occur in adjusting from the present program to a new one. Problems of this kind might delay some farmers in making the adjustments found to be most profitable. The question of implementing a program was not an expressed purpose of the study reported.

PROGRAMS STUDIED

The programs used in the study include the major types of features proposed or discussed. An example, or prototype, program was constructed around each feature to specify the conditions under which wheat is produced and its price. These specifications and prices were selected arbitrarily for purposes of the analysis. For easy reference, programs are identified by letters of the alphabet; they are described in the paragraphs that follow.

Acreage allotments, 1960 (program A): This is essentially the present (1960) acreage-allotment program, but without the conservation reserve. It consists of the 1960 wheat acreage allotments (harvested basis) with the price of wheat supported at a U.S. average price of $1.80 a bushel, which is assumed to be 75 percent of parity. Penalties, which are not specified, effectively limit production to the allotted acreage. Other crops can be produced and marketed freely at the assumed prices (table 3). The situation under this program is used as a basis for comparing situations under other programs.

TABLE 3.—*Crop prices per bushel established for budget analysis, study farms*

Item	West central Kansas	Northwestern Kansas	Northwestern Oklahoma	Eastern Colorado	Northeastern Montana	North central Montana	Eastern Washington	Columbia Basin, Oreg.	Assumed United States
Wheat at—	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
90 percent parity	2.15	2.12	2.14	2.12	2.08	1.96	2.10	2.15	2.16
85 percent parity	2.02	2.00	2.02	2.00	1.95	1.84	1.98	2.03	2.04
75 percent parity	1.82	1.79	1.78	1.77	1.72	1.61	1.75	1.79	1.80
65 percent parity	1.55	1.53	1.54	1.53	1.47	1.36	1.52	1.55	1.56
Nonsupported price	1.26	1.24	1.24	1.22	1.19	1.12	1.20	1.25	1.25
Feed price [1]	1.20	1.18	1.12	1.01	1.05	1.00	1.20	1.25	
Grain sorghum	1.02	1.00	.95	.86					[2] 1.01
Barley					.72	.69	.82	.87	.90
Peas							[3] 3.60		

[1] Based on price of predominant feed grain produced in the area, adjusted for equivalent feeding value.

[2] Equivalent to U.S. price of $1.80 per hundredweight.

[3] Price per hundredweight.

Smaller acreage allotments (program B): Under this program, wheat acreage allotments would be 25 percent smaller than those under program A, but the price of wheat would be supported at a U.S. average price of $2.04 a bushel, about 85 percent of parity. Other conditions would be the same as under program A. Program B is intended to determine the production and effects on the study farms with smaller acreage allotments combined with higher wheat prices.

Larger acreage allotments (program C): Under program C, wheat acreage allotments would be 20 percent larger than those under program A, but the price of wheat would be supported at a U.S. average of $1.56 a bushel, about 65 percent of parity. Other conditions would be the same as under program A. The purpose of program C is to determine the production and income effect on the study farms of larger wheat acreage allotments combined with lower support prices.

Food and export allotment (program D): With this program, each farm would have a wheat marketing allotment in bushels equal to two-thirds of the normal yield on the 1960 wheat base acreage. The marketing allotment is presumed to be the farm share of the wheat required for domestic food uses and exports. This quantity of wheat would be supported at a U.S. average price of $1.56 a bushel, about 65 percent of parity. Other wheat could be grown and sold at a feed-equivalent price, based on the price of the predominant feed grain grown in the study farm locality. The farm has a food wheat quota in bushels equal to five-twelfths of the normal yield on its 1960 wheat base acreage. The farmer could earn a payment of 80 cents a bushel on the food quota by contracting 20 percent of his wheat base acreage in a land reserve. In areas where wheat is commonly grown on fallow, an equal acreage of fallow land must be put into the reserve. This acreage depends upon the proportion of wheat grown in fallow in 1959. Land in the reserve earns annual rental payments equal to the 1960 rates of the conservation reserve program. The farmer would not be required to put the land in the reserve if he wanted to forgo the payment of 80 cents a bushel on his food wheat quota. The total land-reserve payment per farm would not be limited. There would be no other form of land reserve. Other crops could be produced on any remaining land and sold at the assumed prices (table 3).

With program D, the farmer could carry over wheat to apply against his marketing allotment or food quota of a later year. He or the trade would store the extra production from a bumper crop. With the present acreage-allotment program, most of the carryover is stored by the Government.

Food allotment (program E): This program is a similar though simplified version of program D. Each farm would have a marketing allotment in bushels equal to normal yield on five-twelfths of the 1960 wheat base acreage. This quantity of wheat would be equal to the food quota in program D. The price of allotment wheat would be supported at a U.S. average price of $2.16 a bushel, about 90 percent of parity. No special payment could be earned by participation in a land reserve. In fact, no land-reserve program is assumed. Other wheat might be grown and sold at a nonsupported price of $1.25 a bushel, U.S. average. Presumably, nonallotment wheat would be exported, but some of it would be used for feed. Other crops could be produced and sold freely at the assumed prices (table 3).

With program E, the farmer could carry over wheat to apply against his marketing allotment, and he or the trade would store any extra production.

No controls (program F): Under program F, wheat and other crops could be produced in any quantity as no acreage or marketing restrictions would be in effect. Wheat would sell at a nonsupported price, $1.25 a bushel, U.S. average. Other crops would sell at the assumed prices (table 3). There would be no land-reserve program.

The chief production-control and price features of the programs studied may be summarized as follows:

Program	Control	Wheat support level	Price of wheat
			Dollars
A	1960 acreage allotment	75 percent of parity	1.80
B	75 percent of 1960 acreage allotment	85 percent of parity	2.04
C	120 percent of 1960 acreage allotment	65 percent of parity	1.56
D	Marketing allotment: ⅔ normal yield on 1960 wheat base acreage	do	1.56
	Food wheat quota: 5/12 normal yield on 1960 wheat base acreage	80 cents a bushel	
E	Marketing allotment: 5/12 normal yield times 1960 wheat base acreage	90 percent of parity	2.16
F	None	None	1.25

With other specifications, the programs would affect the study farms differently. For example, if in program C, the price of wheat were at 70 instead of 65 percent of parity, net farm income would be about equal to that with program A.

ECONOMIC SETTING FOR ADJUSTMENTS

The adjustments that wheat farmers make to programs are influenced by several key things. One is the comparative returns from wheat and alternative crops. Another is the restriction imposed by crop sequences—crop A may readily follow crop B but not crop C. This becomes important when the choice includes fall-seeded and spring-seeded crops and when some crops are grown on fallow and others in annual cropping.

Traditionally, wheat has been the crop of highest return on the study farms. Generally, it is the crop best adapted ecologically to climate and soils. It often yields more pounds of grain per acre than other crops, except the recent hybrid sorghums, which in some instances yield equally well.

For various reasons, wheat may be grown on study farms when comparative average returns seem to favor other crops. Farmers seed wheat whenever crop prospects are especially favorable because high-yielding wheat may pay better, even at a moderate price, than another crop. Moreover, yield prospects for the other crop may not be as good at the time. Some farmers may prefer to grow only one crop (wheat) because two or more crops would complicate storage. Other farmers have other reasons.

After wheat, the next best paying crop on the study farms usually is a feed grain (table 4). Much of the land is diverted to production of feed grains when the acreage of wheat is restricted by programs. Budget analyses show that returns from forage are not as high as returns from feed grains on the study farms. Forage crops may pay better on farms that specialize in livestock.

On the west-central Kansas study farm, net returns from grain sorghum are higher than wheat at a nonsupported price but lower than wheat priced at 65 percent of parity (table 4). Net returns from grain sorghum are nearly equal to returns from fallow-wheat priced at 65 percent of parity. Most wheat is grown under annual cropping, but in periods of low rainfall some wheat is grown on fallow. Another consideration is that farmers wish to maintain their wheat base acreage when acreage allotments are in effect.

Grain sorghum is the best paying alternative crop to winter wheat on the northwestern Kansas farm. Net returns from grain sorghum at the assumed price are higher than the returns from wheat at the nonsupported price but lower than those from wheat priced at 65 percent of parity (table 4). However, farmers restrict the acreage of grain sorghum because it creates an erosion hazard, especially when it is grown on fallow land. Grain sorghum after wheat, as when in a wheat-grain sorghum-fallow rotation, is less erosive.

On the Oklahoma study farm, grain sorghum pays better than other grain crops, although even at a feed price, it is a relatively poor alternative to winter wheat. Hence this study farm would grow little, if any, grain sorghum if the acreage of wheat were not restricted by programs. Both wheat and sorghum are grown without the use of fallow.

Grain sorghum is also the best paying alternative crop to winter wheat on the Colorado study farm, although returns per acre are somewhat below those from wheat priced at 65 percent of parity. Much of the sorghum is grown on abandoned winter wheat land; wheat abandonment, resulting mainly from low rainfall, averages about 29 percent of the seeded acreage. If not planted to sorghum, the abandoned wheatland can be summer fallowed and may be seeded back to winter wheat in the fall.

Spring-seeded barley is the chief crop alternative to wheat on the Montana study farms. Even so, returns from barley are relatively low, averaging less than wheat at a feed price (table 4). Consequently, little, if any, barley is grown profitably on the study farms except when programs control the acreage of wheat. Because of limited moisture, both wheat and barley are grown on fallow. On the northeastern Montana farm, both crops are spring seeded. Fall-seeded wheat is grown on the north-central Montana farm. If the wheat winterkills, the land can be seeded to spring wheat or barley and a crop will be made the same year.

On the Washington study farm, winter wheat is the major crop, although spring wheat is seeded on fields where the winter wheat kills out. Winter wheat is now grown chiefly in annual cropping, whereas 10 to 20 years ago it was usually grown on fallow. At that time, the problem with annual cropping was the slow rate of decomposition of straw from the preceding crop, which meant that the soil nitrogen was tied up and the wheat seedling starved. Nitrogen fertilizer is now applied to hasten decomposition and to feed the young seedlings. The shift to annual cropping and the use of fertilizer has greatly increased the capacity of this farm for wheat production. Some clean, cultivated fallow has been retained chiefly to control thistle and other weeds. The chief alternative crops are barley and dry peas, but at the assumed prices, neither crop would pay as well as wheat—even at a feed price (table 4). Pea production is held in check by market prices rather than availability of land. Hence, barley is the chief alternative crop when wheat acreage is restricted by programs. Wheat, barley, and peas may be grown on fallow or in annual cropping.

On the Oregon study farm, winter wheat is the best-adapted and best-paying crop. Wheat is grown on fallow land. Annual cropping with the aid of nitrogen fertilization has been tried, but it has no advantage over the fallow system in the locale of the study farm. Spring wheat is seeded on abandoned fields of fall-seeded wheat. Barley, the next best paying crop, gives a return much below that of wheat even at a feed price. Traditionally, the barley has been a spring-seeded variety but in recent years, hardy fall-seeded varieties that yield more bushels than spring barley have been

developed. Both wheat and barley are grown on fallow land.

ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAMS

In this section, the adjustments that the study farms would make to maximize profits under each program are discussed. The effects on acreage and production of wheat and other crops and on expenses and net returns are observed. Since the present situation on study farms is represented essentially by program A, this program is the basis for comparing other programs.

Program A—1960 wheat acreage allotments and prices

Program A is similar to the 1960 wheat program except that no land-reserve program is assumed. The wheat acreage allotments would average about 65 to 70 percent of the acreage of wheat grown before allotments came into effect in 1954. Allotments would be in terms of acreage harvested. Wheat prices would be supported at a U.S. average price of $1.80 a bushel, about 75 percent of parity.

TABLE 4.—*Net return per acre, wheat and alternative crops, study farms* [1]

Item	West-central Kansas		Northwestern Kansas [2]	Northwestern Oklahoma	Eastern Colorado [2]	Northeastern Montana	North-central Montana	Eastern Washington	Columbia Basin, Oreg.
	Continuous wheat [2]	Wheat-fallow [2]							
Wheat at—									
90 percent of parity	$16.18	$14.14	$12.79	$18.90	$10.17	$11.29	$16.38	$79.50	$23.70
85 percent of parity	15.06	12.47	11.80	17.39	9.50	10.34	15.13	73.74	22.35
75 percent of parity	12.91	10.66	10.10	13.95	8.23	8.64	12.73	62.72	18.12
65 percent of parity	10.03	8.31	7.95	10.52	6.90	6.81	10.11	51.71	14.47
Nonsupported price	6.96	5.62	5.58	6.23	5.17	4.75	7.60	36.38	9.13
Feed price	6.18	5.58	5.13	4.52	4.00	3.72	6.35	36.38	9.13
Other crops:									
Grain sorghum	8.09		6.84	3.75	6.00				
Barley						3.06	5.37	31.47	6.89
Peas								20.06	
Land reserve on—[3]									
Continuously cropped land	6.80		8.27	11.37	7.39			13.72	
Crop-fallowed land		5.68	5.52		5.39	4.85	5.55	8.79	9.50

[1] Return to cover depreciation management and use of capital. Return per acre of land used: Average for 2 acres where crop is grown on fallow; wheat on the Oregon, Montana, Colorado, and northwestern Kansas study farms; barley on the Oregon and Montana study farms. Based on prices in table 3, and 1960 cost rates.

[2] Return for wheat includes net income from grain sorghum grown on abandoned wheatland.

[3] Based on average accepted bid rates, 1960 conservation reserve program.

With program A, all study farms would maximize profits by growing their full acreage allotment of wheat. All would use the land diverted from wheat for production of feed grains and other crops. On the Kansas, Oklahoma, and Colorado study farms, the diversion would be mainly to grain sorghum, and on the Montana, Washington, and Oregon study farms, it would be mainly to barley. The west-central Kansas farm would have more summer fallow than it would have without the program. The additional fallow would be used in the wheat enterprise, with more of the wheat seeded on summer fallow and less in annual cropping. The Colorado farm would have less fallow acreage with program A, along with the reduced acreage of wheat. Ordinarily, grain sorghum, the alternative crop, would not be grown on summer fallow. Both Montana farms and the Oregon farm would maintain the prior acreage in fallow because barley, the alternative crop, is also grown on fallow land. The Washington farm would also maintain its prior acreage of fallow to control thistle and other weeds.

The acreage and production of crops, the expenses, and the net returns to management and invested capital with program A for each of the study farms are shown in table 5.

Program B—Smaller wheat acreage allotments, higher prices

Wheat acreage allotments would be a fourth smaller than under program A, but the price of wheat is assumed to be supported at 85 percent of parity, instead of 75 percent as under program A. The increase in price, about 24 cents a bushel, would not compensate fully for the reduction in wheat production. Therefore, gross income from wheat would be reduced about 15 percent. For example, suppose that under program A, a farm has a wheat allotment of 100 acres and a gross income of $3,000. Without program B, the allotment would be 75 acres, and the gross return from wheat $2,550.[1] But more land would be available for producing other crops. For example, a farm with 100 acres of wheat base and a wheat allotment of 68 acres under program A, would have 32 acres available for other crops. Under program B, the wheat allotment would be 51 acres, which would leave 49 acres for other crops.

With program B, operators of all study farms would seed their full though reduced allotted acreage of wheat. All of the land released from wheat would be diverted to production of feed grains, except on the western Kansas study farm. This farmer would divert some of the released land to summer fallow for use in the wheat enterprise. The acreage of feed grain (sorghum) would increase 20 percent. The increase in acreage of feed grains on the study farms in Oklahoma, Montana, and Oregon would be roughly 50 percent. But on the northwestern Kansas and Colorado study farms, the feed grain acreage would nearly double because for each acre of wheat removed from a wheat-fallow system, 2 acres of sorghum could be grown. Operators of the Montana and Oregon farms would shift from wheat-fallow to barley-fallow. The operator of the Oklahoma farm would shift from annual wheat to annual grain sorghum.

Total production of all grain (wheat and feed grains) would remain essentially unchanged on six study farms. But it would increase about 11 percent on the northwestern Kansas farm and about 16 percent on the Colorado farm, because of the shift from wheat fallow to annual cropped sorghum.

Although gross income from wheat would be lower with program B, the difference would be approximately compensated for by the income from the crops grown on land released from wheat production (table 6). Farm expenses would change hardly at all because the costs of growing feed grains would be similar to those of growing wheat.

With program B, net returns to management and invested capital on the four study farms in Montana, Washington, and Oregon would be within 2 percent of the returns with program A. But net returns on the four study farms in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Colorado would be increased by 5 to 9 percent with program B. Program B seems to favor slightly the study farms on which the alternative crop, for instance grain sorghum, is grown annually in contrast to farms on which the alternative crop, such as barley, is grown on fallow.

Although program B would affect the study farms differently, the effect would be somewhat more uniform than those of the other programs considered.

[1] Computed: 75 acres at 85%/75% × $30 + $2,550.

TABLE 5.—*Land use, production, and income on study farms with program A*

Budget item	Unit	Kansas		Northeastern Oklahoma	Eastern Colorado	Montana		Eastern Washington	Columbia Basin, Oreg.
		Central	Northwestern			Northeastern	North-central		
Land use:									
Wheat on fallow	Acre	110	270		550	405	405		520
Wheat, continuous cropping	do	170		473				166	
Grain sorghum	do	138	162	262	364				
Barley	do					173	173	163	280
Summer fallow	do	122	338		886	578	578	87	800
Peas	do							104	
Production: [1]									
Wheat	Bushel	4,444	5,510	6,786	8,204	5,954	8,465	8,238	16,120
Grain sorghum	do	2,932	2,890	3,925	4,365				
Barley	do					3,399	4,817	7,792	10,456
All grain	Ton	215	246	313	368	260	370	434	735
Peas	Hundredweight							1,210	

[1] Excludes seed.

TABLE 5.—*Land use, production, and income on study farms with program A*—Continued

Budget item	Unit	Kansas		North-eastern Oklahoma	Eastern Colorado	Montana		Eastern Washington	Columbia Basin, Oreg.
		Central	North-western			North-eastern	North-central		
Income:									
Wheat	Dollar	8,088	9,863	12,079	14,521	10,241	13,629	14,417	28,855
Grain sorghum	do	2,990	2,890	3,728	3,754				
Barley	do					2,447	3,324	6,389	9,097
Peas	do							4,356	
Total	do	11,078	12,753	15,807	18,275	12,688	16,953	25,162	37,952
Expenses [2]	do	6,403	6,998	10,059	7,762	6,666	7,194	12,987	20,140
Net return [3]	do	4,675	5,755	5,748	10,513	6,022	9,756	12,175	17,812

[2] Includes all expenses except a charge for use of capital. Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates.

[3] To management and capital.

TABLE 6.—*Changes on study farms with program B*

[25 percent smaller wheat acreage allotments, wheat price at 85 percent of parity]

[In percent]

Study farm	Change in acreage of—			Change in production, all grain	Change in gross income from—			Change in net returns [1]
	Wheat	Feed grain	Fallow		Wheat	Feed grain	All sources	
West-central Kansas	−25	20	35	0	−6	23	2	7
Northwestern Kansas	−25	95	−25	11	−17	83	6	5
Northwestern Oklahoma	−25	45	[2]	1	−12	45	1	6
Eastern Colorado	−25	99	−25	16	−15	99	8	9
Northeastern Montana	−25	58	0	1	−15	58	−1	−2
North-central Montana	−25	58	0	1	−14	59	0	0
Eastern Washington	−25	25	0	−1	−16	32	−1	−2
Columbia Basin, Oreg.	−25	46	0	0	−14	46	1	2

[1] Return to management and capital.

[2] No fallow used on this farm.

Program C—Larger wheat acreage allotments, lower prices

Wheat acreage allotments under program C are assumed to be a fifth larger than under program A, but the price of wheat would be supported at 65 percent of parity instead of 75 percent as in program A.

Even with the lower price, wheat would be a better paying crop on the study farms than feed grain at the assumed prices (table 4). The advantage of wheat would be substantial on the Montana, Washington, and Oregon farms where barley is the alternative grain crop. Wheat would have less advantage over grain sorghum on the Kansas and Colorado farms.

Because of the income advantage operators of the eight study farms would seed their full, expanded wheat acreage allotments. They would do this by taking land from feed grains. The operator of the west-central Kansas farm would also take some land out of summer fallow and would grow more of his wheat in annual cropping.

The larger acreage in wheat with program C would compensate for the decrease in price of the wheat—about 24 cents a bushel—so that gross income from the wheat enterprise with program C would be about 4 percent higher than with program A. For example, a farm with 100 acres of wheat allotment and a gross income of $3,000 from wheat with program A would have an allotment of 120 acres and a gross income of $3,120 from wheat with program C.[2] Gross income from wheat would be reduced 5 and 7 percent, respectively, on the west-central and northwestern Kansas farms (table 7). But income from other crops would not decrease as much on these farms as on other study farms.

With more land in wheat under program C, less land would be available for producing other crops. The acreages available for other crops on study farms would be decreased by roughly half. For example, on a farm with 100 acres of wheat base and a wheat allotment of 68 acres under program A, 32 acres would be left for other crops. Under program C, the wheat allotment would be increased to 82 acres, so only 18 acres of the base acreage would remain for other crops. Allotments of study farms would deviate somewhat from this proportion. Associated with the reduction in available land would be a nearly proportionate reduction in gross income from other crops, that is, feed grains (table 7). This loss in income would be greatest, percentagewise, on the Oklahoma, Colorado, Montana, and Oregon farms.

Gross farm income—from all crops—under program C would be reduced by 4 to 10 percent on the study farms. The reduction would be slightly greater on the Kansas, Oklahoma, and Colorado farms than on those in Montana, Washington, and Oregon.

Under program C, net returns to management and invested capital would be reduced on all study farms (table 7). The reduction would be greatest on the Oklahoma, Kansas, and Colorado farms—those having grain sorghum as the alternative grain crop. The reduction would range from 8 to 14 percent on the farms in Montana, Washington, and Oregon—those having barley as the alternative grain crop.

[2] Computed: 120 acres @ 65%/75% × $30 + $3,120.

TABLE 7.—*Changes on study farms with program C*

[20 percent larger wheat acreage allotments, wheat price at 65 percent of parity]

[In percent]

Study farm	Change in acreage of—			Change in production, all grain	Change in gross income from—			Change in net returns [1]
	Wheat	Feed grain	Fallow		Wheat	Feed grain	All sources	
West-central Kansas	20	−16	−28	0	−5	−18	−8	−22
Northeastern Kansas	20	−10	−11	1	−7	−14	−9	−22
Northwestern Oklahoma	20	−36	[2]	−3	2	−42	−8	−25
Eastern Colorado	20	−63	13	−8	4	−63	−10	−15
Northeastern Montana	20	−47	0	−1	3	−47	−7	−13
North-central Montana	20	−27	0	−1	1	−47	−8	−14
Eastern Washington	20	−20	0	1	5	−24	−4	−8
Columbia Basin, Oreg.	20	−37	0	1	4	−37	−6	−13

[1] Return to management and capital.

[2] No fallow used on this farm.

TABLE 8.—*Marketing allotments and food wheat quotas with program D, study farms*

Study farm	Wheat base acreage [1]	Production on base [2]	Marketing allotment [3]	Food wheat quota [4]
	Acres	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*
West-central Kansas	440	6,380	4,249	2,654
Northwestern Kansas	417	6,338	4,226	2,645
Northwestern Oklahoma	718	10,275	6,851	4,486
Eastern Colorado	803	12,306	8,203	5,015
Northeastern Montana	578	9,090	6,060	3,784
North-central Montana	578	12,696	8,465	5,278
Eastern Washington	255	12,495	8,330	5,194
Columbia Basin, Oreg	800	25,584	17,056	10,656

[1] As defined by ASC program.
[2] With normal yields.
[3] Computed as 2/3 of the production on the base.
[4] Computed as 5/12 of the production on the base.

With program C, the price of the wheat would need to be supported at about 70 instead of 60 percent of parity, to achieve the same net return to management and invested capital as with program A.

Production of all grain measured in tons would not differ greatly between programs C and A, except on the Colorado farm, where it would drop by 8 percent under program C.

Program D—Marketing allotments on food and export wheat, stratified prices

Under program D, each farm would have a marketing allotment in bushels equal to two-thirds of the normal yield on its 1960 wheat base acreage. This quantity of wheat is assumed to be supported at a U.S. average price of $1.56 a bushel, or about 65 percent of parity. Other wheat could be produced and sold freely at a feed-equivalent price. Each farm would have a food wheat quota in bushels equal to five-twelfths of the normal yield on its 1960 wheat base acreage. It is further assumed that a payment of 80 cents a bushel of the food quota could be earned by contracting 20 percent of the wheat base acreage in a land reserve. Land in the reserve would earn annual payments equal to the 1960 rates of the conservation reserve program. If wheat is usually grown on fallow, an equal acreage of fallow land would be put into the reserve at a reduced nondiversion rate.

The eight study farms would grow their full marketing allotments (bushels) of wheat as computed in table 8. With a support price of 65 percent of parity, wheat would pay better than the next most profitable crop—feed grains—on each study farm (table 4).

Each of the study farms would also place 20 percent of its wheat base acreage in the land reserve, as would be required to earn the payment of 80 cents a bushel on food quota wheat. This payment, together with the rental payment, would represent a higher return on the reserve acreage than any other available use of the land. Suppose a farm has a wheat base of 100 acres, with a normal wheat yield of 18 bushels, and the land-reserve payment is $10 an acre, at the diversion rate. The food wheat quota would be 750 bushels (100×5/12×18), and the payment would be $600 (750×80 cents). The 20 acres in the land reserve would earn a rental payment of $200. These two payments together would average $40 for each acre in the reserve. In a wheat-fallow area, another 20 acres would be placed in the reserve at the nondiversion rate and would earn a rental payment of $100. The total payment of $900 would average $22.50 an acre for the 40 acres in the land reserve. Returns computed in this way for each study farm are higher than the returns from other available uses of the reserve land. Readers are reminded that the food quota payment is assumed to be independent of the marketing allotment and can be earned only by participation in the land reserve.

Growing the marketing-allotment wheat and meeting the land-reserve requirement for the food quota payment would account for about 90 percent of the wheat base acreage and the associated fallow on the study farms. This would leave only about 10 percent for such other uses as growing feed wheat and other feed grains. This would compare with about 30 to 35 percent of the acreage available for nonwheat uses under program A.

The Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Oklahoma farms would use the remaining 10 percent of their wheat base acreage to grow feed wheat, because it would pay better than barley or grain sorghum (table 4). Also, with wheat grown on the remaining land, ample supplies of wheat would be more nearly assured to fill marketing quotas in periods of below-average yields. These farms would grow no feed grains with program D (table 9). But both Kansas farms would grow grain sorghum in preference to feed wheat. The Colorado study farm would seed all its land to allotment wheat because the average rate of abandonment is so high. The Colorado farm would grow grain sorghum on part of its wheat seedings that fail to make a crop. Except for the Oklahoma farm, all study farms would have less land in fallow with program D, chiefly because of the land-reserve requirement. The Oklahoma study farm would not have this requirement because it would grow wheat cropped annually. The west-central Kansas farm would reduce its fallow acreage even more because it would grow more of its wheat in annual cropping. The Washington study farm would have less need for clean cultivated fallow to control weeds. With some acreage in the reserve, less land would be farmed.

Production of all grain (wheat and feed grains) in tons would be about 20 to 30 percent smaller except on the Washington study farm, where it would be about 4 percent smaller (table 9).

Gross cash returns on study farms would be about the same as with program A on the Kansas farms and from 7 to 14 percent higher on the other farms (table 9). Net returns would be improved even more because farm expenses would be lower with land in the reserve. Net returns to management and invested capital would be slightly higher than with program A on the northwestern Kansas farm, 15 percent higher on the west-central Kansas farm, and 20 to 39 percent higher on the other study farms. With program D, income effects on the representative wheat farms would vary widely from area to area.

TABLE 9.—*Changes on study farms with program D*

[In percent]

Study farm	Change in acreage of—			Change in production, all grain	Change in gross income from—			Change in net returns [1]
	Wheat	Feed grain	Fallow		Wheat	Feed grain	All sources	
West-central Kansas	4	−64	−44	−28	9	−67	1	15
Northwestern Kansas	−23	−15	−23	−21	−12	−15	−2	3
Northwestern Oklahoma	25	−100	(2)	−21	28	−100	10	39
Eastern Colorado	−3	−72	−5	−25	13	−72	7	20
Northeastern Montana	14	−100	−20	−22	24	−100	11	38
North-central Montana	14	−100	−20	−22	24	−100	9	25
Eastern Washington	73	−100	−10	−4	62	−100	14	34
Columbia Basin, Oreg	23	−100	−20	−19	33	−100	12	37

[1] Returns to management and capital.
[2] No fallow used on this farm.

Program E—Marketing allotments on food wheat, stratified prices

Under this assumed program, each farm would have a marketing allotment in bushels equal to five-twelfths of the normal yield on its 1960 wheat base acreage. This quantity of wheat is supported at a U.S. average price of $2.16 a bushel, about 90 percent of parity. For purposes of the study, the marketing allotment was presumed to be the farm share of the wheat required for domestic food use—the food wheat quota in program D. Other wheat could be produced and sold at the nonsupported price which, for purposes of the study, was assumed to be $1.25 a bushel, U.S. average. This other wheat could be exported, used industrially, or used for feed. Other crops, such as feed grains, could be produced on any remaining land, for sale at the assumed prices (table 3). There would be no land-reserve program.

In adjusting to program E, each of the study farms would produce the marketing allotment (bushels) of wheat. The allotment could be produced on about 44 percent of the wheat base acreage, leaving about 56 percent for production of other wheat, feed grains, or other crops. The choice would depend largely upon the relative returns from these crops.

Returns from grain sorghum at the assumed price would be substantially higher than returns from wheat at the nonsupported price on both Kansas study farms. Consequently, these farms would grow as many acres of grain sorghum as they could grow safely in view of the erosion hazard. They would use any remaining land for production of wheat for sale at the nonsupported price. Although grain sorghum would pay slightly better than wheat at the nonsupported price on the Colorado farm, the difference would not be sufficient to

overcome a reluctance to change enterprises. Thus, the Colorado farm would produce no grain sorghum with program E, except on part of its wheat seedings that fail. On the Oklahoma, Montana, Washington, and Oregon farms, wheat grown would be at the nonsupported price in preference to feed grains, because wheat would bring a higher return (table 4). Also, by growing wheat on the remaining land, ample supplies of wheat would be more nearly assured to fill marketing quotas in periods of below-average yields. On the Kansas and Colorado farms, acreages of summer fallow would be reduced, whereas in the Oregon, Washington, and Montana farms, the same fallow acreages as in program A would be kept.

Total wheat production would increase with program E on all study farms except those in Kansas. On these farms, it would decrease. Wheat production would be nearly a sixth larger on the Colorado farm than with program A. It would be nearly a half larger on the Oklahoma, Montana, and Oregon farms, and nearly twice the wheat production under program A on the Washington farm.

The effect of program E on total grain production (tons) would also vary among the study farms. Grain production would decrease 5 percent on the Oklahoma farm and 11 percent on the Colorado farm. In contrast, grain production would increase 8 percent on the northwestern Kansas farm, and 10 percent on the Washington farm. On the other study farms—west-central Kansas, Montana, and Oregon—grain production would change very little. These differences would result from the relative yields of wheat and other grains. If the yields were equal, a shift in acreages between the crops would not affect total grain production. If the yields were unequal, the size of the shift would also affect the degree of change.

Income from wheat would increase with program E on all except the Kansas farms. On these farms, it would decrease because less wheat would be produced. These farmers would grow as much grain sorghum as they could grow with program E. On the other study farms, income from wheat would increase with program E because these farmers would grow only wheat. Except for the Colorado farmer, who would plant grain sorghum on part of the wheat seedings that fail, they would grow no other grains. Total gross income would decrease slightly on two study farms, would be unchanged on one, would increase roughly 5 percent on 4, and would increase by 12 percent on the Washington farm (table 10).

Program E would affect diversely the net returns to management and invested capital on each study farm, even if each made the most profitable adjustments available. Net return would be 4 to 19 percent higher than in program A on 5 of the farms but 2 to 11 percent lower on 3 farms. The Kansas and Colorado farms would have decreases. The Washington farm would have the largest increase in net returns followed by the Montana, Oregon, and Oklahoma farms in that order.

TABLE 10.—*Changes on study farms with program E*

[In percent]

Study farm	Change in acreage of—			Change in production, all grain	Change in gross income from—			Change in net returns[1]
	Wheat	Feed grain	Fallow		Wheat	Feed grain	All sources	
West-central Kansas	7	19	−38	3	−3	9	0	−4
Northwestern Kansas	−16	59	−16	8	−19	55	−2	−11
Northwestern Oklahoma	55	−100	(2)	−5	35	−100	4	4
Eastern Colorado	16	−64	16	−11	12	−64	−3	−2
Northeastern Montana	43	−100	0	−2	32	−100	6	14
North-central Montana	43	−100	0	−2	32	−100	6	11
Eastern Washington	98	−100	0	10	65	−100	12	19
Columbia Basin, Oreg	54	−100	0	−2	37	−100	4	9

[1] Return to management and capital.

[2] No fallow used on this farm.

Program F—No production controls, no support prices

Under program F, farmers would be free to produce wheat and other crops in any quantity and in any combination they wished, to the extent of their resources, for sale at nonsupported prices. U.S. average prices assumed per bushel are wheat $1.25, barley $0.90, and grain sorghum $1.01. Corresponding prices of these crops for study farms are shown in table 3. Program F would have no provision for a land reserve.

Wheat production at the assumed nonsupported price would return more income per acre than barley on the Oregon, Washington, and Montana farms (table 4). These farmers would grow a maximum acreage of wheat and no barley. Wheat would also pay better than grain sorghum on the Oklahoma farm. This farmer also would grow a maximum acreage of wheat. But on the two Kansas farms, wheat would not pay as well as grain sorghum. So operators of these farms would grow as much grain sorghum, with program F, as they could grow safely without serious hazard to erosion. Although grain sorghum would seem to pay a little better than wheat (at nonsupport prices) on the Colorado farm, this farmer prefers to grow wheat. As mentioned previously, he seeds winter wheat on all available land whenever crop prospects are favorable at the fall seeding date. He prefers not to take the chance that crop prospects may not be as good for grain sorghum the following spring. The Colorado study farmer grows grain sorghum as a catch crop when winter wheat seedings fail. Other changes on study farms are found in table 11.

The effects of program F on total grain production would vary on the different farms. Little or no change from program A would occur on the west-central Kansas, Montana, and Oregon farms (table 11). Grain production would increase about 10 percent on the northwestern Kansas and Washington farms. It would decrease 5 percent on the Oklahoma farm and 11 percent on the Colorado farm. This means that a shift from other grains to wheat would increase total grain output if wheat yielded more pounds of grain per acre, and it would decrease the total output if wheat yielded less per acre than feed grain. Study farms differ in this respect.

TABLE 11.—*Changes on study farms with program F*

[In percent]

Study farm	Change in acreage of—			Change in production, all grain	Change in gross income from—			Change in net returns[1]
	Wheat	Feed grain	Fallow		Wheat	Feed grain	All sources	
West-central Kansas	22	−18	−31	0	−22	−21	−21	−52
Northwestern Kansas	−1	56	−26	9	−38	48	−18	−49
Northwestern Oklahoma	55	−100	(3)	−5	2	−100	−22	−66
Eastern Colorado	16	−64	16	−11	−20	−64	−29	−47
Northeastern Montana	43	−100	0	−2	−1	−100	−20	−42
North-central Montana	43	−100	0	−2	−1	−100	−20	−35
Eastern Washington	98	−100	0	10	32	−100	−7	−19
Columbia Basin, Oreg	54	−100	0	−2	4	−100	−21	−44

[1] Return to management and capital.

[2] No fallow used on this farm.

Although wheat production would increase, with program F, the gross income from wheat would actually fall on three of the study farms because of the lower price of wheat. Wheat income would be lower on the Kansas and Colorado farms. It would change very little on four study farms—those in Oklahoma, Montana, and Oregon. And it would increase substantially only on the Washington farm (table 11).

Gross farm income from all sources would be lower with program F on all study farms. On six of the farms, the reduction would be about 20 percent, but it would range from 7 percent on the Washington farm to 29 percent on the Colorado farm.

Net returns would decrease even more than gross returns with program F because expenses would be about the same as with program A. Program F would reduce the net return to management and invested capital by 19 percent on the Washington farm. The reduction would be 35 to 44 percent on the Montana and Oregon farms, about 50 percent on the Kansas and Colorado farms, and 66 percent on the Oklahoma farm.

Adjustments With a Land-Reserve Program for Cropland

A land reserve is a device for holding land out of production. It may or many not reduce the production of a specific crop. The recent acreage-reserve program reduced the acreage of allotment crops because it applied solely to these crops. But a reserve program might be unrelated to any specific crop; it would merely reduce the total acreage of crops on the farm, as did the 1958–60 conservation reserve program. This is the kind of reserve program discussed here.

Because the reserve land could come out of the acreage of any crop, it would tend to come first from the least profitable crops. If rental payments per acre were high enough and funds were available, the program would eventually reach the land now producing wheat. Before wheat production could be affected significantly in the study farm areas, the reserve would need to take the land out of less profitable crops such as oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, and forages. The question is, What rate of annual rental payments per acre for reserve land would exceed the returns from these crops?

Land-reserve programs would mean a different kind of decision for the farmer than would either acreage-allotment or marketing-allotment programs. In the two latter programs the choice would be among crops within the present scale of farming operations. The land reserve would offer the choice of reduced scale of operations or of quitting farming. The farmer would need to consider what productive use he could make of his time (labor and management) and the capital that would be released from farming. A combination of part-time (or no) farming, land in the reserve, and part-time (or full) nonfarm employment might yield a larger net income than full-time farming. The nonfarm opportunities available to operators of the study farms were not considered. Such opportunities would depend upon both the availability of job opportunities and the training, aptitudes, and interests of the farmer. Instead, the net returns from farming with and without land in the reserve are compared and any nonfarm opportunities the farmer may have are disregarded.

For simplicity of analysis, the returns from crops and from the land reserve are compared using the data in table 4. The returns shown for the reserve are based on 1960 rental payment rates of the conservation reserve program.[3] When cropland is diverted from either wheat or barley grown on fallow, 2 acres are involved—one earns the full diversion rate and the other the nondiversion, or half rate. When cropland is diverted from a continuous crop, the 1 acre earns the full rate. The return from the land reserve under each circumstance is shown in table 4. The net return shown represents the rental payment minus taxes, insurance, and repairs to buildings and fences. Depreciation on equipment was not subtracted from returns of either the crops or the land reserve; for this analysis, depreciation is considered a business expense. To the extent that depreciation would be reduced, the reserve would be more attractive than the data indicate.

With these assumptions, the net return per acre from the land reserve compared with the net returns from crops on study farms is summarized as follows:

	Return per acre from the reserve higher than—
West central Kansas	Wheat at feed price.
Northwestern Kansas	Wheat at feed price and grain sorghum.
Northwestern Oklahoma	Wheat at 65 percent of parity and grain sorghum.
Eastern Colorado	Wheat at the nonsupported price and grain sorghum.
Northwestern Montana	Wheat at the nonsupported price and barley.
North central Montana	Wheat at feed price and barley.
Eastern Washington	None.
Oregon	Wheat at the nonsupported price and barley.

If a land reserve with the assumed rates of payment were added to the programs considered in the study, the reserve would bring a higher return per acre than the following crops and might compete with them:

	Land reserve could compete with—
All programs	Feed grains on all farms except west-central Kansas and eastern Washington.
Program C	Wheat on Oklahoma farm.
Program D	Feed wheat on all farms except north-central Montana and eastern Washington; wheat on Oklahoma farm.
Program E	Wheat at nonsupported price on Oklahoma, Colorado, northeastern Montana, and eastern Washington farms.
Program F	All wheat on northwestern Oklahoma, eastern Colorado, northeastern Montana and Oregon farms.

These comparisons suggest that in any land-reserve program, the rental rates should be carefully considered if the desired adjustments in land use are to be accomplished.

PATTERNS OF ADJUSTMENT ON STUDY FARMS

Study farms provide interesting similarities and contrasts in their patterns of adjustment to the array of programs considered in the study. Of particular interest are the production patterns of wheat and feed grains, and the patterns of expenses and returns. These patterns are shown in figures 1 to 4, based on data from budget summaries in tables 12 through 19. The charts depict relationships only for the specific programs and prices assumed in the study.

West central Kansas farm: Total grain production in tons would be about the same with all programs except D, in which some land would be idled by the reserve. With the other programs, the variation in wheat production would be compensated for by an almost equal and opposite variation in production of feed grains. Expenses would be about the same except with programs D, in which they would be lower because some land would not be farmed.

Northwestern Kansas farm: Total grain production would be about 10 percent higher with programs B, E, and F, those under which more land would be in grain sorghum and less in wheat. With program B, the wheat acreage restriction would cause a shift to sorghum production. But with programs E and F, the shift to grain sorghum would be due to the lower returns from wheat at nonsupported or feed prices. Net returns would be highest with program B, lowest with program F, and about the same with other programs. This farm alone would have the highest net return with program B.

Northwestern Oklahoma farm: Total grain production would decrease with any shift of land from grain sorghum to wheat as with programs C, D, E, and F. Expenses are about the same except with program D, in which some land is in the reserve. Net returns would vary widely; they would be highest with program D, followed by programs B, E, A, C, and F.

Eastern Colorado farm: As on the northwestern Kansas farm, total grain production would vary inversely with the acreage in wheat. Grain production would be largest with program B, under which wheat production would be most restricted. Grain production would be about 10 percent smaller with programs E and F, under which there would be a choice between wheat and grain sorghum, than with program A. Net returns would vary widely; they would be higher with programs D and B and lowest with program F.

Montana farms: the northeastern and north-central Montana farms would have similar patterns of production and income adjustments. Total grain production would be smaller with program D but would be about the same with the other programs. A substantial part of the grain would consist of barley with programs A, B, and C but entirely of wheat with programs E and F. Net returns would be enhanced with programs D and E and greatly depressed with program F.

Eastern Washington farm: Total grain production on this farm would be about the same with acreage-allotment programs A, B, and C, but it would be increased substantially with programs E and F, under which wheat acreage would not be restricted. With programs E and F, wheat would be the only kind of grain produced. As with the other farms, expenses would be about the same under all programs except D. The pattern of net returns would be similar to those on the Montana farms—highest with program D followed by program E, then A and B, then C, and lowest with program F.

Columbia Basin, Oreg., farm: The pattern of total grain production on this farm would be about the same as the pattern on the Montana farms—about the same production with programs A, B, and C, and slightly lower with programs E and F, under which only wheat would be produced. The pattern of net returns would be similar also—highest with program D and lowest with program F.

[3] We assume no limitation in payment per farm.

ADDITIONAL TABLES BY PROGRAMS

TABLE 12.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the west-central Kansas farm (540 acres cropland, 440 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Wheat on fallow	Acre	110	149	79	61	68	76
Wheat, continuous cropping	do	170	61	157	230	232	267
Grain sorghum	do	138	165	116	49	164	113
Summer fallow	do	122	165	88	68	76	84
Land reserve	do				132		
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	4,444	3,776	4,969	4,249	4,424	5,033
Grain sorghum	do	2,932	3,598	2,397	960	3,208	2,325
Total grain	Ton	215	214	216	154	223	216
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	8,088	7,628	7,702	8,815	7,830	6,342
Grain sorghum	do	2,990	3,671	2,445	980	3,273	2,371
Land reserve	do				1,375		
Gross income	do	11,078	11,299	10,147	11,170	11,103	8,713
Expenses [2]	do	6,403	6,297	6,483	5,804	6,620	6,487
Net return [3]	do	4,675	5,002	3,664	5,366	4,483	2,226

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[3] Return to management and capital.

TABLE 13.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the northwestern Kansas farm (770 acres cropland, 417 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Wheat on fallow	Acre	270	202	240	207	228	200
Wheat, continuous cropping	do			84			67
Grain sorghum	do	162	316	146	138	257	253
Summer fallow	do	338	252	300	259	285	250
Land reserve	do				166		
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	5,510	4,108	5,982	4,226	4,645	4,941
Grain sorghum	do	2,890	5,294	2,482	2,450	4,485	4,305
Total grain	Ton	246	271	249	195	265	269
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	9,863	8,216	9,153	8,635	7,967	6,127
Grain sorghum	do	2,890	5,294	2,482	2,450	4,485	4,272
Land reserve	do				1,370		
Gross income	do	12,753	13,510	11,635	12,455	12,452	10,399
Expenses [2]	do	6,998	7,440	7,147	6,455	7,304	7,445
Net return [3]	do	5,755	6,070	4,488	6,000	5,148	2,954

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[3] Return to management and capital.

TABLE 14.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the northwestern Oklahoma farm (735 acres cropland, 718 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Wheat	Acre	473	355	568	592	735	735
Grain sorghum	do	262	380	167	0	0	0
Land reserve	do				143		
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	6,786	5,247	8,017	8,286	9,944	9,944
Grain sorghum	do	3,925	5,700	2,259	0	0	0
Total grain	Ton	313	317	304	249	298	298
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	12,079	10,598	12,345	15,496	16,367	12,330
Grain sorghum	do	3,728	5,415	2,146	0		
Land reserve	do				1,863		
Gross income	do	15,807	16,013	14,491	17,359	16,367	12,330
Expenses [2]	do	10,059	9,921	10,154	9,389	10,346	10,346
Net return [3]	do	5,748	6,092	4,337	7,970	6,021	1,984

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[3] Return to management and capital.

TABLE 15.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the eastern Colorado farm (1,800 acres cropland, 803 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Wheat	Acre	550	412	660	535	639	639
Grain sorghum	do	364	724	135	102	130	130
Summer fallow	do	886	664	1,005	841	1,031	1,031
Land reserve	do				322		
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	8,204	6,145	9,834	8,025	9,531	9,531
Grain sorghum [2]	do	4,365	8,685	1,620	1,230	1,560	1,560
Total grain	Ton	368	428	340	275	330	330
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	14,521	12,290	15,046	16,532	16,323	11,628
Grain sorghum	do	3,754	7,469	1,393	1,058	1,342	1,342
Land reserve	do				1,932		
Gross income	do	18,275	19,759	16,439	19,522	17,665	12,970
Expenses [3]	do	7,762	8,328	7,536	6,851	7,394	7,394
Net return [4]	do	10,513	11,431	8,903	12,671	10,271	5,576

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] 252 and 640 acres, respectively, of sorghum in programs A and B is grown in continuous rotation. The remaining sorghum in all programs is grown on abandoned wheat land.
[3] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[4] Return to management and capital.

TABLE 16.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the northeastern Montana farm (1,156 acres cropland, 578 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Spring wheat	Acre	405	304	486	462	578	578
Barley	do	173	274	92			
Summer fallow	do	578	578	578	462	578	578
Land reserve	do				232		
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	5,954	4,469	7,144	6,781	8,495	8,495
Barley	do	3,399	5,384	1,808			
Total grain	Ton	260	263	258	203	255	255
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	10,241	8,715	10,502	12,693	13,477	10,109
Barley	do	2,447	3,876	1,302			
Land reserve	do				1,333		
Gross income	do	12,688	12,591	11,804	14,026	13,477	10,109
Expenses [2]	do	6,666	6,687	6,649	5,696	6,631	6,631
Net return [3]	do	6,022	5,904	5,155	8,330	6,846	3,478

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[3] Return to management and capital.

TABLE 17.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the north-central Montana farm (1,156 acres cropland, 578 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Winter wheat	Acre	405	304	486	462	578	578
Barley	do	173	274	92			
Summer fallow	do	578	578	578	462	578	578
Land reserve	do				232		
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	8,465	6,354	10,157	9,661	12,080	12,080
Barley	do	4,817	7,640	2,564			
Total grain	Ton	370	374	366	290	362	362
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	13,629	11,691	13,814	16,931	17,963	13,530
Barley	do	3,324	5,272	1,769			
Land reserve	do				1,552		
Gross income	do	16,953	16,963	15,583	18,483	17,963	13,530
Expenses [2]	do	7,197	7,224	7,174	6,290	7,149	7,149
Net return [3]	do	9,756	9,739	8,409	12,193	10,814	6,381

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[3] Return to management and capital.

TABLE 18.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the east Washington farm (520 acres cropland, 255 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Wheat	Acre	166	125	199	287	329	329
Barley	do	163	204	130			
Peas	do	104	104	104	104	104	104
Summer fallow	do	87	87	87	78	87	87
Land reserve	do				51		
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	8,238	6,098	9,916	13,900	15,890	15,890
Barley	do	7,792	10,271	5,915			
Peas	Hundredweight	1,210	1,210	1,210	1,210	1,210	1,210
Total grain	Ton	434	429	439	417	477	477
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	14,417	12,074	15,072	23,397	23,742	19,068
Barley	do	6,389	8,422	4,850			
Peas	do	4,356	4,356	4,356	4,356	4,356	4,356
Land reserve	do				969		
Gross income	do	25,162	24,852	24,278	28,722	28,098	23,424
Expenses [2]	do	12,987	13,320	13,034	12,383	13,500	13,500
Net return [3]	do	12,175	11,532	11,244	16,339	14,598	9,924

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[3] Return to management and capital.

TABLE 19.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the Columbia Basin, Oreg., farm (1,600 acres cropland, 800 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Wheat	Acre	520	390	624	640	800	800
Barley, winter	do	158	231	99			
Barley, spring	do	122	179	77			
Land reserve	do				320		
Summer fallow	do	800	800	800	640	800	800
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	16,120	12,285	19,344	19,840	24,000	24,000
Barley	do	10,456	15,308	6,571			
Total grain	Ton	735	736	738	595	720	720
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	28,855	24,939	29,983	38,442	39,590	30,000
Barley	do	9,097	13,318	5,717			
Land reserve	do				3,960		
Gross income	do	37,952	38,257	35,700	42,402	39,590	30,000
Expenses [2]	do	20,140	20,105	20,147	17,932	20,152	20,049
Net income [3]	do	17,812	18,152	15,553	24,470	19,438	9,951

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[3] Return to management and capital.

Mrs. MAY. I want to commend the gentleman, and I would like to have all Members study his suggestions, particularly the significance of this objective study of several hypothetical plans in every major producing area, plans similar to the bushel plan which is sponsored by the National Association of Wheat Growers, the Farmers Union, and others, which shows that this is the plan which brings about the highest income return but, at the same time, results in the smallest quantity of total production of wheat which would bring down in the controlled area the wheat production instead of having it go into storage.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BREEDING. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Washington for his wonderful talk here today and his contribution to this committee.

I should like to bring up the question of acreage. I noticed in the gentleman's statement he said that world acreage for wheat was increasing, yet we in the United States are losing acreage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BREEDING. What is going to happen to the American wheat farmer if this situation continues to exist?

Mr. HORAN. I do not think our American wheat farmer is pleased with acreage restrictions. I am happy to have talked to and to have served with my colleague from Kansas in the direction of more use of wheat, more marketing of wheat, because it just does not make sense for us to hog-tie the American farmer, then try to liberate the farmers all over the world. We may be able to control our own citizens but we cannot control people in foreign countries. That is one of the things that we have to face when we try to solve the farm programs. These facts I have placed in the RECORD I think are as good as we can get. I have had the Foreign Service working on it for some time.

Mr. BREEDING. Does not the gentleman think there ought to be more appropriations for expanding marketing development in foreign countries? I know the field is stifled somewhat, as we cut down our production. What is the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. HORAN. I believe the Department will come up with a program that this subcommittee will be very cordial to. We have in the bill this item, what was in the budget when it originally came up;

it was not revised by the new administration.

Mr. BREEDING. Expanded markets would be the answer to part of our problem here?

Mr. HORAN. I want to say not only is my friend from Kansas serving ably here but his predecessor was one of the fine representatives of the wheat industry and other elements of American agriculture. I commend to the Committee of the Whole House the reading of the testimony of the former Member here, the Honorable Clifford R. Hope, when he appealed to the subcommittee for additional funds for wheat utilization. It is splendid because he breaks down this utilization, not into the making of industrial alcohol that we might burn in automobiles or to paper which is being created at Peoria, but in better utilization as human food.

Mr. BREEDING. Did not Mr. Hope appear before the gentleman's committee and ask for an increased appropriation?

Mr. HORAN. Yes. I have checked and under the able leadership of Dr. Hazel Stiebling we are already carrying on considerable of the work that he did request, and that can be improved, I am certain.

Mr. BREEDING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. I noted with interest the gentleman's reference to the appearance of the Honorable Clifford Hope before the committee. I have read his statement. I also wish to commend the gentleman from Washington for his very excellent statement before the House today. I noticed his interest in the provisions of this bill and in the report relative to market development work. Those of us who have worked on the legislative side of Public Law 480 have been very much interested in the provision that some of these funds shall be made available. We have been very much concerned that there are others who feel they ought to have access to these funds in connection with market development, which is at the end of the road as far as funds are concerned.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman is referring to other departments?

Mr. McINTIRE. That is right; other departments of Government. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that perhaps at long last we have these funds sufficiently well identified, both legislatively and in the appropriation bill, so that they will be used for these purposes?

Mr. HORAN. Well, that is a subject that concerns us all, and I know it concerns my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], because we have made a study of these foreign currencies that are a residue of our activities under Public Law 480. You understand that Public Law 480 made it possible for us to sell our surplus foods for foreign soft currencies, and these are variously distributed. A portion of these currencies finds its way back into our own Treasury, and we have a considerable sum there. And, it just seems to me that some of the departments are somewhat like the casual visitor to Las Vegas. He is leaving the gambling halls and he just cannot wait to spend the last change in his pocket. We find various groups wanting to spend this money abroad, but I want to see our expenditures of those soft currencies reflected in some help to the American taxpayer, and I think in this bill they are, because we have moved out of storage enormous amounts of our surplus commodities to places where it is needed, to places where China and Russia cannot supply wheat and the good things in life. But, in the uses by the other departments we should find a way so that the benefit of the expenditure of these soft currencies is reflected in some help for the American taxpayer here at home.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee once again brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

It has been a pleasure serving with our chairman, the able and distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. WHITTEN. It is a distinct honor to be permitted to serve on this committee with Mr. SANTANGELO, of New York, and Mr. SLACK, of West Virginia. The American farmer has no better friend than the ranking minority member on our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. ANDERSEN. It is a pleasure serving with the distinguished gentleman from Washington, Mr. HORAN, and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MICHEL. We are fortunate to have as our executive secretary Ross P. Pope.

We are in a race with the Soviet Union in outer space and in certain other fields, but this does not apply to agriculture. Our country today is the strongest, most productive and wealthiest nation on earth, and in the field of agriculture we have unquestioned superiority.

Today only 8.7 percent of our people live on farms, but we are still leading the world in agriculture. The Soviet Union has 50 percent of its people living on farms and they are still unable to keep up with the necessary requirements of their country. In our country only 1 person in 12 is engaged in agriculture, and in the Soviet Union 1 out of every 3 is engaged in agriculture.

Under no circumstances should the people in this country criticize the American farmer. Living as we are in the most crucial period in the history of our Nation, we must not only recognize the achievements of American agriculture, but we should be proud of the fact that we are producing all of the food and fiber necessary for our people.

A few people believe that agriculture is not as important as it once was due to the fact that only about 12 percent of our population live on our farms. We must remember that agriculture is still our largest industry and is still the mainstay of our national economy. It is true that the workers engaged in farming have declined over the years and that today only some 7.1 million people are employed on our farms and ranches. This is still 12 times as many people as work in the steel industry; nearly twice as many as the number of people in our transportation industry and public utilities combined, and nearly 9 times as many people as work in the automobile industry. More workers are engaged in farming than in all of the industries that manufacture nondurable goods, including textiles, processed foods, wearing apparel, tobacco products, paper and paper products, printing and publishing, chemical products of all kinds, coal and petroleum products, and products made from rubber and leather.

In addition to those who live on our farms, some 6 million people have jobs furnishing the equipment and supplies necessary for our farmers. Ten million people have jobs storing, transporting, processing and merchandising agricultural products. In this country today 35 percent of all the American workers now in civilian employment are in jobs relating directly to agriculture.

Area by area and crop by crop, our agriculture is the envy of the Communist world. We must continue our efficiency of production. When we produce our agricultural commodities at lower unit cost our farmers receive benefits by way of savings and the same applies to the consumers. We are a great agricultural nation.

From time to time we hear complaints over what is being done to our family-size farm, but not too much action is taken to correct the treatment received by the family-size farmers. When we consider the family farm, we must remember that on this farm most of the labor and management is performed by the operator and the members of his family, and the main source of income comes from this particular farm.

In 1954, we had 4,782,000 farms in the United States. The 1960 census shows a decrease of 23 percent, which makes the total today only 3,704,000. From 1954 to 1960 the size of our farms has increased from 242 acres to 302 acres. The value of the land and the buildings per farm totaled $20,405 in 1954, and in 1960 the total was $33,242.

The productivity of the individual American farmer increased more in the last two decades than at any time in the past. Regardless of this amazing record, realized net farm income dropped about one-third from the year 1947 to the year 1960.

Regardless of our farmers' improved efficiency, his income has been going down. Today, he is paying more for the products he must buy and at the same time is receiving less for the commodities he sells. Our American farmer is making a great and essential contribution to the national welfare but is not being rewarded equally with other groups in the Nation. Our gross farm income for 1945 totaled $25.8 billion and production expenses totaled $12.9 billion. The realized net income for this year was $12.9 billion.

In 1950, the realized gross income for the American farmer totaled $32.5 billion with production expenses amounting to $19.3 billion. Here, we have a realized net income of only $13.2 billion. In the year 1960, the realized gross income of our farmer was $37.9 billion and production expenses totaled $26.3 billion. This leaves a realized net income of only $11.6 billion.

We must keep in mind that the farmers' share of the consumers' dollar for food totaled 51 percent in 1948 and 49 percent in 1951. The American farmer in 1960 received only 39 percent of the consumers' dollar for food purchased.

Our farms are the real backbone of our country and it is largely from the fruits of the soil that we have established our present position of being the strongest, wealthiest and most productive nation on earth.

Mr. Chairman, for fiscal year 1962, we recommend $1,379,006,000 for regular activities; $1,951,915,000 for reimbursements to the Commodity Credit Corporation for foreign assistance and special programs for fiscal year 1961; $1,017,610,000 for restoration of Commodity Credit Corporation capital impairment for fiscal year 1960; $1,600 million for foreign assistance program for fiscal year 1962; and $35,000 for related agencies.

For Agricultural Research Service, we recommend appropriations totaling $196,807,000. For research, we recommend $76,558,000; for plant and animal disease and pest control $55,165,000; and for meat inspection $24,216,000.

We recommend that the committee appropriate $69,992,000 for our Extension Service. For Soil Conservation Service, we recommend $178,680,000.

For Rural Electrification Administration, we recommend $125 million direct authorization for electrification loans together with a contingency authorization of $70 million, making a total of $195 million for electrification loans. This is an increase of $25 million over the 1961 fiscal year authorization. We recommend a direct authorization for telephone loans of $120 million together with a contingency authorization totaling $30 million. The total recommended for telephone loans is $150 million, which is $10 million more than the 1961 fiscal year authorization.

For Agricultural Marketing Service, we recommend an appropriation for fiscal year 1962 of $37,702,000 for marketing research and marketing services. We further recommend that the committee appropriate $1,195,000 for payments to States and possessions under the Agricultural Marketing Service.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Our greatest asset is our schoolchildren. We recommend $125 million for the school lunch program for fiscal year 1962. This is an increase of $15 million over the 1961 appropriation and is $5 million over the 1962 budget request. In addition, we recommend that $45 million be transferred from section 32 funds to be used to purchase meats and other foods necessary to provide balanced school lunches. This is the same transfer authority which was approved for fiscal year 1961. Of the $15 million increase, we recommend that $10 million be used to provide special assistance to help needy schools defray the cost of serving lunches to needy children. Our bill contains the language authorizing the Secretary to allocate this money to areas of greatest need and to prescribe the standards and criteria under which the funds will be used.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

In our Rural Electrification Administration program we now have approximately 5 million consumers on REA-financed lines. Some 96 percent of the farms, ranches, and rural establishments of this country now have electricity. The average number of consumers per mile is about 3.1 and a large number of the cooperatives average less than 2 consumers to a mile. Since a great many of the cooperatives are operating in such thin territory, the amount of equity REA borrowers have accumulated is exceedingly low. Approximately 50 percent of the rural electric systems have less than 20 percent equity in their facilities. Our REA program is one of the great achievements of our present-day Government and it is imperative that an adequate amount be authorized for Rural Electrification Administration loans for fiscal year 1962.

TOBACCO RESEARCH

Last year the need for additional research in tobacco was clearly established. The tobacco industry is undergoing scientific and technological changes that have so significantly affected American agriculture as a whole that tobacco has been neglected in terms of an adequate research program which would provide for its progress and welfare.

At the present time, between 400 and 500 hours of human labor are required to produce and harvest an acre of tobacco. This commodity is grown on a total of approximately 1,154,000 acres in 22 States and is a major source of income in 8 of these States. Seven hundred and fifty thousand farm families are engaged in the production of tobacco and the number of hours required to produce an acre of tobacco has changed very little over the past 50 years. Tobacco is one of the most important cash crops in America. According to the figures for 1958, the amount received from tobacco was $1,007 million which makes this amount the fifth largest amount received from agricultural commodities. Tobacco pays its own way. A little over $2½ billion annually is received in tobacco taxes by the Federal, State and local governments. Of this amount, $1,700 million goes into the Federal Treasury and this does not include indirect taxes. In January of 1960 the Kentucky Legislature approved the sum of $1 million to be used in the construction of an agriculture research building and, in addition, appropriated $50,000 for tobacco research. The tobacco research laboratory established in the agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 1961 at Lexington, Ky., will be housed in this new agriculture research building. Ordinarily, in establishing a research laboratory, the cost of the building is paid by the Federal Government and, in most instances, the cost of the land must also be paid for by the Government before a research laboratory is constructed. Kentucky's action clearly shows the need for tobacco research and certainly sets a precedent. The research laboratory established will research all types of tobacco. In this country we produce burley, dark, flue-cured, Maryland-type tobacco, and other types. The research laboratory established will prove of great benefit to the tobacco producers in the 22 States involved. We recommend approval of the amount carried in the bill totaling $205,000 for use at the new research laboratory at Lexington, Ky.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Our soil conservation districts were started some 26 years ago as an experiment in local self-government. Today our districts include approximately 96 percent of all of the farms and ranches in our country. No program has had a greater impact upon American agriculture, and each year the importance of this particular program will increase. The people in this country generally support our soil and water conservation program. In Kentucky, we have 122 soil conservation districts in the 120 counties, and today over 86,000 farms are participating in this program. In Kentucky, thousands of acres of good farmland have been restored to productive capacity by our soil conservation service, and the eastern and western sections of Kentucky, where we annually suffer flood damage, are in much better condition.

RESEARCH

The American farmer receives many benefits from our agriculture research program and it is all important that this program be geared to the problems now confronting American agriculture and be able to meet future problems. A good research program must reduce waste and losses and improve efficiency of production. Such a program must also improve processing, marketing, and consumption. In order to prosper, we must develop new and improved crops and production and expand our markets for the sale of our commodities. If we are to have an adequate research program it must provide improved nutrition and better living for rural and urban people. It is true that our agriculture research funds have increased over the years, but the results justify the amounts expended.

SOIL AND WATER RESEARCH LABORATORY

Drought, poor drainage, and rapid runoff cause water problems of critical importance in Kentucky. Soil and water are two of the most important resources in the State of Kentucky. Soil erosion is a particularly serious problem on the majority of Kentucky's 193,000 farms. This is due to the high percentage of sloping lands and the erosive nature of many of the soils and the character of the rainstorms which create an erosive problem. The increasing demand for application of conservation measures in

Kentucky under the Public Law 566 program creates a growing need for basic information which will lead to more effective methods of soil and water conservation. Lack of adequate research information is handicapping efforts of State and Federal agencies in planning and applying land and water use and watershed protection programs in the State. Kentucky is one of the only two of the larger States in the entire humid region which does not have federally supported cooperative soil and water conservation investigations. Studies of the soil and water research needs of Kentucky have revealed critical and immediate problems for which information is lacking. A soil and water conservation research laboratory should be established in Kentucky. This laboratory would serve not only Kentucky but those adjoining States which are also in need of such a research program.

Mr. Chairman, when our farmer is prospering, tractors, automobiles, combines, trucks, milking machines and mechanical devices of every description are moving from the factory to the farm. We also know that modern farm problems are tremendously complex and there is no easy answer.

Our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. First may I express my appreciation for the kind remarks the gentleman from Kentucky made relative to the work of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The gentleman has referred to the benefit to our economy from a prosperous agriculture, if and when that is obtained. We might also point to the fact that the rural electrification program, which has been so successful, as the gentleman knows, and which the gentleman from Kentucky has been one of the leaders in promoting throughout the United States, has pumped $12 billion worth of business back into the private economy channels in America. $12 billion worth of radios, television sets, electric irons, and electrical articles of every description have been first manufactured by the makers of these appliances and then sold in the farm areas in the United States, simply because of the fact that we do have the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank my friend for his statement, and I certainly concur with his remarks concerning the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a bill calling for expenditures of nearly $6 billion to run the Department of Agriculture and finance its related activities—and I might say some not so closely related—for the coming fiscal year.

We are now paying the bill for authorizations enacted by the Congress years ago, and unfortunately during the deliberations of those authorizing acts too little consideration was given to the cost of the program. The legislative Committee on Agriculture has the responsibility for drafting and reporting to the House authorizing legislation, but it is the responsibility of our Appropriations Committee to scrutinize carefully the line items calling for expenditures of public funds. The full searching light of inquiry should be made into the costs of all programs presented for authorization. All of us are aware of the current legislation before the House Agriculture Committee and so far as I have been able to determine no serious attempt has been made to estimate the costs of administering such a program as outlined.

For example, the most recently enacted farm legislation, the so-called emergency feed-grain bill, enacted on March 22 of this year, did not include an estimate of administrative cost. However, subsequently and prior to the end of the sign-up program for feed grains, the Department had asked our committee for $20.5 million for administrative expenses. We reduced this amount to $15 million, a decrease of $5.5 million in the budget, but I would wager that before the fiscal year is out there will be a request for supplemental funds. I cite this figure to call attention to the fact that little or no mention was made of this expenditure when the program was presented by the legislative committee earlier this year.

It is always a stimulating experience to participate in the consideration of appropriation items for the Department of Agriculture since I have the honor to represent one of the best agricultural districts in the country. Our land is relatively flat and level and sells in the neighborhood of $500 to $700 per acre and taxed at $10 and $12 an acre. Ours has always been a farming community, and I presume it always will be. Nearly 100 percent of the farmers in my district farm on a full-time basis, and use the most advanced methods of production and marketing; and for the most part dislike the regimentation imposed by the Federal Government upon their operations. Our farmers in the main are an independent, resourceful lot.

There are several programs, and sizable ones, with which I am very much concerned. The first is the insistence of the committee to disregard the recommendation of the President with reference to the agricultural conservation program. This program is designed to stimulate farmers and ranchers to voluntarily apply needed conservation measures. It is used in nearly all States and territories of the United States and has over the years provided splendid technical service to operators to conserve our natural resources. However, in recent years practices have violated what was considered to be basic conservation practices and have gotten over into the field of production which is in contradiction not only to this administration but to all past administrations to reduce output. I refer specifically to the application of lime and phosphates to land which definitely increase production, and I do not believe is necessary in a conservation project. I am somewhat disturbed also because of the fact that in the face of the decline of the number of farmers participating in the ACP program the advance authorization is continued by this committee at the $250 million level.

On page 10 of the committee report reference is made to strip-cropping and contour farming which has been instituted on several millions of acres. If my memory serves me correctly, part of this should be credited to the Soil Conservation Service, which has been very effective in many of these districts. It appears to me that part of the justification for the ACP program rests on the accomplishments of the soil conservation districts.

For the last several years I have offered amendments to cut this particular item by $50 million and $100 million, and I have not had too good a support from Members on the floor of the House. I know it is not an easy task for a Member of Congress to tell a farmer that he has voted to take $100, $200, or $300 away from him in ACP payments, but I just happen to have the old-fashioned belief that conservation of one's own land is the individual's responsibility and that if we eliminated the entire program all of our farmers would be on an even footing and we would save an expenditure of a quarter of a billion dollars.

There has been more concern expressed in this Congress about backdoor spending. I think we ought to touch a little bit on the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Public Law 480 program. I am rather distressed when I find even Members of the Congress coming to me and, frankly, knowing so little about how the Public Law 480 program works and for what we are selling our commodities abroad. These commodities are not being sold for dollars but for local currencies which cannot be used to restore the capital impairment of CCC. In this bill we are restoring the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation for sales made in 1960 and 1961. We are not getting hard dollars for these sales abroad and so we have to come back eventually and restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and this is brought home to us very forcefully in the bill we have here today. There has been some question as to the committee taking it upon itself to put this on a pay-as-you-go basis. In other words, we have added an additional $1,600 million—to place this particular program on a pay-as-you-go basis. In other words, we are saying in effect we would like to see Public Law 480 operated in this coming year within these limitations. It should bring the financial operations of Public Law 480 out into the open. I think it is a step in the right direction.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] earlier had raised a question as to what is being done in utilization research. I support the research activities of the committee. I think we told the

Department we would like to see a little more emphasis on utilization rather than basic research, and we provided funds in the bill for that. Specifically, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Indiana, I would refer him to pages 421 and 422 of the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, I now turn to a discussion of the REA program. Rural electric cooperatives should be complimented on the remarkable job they have done for the past 25 years getting electricity to the Nation's farmers. It was brought out in the hearings that since the inception of the electrification program in 1935, the percentage of farms with central station electric service has increased from about 10 percent to approximately 97 percent, with the facilities financed by REA serving slightly more than one-half of these farms. In addition, REA facilities were serving 2 million nonfarm customers.

As a member of this subcommittee, I have a particular interest in this program—what it has accomplished and where it may be going in the future. I want to see that farmers have the needed funds to take care of their electrical requirements—and I think the Congress is making certain of this—but at the same time there are several aspects of the program brought out in the course of the hearings which cause me serious concern.

The rural electric program is being sold to the American people and to the Congress on the representation that it was to be self-liquidating and, therefore, does not constitute a drain on the taxpayers.

The program is now 25 years old, which seems to me should make it mature enough to start standing on its own two feet. However, the borrowers are still receiving more money annually from the Federal Government than they are repaying, thereby increasing the taxpayer debt. I prepared a chart on this subject based on the following data. It appears on page 499 of the hearings.

The chart shows that the difference between REA funds being advanced and principal being repaid is becoming increasingly greater year by year rather than lesser.

Rural electrification program—Loan advances, principal collections and funds outstanding, 1942–60

[Millions of dollars]

As of June—	Loan advances		Principal collections		Funds outstanding (advances less principal repayments)
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
1942	58.2	354.6	5.5	12.4	342.2
1943	14.6	369.2	12.1	24.5	344.7
1944	18.4	387.6	15.1	39.6	348.0
1945	39.8	427.4	10.7	50.3	377.1
1946	87.2	514.6	11.0	61.3	453.3
1947	190.1	704.7	13.6	74.9	629.8
1948	246.2	950.9	21.2	96.1	854.8
1949	321.3	1,272.2	22.7	118.8	1,153.4
1950	286.7	1,558.9	26.7	145.5	1,413.4
1951	268.1	1,827.0	37.2	182.7	1,644.3
1952	227.6	2,054.6	48.4	231.1	1,823.5
1953	207.6	2,262.2	48.8	279.9	1,982.3
1954	181.6	2,443.8	59.0	338.9	2,104.9
1955	156.7	2,600.5	74.4	413.3	2,187.2
1956	154.7	2,755.2	79.8	493.1	2,262.1
1957	186.0	2,941.2	84.3	577.1	2,363.8
1958	205.3	3,146.5	97.2	674.6	2,471.9
1959	211.8	3,358.3	99.9	774.5	2,583.8
1960	222.6	3,580.9	100.2	874.7	2,706.2

Source: Rural Electrification Administration, "Rural Lines, U.S.A.," Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960, p. 56. Data for fiscal 1960 from Rural Electrification Administration, Monthly Statistical Bulletin, July 1960.

Unfortunately, this discrepancy will tend to grow larger now that virtually all of the farms have been electrified and the REA is concentrating more on loans for construction of the more expensive generating and transmission facilities and facilities to serve large industrial and nonfarm loads.

REA was given an opportunity to comment on the chart and admitted it is correct. The first sentence of their statement on page 500 of the hearings says, "The chart, 'Rural Electrification Loan Program' accurately reflects the status of loan funds advanced, funds outstanding, and cumulative principal repaid for the electrical program for 1942 to 1960."

The REA statement then goes on to discuss the repayment of loans, but never once does the REA address itself to my fundamental question relating to the non-self-liquidating nature of the overall program. Thus, let us here and now admit to the people of this Nation that the rural electrification program as it is presently operating is not really self-liquidating.

While it is true that some individual loans have been repaid and others will be repaid in the future, the fact still remains that borrowers always come back to the Government for additional expansion funds. This means the program as a whole can be viewed as an inverted pyramid getting larger and larger as it goes up. Congress seems to have accepted the policy that it is necessary to provide Federal loan funds for the REA at 2 percent—a rate of interest lower than that paid by the Government on its borrowings.

Therefore, it would seem to be sound fiscal policy to make every effort to get this program on a self-liquidating basis to the point where it is showing a decreasing balance rather than a consistently increasing balance as has been the experience to date, because if the present trend continues there may come a time in the not too distant future when this Nation's taxpayers may either be unwilling or unable to carry the load.

The Nation's rural electric program must continue to meet the future energy needs of cooperative customers effectively. To accomplish this without being too burdensome on the taxpayers, Congress must assure the most efficient and economical use of REA loan funds. This can only be done by a more careful examination of loan applications—particularly for generation and transmission-type loans since they are relatively much larger in size—in terms of whether the loan must absolutely be made or whether more benefits will accrue to the cooperative customer by utilizing an alternative source of power.

I might say that there is a small reference to this particular item in our report at page 27, and I am very happy to see it there.

At the present time there seems to be no checks or balances on this type loan even though 40.5 percent of last year's appropriations were for G. & T. facilities. However, the G. & T. loan application is held in absolute secrecy and it is impossible for existing suppliers to learn whether their wholesale business is being taken away from them or even given a chance to bid on a new contract which might prove more favorable to the farmer consumers of an REA cooperative than a generating plant of their own.

Our very capable subcommittee chairman, the honorable gentleman from Mississippi, seems to be concerned about this problem, also. During the hearings, he sincerely said, and I quote:

> As long as we have our present debt and determinations are made as to the reasonableness of any existing or proposed contract, in my opinion at least, good faith would require that private enterprise be given an opportunity to meet objections to the terms of any existing or tentative contract, prior to making a loan for these purposes.

These purposes he mentioned were G. & T. type loans.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield.

Mr. BECKER. I would like to ask the gentleman this question:

I see from the report that this appropriation bill carries approximately $195 million additional loan money for the REA. Is that correct?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes; that is true.

Mr. BECKER. Is it not a fact that this money will be lent by the REA at a 2-percent interest rate fixed under previous law?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, by law.

Mr. BECKER. Is it not a fact that the Government must borrow this money on today's market at approximately 3.5 percent or more?

Mr. MICHEL. That is true.

Mr. BECKER. Therefore, the taxpayers throughout the country must

pay this additional interest at all times on all money that is lent to the REA by the Treasury.

Mr. MICHEL. Yes.

Mr. BECKER. This has amounted to millions and millions of dollars over a period of years. I feel that a prospering area can well afford to pay the going rate of interest on this borrowed money. It is my understanding that various cooperatives of the REA have created surpluses which they have invested in Government bonds that pay 3 or 3.5 percent interest; is that correct?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I might say that last year the distinguished gentleman from New York and I explored this matter with the REA Administrator. At that time, as I recall, there was about a quarter of a billion dollars in reserves that was being reinvested in Government securities, not all of it being, of course, at an interest rate in excess of 2 percent, but a good share of it was.

Then the Treasury Department came back with the issue, and I understand in the hearings this year they say $10 million has been invested in that special Treasury issue. Nonetheless, I do not think it is morally right for our co-ops to take money from the Government at 2 percent and reinvest it at a greater rate of interest.

Mr. BECKER. I have offered amendments in previous years to correct this situation. I would think the farmers would want to do this. It is a morally sound proposition.

Mr. MICHEL. When the farmers in my district were told what the conditions were and what the situation of the country is, they are quite willing to pay their share. Frankly, I have had no qualms about supporting the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BECKER. I am going to introduce the same amendment again to try to get a recognition of this problem, so that these people we want to help and have been helping during the years, because today there are others throughout the country who have been paying high rates for electricity and taxes, shall pay the going rate of interest. I think that is morally sound.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, inspired by my subcommittee chairman's thought-provoking words, I was prompted to insert into the record of the hearings a letter which I had just received from a Mr. Walter Bouldin of Alabama. He happens to be the president of Alabama Power Co. I had never met nor heard of Mr. Bouldin prior to receipt of his letter, but he later testified before our subcommittee. His letter and testimony clearly point up the overall problem of REA secrecy and the inability of existing power suppliers to obtain any information from REA or its borrowers on proposed generation and transmission loan applications. I commend its reading to every Member of the House who is concerned about the success of the REA.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Bouldin's letter, appearing on pages 493–494 of the hearings, is as follows:

ALABAMA POWER CO.,
Birmingham, Ala., April 21, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies, you will soon be considering appropriations requested by the Rural Electrification Administration. We know that in considering such appropriations you will examine into the policies of such Administration in granting loans for generating and transmission facilities. As the situation in Alabama may be typical of many other such instances in our country, an outline of it may be helpful to you in defining the problems involved.

There is in Alabama one generating and transmission co-op which sells power wholesale to six municipalities, some industries, and to five distribution co-ops in Alabama, three of which also receive such service from our company. Our company serves the entire power requirements of nine other distribution co-ops. Our rates to the distribution co-ops are substantially lower than the rates of this generating co-op to its co-op customers. Our company has a contract with the generating co-op under which we undertake to provide all its power requirements over and above its own generating capacity, and we make such power available at a very low rate which has averaged about 6.5 mills per kilowatt-hour over the past 3 years.

In March 1959, this co-op inquired as to whether we intended to increase our power rate to it upon completion of its steam plant then under construction. In May, representatives of our company visited the co-op but did not determine definitely just what term contract this co-op would desire; and in July we wrote asking the term of contract which it desired us to consider. Its reply to our letter did not give us this information. Without a specific answer to our inquiry, we made a proposal to this co-op in October for a new power contract for a term of 5 years at the same rate then in effect. In the closing paragraph of our October letter, we stated, "We will be glad to hear from you regarding this matter and to meet with you to discuss any problems that may occur to you in connection with this proposal." We wrote a followup letter in April 1960, stating that we would appreciate hearing from it about our proposal. In July 1960, the co-op wrote us advising that our proposal was receiving careful consideration. We have heard nothing further from the co-op.

We understand that this generating co-op has for some time been planning to make application to REA for a loan for additional generating facilities. We have inquired at the REA office in Washington whether such application has been filed and have been informed that it is not the policy of REA to disclose whether or not any such application is pending. As you doubtless know, it has been the policy of REA not to disclose the contents of any such application.

We are convinced that an allocation of public funds to this co-op for generating facilities is completely unjustifiable. Such generating facilities would not make electric service available to a single customer to whom such service is not now available. Such facilities would idle generating facilities which our company has already provided for service to this co-op or take the place of future facilities which our company is ready, able, and willing to provide.

The generating co-op is, of course, exempt from Federal income tax. Allocation of public funds to provide generating facilities for such co-op would deprive the Federal Government of income tax paid by our company on the revenue derived from our generating facilities which the co-op facilities would supplant. To use tax funds to destroy a source of tax revenue seems to us fundamentally wrong in principle and particularly unjustifiable at this time when every means should be sought to protect Federal revenues which are so sorely needed for vital purposes.

Co-op generating facilities in Alabama are not necessary to provide electric service at reasonable rates. Cost of power under our rate to this generating co-op, even with Federal income tax included, is, we believe, lower than the cost to such co-op of providing such power from additions to its own generating facilities. If the income tax component were excluded in a comparison between our rates and their costs, we are certain that our rates would be lower than such costs. As mentioned above, however, we are not permitted to present to the REA a comparison of such costs, as the co-op cost estimates in loan applications are not available to us.

Loan policies of the REA, of course, determine the amount of appropriations which they request. If it is to be the policy of REA to grant loans under such circumstances as are presented here in Alabama, the Federal Government would be subject to vast unnecessary expenditures and a serious erosion of its revenue, which you, as well as we, desire to avoid.

Sincerely,

WALTER BOULDIN.

This letter raised in my mind the question of what other areas throughout the country, including my home State of Illinois, are having similar problems. Therefore, I requested of the REA a list of G. & T. loan applications pending or under study similar to the list appearing on page 50 in the Senate second urgent deficiency appropriation hearings of 1957. Furthermore, I thought it would be of interest to have these data in the RECORD so that all Members of Congress might be aware of what is being planned in their areas. However, I was unable to get this information put into the record of the hearings, even though the REA is financed by the taxpayers' money.

I feel it appropriate at this point to call attention to the Moss special subcommittee which has been engaged for the past several years in an intensive investigation into the "Availability of Information From Federal Departments and Agencies." The subcommittee issued a report on July 2, 1960—House Report No. 2084, 86th Congress, 2d session—stating in part that: "Secrecy—the first refuge of incompetence—must be at a bare minimum in a democratic society, for a fully informed public is the basis of self-government. * * *" Moreover, it will be recalled that President Kennedy made an issue in the presidential campaign on the matter of the flow of Government information and stated emphatically:

An informed citizenry is the basis of representative government. Democracy—as we know it—cannot exist unless the American people are equipped with the information which is necessary if they are to make the informed political choices on which the proper functioning of democracy depends. An informed people—able to examine and,

when necessary, to criticize, its government—is the only guarantee of responsible democracy. And the President—who himself bears much of the responsibility for the preservation of American democracy—has the affirmative duty to see that the American people are kept fully informed. It is true that in today's world of peril some Government information must be kept secret—information whose publication would endanger the security of the United States. But within the rather narrow limits of national security the people of the United States are entitled to the fullest possible information about their Government—and the President must see that they receive it.

The policy of secrecy is of special significance in connection with loans for generating and transmission facilities because of the standards REA is required to apply in making such loans. According to the agency's regulations—Administrative Bulletin No. 61—G. & T. loans will only be made either, first, when no adequate and dependable source of power is available, or second, where the rates offered by existing power sources would result in a higher cost of power to the borrowers than would be the cost of power from facilities financed by REA. Unless alternative power suppliers—whether they be municipalities, public utility districts or private companies—have an opportunity to negotiate or make additional offers it cannot be assumed that the proposed loan is necessary.

Now this brings up another point which bothers me concerning the obvious intent of the REA to indulge in what might be called back-door lawmaking in its announcement of a new criterion to be added to the existing generation and transmission loan policy. In the hearings the Administrator stated that the REA was in the process of expanding its established criteria to guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry.

I previously mentioned the two criteria under which the legislative history of the 1936 act permitted the REA to make generating and transmission loans. There is nothing in the 1936 act or in congressional legislative history on REA legislation or in reports in Congress or floor debate that could be interpreted in any sense of the word to make generating and transmission loans to guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry. Should a major policy change like this be made, it should be done by the appropriate legislative committees of Congress, and not by agency action.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is important for our colleagues to realize that the institution of this so-called third criteria—when considered in connection with the subsidy to the REA through the use of 2-percent money and freedom from Federal taxation—might possibly have the effect of not merely securing "a permanent place in the American power industry," but of taking it over completely.

I think it is perhaps appropriate again to repeat the very sage advice given by our esteemed subcommittee chairman during the recent hearings when he said:

I think that authority to make loans for power generation is very, very important. I would take issue with anybody who wished to repeal it. I do think that it is important, however, not to put the private companies out of business, but to see that they give reasonable contracts in time and in cost to their co-op customers.

He went on to say further—

I subscribe to the fact that, since the Government has to have taxes any way you take it, the Government can't provide sound REA loans except from taxes. Those taxes are obtained from private enterprise, not from Government enterprise, or from the sale of bonds, which in turn must be predicated on tax income.

The able gentleman from Mississippi then concluded by saying:

So I think anybody who studies it realizes that the REA—as sound and solid as it is—should not be used for the purposes of putting the private companies out of business.

Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the taxpayers of the country who must put up the money for this program, as well as in fairness to the REA, for this is creating a bad public relations picture of the REA, I bring these facts to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity also to compliment the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for reporting what I consider to be a very good bill.

My purpose in taking the floor at this time is to give the Members of the Congress an insight into some of the glaring defects of the so-called omnibus farm bill now pending before the House Committee on Agriculture.

I want to compliment particularly my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] for disclosing some of the glaring defects in this legislation. Too little has been said about this bill which is of great importance not only to the farmers of this country but to the entire American economy.

Title I of H.R. 6400, is the most fantastic power grab ever devised by any administration in the history of our country. The Secretary of Agriculture would virtually become a one-man national legislature for agriculture. Under our concept of separation of powers as set forth in the Constitution of the United States, the Congress writes the laws and the executive branch of the Government, through the President, approves or vetoes the legislation. Under the provisions of title I of H.R. 6400, the executive branch of the Government through the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to write the law and the Congress, or legislative branch of the Government, is given the authority to approve or veto. Such procedure is a complete reversal of what the Founding Fathers of this country intended.

Proponents of the legislation contend that the Secretary of Agriculture could only present a farm program after consultation with commodity advisory committees. They say this would give farmers an effective voice—the formulation of farm programs. The truth is that the Secretary of Agriculture would select the members of the advisory committees, he could set their term of office, set the number of members, and could limit the committee's functions and even dissolve them. Furthermore, the Secretary will not be required to follow the recommendations of an advisory committee. Farmers should not be deluded into thinking they would have an effective voice in the formulation of farm programs. They would merely be rubberstamp advisers to the Secretary. The Secretary of Agriculture himself would actually write the bill. Even the referendum process provided for in title I is rigged because the Secretary can determine who will vote and who will not vote in the referendum. These tremendous grants of power would raise grave constitutional questions.

May I also point out that once a farm program is submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture, the bill provides that it must be affirmatively rejected by the Congress within a period of 60 days after its submission. If the program is not affirmatively disapproved within the 60-day period, the program becomes law subject to a referendum. There is no provision in the bill which provides for committee hearings. The Congress would have to act on the proposal on a take-it-or-leave-it basis without any opportunity to even amend or revise the proposal. I cannot conceive of the Congress thus delegating its legislative rights and prerogatives to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Congress would completely abdicate all of its legislative authority to the executive branch of the Government, which in my opinion would be unconstitutional.

There is no limit on the amount of money which can be spent on any one or all of the possible 256 farm programs. With a great number of commodity groups acting independently, the administrative bottlenecks and Government costs would skyrocket. It is estimated that title I alone could well cost from $12 to $15 billion a year.

Farmers would lose under this bill. If they accepted the proposed programs they would be subjected to the strictest controls in history. If they turned them down, which they would not likely do, their price support would be reduced to not more than 50 percent of parity. Hence, every farmer would almost be forced to approve any program in a referendum as a matter of self-preservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentlemen for yielding me additional time.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Can the gentleman from Iowa inform me as to any probability that this House or this Congress would admit that it cannot legislate on agricultural matters?

Mr. HOEVEN. I cannot conceive of the Congress of the United States abdicating its rights and prerogatives in the field of legislation; a complete reversal of our legislative process.

Probably the most fantastic single aspect of this whole bill is in regard to the Secretary's request for a "blank check" for a 1962 wheat program. H.R. 6400 allows the Secretary to handpick a wheat advisory committee for the 1962 wheat program without going through the regular selection process outlined for other crops. After he had picked this advisory committee, the Secretary would submit his new wheat plan directly to eligible wheat farmers for a referendum. The new plan would not be subject to any review, study, or amendment by Congress whatsoever. Many of us from the Corn Belt feel certain that the 1962 wheat program proposed would be the multiple-price plan endorsed by President Kennedy in last fall's campaign. This type of legislation has been resisted by the Corn Belt for many years because of its adverse effect on the feedgrain picture. I do not propose to sit idly by and let a program such as this go into effect by default as Secretary Freeman has proposed. The outcome would be quite certain under this provision because the bill sets the choice that wheat farmers would have as either the new plan or virtually nothing—that is, not more than 50 percent of parity to those wheat farmers who stay within their present allotments and no price support at all to those who fail to comply with these allotments. Needless to say, this "blank check" grant of legislative power to the Secretary raises the most serious constitutional questions as well as being a dire economic threat to the Corn Belt.

I should point out, however, that title I of H.R. 6400 is in real legislative trouble at the present time. Similar legislation last year had the same trouble. The so-called Family Farm Income Act of 1960, or Poage bill, could not even get out of committee until 251 commodities were exempted from the provisions of the bill. That bill was overwhelmingly defeated by the House in June 1960, by a vote of 236–170. Title I of H.R. 6400 which is this year's model of that same legislation is now facing the same fate.

Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle have in recent weeks been increasingly vocal in opposition to H.R. 6400. Several of my Democratic colleagues on the House Committee on Agriculture apparently cannot swallow title I in its present form.

Playing underneath the current of controversy on this bill is the avowed intention of the architects of H.R. 6400 to control American agriculture in a manner similar to that of a public utility. Farmers are now facing one of the most important decisions ever faced by American agriculture. I sincerely hope that the Congress will not abdicate its constitutional responsibilities in favor of such an unworkable plan. I urge all Members of Congress, farmers, and all citizens to study title I of H.R. 6400 carefully with the full confidence that if this is done the most effective opponent of the administration farm bill will be the administration farm bill itself.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment briefly on the general farm bill. Inasmuch as some of my colleagues are critical of this legislation, I would like to have included in the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Herschel Newsom, Director of the National Grange, contained in the June 1 issue of the National Grange Letter. I consider Mr. Newsom to be one of the greatest authorities of our country on farm matters, and I believe the statements made by him on the farm bill will be helpful to all Members.

This is the kind of a Grange Letter we don't like to write—that we had hoped it would never be necessary to write.

Through its nearly 100 years of distinguished service to rural America, the Grange has earnestly striven for cooperation and the maximum possible unity in agriculture. We shall continue those efforts.

The Grange, however, never has, and does not now, compromise basic principles, or sacrifice the interests of agriculture, for the sake of unity. Nor can we continue to leave unrefuted the falsehoods and distortions by those who place their own interests above those of farmers and the Nation.

The Grange has never hesitated to consider, discuss, and debate the issues affecting American agriculture. The Grange since 1867 has defended agriculture against those who would exploit farmers. The efforts of the Grange are closely interrelated with the progress of family farmers and sound programs over the past 94 years.

When forces from within agriculture form an alliance with interests foreign to those of farmers, agricultural unity becomes less important than preservation of the basic principles of equity for American agriculture.

We believe that, in the long run, farmers will, given the facts, reject those who would mislead them, that they will make decisions which support their legitimate interests. They always have.

American agriculture is today reaping the harvest of suspicion and distrust sown in past years by those who sought, first, to discredit present programs, and then substitute their own ideas of an agriculture defenseless against those who would exploit it and force on it their ideologies.

Those efforts are more insidious by reason of the fact that some of those make them do so in the name of American farmers.

"We believe," Grange Master Herschel D. Newsom said, "that Grange responsibility does not end with a fair presentation of the facts, but that it includes the exposure of false and misleading propaganda."

Where the interests of American agriculture are involved, any other course, he said, would be a disservice to farmers and the Nation.

It is not possible within the space limitations of this letter to expose and refute all of the false propaganda being used to block enactment of progressive agricultural legislation. Some of the baseless charges being made in regard to the Agricultural Act of 1961, now before the Congress, must be refuted if sound decisions, based on facts are to be made.

Congress has wisely given both those who support and those who oppose the principles and objectives of that bill the full opportunity to be heard. That opportunity still is open to every farmer who wants to write to or talk with his Congressman.

The use of unsupported and unfounded, but inflamatory generalities, in a frantic effort to defeat improvements in farm programs is regrettable. Two paragraphs in the June issue of the Nation's Agriculture (Farm Bureau official organ) indicate the extent to which opponents of the farm bill will go into the realm of fantasy.

The statements attributed to Charles Shuman, AFBF President, are:

"Purpose of the administration omnibus farm bill is to have the Nation's food produced by docile, licensed, and properly managed farmers who would look to the political machine rather than consumer markets for determination of family income.

"Would any farmer dare risk displeasure of the multitude of Government agents and committees required to measure all crop acres and count every cow, sow, ewe, and hen in the Nation?"

A more flagrant distortion of facts would be difficult to imagine.

Any sane and objective study of the bill refutes such wild generalizations. Some of the allegations, however, are more specific, although equally unfounded. Let's look at some of those, and then at the facts.

"The omnibus bill," it is charged by some, "would force Congress to abdicate its power to enact farm legislation."

The truth is: Congress would retain intact it's responsibility to hold hearings, to approve, reject or amend any farm program proposals made by the Secretary of Agriculture and representative committees of producers.

"The bill would make the Secretary a virtual dictator over agriculture."

The truth is: It would diminish the power of the Secretary by requiring, first, congressional approval of changes in price supports, allotments, and other program changes, and secondly, a two-thirds vote would be needed before a change in programs could be made.

"The bill would force rigid controls on all producers."

The truth is: Producers of any commodity which does not have price supports or controls can remain free of controls. Any change would have to be initiated by producers, and later approved by two-thirds of them.

"The bill would add billions of dollars to the cost of farm programs."

The truth is: It would cut governmental costs for programs designed to raise farm income in direct proportion of the ability of producers to design sensible marketing agreements and tools.

"The bill would regiment farmers."

The truth is: It would encourage self-help, self-financed plans to stabilize agricultural markets. It would clear the way for fewer, not more, Government controls.

Those are only a few of the obvious distortions being made in a frantic effort to defeat enactment of reasonable and sensible farm programs. No one contends the present bill is perfect. Changes to improve it should and will be made by the agriculture committee or on the floor by Congress.

It is the responsibility of reasonable farm leaders to work for improvements, rather than seek total defeat because of imperfections. There is too much at stake to permit any other approach.

The legislative timetable for consideration of the omnibus farm bill still is indefinite. Hearings have been completed, except return appearance by Secretary Freeman before the Senate Agriculture Committee to answer charges made by opponents of the bill.

The House Agriculture Committee expects to meet next Monday in executive session to begin revisions. The rewriting is expected to take at least a week, possibly two. The Senate Agriculture Committee plans to start making revisions in a week or so.

It appears now that floor debate will begin sometime late in June. Odds are that a modified bill will be passed—but without destroying the objectives of maximum freedom of choice by producers to initiate self-help farm programs, commodity by commodity.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the members of the committee have convinced some of us that the farmers are in dire need and that they are following a pursuit, that is, farming, which apparently is unprofitable. And, I reach that conclusion because this bill is to aid the farmers, and it carries something like $5.9 billion. Certainly a group as intelligent and conservative as are the Members of the House never would advise appropriating that much money unless it was sorely needed. Farming must be a hazardous business and farmers near starvation if it takes $5.9 billion to keep them alive.

There was another matter that I thought should be called to the attention of the House. This morning the Members of Congress who come from Michigan all received a letter. It is important, because it has some bearing upon the Federal aid to education legislation which will come before us in the next 2 or 3 weeks. This letter is from the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 5461 Brush Street, Detroit.

It is as follows:

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE
FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
Detroit, Mich.

To Michigan Representatives THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, GEORGE MEADER, AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, CLARE E. HOFFMAN, GERALD R. FORD, Jr., CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, JAMES G. O'HARA, JAMES HARVEY, ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, VICTOR A. KNOX, JOHN B. BENNETT, CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., LOUIS C. RABAUT, JOHN D. DINGELL, JOHN LESINSKI, MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD:

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom at its annual meeting in Rochester, Mich., on May 27, 1961, has passed the following resolution:

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom of Michigan will continue in its efforts to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities because:

1. In the case of *United States* v. *Watkins* the U.S. Supreme Court made it clear that the HUAC misused its powers in unconstitutional ways and had become an agency for repression.

2. The mandate given the HUAC is contrary to democratic traditions. The Supreme Court has upheld the Congress' legality in creating the committee, but the Congress is not bound to continue it.

3. The committee acts with powers and under immunities that even police and public prosecutors do not have.

4. Huge appropriations given to the HUAC are wasted because its occasional legitimate functions belong more properly and effectively to other, older standing committees. The committee encroaches upon the jurisdiction of other governmental agencies including police, justice departments, and the courts without producing the results of these agencies. The HUAC investigations have resulted in no important convictions in the years of its existence nor in the proposals for any legislation.

5. It has used legislative investigation to disgrace, harass, and abridge the freedom of Americans, many of whom have been working for racial equality and justice. Secret witnesses and sources, defamation, denying due process of law have been the committee's methods of "investigation." Its use of deliberately distorted film in the guise of combating communism is reprehensible.

6. The committee is as dangerous to our country as what it investigates. The news of its activities when it reaches other countries discredits our democratic ideals at this time when we need to reassert our confidence in democracy.

Sincerely,

NANCY FOWLER (Mrs. Don E.),
State Legislative Committee,
Michigan Branch.

The purpose is to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities. Permit me to quote again a part of No. 6.

The committee is as dangerous to our country as what it investigates.

They are referring to the Committee on Un-American Activities. We have a Michigan man on that committee, Mr. JOHANSEN, from the Third District. It is the committee of which Mr. WALTER, our very patriotic, able, and distinguished colleague is chairman. This organization insists that that committee should be abolished because it is doing more harm than the Communists.

Thinking that over, you recall that we are to have Federal aid to education. It occurred to me that inasmuch as this letter makes that statement, and inasmuch as all but six of the Members of the House, 431 of the 437, voted to sustain the committee, and we voted every dollar the committee wanted for its work in order to enable it to operate, does it not follow, and I come to the conclusion the ladies reach is that Members of the House are either ignorant or disloyal because if the committee on Un-American Activities is doing that kind of job, doing more to ruin our country, our form of Government, and destroy it, than the Communists, there must be something wrong with our thinking.

Then thinking along down the line I began to wonder whether the committee that sponsored this letter knew what they were writing about, because did we not a month or two ago, all but six of us, as I said, vote to sustain that committee? Are they not a little late? Are they up to date with what they are trying to do? I would not criticize them because they do not apparently know that the Supreme Court Monday sustained the anti-Communist legislation that has been before the Court so long.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. They did not ask for abolishment of the Supreme Court, did they?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not this organization, no. They praised the Chief Justice and some of his colleagues. But my mail is overwhelmingly in favor of impeaching Justice Warren. This committee is on the other side of that question. They think more of the commies than of us. Democrats from Detroit please note—this committee which wrote you is one of your chicks or chickens. The gentleman from Iowa, I am sure, is not intimating that the Supreme Court should be educated? He did not have that in mind?

Mr. GROSS. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. At once as is usual I answered, writing to Mrs. C. E. Woodruff, who, with a covering letter, sent on the quoted communication. I wrote:

JUNE 6, 1961.

Mrs. C. E. WOODRUFF,
State Legislative Chairman and Chairman of Resolutions, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MRS. WOODRUFF: Thanks for your recent form letter, enclosing a copy of the resolution adopted by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, calling for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and citing your reasons.

In the sixth reason, you state, "the committee is as dangerous to our country as what it investigates."

In my opinion—and I have had 26 years' experience here—you couldn't show greater ignorance of what the committee has done than by that statement. Since the committee was first created, it has received overwhelming support in the House, which leads me to the conclusion that you either do not know what you are writing about, or, you have reached the conclusion that House Members (and I think the last time, there were only 6 out of 437 who opposed the committee) lack either good judgment or patriotism.

The thought occurs to me that perhaps your members should do a little research, a little sound, patriotic thinking. I assume your motives are patriotic, and am extremely sorry you have reached such erroneous conclusions.

Sincerely yours,

_____.

And here is a pertinent editorial from next Saturday's Evening Post:

RED ADVANCES SPARK A MODEST CONSERVATIVE REVIVAL

Despite all the hoop-la, including pickets, full-page advertisements in newspapers, student riots in colleges and solemn declamations by some of our more naive professors, the backers of "Operation Abolition," designed to end the House Committee on Un-American Activities, managed to corral only six votes. Even Representative JIMMY ROOSEVELT, of California, who started out as the sponsor of the abolition movement, finally settled for an effort to curtail the

committee's appropriation. That didn't get anywhere either.

Those who expected some other result have overlooked symptoms at the grassroots, which Members of Congress, perhaps even including JIMMY ROOSEVELT, have been quick to detect—a quiet but unmistakable impatience with politicians and others who, for whatever reason appeals to them, object to investigations of the Communist conspiracy. For one thing, there has been a shift in college and university opinion. Young conservatives are no longer sneered at—anyway not so often.

On the literary front, Allen Drury's novel, "Advise and Consent" (Doubleday), which suggests that liberal statesmen can play some pretty dirty pool, is doing a land-office business; and in New York the play based on Mr. Drury's book has been a sellout. Rumors that the play might be toned down because liberals didn't like it were emphatically blown down by Mr. Drury. John Dos Passos' exciting novel "Midcentury" (Houghton, Mifflin), in which the tyranny of some labor unions over their own members is dramatically portrayed, is another best seller. A few years back, books like these would have been hard to come by in many bookstores if you didn't know the manager.

In several universities conservative student magazines have appeared. An impressive representative of this new group is "Analysis," published by students at the University of Pennsylvania. The writers in the first issue of "Analysis" are not all students. Prof. A. H. Hobbs of the sociology department is a contributor. The students, however, dissect their ideas with freshness and frankness and without invective like that credited to a member of Students for Democratic Action who declared that student conservatives displayed "the social conscience of a Hitler, a Stalin or a BARRY GOLDWATER."

In JIMMY ROOSEVELT'S own State an interesting movement recently got into orbit, launched at the outset by Walter A. Wolford, city clerk of San Gabriel. Mr. Wolford first persuaded his city council to adopt a resolution citing the peril of Communist infiltration and urging "rededication of all loyal Americans to the principles and ideals of our Founding Fathers." He then formed a committee which put on a mass meeting, the main feature of which was the showing of "Operation Abolition," the documentary moving picture of last year's riots against the Un-American Activities Committee in San Francisco. The place was packed. Since then a score of California communities have taken similar action.

Mr. Wolford insists that his idea is not to promote "witch hunting" or merely to make people angry. The program he advocated includes education, with special emphasis on seeing to it that public libraries and school libraries have reliable books on the history, ideology and purposes of communism. Whatever comes of this particular effort, it represents a straw in the wind which Members of Congress undoubtedly felt blowing strongly when they voted on the resolution to put an end to the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Of course, the battle isn't over. Queer characters still appear on college campuses sponsored by "liberal" groups. Nevertheless, as the response to City Clerk Wolford's crusade suggests, America seems to be catching on.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the Agriculture Subcommittee, referred to the addition of a third criterion to be used by REA in considering a generating and transmission loan as "back-door lawmaking." The REA, by unilateral administrative action, has proposed to use its authority to grant such loans "to guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry." I believe he expressed the opinion that if REA wants to change the basic authority of its act, it should come to Congress and go through the proper procedures as do other agencies of Government. I would like to add a lusty "Amen" to the gentleman's statement. If Congress sits complacently by and allows bureaucrats to pervert the body of existing law to suit their own questionable ends, then we might as well close up shop and go home.

I have before me now a speech made by the REA Administrator on June 5 before the New Mexico Rural Electric Cooperative Association at Albuquerque. The speech says the so-called third criterion has already been put in force.

This criterion is an attempt to take out all stops in making loans for generation and transmission facilities. This in spite of the fact that there is nothing in the legislative history of the 1936 REA Act or in subsequent reports of Congress or floor debate that could be interpreted in any sense of the word to permit REA to stretch generating and transmission criteria "to guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry." As a matter of fact, REA was made permanent by Congress in 1944, and it had nothing to do with G. & T. loans.

It should be recalled that during the Senate debate on the 1936 act there was much controversy raised on the Senate floor as to the advisability of giving REA any right whatsoever to construct generating plants. Senator George Norris, generally considered one of the fathers of REA, clarified the discussion by placing in the RECORD a memorandum from Morris Cooke, then Administrator of the temporary REA agency, as to the conditions under which such loans could be made. The Cooke memorandum set forth the basic criteria which were to be followed in making a generating loan. They were: First, energy was not available from any existing source, second, a plant could produce energy at lower costs than it could be obtained from any other source, and third, the output would be used mainly for supplying rural areas.

It did not take REA very long to use "back-door lawmaking," changing generation and transmission criteria to permit loans to be made when in REA's opinion no adequate, dependable source of supply was available to meet the borrower's needs, or where the rate offered by existing power sources would result in higher cost of power to borrowers than the cost of facilities financed by REA. Note the broadness of the change. Eliminated from it was the primary condition of the first criterion that power was not available from any other source. Also note the elimination of the words "and the output would be used mainly for supplying rural areas." It was revised so the generation and transmission criteria would take on a competitive rate element rather than a means of getting power out into unelectrified areas. However, this first administrative change at least stuck somewhat to the original legislative intent of the act as it was limited to cost and supply of wholesale power.

But to guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry has nothing whatsoever to do with the specific problems of rates or service, even though the Administrator has tried to stretch it by claiming they need it to assure fair power contracts. The words of the third criterion are so broad and nebulous an REA Administrator could approve virtually any G. & T. loan under any conditions irrespective of the actual need and certainly irrespective of the availability or the price of power from an alternative source.

In addition, the Administrator in this very same speech states they are going to broaden the use of section 5 loans. This type loan was made available to REA borrowers in the 1936 act to finance the wiring of the premises of people in rural areas and to acquire and install electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment. Now, through back-door lawmaking or the back-door legislating, whichever you care to call it, the REA is trying to expand this section of the act so co-ops can use section 5 loans to finance the purchase and installation of electric-powered machines and equipment in factories and commercial establishments in their service areas.

In other words, REA is now getting completely away from the original purpose of the act and is becoming what might be termed a rural power company. And these rural power companies will use 2-percent money and the other subsidies we are giving them to lure industry right out of your towns and cities into rural areas.

Congress enacted the area development bill last month because it apparently believed it would help depressed areas. But, now we find the Agriculture Department, by administrative fiat, has set up through its rural development program a community facilities program where the Department will lend money in any rural area to develop industry and to take business, irrespective of whether the area is depressed or not.

As the gentleman from Illinois stated, this is all being done through back-door lawmaking. It is not being done through Congress. REA is an outstanding example of how a government agency makes its own "back door" law through the issuance of policy statements. If it desires to stretch its authority just a bit to accomplish an objective not covered by its basic act, it issues a statement or a legal opinion to carry out its plan and then at some convenient time tells a congressional committee of its action. Unless REA is specifically overruled by Congress then it goes forward with this new policy as though it were the law of the land. If at a later date there are objections, REA contends that it has notified a committee of Congress and Congress' failure to take action authorizes this activity. This holds true even

though a vast majority of our Members may never have known of REA's action until some complaint occurs long after the policy has been put into effect. Criticism of this back-door legislative tactic acknowledges the fact that Congress cannot write legislation that does not require some interpretation by the administering agency, but REA presents a case in point where this type of activity is a rule rather than the exception.

I want to repeat there is nothing in any act of Congress that would permit REA to expand its duties as it has done in the case of the expanding of G. & T. and section 5 loan criteria. These are not the only cases in which REA has followed this tactic, just the current ones. If REA desires to do these things; if they want to build generating plants just for the sake of building generating plants; if they want to build industries out in the rural areas just for the sake of building industries, then they should come here and get the permission of Congress and not try to do it through the back door.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I listened intently to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] when he spoke earlier this afternoon, and to others from the metropolitan areas who have said they support this bill and who support farm legislation generally. I am not questioning their sincerity for one moment; I can understand why they do, and that is because under the farm programs that we have today the food basket is being heavily subsidized to consumers in the cities. Without this farm program the price of food would eventually be considerably higher to the consumers in the metropolitan areas. So, while I do not for one moment question the sincerity of their statements, they have a real interest in this farm legislation on behalf of their consumers.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Seventy-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, is a parliamentary inquiry in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May a Member of the minority be recognized for a motion to adjourn?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at this stage of the proceedings. The Chair has directed that the roll be called.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 69]

Adair	Conte	Fallon
Beermann	Cramer	Farbstein
Bennett, Mich.	Daniels	Fascell
Blitch	Davis, Tenn.	Fino
Boggs	Derwinski	Fogarty
Boland	Diggs	Ford, Jr.
Brooks, La.	Dominick	Grant
Buckley	Downing	Gray
Celler	Evins	Green, Pa.
Halleck	Mason	Saund
Hardy	Miller,	Sheppard
Harrison, Va.	George P.	Sikes
Hébert	Morrison	Smith, Miss.
Henderson	O'Brien, N.Y.	Spence
Herlong	O'Konski	Springer
Hosmer	O'Neill	Thomas
Kearns	Passman	Utt
Kilburn	Pilcher	Walter
Kirwan	Pirnie	Williams
Kluczynski	Rains	Willis
Knox	Roberts	
Machrowicz	St. Germain	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KILDAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7444) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 371 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the gentleman ask for this quorum call?

Mr. GROSS. No, no, not this one.

Mr. Chairman, when the quorum call was made, I was at the point of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question or two concerning the bill. Do I understand there are two airplanes in this bill for the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. WHITTEN. The Department of Agriculture has these planes that are used in spraying for the control of the various insects, and that is by far the most economical way to deal with these pests. But insofar as any personal use of these planes is involved, there is none.

Mr. GROSS. Neither of these planes is for the personal use of the Secretary?

Mr. WHITTEN. No, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. These are strictly planes to be used in spraying?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. If the gentleman will permit me to make an announcement at this time for the benefit of our colleagues, I want the Members to know that general debate is about to conclude and we will start reading the bill when the gentleman from Iowa has concluded. I expect to take 1 minute on this side. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me to make that statement.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi if there is any representation allowance in this bill other than the $30,000 appropriation to be found on page 16 of the bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. That allowance is for the agricultural attachés who, as the gentleman knows, are our representatives in various foreign countries and who are a part of our embassies. They have their obligations along with our other representatives. The total amount here is only $30,000.

Mr. GROSS. That is quite some contrast to the allowance of $925,000 for the State Department. I suppose we treat Agriculture differently than the State Department in this respect.

I will say to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that I am not going to offer an amendment to strike out the $30,000, for the reason that I offered an amendment to the State Department appropriation bill to strike out some $400,000 for liquor and entertainment and got nowhere on that; so I do not believe I would get very much support on the $30,000.

I believe the report indicates that there was a 5 million increase in foreigners coming into this country last year. Is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. Those are the figures that were provided to us.

Mr. GROSS. And the House passed a bill not long ago authorizing the appropriation of a substantial sum of money to promote foreign tourists coming to this country. Is not that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is my recollection.

Mr. GROSS. Now we find it necessary to appropriate additional money in this bill to take care of any diseases that may be imported by these foreigners. Is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is one way of expressing it. The money is for additional inspectors to inspect baggage and other things that may be brought in by visitors, to this country or our citizens returning from abroad.

Mr. GROSS. If the tourist promotion bill is successful it will means still greater appropriations for inspections will it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. We certainly will, because just one disease might cost us millions of dollars.

Mr. GROSS. It is a good deal like the farm program where money is spent to take land out of production while spending with the other out of Federal funds to increase production. Then there is the added cost of taking care of the surplus. So we are going around Robin Hood's barn.

Will the gentleman agree with me that that is the situation?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly we are in some sort of vicious cycle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. MONTOYA. I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi, the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, a question. I note in title 1

under subparagraph head entitled "Special Funds," page 4 of the printed bill, there is provided $1 million for a special contingencies fund for research. Also the committee report on page 8 contains an outline of possible purposes for which this fund may be used. In the West for years we have been faced with progressive infestation of our streams and water by what is known as phreatophytes. Some means for the eradication of this menace is sorely needed.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose this question to the subcommittee chairman: Is it the gentleman's understanding that any part of this appropriation item may be used for this type of research by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman from New Mexico, I think he is looking at a special fund which is for a different purpose. However, included in the bill is an extra $1 million for a contingency fund which was set up for the purpose of meeting the type of situation the gentleman describes. Personally, I am not familiar with the gentleman's problem; but it is that type of thing that we have tried to make provision for. The way it is in this bill, it is a matter within their discretion based upon the circumstances.

Mr. MONTOYA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Research: For research and demonstrations on the production and utilization of agricultural products, home economics, and related research and services, including administration of payments to State agricultural experiment stations, $76,558,000: *Provided*, That the limitations contained herein shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C 113a): *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may sell the Entomology Research Laboratory at Orlando, Florida, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he deems advantageous and the proceeds of such sale shall remain available until expended for the establishment of an entomology research laboratory: *Provided further*, That in the establishment of such laboratory the Secretary may acquire land therefor by donation or exchange;

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISHER, Texas: Page 3, line 20, change the semicolon to a colon and add the following: "*Provided further*, That the Secretary may acquire approximately thirty-five acres of land at Kerrville, Texas, by donation, for research purposes;"

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply authorizes the donation of 35 acres of land to the Department of Agriculture for use by the Entomology Research Station located at Kerrville, Tex.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the program authorized in sections 7 to 15, 16(a), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590g–590(o), 590p(a), and 590q), including not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States, $238,000,000, to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1961, carried out during the period July 1, 1960, to December 31, 1961, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $29,100,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses for carrying out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $5,750,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1962 program of soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to $250,000,000, including administration, and no participant shall receive more than $2,500, except where the participants from two or more farms or ranches join to carry out approved practices designed to conserve or improve the agricultural resources of the community): *Provided further*, That no change shall be made in such 1962 program which will have the effect in any county of restricting eligibility requirements or cost-sharing on practices included in either the 1958 or the 1959 programs, unless such change shall have been recommended by the county committee and approved by the State committee: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the 1962 agricultural conservation program for any county may, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program in the participating counties, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such counties, and in addition, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, not to exceed 1 per centum may be made available to any other Federal, State, or local public agency for the same purpose and under the same conditions: *Provided further*, That for the 1962 program $2,500,000 shall be available for technical assistance in formulating and carrying out agricultural conservation practices and $1,000,000 shall be available for conservation practices related directly to flood prevention work in approved watersheds: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming material, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REUSS: On page 19, line 24, after the word "to" strike out "$250,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000".

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce the $250 million for the agriculture conservation program in the appropriation bill to the $150 million requested by the Kennedy administration. As reduced, it would still be $50 million more than the $100 million requested in President Eisenhower's budget of January 16, 1961.

I am proud of the achievements of the ACP insofar as genuine soil conservation is concerned—stripcropping, terracing, contour plowing, tree planting, and the like. But increasingly a large part of ACP has been devoted to subsidizing practices which have little to do with permanently conserving our soil, but are primarily aimed at getting more production per acre.

The Kennedy administration's $150 million budget request is ample for the legitimate conservation activities of ACP. Keeping the budget request at this level, and rejecting the extra $100 million which the Committee on Appropriations has tacked onto it, will enable the ACP to do its intended job, and cut out the waste.

My amendment will force the ACP to curtail two of its present programs which are related primarily to expanded production, rather than to real soil conservation.

The first such wasteful program involves governmental subsidies of $70 million or more a year for fertilizer, largely lime, and rock phosphate. Much of this is applied on flat land, where there is no erosion, and simply results in larger crops per acre. The taxpayer then has to pay for the price-support program on these overproduced crops, costing billions of dollars every year. He then pays a third time in higher food prices.

The fertilizer manufacturers, of course, are all in favor of this multimillion-dollar subsidy. In fact, the main witness who testified for adding another $100 million to the Kennedy administration's $150 million budget request was Robert M. Koch, who is president of the National Limestone Institute—hearings, part 3, pages 21–23.

The second such wasteful program is the subsidized program of draining farm wetlands, which has cost the taxpayers $16 or more million every year.

Like the fertilizer program, it results in more crops per acre, higher price supports, and higher food prices.

But the farm drainage program has caused harm over and beyond the waste of taxpayers' money. As a result of the Government-subsidized drainage of valuable wetlands, particularly in the prairie pothole region of Minnesota and North and South Dakota, more than one-third of the valuable wetlands where wild ducks and geese nest and rest have been drained in recent years. As a result, the Department of the Interior estimates that if the drainage movement continues, our continental supply of ducks and geese will go the way of the passenger pigeon.

You have the ridiculous spectacle of the U.S. Government, through the Department of Agriculture, paying farmers to drain their potholes, and the Department of the Interior then paying farmers again to flood the drained potholes so that they will once more support waterfowl.

All of this drainage is done in the name of conservation. Madame Roland deprecated the excesses of the French Revolution by saying, "O liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name." One might say the same thing of some of the conservation administered by the agriculture conservation program.

The efforts of myself and others to end federally subsidized drainage of wetlands valuable for wildlife have so far come to nothing. Bills I introduced in the last two Congresses to forbid federally subsidized drainage of wetlands where wildlife preservation would be seriously harmed died without a hearing.

The Department of Agriculture made a so-called agreement on May 2, 1960, to listen to the Department of the Interior before going ahead with subsidizing farm drainage which would hurt wildlife. Mr. Chairman, during the first period under this agreement for which we have a record, the period July 1–December 31, 1960, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of the Interior reports that the Department of Agriculture went right ahead and subsidized drainage in 77 percent of the 553 cases recommended by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for denial of financial assistance for drainage.

The full report of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife follows:

A total of 1,863 wetland areas, for which farmers had requested assistance for drainage, were inspected between July 1 and December 31, 1960. These areas were located within six counties in South Dakota, three counties in Minnesota, and three counties in North Dakota.

The Soil Conservation Service need and practicability surveys revealed that 234 (13 percent) of the wetland areas were not qualified for drainage assistance. Of the 1,639 wetlands qualified for drainage assistance 553 areas (34 percent) had significant wildlife values and Bureau biologists recommended their conservation. The ASC county committees denied drainage assistance for 128 wetland areas. This was 23 percent of the areas the Bureau recommended for conservation. However, 23 percent of the wetland areas denied Federal assistance for drainage were drained privately in South Dakota and Minnesota. Surveys to determine the extent of such private drainage have not been completed in North Dakota.

Considering both the private and federally assisted drainage, 11 percent of the wetland areas the Bureau recommended for conservation were saved in South Dakota and Minnesota.

The ASC county committees approved assistance for the draining of 93 potholes whose owners expressed interest in our acquisition program in Minnesota and South Dakota.

Data are being compiled to show the number of acres of wetlands saved as a result of the inspection program. This information should be available in about a month.

When drainage data for the calendar year 1960 have been collected and analyzed for all 89 prairie pothole counties, probably in April or early May of 1961, it will be possible to compare the trend of drainage in the 12 pilot counties with the trend in the 77 remaining counties for calendar years 1959 and 1960 to give a better measure of the effectiveness of the inspection program.

The attached table is a current, cumulative summary of the ACP 247 drainage referral inspection program in 12 pilot counties in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota.

Cumulative summary inspection of ACP 247 drainage referrals in 12 pilot counties in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota

	South Dakota	North Dakota	Minnesota	Total
1. Number of wetland areas which SCS said qualified for assistance for drainage	339	1,090	200	1,629
2. Number of wetland areas which SCS said did not qualify for drainage assistance	108	100	26	234
3. Number of SCS qualified wetlands FWS recommended saving	148	234	171	553
4. Number of SCS qualified wetlands FWS did not recommend saving	191	856	29	1,076
5. Number of SCS qualified wetlands FWS recommended saving for which ASC committees denied drainage assistance including appealed cases	42	84	2	128
6. Number of wetlands listed in item 5 which were drained privately	8	(1)	2	
7. Number of wetlands actually saved (item 5 minus item 6)	34	(1)	0	
8. Number of wetlands in which farmer was interested in our acquisition program	89	0	4	93

[1] Incomplete.

Here is the resolution on drainage adopted by the National Wildlife Federation at its 25th annual convention, Washington, D.C., March 2–5, 1961:

Whereas the United States of America continues to be plagued by so-called surpluses of some agricultural products and we, the National Wildlife Federation, being dedicated to preservation of natural resources, cannot see any logical reason for removing an important resource, our soil, from a state of natural protection: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government or any State or any subdivision thereof discontinue the practice of financing any drainage of wet lands either by direct subsidy or by loan or by free technical assistance; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation commend the President of the United States for his statement to the Congress wherein he directed the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to resolve the conflicts between agencies "Namely, one department paying to have wet lands drained for agricultural purposes while another is purchasing such lands for wildlife or waterfowl refuges."

The National Wildlife Federation heartily endorses the President's directive to the executive branch of the Federal Government and respectfully requests Congress to enact such legislation as is necessary to eliminate the drainage of wet lands with the aid of Federal subsidy and acquire or otherwise reserve the necessary habitat to provide a stable continental waterfowl population.

The Kennedy administration's $150 million request will permit the real conservation job to be done.

I ask all Members who are interested in economy in Government, and in conserving our natural resources, to support the Eisenhower-Kennedy budget request by supporting this amendment.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I think the gentleman recognizes that the Fish and Wildlife Subcommittee has just reported a bill to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries which would cure, in part, some of the problems by accelerating the acquisition of these wet lands and stopping them from going into production of additional surplus crops.

Mr. REUSS. Yes. That is a splendid bill, and I commend the gentleman for his leadership in reporting that out of the subcommittee. But how ironic it is that we are embarking on an accelerated program of using taxpayers' money to buy wet lands at the same time that we are using taxpayers' money to drain wet lands.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. A few moments ago I made the same point, that money is spent to drain these lands, put them into production, and then pay to take care of the surpluses grown on the land. Let us keep a reasonable amount of this land in its present state and bring it into production when it is needed, and it will be needed some day.

Mr. REUSS. I think the gentleman has spoken well. That would be the best

kind of a soil bank. Meanwhile, the people of this country who love the outdoors would have some use of it.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, would not the gentleman's amendment somewhat cutback the use of lime rock, which increases production and is a form of subsidy?

Mr. REUSS. Yes. The administrations of both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have felt that there is too much use of subsidized fertilizers, such as lime rock, and this amendment would cut out some of the abuses there. There would be plenty left for all legitimate conservation purposes.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin has discussed with us several times the problem he has in his area in regard to wet lands and the interests that they have in the breeding of ducks in those wet lands. I am in accord with his desires, and we have requested the department to cooperate fully. They assured us this year that they would meet with the Department of the Interior and try their best to solve the problem that the gentleman points out.

Now, let us look at the merits of this thing. This bill carries lots of money, as I have pointed out. But, my friends, I do not know of anything in this Nation that is a better investment than the agricultural conservation program. More than a million farmers put up $2 for each one that the Federal Government puts up in conservation practices scattered all over the United States.

In spite of our efforts, not only through this but through every other means, the record shows that the amount of erosion of topsoil into our rivers and harbors each year exceeds the volume of earth dug from the Panama Canal.

There is nobody in this Congress that is more disturbed about the national debt and inflation than I. But, as I pointed out in making a motion to override the veto of the public works bill a few years ago, nothing of local, national, or international interest is more important than to leave our children a good, sound country with the soil protected and erosion stopped.

The gentleman has had this argument and we have tried to resolve it. But if you are going to have this program, the cost of administering a $150 million program would be just as high as if you carried the $250 million. We have had the $250 million for some time. I think we would get far more good from a soil conservation program if we carried it on at a consistent level.

The practices are selected by the farmer himself. He selects the practice where he is willing to put up a dollar and his own labor. It means in the areas where there are minerals lacking in the soil that the farmer selects the mineral that he feels is worth the dollar he contributes and his labor.

I say again, this is a program where 1 million participants put up an equal amount of money with the Government and supply their labor. Do not take a step back. I hope you will vote the amendment down and go along with this program. I assure the gentleman from Wisconsin I will cooperate as fully as I know how in trying to get his problem resolved. If the gentleman will read the hearings, he will find that we have the assurance of the Department of Agriculture that they will cooperate.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin has clearly exposed his interest in this amendment. It is not merely aimed at reducing the ACP practices. He is trying to damage my area. I resent the gentleman's trying to say to the House of Representatives that the rights of the duck hunters from Milwaukee should take precedence over the rights of my farmers in western Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Iowa. The farmers of this area want to be able to get the excess water off their farms. I think the gentleman ought to be ashamed of himself for taking the back-door way. His amendment is not going to have anything to do with wet lands. He would not try to take away the $100 million, because he knows that would be legislation on an appropriation bill. So I say to my good friend from Wisconsin that he has been in here every year as long as I can remember trying to do damage to my part of the country. He is trying to help his duck hunters at the expense of my farmers. He should go to the legislative committee and try to get legislation.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I will not yield to the gentleman because I know I cannot convince him and he cannot convince me.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I come to the well of the House and oppose any amendment designed to save our Government some money, but there is such a thing as being pennywise and pound foolish.

If we adopt this amendment and delete this money from the agricultural limestone program, we will be doing exactly that—saving what actually represents a mere pittance, when compared to the massive outlays of money for every conceivable purpose, at the expense of our God-given and irreplaceable soil. We would be saving only a few pennies per taxpayer while opening the door for millions of dollars of soil damage and paving the way for the loss of land that cannot be replaced in the future with dollars.

We will also strike a blow at a program which does what I have advocated since coming to the Congress in 1940 and that is helping the farmer help himself.

Money spent on the agricultural limestone program is, in a way, a fulfillment of the obligation we owe to prosperity. If there is any obligation we owe to posterity more than that of conserving our God-given soil, I do not know what it might be.

With our great increases in population comes the necessity for feeding ever-growing numbers.

The old Chinaman once told his young son, "Hold onto this half acre of land because God will not make any more." We had better follow this advice, because that man was right—God is not going to make any more soil. We are going to need it. It does not belong to us. We are just tenants of the earth. We owe it to posterity to take care of it, and to leave it as good as or better than we found it.

In my opinion, and I have studied this problem for many years, there is nothing that would do more to destroy the earth than to stop the agricultural limestone program which helps establish roots in the soil and keeps it from washing down into the brooks, creeks, and rivers. It has saved and will save millions of dollars that would otherwise be necessary for flood control. By holding the soil in place, by stopping runoff and erosion, it keeps stream beds from being filled up and it lessens the possibility of floods.

Now, I believe that my recommendation to defeat this amendment might lose now, but when we go back to the House there will be a separate record vote on the amendment to delete money from this program and it will be defeated. Those who support this amendment will be saying, in effect, that they are indifferent to the good created by this program, that they are callous to the desires of farmers who are preserving our soil and making it better for posterity.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be most unwise for the House to reduce the level of the conservation program. We have had a good program in this particular area for several years and I do not think it should be disturbed. The program has worked well year in and year out both under Democratic and Republican administrations. I think it is in the overall best interests of the country. I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this debate is getting warm. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana, my very good friend [Mr. WILSON] that we should conserve the soil. But, what good would that land be to anyone if we did not have water on it? We would have another dust storm. We all remember those days when for lack of water the soil blew over the fences and farms were abandoned—sure, we all do. It is not very often that I find myself in support of anything that comes from the other side—usually, because it is not very beneficial to our people—just another spending measure. But, in this particular case, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], I think, is right. If the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] will excuse me for differing with him, permit me to share part of the shame and disgrace which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN]

intimated was due to be loaded upon the shoulders of our friend from Wisconsin because he offered an amendment to save $1 million. I would like to help to divide his burden of disgrace which our colleague so graciously said he should bear. Everyone knows we have been appropriating a great deal of money to build ponds on the farms. What for? For water—sure—to conserve the land as well as water.

The gentleman from Wisconsin said why with one hand drain every damp spot and with the other dig ponds, dams, to hold water, prevent floods? We spend millions to conserve water—our supply is in danger we are told. Then out of the same fund we speed the flow of water to the oceans. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is right about this, and I am sorry—oh, I am so sorry—you have no idea how grief bears me down to find myself doing something which the gentleman from Minnesota says will hurt the farmer—benefit future generations. I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] how much do the duck hunters, those lazy fellows he berated pay in for licenses and how much do the fishermen pay in for licenses; and how much have we spent; and how much will we spend to build dams to create lakes to conserve water? On a little piece of sand that I own, I put a pond. Why? Because we wanted to hold some water there. Millions of others do the same as do the States and the good old United States of America. Farmers pump some of this stored water over on the land and grow watermelons and canteloupes and all kinds of garden trucks. It was helpful. My heart certainly goes out to the farmers that the gentleman from Minnesota represents and in anguished tones cries for on every possible occasion. To hear him you might get the idea that every individual who was not a farmer or a farm corporation in that great and glorious State was some kind of odious creature. To hear him talk you would think we were taking the shirts right off the backs of the farmers and giving them to some dirty duck hunters or fishermen—a new breed of inferiors who should be shot if they did not own a farm and draw subsidy.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I rise at this time to speak to my colleagues who represent city areas so that they may have the benefit of information which we have so that they can properly evaluate this amendment. We have assurances that this pothole situation will not take place. The Department of Agriculture is going to work with the Department of the Interior so that this bad situation will not be repeated. But, this particular program is good for the people in the cities who need good water. It is a program that is closely connected and related to the water supply situation in our city of New York as well as the State of New York. These soil conservation practices preserve the land keep water from running off as a result we can get good fresh drinking water in the city of New York and other big cities. If we do not protect the land areas of our Nation, the people who depend on this program to safeguard their supply of potable water will find themselves in a mess. This is no time to be pennywise and pound foolish. I strongly urge the committee to defeat this amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, not very often do I come to the well of the House to talk in favor of an amendment which would make this size cut in the budget. I think my good friends, at least one of whom said that we are going to cut out a valuable program, and some of my other colleagues on the Appropriations Committee may, perhaps, have failed to tell the House the full story because of lack of time to debate this matter properly. But, let me say this. The last administration recommended $100 million for this program. The present administration recommended $150 million for this program. The agriculture subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in its generosity put $250 million in this program which is over $100 million more than was requested and over $100 million more than the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget and the administration say can properly be spent for this program. We are told that this ACP program preserves water. My good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, who preceded me, pointed out that on the one hand we are draining and on the other hand we are building ponds. The $150 million will build a lot of ponds. The $150 million will buy a lot of phosphate. The $150 million will buy an awful lot of lime to improve the land. This is the amount left by the amendment.

We were told that the Department of Agriculture was going to get together with the Department of the Interior and try to solve this problem of drainage of waterfowl habitat.

I have been in Congress for a long time, and others here much longer. We have had this agriculture problem for a long time, but I have not seen any signs that the Department of Agriculture has solved a single major problem it has had in its hands since it has been there. If the money provided is not sufficient to meet its needs they can come back for more next fiscal year, we can always give them more, but as it stands now it is just a form of largesse, a form of waste, a form of squandering the taxpayers' substance and taxpayers' money; and I say that if this House of Representatives today votes this extra $100 million we can go home and look our taxpayers in the eye and say "I was a party to waste; we wasted, we shot, we blew $100 million of your money in a program which goes far beyond the needs of the country."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say to the members of the committee that the Department of Agriculture requested $250 million, which was the same level we have had heretofore. In checking the matter, I have been unable to find any possible reason for the reduction to $150 million; I have not had anybody from the Budget Bureau or anyone from the Department justify this.

It seems to be something of an accident rather than a real intent of those in control. May I also say that this is the announcement of next year's program. It is not in the money to pay for the present year's program. If you adopt the amendment it will reduce the program for next year.

I repeat, Secretary Freeman of the Department of Agriculture requested that $250 million and made a very strong case to our committee on the basis that we should keep it on an even keel. To adopt this amendment would be to help defeat the very purpose for which we devised the program.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I believe the amendment should be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REUSS) there were—ayes 107, noes 65.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REUSS: On page 20, line 4, after the colon, strike out all through the end of line 9.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment becomes necessary in order fully to effectuate the amendment which the Committee of the Whole House has just seen fit, wisely in my opinion, to adopt. It would strike out language on page 20, lines 4 to 9, which says in effect that the county committee can have the absolute voice over whether a given practice can or cannot be followed.

I know that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], takes the view that this language does not inhibit the Department of Agriculture from cutting down on certain practices, but the language on its face seems to do so; therefore, in order to permit the Department of Agriculture fully to comply with the amendment which has just been adopted, which amendment cut down the appropriation to the $150 million requested by the administration, it is necessary to delete the language which is at issue in the amendment now before the House.

Before I yield back my time, I should like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], for his very cooperative efforts over the years to get the Department of Agriculture to get rid of some of the excesses in connection with its farm drainage program. It has been through no fault of the gentleman from Mississippi that the Department of Agriculture finds itself subject to the criticism which it so much deserves. The only way, however, in which the Department can be induced to comply with the will of Congress is by the kind of amendment which was just passed.

I hope the House will adopt my technical amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the Justice Department deem the language in the gentleman's amendment necessary to bring about the results he desires?

Mr. REUSS. No. I have not consulted the Department of Justice. I have consulted with able lawyers, like the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, if this committee should agree to the gentleman's amendment, it will take away from the county ASC committees practically any voice whatsoever in the program and place all of that authority in the hands of the Secretary in Washington. Certainly the gentleman should know that all the practices by which the county committees must abide are contained in what is known as the ACP Handbook which has been approved at the State level and at the Washington level. It is only from those particular practices that the county committee can make recommendations. It simply says that the county ASC committee, with reference to its own particular county, may find certain practices will do more good. If so, then the State committee cannot veto that decision. They can then carry out that particular practice and pay for that particular practice out of the county allotment of ACP funds.

I again say, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Wisconsin does succeed in getting this amendment adopted, it simply means that what little voice the county committee has had in the farm program will be lost due to the action of this committee.

I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

There is not a Member of this House who would not have supported this amendment had he been out in the field the last 2 years as I have, seeing what is being done with this agricultural limestone program.

I have traveled all over my district and other soil-conservation districts in Indiana. I have seen farmers doing the very job I have advocated ever since I came here in 1940—prevent erosion and soil damage and make a sweeter and more productive soil through the use of agricultural limestone.

I think we are really just getting started on this program. The agricultural limestone program is the greatest program we have ever offered, because it is the kind of program that does the very thing in which I believe—it helps the farmers to help themselves.

Earlier in this debate there was some talk of foreign aid. I would be for foreign aid if it was as good a program as the agricultural conservation and agricultural limestone programs. If we were only helping nations overseas to help themselves as this program does, I would be an ardent foreign aid supporter.

Here is a program that is developed lock, stock, and barrel to help the farmers cure their own problems. The Government does not dictate. It does not regulate, interfere, or meddle. It provides the bare essentials. The farmer provides the knowledge, the work, and the enthusiasm.

We have seen in the House today where someone who has a pet peeve of some kind about the program is trying to promote opposition to the conservation program by bringing in topics and discussion that have nothing to do with this program at all. Ninety percent of the debate you have heard on this amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with this program. The gentleman has been trying to undercut this program for years and he has taken advantage of an opportunity, with unlimited time for debate, to clarify his stand against this valuable program.

I could take time here today to go into the public law under which this program was initiated. I could review its purpose and review sites in my district and down South that I have inspected. I could show you exactly what this program has done for people in many soil conservation districts.

I could show you how farmers terrace the hillsides, use lime and then plant legumes that grow in the soils, making firm, sturdy root systems which hold back the soil when rain falls. This lime makes the soil sweeter, more productive, and better.

You can look 5 miles across some of the valleys in my district and see, just as clearly as if a fence had been built, the difference in land where the agricultural limestone program is followed and where it is not followed. In August you would find herds of cattle grazing in lush clover and succulent grasses on a farmer's land where limestone had been used. The difference where the program has not been used is as clear as if a fence were built, but none exists.

Why are pastures that have been limed so much better? Why is the grass greener and more lush? Why is the soil being conserved better than in other ways? It is simple. Water is held back by terracing, limestone treatment induces legume growth, sturdy roots are formed. The end result is excellent pasture; better, sweeter land for this and other generations.

How is all this accomplished?

I will tell you how. It is done by the simple expedient of helping the farmer to help himself. This is the best kind of soil conservation policy and I urge you to vote down this amendment, or any amendment, which cripples this program.

I feel just as assured as I did on a previous amendment that if this amendment is not voted down here in committee, it will be voted down later in the House when Members are on record and when those for and against soil conservation will have to stand up and be counted.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It was even said here that lime was used to increase the yield of corn, when, as a matter of fact, corn is grown in acid soil. Lime is used on legumes which are not supported crops.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Of course; they do not know what they are talking about. Lime is used to produce legumes which, in turn, harbors a nitrogen producing bacteria. This bacteria lives in the soil and grows there. When inoculated, the soil produces nodules on the roots of legumes and adds to the fertility of the soil, making it productive. This program does much for my section of the country in just this manner. It will continue to do more if not hobbled by this or any other crippling amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will vote this amendment down. May I explain what it will do? The language that would be stricken prohibits dictation from Washington. I certainly do not think centering this program in Washington would be sound in the least. I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I would like a point of clarification. Under the language as it now exists in the bill, lines 4 to 9, the language we are talking about, if a county committee wishes to embark upon a practice and use taxpayers' money to do it, which the Department of Agriculture in Washington believes has become a wasteful practice, a practice no longer relevant to good soil conservation practices, then they cannot go ahead, nevertheless, and spend the money.

Mr. WHITTEN. The catalog comes about in this way. Recommendations from the county are made to the State, and from the State to the Federal level. At the Federal level these practices are approved and are put in the Federal catalog. Once they put them in the catalog, then it is up to the State committees to determine what practices they wish to select, and then the county committees select what they wish for the county.

I would hope that they would not dictate from Washington, but I have seen times in the past when the Department told these districts what to do. And, despite the gentleman's interest in this matter, as well as the interest of the present Secretary in that area, I just do not think the gentleman's amendment will help his pothole situation.

One of the troubles we have when we get into a contest with my friend from Wisconsin or my friend from Michigan, or in any contest in Congress or else-

where, is that 10 times as many people not farmers as are farmers. If somebody does not look out we are going to ruin our watersheds and we are going to ruin the water and food supply for a whole lot of cities without meaning to. This whole program is the best investment we can possibly make.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Does the gentleman know anybody around here who has voted more consistently for these agricultural programs than I or my colleagues?

Mr. WHITTEN. If my friends from the city districts had not been voting for the agricultural programs we would not have any, because you have the numbers. However, in a contest when agriculture has only 10 percent and the other side 90 percent, and with only about 20 percent of the Members in Congress having any farm interests back home, we must have city support. When we get into a division, agriculture is on the little side.

Mr. DINGELL. I would point out to my good friend that we still leave $150 million here to carry out this ACP program, but all we ask is a little bit of consideration be given to some of these aspects of the program to which attention has not been paid, and we preserve one of the best flood control systems that have been developed, and that is better than are all of the programs that have been constructed under the ACP.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have tried to help solve these problems, but when the farmers read this debate and see that you have cut the heart out of the program, they will retaliate by doing what you are against. I am trying to help you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REUSS) there were—ayes 26, noes 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE OF AGRICULTURE

Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for planning, promoting, coordinating, and assisting participation by industry, trade associations, commodity groups, and similar interests in the celebration of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture; expenses of an honorary committee established in connection with such celebration; and employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); $100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1962.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language beginning on page 28, line 14, and continuing down to and including line 2 on page 29, that it is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. May I say we have checked this matter and under the organic act of 1862 creating the Department of Agriculture, authority is granted to disseminate information. It is our argument and our insistence that the language which the gentleman would strike under which a centennial observance of the creation of the Department of Agriculture is to be held here in Washington where visitors from all over the United States may come to see the exhibits and demonstrations and reports and various other things that the Department has brought together over the years is clearly disseminating information, and is within the organic act which created the Department of Agriculture, which act was passed in 1862.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asks the gentleman from Mississippi if he can refer the Chair to any special or specific legislation authorizing the celebration of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture or does the gentleman rely on the general organic act?

Mr. WHITTEN. I rely upon the general organic act, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not find anything in that act which said anything about any honorary committee—they never even dreamed of that at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard further?

Mr. WHITTEN. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KILDAY). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] makes a point of order against that portion of the bill appearing in line 14 on page 28 through and including line 2 on page 29. The Chair is constrained to hold that the language does constitute legislation on an appropriation bill and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIBRARY

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses, including dues for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members, $1,000,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 29, after line 2, strike out all down to and including line 8.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I should be against this item. I am trying to hear something more about it. I wish the gentleman in charge of the legislation would tell me just what that means—what necessary expenses including dues for library members in societies or associations are to be paid. That looks like a move to give members of certain groups special rates. What groups do you want to give a special price to? Why should we give a million dollars to the members of certain groups?

Mr. WHITTEN. The $1 million is for the library for the Department of Agriculture, in which all of the agricultural information that we have accumulated through the years is kept together and which is used throughout the country by the Extension Service and all the other branches of government. The language to which the gentleman refers permits these few people to get this assistance. Incidentally, this is a very small unit that operates the library. This language permits these few people to belong to these societies and associations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, but what I want to know is what societies and what associations are to be favored? What are the names?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry I do not have the specific names of these societies and associations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What you have here is a million dollars to be given to members of certain societies and you do not know who they are? One of them might be the one I talked about earlier today, that organization called the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, in Detroit, Mich., who say that we are worse than the Communists when we voted to support the Committee on Un-American Activities of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is chairman. Think of that and support this amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What are the dues to be? If the dues were $100 a year for each one of these societies or associations that would be about 10,000 societies; would it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, I do not know of any two friends that I have who can stir up more questions on short notice, but this $1 million is for the library and in all probability all of it will not be used.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, what library? The bill says societies and associations, does it not? I cannot yield any more. Here you are giving this money to members of groups, and it is not even foreign aid and we do not know even the names of the organizations getting the money. We are giving away $1 million to unknown beneficiaries of unknown organizations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know just what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] meant. I think the gentleman said something about two people who can stir up more trouble on short notice. Was that supposed to be a compliment to you and me?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know, but the gentleman, I think, will admit that by and large we have good intentions and favor efficiency and saving the tax dollars.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this language has been carried in this bill for many, many years.

I am sorry, I say to the committee, that I do not have the names of the societies at my fingertips. This $1 million is to run the library of the Department of Agriculture; only a small portion of the million is involved. It is used to keep the people who deal with the agriculture library in touch with those associations of library science where they can swap information and deal with others, such as the Library of Congress, on a basis which serves the interest of the Department and the library.

Again I assure you, Mr. Chairman, this $1 million is for the operation of the Department's library.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Nothing in this Act shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided*, That not to exceed $47,500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That $1,000,000 of this authorization shall be available only to expand and strengthen the sales program of the Corporation pursuant to authority contained in the Corporation's charter: *Provided further*, That not less than 7 per centum of this authorization shall be placed in reserve to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for use only in such amounts and at such time as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided further*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AVERY: On page 33, line 22, strike out the period, and add ": *Provided further*, (1) That no part of this authorization shall be used to formulate or carry out a price support program for 1962 under which a total amount of price support in excess of $50,000 would be extended through loans, purchases, or purchase agreements made or made available by Commodity Credit Corporation to any person on the 1962 production of all agricultural commodities, (2) That the term "person" shall mean an individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or other legal entity, or a State, political subdivision of a State, or any agency thereof, (3) That in the case of any loan to, or purchase from, a cooperative marketing organization, such limitation shall not apply to the amount of price support received by the cooperative marketing organization, but the amount of price support made available to any person through such cooperative marketing organization shall be included in determining the amount of price support received by such person for purposes of such limitation, and (4) That the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue regulations prescribing such rules as he determines necessary to prevent the evasion of such limitation"——

Mr. AVERY (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. This in effect is not new language, but was adopted by the House 2 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for trespassing upon the time of the House at this late hour. However, this is not new language. We adopted this 2 years ago when the House adopted an amendment in substantially the same language in 1959. I thought we had accepted it in 1960 because of a colloquy I had with the gentleman from Mississippi, but apparently we were not in agreement as to what the language meant in the bill last year.

I also attempted last year to amend the basic Commodity Credit Corporation Act that really emanated from the Banking and Currency Committee. However, I could not even get a hearing before the Banking and Currency Committee, so I am left with no remedy except to offer again this limitation on the agricultural appropriation bill for 1962.

The effect of the amendment would be to limit the lending power of the Commodity Credit Corporation to any one corporation to a total of $50,000. You ask: Does anybody get a larger loan than $50,000? Yes, there are loans as high as a million, quite a few as high as half a million, and 117, I think, wheat loans in excess of $50,000.

You ask further: Does not the purchaser pledge his grain to repay this loan? The answer is, yes, he does; he pledges his wheat. The Commodity Credit Corporation sustains in excess of $1 per bushel loss on each bushel of wheat on which a farmer receives a loan. On a half-million-bushel loan the Commodity Credit Corporation loses approximately $250,000.

So I do not see that this in any way jeopardizes the intent of the legislation but it certainly will prevent tremendous loans to these large farms. For instance, in Arizona there is a Goodyear farm which received a loan of $387,000. The Commodity Credit Corporation sustained a loss in excess of $20 per bale on each bale of cotton on which the loan was made, so you figure out what a subsidy was given the Goodyear Farms Corp. from the Federal Treasury. That is charged up to the cost of the Department of Agriculture program.

The Commodity Credit Corporation program was not designed originally to subsidize such farm operations as are listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It has grown and developed into a vehicle whereby these corporations take advantage of the program, a program that was designed to stabilize the economy of the so-called small or average size farm.

If there is any other way to reach the problem, I will discuss it with the legislative committees of the House, or with the Committee on Banking and Currency. Since it will not entertain legislation to put this limitation on, I feel that certainly we are doing the farmers of America a favor to preserve the program by enacting a reasonable limitation on the lending authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi insist on his point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. It provides for new duties on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, in addition to other legislative provisions.

May I say to the gentleman from Kansas that if he will check the matter he will find my statement last year was accurate. It would have the effect of controlling this, so to that degree it was true. I am opposed to the amendment, of course. And may I repeat again, it is our contention that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, and for that reason the point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. AVERY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

As I recall it, about 2 years ago right now, in 1959, I think the distinguished gentleman from Texas was in the chair that day; if not the gentleman from Texas presently in the chair, it was one of his Texas colleagues. When I submitted the original amendment to this same section of the appropriation bill, the gentleman from Mississippi raised a point of order against the amendment. After a considerable amount of deliberation, shall I say, the Chairman upheld the amendment as being a further limitation on the administrative costs of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Therefore, the point of order was not sustained.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KILDAY). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment which has been reported. The Chair would observe it was probably this chairman who occupied the chair on the occasion the gentleman from Kansas referred to. It was apparently on the 18th of May 1959.

The Chair did not understand the gentleman from Kansas to state that the amendment now pending is in identical language as that which was offered in 1959.

Mr. AVERY. I did not so state, or at least I did not intend to so state.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman did not understand the gentleman as so stating.

Mr. AVERY. It is substantially the same amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the language which was before the Chair in 1959, and will read it:

Amendment offered by Mr. AVERY: Page 27, line 19, strike out the period, add a colon and insert: "Further, no funds appropriated in this section shall be used to process Commodity Credit loans which are in excess of $50,000."

The Chair points out that that language was directly, solely and exclusively directed at the purpose for which funds being appropriated at that time could be used.

The Chair has examined the pending amendment, and while the first sentence of the pending amendment would indicate that it is in the nature of a limitation, it does refer to authorizations. This is the crux of the ruling of the Chair.

The Chair points out that the language of the amendment contains definitions, authorizations, and imposes duties upon an officer of the executive department. It is therefore clearly legislation on an appropriation bill. It is not identical or, in the opinion of the Chair, similar to the amendment offered in 1959.

The Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to inquire of the Chairman in what way the amendment that I have now pending at the desk imposes any further obligations upon the Secretary than is covered by *"Provided further"* at the bottom of page 33.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the gentleman's attention to paragraph No. 4, that the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue regulations and prescribe such rules as he determines necessary to prevent an evasion of such limitations. That is only one of the legislative provisions which the Chair observes in the amendment.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, may I submit another parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, the language of the amendment now pending at the desk is the identical language that came into conference from the other body following action of the House, and my amendment in 1959 became incorporated, I believe, in the conference report. Does that in any way change the legislative history of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may advise the gentleman that nothing is pending before the Chair, but by way of observation, the language the gentleman speaks of was apparently added by the other body. The present occupant of the Chair would not attempt to state or to interpret the rules or procedure of the other body.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the Chairman.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, at a time of worldwide economic competition, with only $6.2 billion gold reserve beyond the $11.2 billion which supports our currency, we here today are asked to provide $3,662 million in food giveaway to foreign nations under Public Law 480. This is in addition to $4½ billion in foreign aid, the billions of unexpended balances of previous years of foreign aid, the offshore procurement, the foreign military bases expenditures, and the interest on that part of our national debt attributable to earlier years of foreign aid and deficit spending. What are we trying to do? Rush to our economic suicide? Are we indeed spending ourselves into bankruptcy? Our estimated Federal expenditures have increased since January until now we are faced with at least a $4 billion deficit. This does not take into account the additional appropriations yet to come.

It is beginning to become clear that if our Nation perishes economically, and it is certainly possible following our present course, it will be by our own hands, our own lack of self-discipline. I am heartily opposed to this ridiculous agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLS) having assumed the chair, Mr. KILDAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7444) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Reuss amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 24, after "to" strike out "$250,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 196, answered "present" 0, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—184

Addabbo	Findley	Michel
Addonizio	Finnegan	Milliken
Anderson, Ill.	Ford	Minshall
Ashbrook	Frelinghuysen	Moeller
Ashley	Friedel	Monagan
Auchincloss	Fulton	Moorehead, Ohio
Ayres	Gallagher	Moorhead, Pa.
Baring	Garland	Morse
Barrett	Garmatz	Mosher
Barry	Gary	Murphy
Bates	Gavin	Nix
Becker	Giaimo	O'Brien, Ill.
Beckworth	Gilbert	O'Hara, Ill.
Bell	Glenn	Osmers
Bennett, Fla.	Goodell	Ostertag
Betts	Goodling	Pelly
Boland	Granahan	Philbin
Bolling	Gray	Pike
Bolton	Green, Oreg.	Pillion
Brademas	Griffin	Price
Brewster	Griffiths	Pucinski
Bromwell	Gross	Ray
Broomfield	Haley	Reuss
Brown	Halpern	Rhodes, Ariz.
Broyhill	Harsha	Rhodes, Pa.
Bruce	Harvey, Mich.	Riehlman
Burke, Mass.	Hechler	Robison
Byrne, Pa.	Hiestand	Rodino
Cahill	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Carey	Hoffman, Mich.	Roosevelt
Casey	Holland	Rostenkowski
Cederberg	Holtzman	Rousselot
Chamberlain	Joelson	Ryan
Church	Johansen	St. George
Clancy	Jonas	Schenck
Clark	Judd	Scherer
Cohelan	Karsten	Schneebeli
Collier	Kearns	Schweiker
Corbett	Keith	Scranton
Cunningham	Kelly	Shelley
Curtin	King, Calif.	Short
Curtis, Mass.	King, N.Y.	Sibal
Curtis, Mo.	Kirwan	Siler
Daddario	Kluczynski	Smith, Calif.
Dague	Kowalski	Sullivan
Delaney	Kunkel	Taber
Dent	Latta	Thompson, N.J.
Derounian	Lesinski	Toll
Derwinski	Lindsay	Tollefson
Devine	Lipscomb	Udall
Diggs	McCulloch	Vanik
Dingell	McDonough	Van Zandt
Donohue	McDowell	Wallhauser
Dooley	McVey	Weis
Dulski	Macdonald	Whalley
Durno	MacGregor	Widnall
Dwyer	Machrowicz	Wilson, Calif.
Ellsworth	Madden	Yates
Farbstein	Mailliard	Younger
Fascell	Martin, Mass.	Zelenko
Feighan	Martin, Nebr.	
Fenton	Meader	

NAYS—196

Abbitt	Bonner	Dawson
Abernethy	Bow	Denton
Alexander	Boykin	Dole
Alford	Bray	Dorn
Andersen, Minn.	Breeding	Dowdy
Andrews	Brooks, La.	Doyle
Anfuso	Brooks, Tex.	Edmondson
Ashmore	Buckley	Elliott
Aspinall	Burleson	Everett
Avery	Cannon	Fisher
Bailey	Celler	Flood
Baker	Chelf	Flynt
Baldwin	Chenoweth	Forrester
Bass, N.H.	Coad	Fountain
Bass, Tenn.	Colmer	Frazier
Battin	Cook	Gathings
Belcher	Cooley	Gubser
Berry	Corman	Hagan, Ga.
Blatnik	Davis, James C.	Hagen, Calif.
	Davis, John W.	Hall

Hansen	Magnuson	Schadeberg
Harding	Mahon	Schwengel
Harris	Marshall	Scott
Harrison, Wyo.	Mathias	Seely-Brown
Harvey, Ind.	Matthews	Selden
Hays	May	Shipley
Healey	Merrow	Shriver
Hébert	Miller, Clem	Sisk
Hemphill	Mills	Slack
Henderson	Montoya	Smith, Iowa
Horan	Moore	Smith, Miss.
Huddleston	Morris	Smith, Va.
Hull	Morrison	Spence
Ichord, Mo.	Moss	Springer
Ikard, Tex.	Moulder	Stafford
Inouye	Multer	Staggers
Jarman	Murray	Steed
Jennings	Natcher	Stephens
Jensen	Nelsen	Stratton
Johnson, Calif.	Norblad	Stubblefield
Johnson, Md.	Norrell	Taylor
Johnson, Wis.	Nygaard	Teague, Calif.
Jones, Ala.	O'Hara, Mich.	Teague, Tex.
Jones, Mo.	Olsen	Thomas
Karth	Patman	Thompson, La.
Kastenmeier	Perkins	Thompson, Tex.
Kee	Peterson	Thomson, Wis.
Keogh	Pfost	Thornberry
Kilday	Poage	Trimble
Kilgore	Poff	Tuck
King, Utah	Powell	Tupper
Kitchin	Quie	Ullman
Kornegay	Rabaut	Van Pelt
Kyl	Randall	Watts
Laird	Reece	Weaver
Landrum	Reifel	Wharton
Lane	Riley	Whitener
Langen	Rivers, Alaska	Whitten
Lankford	Rivers, S.C.	Wickersham
Lennon	Rogers, Colo.	Williams
Libonati	Rogers, Tex.	Wilson, Ind.
McFall	Rooney	Winstead
McIntire	Roudebush	Wright
McMillan	Rutherford	Young
McSween	Santangelo	Zablocki
Mack	Saylor	

NOT VOTING—56

Adair	Fino	Morgan
Albert	Fogarty	O'Brien, N.Y.
Alger	Grant	O'Konski
Arends	Green, Pa.	O'Neill
Beermann	Halleck	Passman
Bennett, Mich.	Hardy	Pilcher
Blitch	Harrison, Va.	Pirnie
Boggs	Herlong	Rains
Burke, Ky.	Hoeven	Roberts
Byrnes, Wis.	Holifield	St. Germain
Chiperfield	Hosmer	Saund
Conte	Kilburn	Sheppard
Cramer	Knox	Sikes
Daniels	Loser	Utt
Davis, Tenn.	McCormack	Vinson
Dominick	Mason	Walter
Downing	Miller, George P.	Westland
Evins	Miller, N.Y.	Willis
Fallon		

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Pilcher against.

Mr. Daniels for, with Mr. Evins against.

Mr. Beermann for, with Mr. McCormack against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Hosmers for, with Mr. Pirnie against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Boggs against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Albert against.

Mr. St. Germain for, with Mr. Hoeven against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Loser against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Rains against.

Mr. O'Neill for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Harrison of Virginia against.

Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Downing with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Grant with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Burke of Kentucky with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Saund with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Messrs. BUCKLEY, SCHWENGEL, GUBSER, and BASS of New Hampshire changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. CUNNINGHAM, BRUCE, and HALPERN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MICHEL. In its present form I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MICHEL moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 320, nays 65, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—320

Abbitt	Brooks, Tex.	Edmondson
Abernethy	Brown	Elliott
Addabbo	Broyhill	Ellsworth
Addonizio	Buckley	Everett
Albert	Burke, Ky.	Fallon
Alexander	Burke, Mass.	Farbstein
Alford	Burleson	Fascell
Andersen, Minn.	Byrne, Pa.	Feighan
Andrews	Cannon	Fenton
Anfuso	Carey	Finnegan
Ashley	Cederberg	Fisher
Ashmore	Celler	Flynt
Aspinall	Chamberlain	Forrester
Avery	Chelf	Fountain
Ayres	Chenoweth	Frazier
Bailey	Church	Frelinghuysen
Baker	Clark	Friedel
Baldwin	Coad	Gallagher
Barrett	Cohelan	Garland
Barry	Colmer	Garmatz
Bass, N.H.	Cook	Gary
Bass, Tenn.	Corman	Gathings
Battin	Cunningham	Gavin
Beckworth	Curtin	Giaimo
Belcher	Daddario	Gilbert
Bennett, Fla.	Dague	Glenn
Berry	Davis, James C.	Goodling
Betts	Davis, John W.	Granahan
Blatnik	Dawson	Gray
Boland	Delaney	Griffin
Bolling	Dent	Griffiths
Bolton	Denton	Gross
Bonner	Diggs	Gubser
Bow	Dole	Hagan, Ga.
Boykin	Donohue	Hagen, Calif.
Brademas	Dooley	Hall
Bray	Dorn	Hansen
Breeding	Dowdy	Harding
Bromwell	Doyle	Harris
Brooks, La.	Durno	Harrison, Wyo.
		Harsha
Harvey, Ind.	Mack	Rooney
Harvey, Mich.	Madden	Roosevelt
Hays	Magnuson	Rostenkowski
Healey	Mahon	Roudebush
Hechler	Marshall	Rutherford
Hemphill	Martin, Nebr.	Ryan
Henderson	Mathias	Santangelo
Hoeven	Matthews	Saund
Holifield	May	Schadeberg
Holland	Meader	Schneebeli
Holtzman	Merrow	Schwengel
Horan	Miller, Clem	Scott
Huddleston	Milliken	Scranton
Hull	Mills	Seely-Brown
Ichord, Mo.	Moeller	Selden
Ikard, Tex.	Monagan	Shelley
Inouye	Montoya	Shipley
Jarman	Moore	Short
Jennings	Moorehead, Ohio	Shriver
Jensen	Moorhead, Pa.	Sibal
Johnson, Calif.	Morgan	Siler
Johnson, Md.	Morris	Sisk
Johnson, Wis.	Morrison	Slack
Jonas	Morse	Smith, Iowa
Jones, Ala.	Moss	Smith, Miss.
Jones, Mo.	Moulder	Smith, Va.
Judd	Multer	Spence
Karsten	Murphy	Springer
Karth	Murray	Stafford
Kastenmeier	Natcher	Staggers
Kee	Nelsen	Steed
Keith	Nix	Stephens
Kelly	Norblad	Stratton
Keogh	Norrell	Stubblefield
Kilday	Nygaard	Sullivan
Kilgore	O'Brien, Ill.	Taylor
King, Calif.	O'Hara, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
King, N.Y.	O'Hara, Mich.	Teague, Tex.
King, Utah	Olsen	Thompson, La.
Kitchin	Ostertag	Thompson, N.J.
Kluczynski	Passman	Thompson, Tex.
Kornegay	Patman	Thomson, Wis.
Kowalski	Perkins	Toll
Kunkel	Peterson	Trimble
Kyl	Pfost	Tuck
Laird	Philbin	Tupper
Landrum	Poage	Udall
Lane	Poff	Ullman
Langen	Powell	Vanik
Lankford	Price	Van Pelt
Latta	Pucinski	Van Zandt
Lennon	Quie	Watts
Lesinski	Rabaut	Weaver
Libonati	Randall	Weis
Lindsay	Reece	Whalley
McCormack	Reifel	Whitener
McCulloch	Reuss	Whitten
McDonough	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wickersham
McDowell	Rhodes, Pa.	Williams
McFall	Riehlman	Wilson, Ind.
McIntire	Riley	Winstead
McMillan	Rivers, Alaska	Wright
McSween	Rivers, S.C.	Yates
McVey	Rodino	Young
Macdonald	Rogers, Colo.	Zablocki
MacGregor	Rogers, Tex.	Zelenko
Machrowicz		

NAYS—65

Alger	Dulski	Pelly
Anderson, Ill.	Dwyer	Pike
Ashbrook	Findley	Pillion
Auchincloss	Ford	Ray
Baring	Fulton	Robison
Bates	Goodell	Rogers, Fla.
Becker	Green, Oreg.	Rousselot
Bell	Haley	St. George
Brewster	Halpern	Saylor
Broomfield	Hiestand	Schenck
Bruce	Hoffman, Ill.	Scherer
Cahill	Hoffman, Mich.	Schweiker
Casey	Joelsen	Smith, Calif.
Clancy	Johansen	Taber
Collier	Kearns	Thomas
Corbett	Lipscomb	Tollefson
Curtis, Mass.	Mailliard	Wallhauser
Curtis, Mo.	Martin, Mass.	Wharton
Derounian	Michel	Widnall
Derwinski	Minshall	Wilson, Calif.
Devine	Mosher	Younger
Dingell	Osmers	

NOT VOTING—50

Adair	Davis, Tenn.	Hébert
Arends	Dominick	Herlong
Beermann	Downing	Hosmer
Bennett, Mich.	Evins	Kilburn
Blitch	Fino	Kirwan
Boggs	Flood	Knox
Byrnes, Wis.	Fogarty	Loser
Chiperfield	Grant	Mason
Conte	Green, Pa.	Miller, George P.
Cooley	Halleck	Miller, N.Y.
Cramer	Hardy	O'Brien, N.Y.
Daniels	Harrison, Va.	

O'Konski	Roberts	Utt
O'Neill	St. Germain	Vinson
Pilcher	Sheppard	Walter
Pirnie	Sikes	Westland
Rains	Thornberry	Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Daniels with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. O'Neil with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. St. Germain with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Beermann.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Roberts.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Harrison of Virginia with Mr. Dominick.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Westland.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Hosmer.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am unable to participate in the fifth meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group and, therefore, submit my resignation to become effective immediately.

I very much regret that this action is necessary, but because of a conflict in my schedule I must sever my participation in the meeting.

Sincerely,

JAMES HARVEY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–42, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in the District of Columbia, commencing on June 8, 1961, the gentleman from New York, Mr. HOWARD W. ROBISON, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1852) entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. DODD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. PELL, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. WILEY, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota to be members of the Canadian-United States Interparliamentary Group.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, S. 1852, to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, KILDAY, RIVERS of South Carolina, PHILBIN, HÉBERT, ARENDS, GAVIN, VAN ZANDT, and BATES.

EXCERPTS FROM REVIEWS OF THE "MARK TWAIN TONIGHT" EUROPEAN TOUR

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentltman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, we have recently heard some criticism of the cultural exchange program under current laws on the floor of the House and also in the public prints. Some of this criticism is based on lack of information.

The members of the State Department Organization and Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs were privileged last week to hear testimony from Hal Holbrook, the eminent actor, who has made such a conspicuous success in recent years in his famous portrayal of Mark Twain.

Mr. Holbrook told the committee of the great success that his appearance in Europe had achieved in improving relations between the United States and Europe and in making Europeans aware of a uniquely American culture.

Since Mr. Holbrook's appraisal of the effect of his performance on European audiences was a personal one, it could be claimed that there was bias in his estimate, but there can be no bias in the estimates of the European newspapers in the various cities where Mr. Holbrook appeared. Their reactions give eloquent testimony to the value of Mr. Holbrook's contribution and the profit which accrues to the United States from this program.

I believe that this editorial comment is so valuable that it should be made available to the Congress and I include at this point excerpts from reviews of "Mark Twain Tonight" which were written during Hal Holbrook's European tour of September, October, and November 1960:

EXCERPTS FROM SOME OF THE REVIEWS OF "MARK TWAIN TONIGHT" EUROPEAN TOUR, SEPTEMBER–NOVEMBER 1960

He presented the phenomenal Twain in his seventies when the author had reached the height of his fame and could pride himself that most "bon mots" which circulated at the turn of the century had originated in the brain from which also the classical romantic figures of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn sprang. In his diversified and mostly ironical causeries which he had amassed in an adventurous life, Twain revealed himself at that age as a fascinating stage personality who owed his great popularity to his qualities as an author rather than to his qualities as an orator.

Holbrook accomplished putting new life into that old subtle entertainer with a suggestive performance which fascinated from beginning to end—De Telegraaf, Amsterdam.

Mark Twain—the renowned American author and humorist who was born 125 years ago—was portrayed full length in Amsterdam last night as a man in his seventies. The American actor, Hal Holbrook, who was born in 1925, that is 15 years after the death of the famous author, again brought to life the great story-teller of the Mississippi River before an audience which he completely enthralled. Not a word was spoken on the sober stage that was not written by Mark Twain, not a gesture made which was not a true copy of the curious mannerisms of a nonconformist old man of some generations ago.

It was especially Twain, the narrator of anecdotes—the great supplier of witty fillers as a welcome attraction for magazines—who was presented on the stage. * * * It was an evening of clever portraying a 2½-hour anthology from Twain's inexhaustible repertory, a sample card of American southern accents. * * * It was a pity that the show did not last longer and that only one show was given in our country. * * * This is American art at its best.—De Volkskrant, Amsterdam.

Americans have a perplexing ability to bring things on stage that at first glance seem utterly untheatrical and ineffective dramawise. But what now was being staged in the Frankfurt Amerikahaus was apparently, at first sight, the most singular rarity of all those American theater treatments. Because there was Mark Twain, the great American humorist, known to everybody here as the author of "Tom Sawyer" and "Huckleberry Finn"—from which book, according to Hemingway, the entire modern, American literature derives—and Mark Twain made his appearance in a white linen suit, with a red plastron, with gray shaggy hair and a moustache of the same color, and addressed the audience. He talked parenthetically, with a rough snarl, citing and quoting from his own works: hilarious, bitter, sarcastic objects, or bizarre, right out of the realm of Ionesco, and many a thing pensive or meditative.

The young American actor Hal Holbrook lends him physical shape, voice, gesture, and

presence of mind. Holbrook is 35 years old, half as old as the Mark Twain he represented, but the young man allows himself to be merged in the great old man of American literature. This could be seen as more than acting, it is almost identification. * * *

But with all the refinement and the accuracy of the acting, as it were a scientific reconstruction, delightful though, there would remain a slight uneasiness were it not the peculiarly original Mark Twain who is still alive as a satirist and moralist, as a grumbler and jolly dog. His noble attitude considering the human races, his mockery on tourists and guides, for instance, prove himself a writer necessary for our time. * * * It is Mark Twain's imperturbability that makes this guest performance so relevant.—Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung.

So, after many hilarious incidentals Mark Twain's appearance in the year 1960 was a real rapture. The great American humorist is dead for 50 years now and his quips and tales, his innuendos on techniques and civilization are still as fresh as in those days when he toured the world as a traveling entertainer. Hal Holbrook's years of studying Mark Twain and any pertaining material he could lay hands upon gave him the capability of identifying himself with Mark Twain. The personal appearance of the author of Tom Sawyer's adventures—floating white mane, white suit, and a smoking black cigar, his bent carriage, and harsh old-man's-voice was perfectly impersonated by Holbrook in all details. * * *

Mr. Samuel Langhorne Clemens, known everywhere as Mark Twain, appearing bodily at that evening, is the result of an unheard-of-acting training in the services of one single character. Even the purists of the word would gladly agree in this case that true-to-life imitation of a man and his environment may indefinitely enhance the effect of his spoken words.—Frankfurter Rundschau.

The young American actor Hal Holbrook who made theater history in his brilliant performance as the 70-year-old Mark Twain during the last year has re-enlivened the figure of the great American humorist also in Frankfurt. During his Germany tour which led him to Munich, Hamburg, and Berlin he made his appearance in a closed show before an audience of invited guests of the Frankfurt Amerikahaus.

With a *wily smile* an old man in a white suit conveniently entered the stage. Long before he came to a halt near an old-fashioned reading desk, genially beckoning to the audience, everybody sensed the waves of sympathy and respect that surged toward the stage.

Mark Twain, America's master of humor, died in 1910. But his image, such as it is known to the world, is again taking possession today of the stages and podiums of America and Europe, thereby delighting ever new listeners with the same old quips and stories. However, the Mark Twain of today is the fantastically genuine, clever, and funny creation of a 35-year-old actor called Hal Holbrook.

Before Hal Holbrook gave his debut on Broadway, and by so doing offered the greatest surprise of the theater year 1959, Mark Twain was mainly known to the modern world as the genitor of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn.

Holbrook induced a tide of curiosity. Everybody was eager to learn more about Mark Twain, his life and his few known works. America rediscovered him, enthusiasm reached its climax in 1960, 50 years after his death, and these waves of rapture are now rolling onto the shores of the Old World. * * *

Arnold Bennett once called Mark Twain "the divine amateur." More planning and preparation was applied to the art of narration, though. Hal Holbrook dug up quite a number of Mark Twain's notes on the technique of a speech which subtly analyzed, for instance, the value and the precise length of pauses. And the actor profits by the heritage in a wondrous way—as for example with the trick to let the point of a joke flash up in three to four cascades, seemingly unintentionally and improvised.

Holbrook studied an old record and a film which enabled him to adapt the gestures and the old man's deportment. He talked to relatives and friends who had known Mark Twain. For 12 years he read everything he could find about Mark Twain until the private life of the poet was just as familiar to him as his way of appearing in public.

Holbrook's role is a most difficult test for acting ability. To the components of Mark Twain's personal appearance * * * he had to add something of the peculiarities of Mark Twain's private personality. * * *

The critics' applause was overwhelming. * * *

And so it was. But a new resplendence of his glory brought him back to us, a bright shine which, this time, beams down on two great talents.—Offenbach Post, Frankfurt.

A lively, 70-year-old man in a light suit tripped onto the stage of the Amerikahaus with small, measured steps, apparently feeling at home there, and began to chat, to narrate, and to reason. He lighted a cigar with great ceremony and lectured on the dangers of moderation. * * *

Mark Twain or Samuel Clemens—we have known him almost only as the author of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn—was already a national institution in the States before his death in 1910, a national court jester, and an unconventional literary pioneer. * * *

Holbrook awakened a Mark Twain renaissance among his own countrymen.—Muenchner Merkur, Munich.

We cast a glance of curiosity at the program and noticed this: "We had engaged a trumpeter but he is unreliable, so please do not wait for him." There was the spirit of Mark Twain, the best humorist that the New World has so far brought to us. And slowly but with certainly there developed the complete and spiritual force of Mark Twain, before a public that completely filled the seats of the Amerikahaus, as at a festival premiere.

It truly was a festival. That which Hal Holbrook presented to us from the podium, through the magic of his theatrical makeup and through his mimicry, was the mask of the 70-year-old Mark Twain. There to the life stood the old man who used to like to speak of the "damned human race," and who yet in his writings and outlook was so truly philosophic and so truly religious in his humor that he could utter these courageous words "Humor is one of the most truly important attributes of God."

And how wonderfully spontaneous did Holbrook present his wit and wisdom. Repeatedly he brought Twain to life on the stage. Realistically Mark Twain with his big cigar moved here and there, his eyes twinkling, re-created through Holbrook. This was a gift worthy of a festival, and the public with thunderous applause gave thanks for this wonderful gift.—Hamburger Abendblatt.

The old gentleman delivered his sharp-pointed sentences on everything and everybody. Each point came out of a full basket of anecdote. How Holbrook achieves this is truly remarkable. How he walks between table and stand, his timing perfect as he smokes his cigar, calculates the timing, and then produces his effect is truly effective. An extraordinary evening.—Die Welt, Hamburg.

It was thanks to the cultural section of the local American Embassy that this witty pleasure was now made available in the original to the American colony in Bonn and also to interested Germans knowing the language. For 2 hours laughter and high spirits prevailed in the auditorium of the university. Hal Holbrook recited Mark Twain and he was Mark Twain; he was authentic right to his finger tips and to the pauses for effect in his recitations. Very well known texts alternated with etudes in prose of which we had no notion, trite aperçus with classical passages from "Huckleberry Finn." Criticism was levied against the press and the abuse of interviewing people; and American tourists in front of European objects of art were taken on the point of his ironical pen, * * * the attention of the audience never ceased. Neither did the laughter. It was magnificent.—General-Anzeiger, Bonn.

When the curtain on the Amerikahaus stage was raised, one believed to see the 70-year old Mark Twain in person. In a white suit, with a red tie, and golden watch chain, he stood at the footlights, slightly bent forward, grinning stealthily behind his white mustache, and talked for 2½ hours with an amusing text material, which had the effect of an ad-libbed speech, to a thrilled, enchanted audience.

The illusion of seeing the old author at the peak of his fame on one of his lecture tours, which 64 years ago also led him to Berlin, was complete.

The American actor, Hal Holbrook, born almost 100 years later than the man he was personifying, has spent many years on detailed study to make his performance seem like a portrait of Mark Twain. As a result the author of typical American humorous spirit was in a very striking way appreciated and represented, even up to details of mannerisms and way of talking.—Der Kurier, evening edition, Berlin.

It was incredible what we experienced in the Merkur Theater last night, and for a couple of hours the performance lasted we would have liked to rename the Merkur the Mark Twain Theater.

Holbrook has identified himself with Mark Twain. As a truly great actor he is—to the life—the great humorist and entertainer on the stage, at the same time keeping a close watch, in a technically polished form, on the character he is bringing to life. In its way it is a work of genius. * * *

We were very fortunate to see him and would have wished him to stay for more performances—in honor of that Copenhagen audience which is very well versed in the English language. * * * One may pay tribute to Holbrook on many counts: His make-up * * *; Mark Twain at 70 (that is, in 1905), an old man's face which we could not have distinguished from Twain's own face, had he been present, a face full of life, with intelligent, warm, sad eyes. The slightly hoarse, but expressive ring of the voice, the figure's shuffling old man's gait, the spry, vivid fiddling of the hands.

But above all, Mark Twain as the interpreter of his own works * * * all that we love in these books, all that we love in Mark Twain leaped out to meet us. * * *

He [Holbrook] received a merited tribute of laughter, emotion, and applause. His performance unites deep originality with a wide, comprehensive humaneness of rich humor, gentle and wry at the same time. We shall not forget Hal Holbrook; we shall not forget Mark Twain.—Aktuelt, Copenhagen.

Somehow this review of Hal Holbrook's "Mark Twain Tonight," presented yesterday on the National Theater's Little Stage, is the most purposeless one I've ever written seeing that Holbrook will give only this one performance. If I succeed at all in giving an impression of the performance I shall only make those sorry who didn't get to see him. As for those who were present my review can be but a pale, indifferent reflection, a voice echoing beyond faraway hills.

This man of 34 who acts Mark Twain, nay, who is Mark Twain, makes him come more intensely alive on the stage than even the best reader can imagine him through his books. * * * "Fantastic" was the sibilant comment soughing through the theater when the curtain went up and the spare old man, in a not-too-well-fitting white suit came out on the stage, a little uncertainly, a little astonished, as he stood for a moment looking at us while we looked at him. A face furrowed by wisdom and wit. The applause rose higher and higher before he had uttered even a word. From there on in he had us all the way; we gave ourselves over completely—no inhibitions were left.

But all this virtuosity would have had no meaning if it had not been for Holbrook's identifying himself so deeply with the poet-man Samuel Clemens, an achievement that took him years of devoted and profound study. No matter how greatly he bewitched us with ever new rockets of histrionic fireworks, he never came closer to us nor gripped us more deeply than at the end where old Mark Twain reminiscences about his life and talks to us about death. Jokingly, of course, but his voice is softer now, and our laughter is too. "Good night." He leaves the stage.

Good night! Yes, but it can't be possible that there won't be another performance after this one.—Morgenbladet, Oslo.

Before his performance October 12 at the conservatory in Helsinki, Holbrook visited Oslo where, the reviews said, the audience had been downright transported to ecstasy. One might say this happened at the conservatory, too, during Holbrook's three-act performance.

Mark Twain who died 50 years ago is a person well known the world over, and no extensive introductions are necessary. This could be observed immediately at the beginning of the evening. Twain's person, however, was to nobody so familiar as to the actor himself. He might be assumed to be a veritable kindred spirit of Twain's, so profoundly had he become absorbed in the person he impersonated, guided by facts as well as an apparent instinct.

Holbrook's makeup is faultless, even seen at close quarters * * * no makeup however, can impart the impression of a pleasantly spiteful, but exceedingly kindhearted old man, if not the performer himself. And it was imparted by young Holbrook. Quite irresistible was the fragment in which Twain—thus no longer Holbrook—performs his young hero Huck Finn. It was a doubly successful piece of acting.

When Twain then bids goodnight and leaves the stage without so much as another look at his audience, with a cigar in his mouth, one is tempted to ask him to prolong his going to bed to a little bit later.—Nusi Suomi, Helsinki.

The 35-year-old actor Hal Holbrook has indeed become absorbed in the figure of the 70-year-old Twain down to every cell, every carefully considered comma and pause. And the audience readily responded to the message and his expressive eyes, the pathos of speech style, the gestures—and to the one-word or two-word remarks which turned noble thoughts topsy-turvy.—Turun Sanomat, Turki, Finland.

As the curtain went up one had the feeling that the old man, who was in Vienna in 1897 and 1898, had stepped down from the Yankee section of Olympus in order to repeat the lectures he held then. He took us to a genuine Golden West of humor, an America which Hollywood films have so distorted. In spite of the two and a half hour length, the audience of the packed house was delighted anew with the mirth of the master of American folk humor and with the artistic ability of his entertaining imitator.—Neues Oesterreich, Vienna.

It is absolutely sensational when one can crawl into another person the way Holbrook can. One laughs, one is enchanted by the performance. One can understand why this presentation must be a success throughout the entire world, even in areas where the people don't know English well enough to understand every nuance of the humor. The audience in the Josefstadt was delighted with the intelligence and ready wit of the author and was carried away by the grandiose acting talent of the interpreter.—Oesterreichische Neue Tageszeitung, Vienna.

Holbrook read from "Huckleberry Finn," a book which many American critics count among the most important writings on the freedom of the individual to come from America. One feels strongly that this is not just a book for children but that here the important thing is the fight for the rights of the individual. Holbrook understood this and brought it out. * * * Holbrook brought Mark Twain back to life.—Die Neue Zeit, Graz.

For us this was not a powerful, skillfully made, technically perfect creation of Mark Twain, but a living, spontaneously seen Mark Twain. The only one, that genuine one.

A few decades ago, when I was in the fourth grade of the secondary school, during a lesson of geography, the professor asked his pupils about the Mississippi. Many pupils just said what they knew about it; that it was the biggest river in North America, that it flowed across many States, what its tributaries were, how navigable it is, what kind of ships could be seen there, which areas are flooded by it, that it flows into the Mexican sea, etc. But, the professor was not satisfied with all those answers in order to show how ignorant we were. He tirelessly continued to put more questions in order to find out whether anybody could tell something more about this subject. After he insisted for quite a while, I got up, and in justified pupil's rage, to everybody's satisfaction and rejoicing, added defiantly the Mississippi constitutes the river which flows through the works of Mark Twain in the most realistic and beautiful way.

Luckily, I say this with melancholy, the time when I was at school is far away. But, if now someone would, with a magic disregard for time, take me back to the distant past and ask me what else I would tell him about Mark Twain, I would really be tempted to say: But that is the talented actor and master of transformation, Hal Holbrook.—Eli Finci, Belgrade newspaper Politika.

Holbrook, a young man, was carving out the well-known figure of the 70-year-old Samuel Clemens—Twain; through intelligently selected excerpts from the large storytelling and novel writing opus of Twain he has painted above all the lively and flexible wit of the writer, slightly disappointed and cynical when speaking about men, but sufficiently brave to look with pleasure at his reflection in the mirror. * * *

It is almost unbelievable how many nuances are there in that complex transmission of the story about Huckleberry Finn.—Berba, Belgrade.

Who does not know Mark Twain, the witty old man of unruly, disorderly hair, of gray hair, the man who knew how to make laugh a continent and to deride it, and through it the whole world. These days he has been staying among us: an interesting young man, Hal Holbrook, took up the idea to do what once was doing the old master of the finest humor. * * *

Twain's humor is typical to us Americans. For us who smile more than ever just then when we are afraid. I feared this laughing would not be received in Europe. However, it occurred at the first performance, as that in Amsterdam, that people were laughing exactly there where Americans used to laugh. This meant that language was no barrier. Joke, the mightiest weapon of mankind, as Twain said, and as I felt it, too, is accepted by all and it does not matter if it is somewhere received with more noise or in a quieter manner.—Nin, Belgrade.

Already while reading a book we imagine that we know the writer and understand his times, but if somebody, this time our unknown friend Hal Holbrook, re-creates for us the actual man we are almost ready to maintain that we have met in the flesh the man who died 50 years ago; but the texture of that flesh is a masterfully composed illustration compelling our belief.—B. Pogaĭnik, last paragraph of a lengthy review in Delo, Ljubljana, Yugoslavia.

On Saturday night, the Komedija Theater's overflow audience * * * enthusiastically greeted Mark Twain's appearance in Zagreb. We saw and heard essentially the true Mark Twain: the pioneer of democracy and free thought (which the famous author always spiced with cynicism to give it its true value). We saw a vivacious old man who in his witty style—now packed with meaning, now calculated to reach the audience of the common American small town that was already beginning to understand what the American way of life means—told of whatever occurred to him; but each of his little stories was as if cut from life. The voice of the writer and lecturer revealed a man who had wandered through printing offices from the age of 12 to 19, had been a pilot on the Mississippi, a dreamer, pioneer, tough guy, and cynic. * * *

Hal Holbrook was given only his due when he received a storm of applause on the open stage after his matchless interpretation of the passage from "Huckleberry Finn."—Zagreb daily newspaper Vecernji Vjesnik.

In spite of the difference of a whole century Hal Holbrook's life reflects a definite analogy with the original reproduced with so much talent by this excellent American actor. As we know, Twain passed a hard school of life before he gained a rare and perhaps unique position of an extremely popular writer in the highest and most exclusive circles in the world and with the millions of old and young readers without any pretensions. Recently Hal Holbrook published a book in which he depicted with fascinating correctness and equally fascinating sense of humor the long and tedious road he had to pass and the painful experiences he had to suffer before he gained recognition, peak success and a wide open road to world fame. * * *

It goes without saying that one must have a good deal of Twain to impersonate this writer on the stage with such unprecedented accuracy. In this case even the most perfect techniques of acting could not produce this result. Insofar as his physical appearance is concerned, he resembles his master and example perhaps only with his stature.

His smile however, and the way he views the world, his attitude toward people—radiating warmth and complete understanding of their shortcomings, the freezing look changing into high strung irony whenever he detects boasting and elation causing justified apprehension and opposition—each motion of his hand or tilting of his head—all of this besides Twain's characteristics reproduced on photographs and described in the detailed analysis of Twain's external features, has in addition a much greater significance, a larger connection with the creator of Huckleberry Finn—a common origin. Both are members of the family more resplendent than any royal family—the family of man. Closely related with them were Swift, Voltaire, Gogol, and Tchechov.

It is commonly accepted that the fortunes of Huckleberry Finn are of interest only to boys. Yet T. S. Elliot, a rather hermetic poet, wrote an introduction to a new edition of this book and devoted an extensive essay to American literature chiefly to Twain. "Twain," wrote Elliot, "belongs to this class of writers of which there are very few in world literature." Twain himself stated: "Laughter is the only power against which nothing can resist * * * the lack of respect," he added, "is the supporter of freedom and the only reliable defense."

Accordingly the reaction of the Warsaw public indicated that * * * its receptivity was certainly large. * * * Besides the already mentioned vitality of the audience and the genius of Twain—the actor's personal charm was irresistible, dominant, and bewitching. His wonderful talent and excellent performance, even including the tendency of exaggerated care in his definitions, must be rated simply as excellent. Again the personal charm of the Holbrook off the stage, shining like a leading star not in the sky but on earth, is clearly outstanding. Seeing him and in contact, we begin to understand the warn out phrase calling great actors—stars.—Nova Kultura, Warsaw.

Holbrook's undertaking is among those that do honor to the theater, and the Roman audience, despite geographical distance and psychological and linguistic differences, compensated the actor with their cordial and repeated applause.—Il Messagero, Rome.

In the second part of the performance, not exclusively humorous, Hal Holbrook revealed the man Mark Twain, and while reciting that part his public did not laugh, and quite rightly so.—Il Gidrnale D'Italia, Rome.

In his disguise as Mark Twain, Hal Holbrook appeared to us as an actor of incomparable virtuosity. * * * Resurrecting the sarcastic personality of the great American writer with hallucinating precision Mr. Holbrook roused the admiration and the laughter of the Anglo-Saxon audience. * * * What it really was may be described as a fantastic feat of incredible cleverness, the result of research and work of immense magnitude. * * * It is something of a miracle.—La Tribune De Geneve, Geneva.

ACTION, NOT WORDS

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, we have let Fidel Castro make chumps of us. He dangled the bait in front of our eyes and we jumped at it. He has proven his point—he can get away with blackmailing the United States. But now that his victory over our national integrity is complete, he is apparently turning his back on the deal.

It is but a few weeks since the bearded psychopath, who serves as communism's stooge in Cuba, shocked the world with his outrageously cold, vicious and inhuman blackmail attempt—the "tractors for prisoners" deal.

By yielding to his demands, we have established the fact that we do not have enough confidence in our ability to beat him—and his kind. By yielding to his demands, we have acknowledged the fact that he has a right to deal with the United States—that he is worthy of the world status to which he has aspired. He should have been treated with contempt as he represents an evil, unscrupulous philosophy that endangers the whole free world.

Those private citizens who constitute the "tractors for prisoners" committee argue that it is individual humanitarianism and not the act of a nation giving in to highhanded blackmail. But may I point out this fact: the program to raise money for tractors has been given an endorsement by the President. In my mind, and in the minds of many thousands who resist the degradation implied in yielding to blackmail, this endorsement by the President is tantamount to the labeling of these efforts as "official."

In this case, Mr. Speaker, our own citizens have contributed to the lowering of national dignity and pride.

Action must be taken against Cuba—quickly and decisively. But this necessary action has been delayed—not only by our own citizens but by our allies.

The Organization of American States has been constrained from any action whatsoever in Cuba because of two nations—Brazil and Mexico. These two Governments combined, as Virginia Prewett pointed out in the June 5 Washington Daily News, represent more than half of Latin America's population. For that reason, the United States is "walking softly."

Mr. Speaker, there are 180 million people in the United States—people who ought to be taken into consideration. Communism is our avowed enemy. We must act to resist the inroads of communism in our hemisphere.

Neither the OAS—nor any other organization—can function effectively or even survive if action—or rather lack of action—is determined by 2 or 3 countries.

We must impress it upon Mexico and Brazil that our 180 millions count—that the 5,034,838 in Venezuela—the 13,227,480 in Colombia count. Central America, Venezuela and Colombia, along with the United States—are the nations most directly endangered by the rise of communism in the Caribbean. Should not the fact that their total population is far more than that of Brazil and Mexico count? Or should we continue to be, in Miss Prewett's words, "paralyzed" because of two or three countries?

Mr. Speaker, alliances such as the OAS are forged to protect the common good. Communist aggression is not in the common good for the Western Hemisphere.

Castro has degraded us. We cannot permit him to continue "proving a point" at our expense—as he has done by even suggesting that you can barter men for machines.

As the crises in the Caribbean mount, it becomes even more imperative that we as a nation act—that the OAS, as the guarantor of American solidarity, act.

The necessity for decisive action has been intensified by the recent assassination of Dominican Republic Dictator Rafael Trujillo. Whatever Generalissimo Trujillo's strengths or weaknesses may have been in life, his death has inspired a series of events that will once again test the determination and ability of the Western Hemisphere to preserve freedom and resist the inroads of communism.

We cannot wait. We must act decisively—and let the world know we mean business in our fight against Communist aggression.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill just passed may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on that bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of amendments to H.R. 7444, I was called to the White House as a member of the House minority leadership to attend a briefing by President Kennedy on his recent trip to Europe. During my absence a record rollcall, No. 70, was had on the so-called Reuss amendment. If I had been present to vote on the amendment, I would have voted in the negative.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was present at the same meeting. I also would have voted in the negative if I had been present.

JEFF DAVIS—KING OF THE HOBOES

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanicous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, in the first years of the Presidency of Woodrow Wilson, I met Jeff Davis. I owe a great deal to Jeff Davis. He administered to me a simple oath never to regard someone who begged in public as a panhandler. I could not know what his need was, what circumstances had caused it and what were the events, weaknesses perhaps but also per-

haps misfortunes and tragedies, and it was not given me to judge, but there was given the privilege of giving to another human being in distress, even though my alms might bring a fleeting relaxation from the tensions by an indiscreet indulgence. That was many years ago, but I have never forgotten Jeff Davis, and I have tried to live up to his philosophy.

Jeff Davis then was the "King of the Hoboes." He was the subject of much newspaper comment. He had dedicated himself to the job of putting dignity into the life of the homeless wanderers that the world knows as tramps or hoboes or sometimes but not often as panhandlers.

Many things lead to a man's departure from the usual moorings. It may be a grief, it may be a disappointment, a frustration. It may be alcoholism, or it may be just a natural love of adventure, of having no appointed spot and in finding in all the world the home that he likes best and the people closest to his heart. But who is to judge? Who is to pass upon the decisions of others?

Jeff Davis has found a nobility in many of these homeless wanderers. He is now an old man. His name no longer often appears in the newspapers. I had not heard from him in years until today I received a letter. He is still "King of the Hoboes," the title having been voted to him for life by his homeless followers. He conferred upon me a title, the first title that ever in my humble life I had been given, the title of Grand Supreme Knight of the Knights of the Road. I hope that in my humility and in my consideration of my fellow man I may live up to that title. Here is the letter he sent me:

HI, BARRATT, OLD PAL: I often think of you—especially of the time you got on the soap box on Chicago Avenue—when we held the convention outdoors—and the cops were pinching our delegates whenever they got up on the box.

Then you came along—you got on the box—the cop did not pinch you—and our convention proceeded a la soap box. You were Lieutenant Governor then, many, many years ago.

We are having our 53d annual convention in Kalamazoo, June 26 to July 1.

Drop us a line of greetings—mention the soap box affair—it will give our delegates of today a kick. I saw your name in tonight's paper so I just had to send you a few lines—and a Grand Duke Citation—you deserve it.

Hoboically,

JEFF DAVIS,
King Emperor.

The incident to which he refers was back in 1913 or 1914 when the hoboes were holding their first national convention in one of the parks of Chicago. I happened to be passing by. The police were questioning the propriety of the thing and I think had ordered the removal of the soapbox on which the speakers were to address their fellow hoboes. I then was the Lieutenant Governor of Illinois, young and with black hair worn so long that it might have given the hobo impression. I pushed through the crowd, took possession of the soapbox and proceeded to address the convention, the members of which would not be in Illinois or any other place long enough to vote at the next election, but they all were human beings.

I am happy to note from Jeff Davis' letter that the conventions still go on. The convention this year will be the 53d annual convention. I am happy to send to the convention and to Jeff Davis my warmest good wishes. Who can say which has made a greater contribution to the world into which we were born—I, a Member of the greatest deliberative body in the world, or Jeff Davis, who has given his life to putting dignity into the human existence of men who have no homes, the wanderers the world calls hoboes or tramps.

I think I should add that among the knights of the road, honored as I have been by the title conferred by Jeff Davis, are Supreme Court Justice Douglas, Lowell Thomas, an old friend and associate, and Earl McMahon and Joseph D. Keenan, outstanding leaders in labor.

My hat is off to my fellow knights of the road. It is the road we all pursue, and all who travel the road are our brothers.

FEDERAL AID TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like all the Members of the Congress to be informed of my sincere opposition to the various proposals for Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. Accordingly, I include herewith my full views to be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where all Members may examine them:

SUPPLEMENTAL MINORITY VIEWS OF HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

I emphatically oppose H.R. 7300 providing for Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. I do so because the facts clearly indicate that Federal aid in this instance is neither necessary nor desirable.

President Kennedy, in his message to the Congress of February 20, 1961, stated:

"It is equally clear that we do not have enough classrooms. In order to meet current needs and accommodate increasing enrollments, if every child is to have the opportunity of a full-day education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed during the next 10 years."

Six hundred thousand classrooms over a period of 10 years means 60,000 classrooms per year. Average annual construction of classrooms over the past 5 years has been 69,860. Over the past 10 years average annual construction has been 62,600 classrooms per year. Doubtless President Kennedy intended his statement to the Congress as proof of extreme need for Federal intrusion into the general field of lower education. Based on the facts of classroom construction without Federal aid, the President's statement is, in itself, strong proof that the States and local authorities have been meeting this problem effectively.

We often hear the complaint that this Nation does not spend enough money on education. Although I agree that our people should exert more effort and allocate more funds to education, the facts indicate that we have been increasingly doing so over the past 15 years. In 1945 public school revenues represented 1.7 percent of the national income. In 1960, public school revenues represented 3.5 percent of the national income. This was accomplished without Federal intervention. It seems to me rather tenuous, to say the least, for the proponents of Federal aid to argue that increased emphasis on education can only come from the Federal Government.

While student enrollment in our elementary and secondary schools over the past 20 years has increased by 64 percent, expenditures for education have increased 713 percent. The facts completely contradict the absurd assertion that our State and local officials have not been meeting their responsibilities to education.

FEDERAL CONTROL

Many sincere advocates of Federal aid to lower education argue that fears of eventual Federal control are unfounded. At the same time, many other proponents of Federal aid insist that Federal control over education is precisely what is required in America today. This was phrased most emphatically by one advocate in a recent publication.[1] I quote:

"Surely a Congress asked to appropriate a billion dollars a year for the schools will hold hearings to determine whether the money is doing any good. And surely they will be told of all the ways in which it could be more wisely spent if the myopic local school board or the self-seeking State legislators were not in the saddle.

"But if congressional appropriations lead sooner or later to congressional control, does it follow, as everyone seems to assume, that this is undesirable, much less disastrous? Americans are still shackled by the Jeffersonian untruth that the best government governs least, and that central government is worst of all."

If advocates of Federal involvement in general education do not in fact want Federal control, why do they oppose various proposals which would return taxes to the States for education? I have introduced legislation which would return 2 percent of the Federal income tax paid from each State, amounting nationally to $784 million. I have also introduced H.R. 5265, which would return the 10-percent Federal general telephone tax to the States where collected, amounting to $426 million nationally. The Thompson Federal aid bill would provide $720 million of Federal money the first year. The major difference lies in the simple truth that a tax return program could not possibly result in any Federal control, while there is always implicit in the spending of Federal money a large degree of control.

HAS THE INCREASED BIRTH RATE OVERLOADED OUR SCHOOLS?

It is a fascinating fact that from 1914 through 1929, with the exception of a single year, more than 4 million children entered first grade in this country every year. Since 1929 there has not been a single year when more than 4 million children entered first grade in the United States. It would appear that those who point to the birth rate and the great new influx of children into the school as a justification for Federal aid are guilty of considerable exaggeration.

TEACHERS SALARIES

Those teachers who believe that Federal participation will raise their salaries should take a careful look at the record. In the past 20 years, after making allowances for

[1] The Washington Post, Jan. 22, 1961, quoting an article from New Republic.

inflation, teachers have increased their earnings by 106 percent while civilian employees of the Federal Government have increased their earnings by 73 percent. During the same period, all persons working for wages or salaries increased their earnings by 91 percent. Watch out, teachers. Look before you leap.

STATE AND LOCAL TAX EXEMPTIONS TO ATTRACT NEW INDUSTRIES

During the debate, I intend to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of some of the State laws exempting various new business from taxes. At this point I wish merely to emphasize that the following 7 States, for example, have such laws: Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont. It is interesting to note that the distribution formula contained in H.R. 7300 seems generally to give the highest per population allotments to those States granting special tax exemptions. Are the taxpayers of New York State and other areas of the country to give this kind of a bonus to the very States that have been "stealing" our industries?

THE REAL PROPERTY TAX COMPARED BY STATES

A recent study reveals the disproportionate burden of property taxes among the States.

This study shows the average property tax paid by a person purchasing or building a new or existing home with financing insured by the Federal Housing Administration.

These statistics, which are based on official Federal Housing Administration data published in "FHA Homes in 1959, Data for States and Selected Areas, on Characteristics of FHA Operations Under Section 203," and prepared by Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, Inc., of New York, are as follows:

TABLE I.—*New homes*

	Average property tax	Average property value	Tax rate per $1,000 value	Average owner income	Tax as percent of income
1. Massachusetts	$321.96	$14,548	$22.13	$7,145	4.5
2. New York	331.56	15,607	21.24	7,696	4.3
3. New Hampshire	272.04	13,346	20.38	7,592	3.6
4. Arizona	274.68	13,633	20.15	8,085	3.4
5. South Dakota	262.32	13,613	19.27	7,204	3.6
6. Colorado	269.64	14,907	18.09	7,691	3.5
7. Wisconsin	275.40	15,334	17.96	6,662	4.1
8. New Jersey	252.72	14,387	17.57	7,471	3.4
9. Oregon	243.24	13,932	17.46	7,494	3.2
10. Kansas	240.24	14,738	16.30	7,218	3.3
11. Nebraska	235.68	14,533	16.22	7,127	3.3
12. Vermont	228.00	14,823	15.38	7,251	3.1
13. California	248.28	16,375	15.16	8,399	3.0
14. Pennsylvania	214.92	14,390	14.94	7,141	3.0
15. Maryland	218.40	14,910	14.65	7,473	2.9
16. Rhode Island	186.48	12,752	14.62	6,514	2.9
17. Maine	184.68	12,639	14.61	6,531	2.8
18. North Dakota	197.16	13,655	14.44	6,866	2.9
19. Minnesota	212.88	15,095	14.10	6,415	3.3
20. Connecticut	203.52	14,676	13.87	6,622	3.1
21. Texas	184.68	13,449	13.73	7,147	2.6
22. Montana	217.20	15,895	13.66	8,164	2.7
23. Michigan	199.20	14,872	13.39	6,984	2.9
24. Illinois	198.60	15,206	13.06	7,246	2.7
25. Iowa	181.80	14,004	12.98	6,386	2.8
26. Wyoming	189.72	15,681	12.10	7,944	2.4
27. Washington	$169.68	$14,517	$11.69	$7,263	2.3
28. Alaska	345.96	30,008	11.53	13,986	2.5
29. Missouri	171.24	14,989	11.42	7,151	2.4
30. Ohio	153.84	14,917	10.31	6,762	2.3
31. Utah	150.00	14,951	10.03	6,826	2.2
32. Kentucky	132.36	13,386	9.89	6,626	2.0
33. Nevada	159.24	16,235	9.81	8,771	1.8
34. Idaho	150.72	15,792	9.54	7,594	2.6
35. Oklahoma	124.56	13,236	9.41	6,982	1.8
36. New Mexico	133.92	14,340	9.34	7,603	1.8
37. Tennessee	122.52	13,771	8.90	7,182	1.7
38. Arkansas	124.20	13,969	8.89	7,108	1.7
39. North Carolina	114.60	13,513	8.48	7,298	1.6
40. Virginia	129.00	15,402	8.38	7,640	1.7
41. Indiana	114.12	13,923	8.20	6,954	1.6
42. Georgia	108.84	13,934	7.81	6,908	1.6
43. Florida	98.76	14,184	6.96	7,040	1.4
44. Hawaii	143.28	20,869	6.87	9,325	1.5
45. Delaware	92.16	15,078	6.11	7,210	1.3
46. West Virginia	85.08	16,000	5.32	7,077	1.2
47. Mississippi	68.40	13,181	5.19	6,854	1.0
48. Alabama	76.92	14,894	5.16	7,348	1.0
49. Louisiana	77.64	15,285	5.08	7,069	1.1
50. South Carolina	59.04	13,208	4.47	6,584	.9
U.S. average	182.64	14,645	12.47	7,336	2.5

TABLE II.—*Existing homes*

	Average property tax	Average property value	Tax rate per $1,000 value	Average owner income	Tax as percent of income
1. Massachusetts	$297.84	$12,836	$23.20	$6,741	4.4
2. Arizona	288.12	12,659	22.76	8,089	3.6
3. New York	307.32	14,399	21.34	7,809	3.9
4. South Dakota	235.08	11,696	20.10	6,972	3.4
5. New Hampshire	215.64	11,104	19.42	6,495	3.3
6. Wisconsin	267.00	13,857	19.27	6,570	4.1
7. New Jersey	271.68	14,210	19.12	7,603	3.6
8. Nebraska	232.08	12,621	18.39	6,653	3.5
9. Vermont	192.60	10,616	18.14	5,663	3.4
10. Colorado	230.40	13,237	17.41	6,991	3.3
11. Rhode Island	190.32	11,197	17.00	6,178	3.1
12. Oregon	195.96	11,573	16.93	6,879	2.8
13. Kansas	206.04	12,170	16.93	6,732	3.1
14. Minnesota	245.76	14,953	16.44	6,661	3.7
15. Pennsylvania	178.44	11,248	15.86	6,341	2.8
16. Maine	174.48	11,096	15.72	6,167	2.8
17. North Dakota	204.96	13,214	15.51	7,053	2.9
18. Connecticut	237.00	15,709	15.09	7,555	3.1
19. Michigan	198.00	13,336	14.85	6,851	2.9
20. Maryland	202.68	13,821	14.66	7,239	2.8
21. California	206.88	14,135	14.64	7,761	2.7
22. Illinois	202.92	14,397	14.09	7,352	2.8
23. Iowa	180.12	12,902	13.96	6,602	2.7
24. Montana	193.08	13,994	13.80	7,827	2.5
25. Texas	151.08	11,069	13.65	6,607	2.3
26. Missouri	147.00	12,714	11.56	6,747	2.2
27. Wyoming	$163.44	$14,237	$11.48	$7,705	2.1
28. Nevada	184.44	16,169	11.41	9,636	1.9
29. Ohio	159.48	14,520	10.98	6,954	2.3
30. Idaho	134.04	12,331	10.87	6,702	2.0
31. Alaska	252.48	23,784	10.62	11,963	2.1
32. Utah	142.32	13,773	10.33	6,738	2.1
33. Tennessee	108.24	11,137	9.72	6,367	1.7
34. Washington	120.84	12,875	9.39	6,931	1.7
35. New Mexico	113.64	12,208	9.31	7,004	1.6
36. Virginia	130.08	14,061	9.25	7,368	1.8
37. Arkansas	104.64	11,356	9.21	6,567	1.6
38. Kentucky	113.52	12,463	9.11	6,512	1.7
39. North Carolina	105.60	11,743	8.99	6,754	1.6
40. Georgia	109.56	12,908	8.49	6,646	1.6
41. Oklahoma	89.88	10,600	8.48	6,186	1.5
42. Indiana	108.84	12,894	8.44	7,056	1.5
43. Delaware	106.80	12,668	8.43	6,624	1.6
44. Mississippi	76.20	11,148	6.84	6,390	1.2
45. Florida	92.40	13,746	6.72	7,197	1.3
46. West Virginia	81.12	13,992	5.80	6,986	1.2
47. Hawaii	110.52	19,414	5.69	9,043	1.2
48. Alabama	67.92	12,925	5.25	6,848	1.0
49. Louisiana	67.20	13,426	5.01	6,724	1.0
50. South Carolina	55.32	11,379	4.86	6,153	.9
U.S. average	178.08	13,190	13.50	7,085	2.5

The data shows, in addition to the average property tax, the average property value, the tax rate per $1,000 of value, and the average owner income in each State.

With this information, it is possible to determine the tax as a percentage of income.

The compilation shows some States paying four times as much tax, on the average, as the lower States. This, I believe, illustrates that certain States are falling far below others in utilizing their proper tax resources. That is their right, but is it our obligation to take up their burden under such circumstances?

THE UNFULFILLED PROMISE OF THE JUVENILE COURT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the attention of our col-

leagues the following article written by the Honorable Orman W. Ketcham, judge, juvenile court of the District of Columbia. Judge Ketcham's comments are particularly important in view of the current discussion of legislation in this area. The article is from Crime and Delinquency, a publication of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, and appeared in their April 1961 issue:

THE UNFULFILLED PROMISE OF THE JUVENILE COURT

(By Orman W. Ketcham, judge, juvenile court of the District of Columbia)

(As the result of a conference conducted by the University of Chicago, School of Social Service Administration, on March 27-28, 1959, this article was originally prepared as a chapter in a forthcoming publication entitled "Justice for the Child."—Ed.

(I wish to acknowledge the invaluable assistance and research of my law clerks, James P. Felstiner and Richardson White, Jr. (who succeeded Mr. Felstiner on August 15, 1959), during the period in which this article was prepared.—O. W. K.)

Even though most readers of this journal are well versed in the judicial history of the juvenile court in the United States, some consideration of the social and legal theory underlying this development is necessary to a proper examination of that unique institution.

ORIGINS OF THE JUVENILE COURT

The Latin phrase, parens patriae, has for many years been used to epitomize the legal and social philosophy underlying the juvenile court.[1] Parens patriae describes a doctrine of the English Court of Chancery by which the king, through his chancellors, assumed the general protection of all infants in the realm. The theory, as was pointed out in an early case,[2] was that the sovereign, as pater patriae, possessed an obligation to oversee the welfare of the children in his kingdom who, because of the frailties intrinsic to their minority, might be abused, neglected, or abandoned by their parents or other guardians. The king, through his Court of Chancery, could thereby step in and provide the requisite parental protection and care.[3]

Despite the apparent latitude suggested by the broad criterion of a child's welfare, the chancery court undertook performance of this duty only rarely. The jurisdiction was "a delicate one," to be "exercised only when plainly demanded as a means of securing the infant's present and future well-being."[4] One reason for this hesitancy was that the English common law imposed a duty on the parents toward their children and also created a presumption that they would live up to it. Consequently, although the chancery court would interfere under appropriate circumstances, a strong case demonstrating a situation severely detrimental to the child had to be made out.[5] Secondly, as stated in numerous cases, the court was cautious about interfering not from want of jurisdiction but rather from absence of the means by which to effectuate care and custody; in practice, for many generations, it limited its parental duty to the supervision of wealthy minors.[6] Finally, the welfare of the child was the sole and fundamental consideration (a limitation which is of interest with respect to later American developments of the doctrine of parens patriae). Neither the punishment of the parents nor the protection of society was a relevant criterion for judicial intervention.[7]

In the United States, the transplanting of the general English judicial system meant that the States and the Federal Government[8] took the place of the crown. Courts all but universally upheld the plenary powers and parental obligations implicit in the doctrine of parens patriae.[9] However, the common law presumption that parents would properly perform their natural duty and later the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution (which has consistently been interpreted to protect the natural right of a parent to the custody of his child from State intervention without due process of law) both tended, during the 18th and 19th centuries, to restrict the court's assumption of custody to cases where it was clearly necessary in order to prevent injury to the child.[10] The focus remained on the protection of the health, morals, and welfare of the child rather than the protection of society, but the absence of property was no longer a consideration.

In addition to the continuation of the doctrine of parens patriae in the colonial courts and later in the State courts, other historical antecedents of the present system—such as the establishment of private and public welfare organizations, orphanages, and houses of refuge, and the use of foster homes and cottage-type reformatories—attempted to deal with children's crime, poverty, and parental fallibility in ways different from the punitive, society-protecting orientation of the traditional criminal court. Furthermore, the 18th century philosophy of laissez-faire in personal affairs was steadily replaced, during the latter part of the 19th century and the first quarter of the 20th, by an expansion of governmental social welfare activity.

In summary, then, the major trends which culminated in the first juvenile court act included the equitable concept of parens patriae, the increased use of legislation to obtain humanitarian social ends, the growing horror at the traditional judicial practice of treating children over seven as criminals, and the mounting number of specialized correctional facilities for dealing with children.

The fundamental aim of the Illinois statute enacted on July 1, 1899 was that "The care, custody, and discipline of a child (found to be delinquent, dependent, or neglected) shall approximate as nearly as may be that which should be given by its parents. * * * "[11] The nature of this first act and its history and development are so well known to students of the juvenile court movement as to warrant no repetition here.[12]

The truly significant innovation of the Illinois act, so far as this article is concerned, was that children charged with law violations were not to be treated as criminals, but were to be accorded the same individualized assistance as that given to dependent and neglected children. It marked an important departure from previous English and American chancery proceedings involving parens patriae, which had provided protection only to those children whose distress was the result of their parents' actions rather than their own delinquent acts.

The innovation met with widespread approval, and by 1927 all but two States (Maine and Wyoming) had similar juvenile court laws.[13] Except for a few early cases, appellate courts upheld the constitutionality of the various juvenile court acts against a variety of challenges.[14] The result has been that—along with the concepts of retribution, punishment, and deterrence—the standard rules of criminal procedure (e.g., right to jury trial, protection against self-incrimination, open hearings, proof beyond a reasonable doubt, right to counsel, limitations upon the use of hearsay evidence, the right to bail, etc.) have been generally discarded in American juvenile courts. Thus the juvenile in America may be brought within the protective power of the juvenile court without the operation of legal safeguards customarily offered to a person accused of a law violation.

In sharp contrast, in England (the country of origin of the parens patriae doctrine), juvenile courts hearing delinquency cases still provide to children all the essential protections of criminal procedure, even though their dispositions are similar to those provided by American juvenile courts.[15]

MUTUAL COMPACT THEORY OF PARENS PATRIAE IN AMERICA

By the enactment of a typical American juvenile court act, a State undertakes to remove the detriments and stigmata of a criminal proceeding against the child and promises to provide him with the essentials of parental training, care, and custody which were not provided by his natural parents. Because of these assurances by the State, the juvenile lawbreaker is stripped of the constitutional protections traditionally afforded to persons charged with a crime or a violation of the law.

For the purposes of this article, let us assume that a relationship which may be described as a mutual compact has been created between the State and the delinquent or criminally inclined child. It can be regarded as a bargain or agreement whereby the State, through the juvenile court,

---

[1] See, e.g., *Commonwealth* v. *Fisher*, 27 Pa. Super. 175 (1904), aff'd 213 Pa. 48, 62 Atl. 198 (1905); *Ex parte Johnson*, 31 N.J. Super. 382, 106 A.2d 560 (1954), aff'd 18 N.J. 422, 114 A.2d 1 (1955), cert. denied 350 U.S. 942 (1956); *In re Holmes*, 175 Pa. Super. 137, 103 A.2d 454 (1958), aff'd 379 Pa. 599, 109 A.2d 523 (1959), cert. denied 348 U.S. 973 (1955); *Pee* v. *U.S.*, 107 U.S. App. D.C. 47, 274 F. 2d 556 (1959).

[2] *Eyre* v. *Shaftsbury*, 2 P. Wms. 103, 118, 24 Eng. Rep. 659, 664 (1722); *Wellesley* v. *Beaufort*, 2 Russ. 17, 20, 38 Eng. Rep. 236, 243 (1827).

[3] Where the court-appointed guardian was deficient in the performance of his duties toward the child, the court could replace him. *Beaufort* v. *Berty*, 1 P. Wms. 703, 705, 24 Eng. Rep. 579, 580 (1721).

[4] Pomeroy, A Treatise on Equity Jurisprudence § 1307 (5th ed. 1941).

[5] Snell, The Principles of Equity 400 (19th ed. 1925).

[6] See Mack, "The Juvenile Court," 23 Harv. L. Rev. 104 (1909) for citations.

[7] *Ball* v. *Ball*, 2 Sim. 35, 57 Eng. Rep. 703 (1827).

[8] Only as to territories and the District of Columbia, 27 Am. Jur. Infants § 102.

[9] 27 Am. Jur. Infants, § 101–105; 43 C.J.S. Infants, § 4; 67 C.J.S. Parent and Child, § 10.

[10] For discussions of the theories under which the State operates when it supersedes the parents as guardians, see Note, 27 Col. L. Rev. 968 (1927); Note, 29 Ind. L.J. 475 (1954) and Note, 19 Harv. L. Rev. 374 (1906).

[11] Ill. Laws, 41st Gen. Ass., 1899, The Juvenile Court Act § 21 at 137.

[12] Among the more useful discussions of the legal and social antecedents of this pioneer legislation are the following: Lou, Juvenile Courts in the United States 1–31 (1927); Hurley, Origin of the Illinois Juvenile Court 9–52 (3d ed. 1907); Tappan, Juvenile Delinquency 167–173 (1949); Ludwig, "Rationale of Responsibility of Young Offenders," 29 Neb. L. Rev. 521 (1950); Flexner, "The Juvenile Court * * * Its Legal Aspect," 36 Annals 49 (1910).

[13] Tompkins, Sources for the Study of the Administration of Criminal Justice, 1949–1955, 130 (1956).

[14] The cases are collected in Note, 29 Ind. L.J. 475, 479–480 (1954) and in Paulsen, "Fairness to the Juvenile Offender," 41 Minn. L. Rev. 547 (1957).

[15] Henriques, "Children's Courts in England," 37 J. Crim. L., Crim. and Pol. Sci. 295 (1946).

is permitted to intervene, under broadly defined conditions of delinquency or violations of law, in the lives of families who have given up certain of their constitutional safeguards. By use of this literary device (which may not be able to withstand the rigorous testing of traditional legal analysis as a bilateral contract, but which, nevertheless, has intriguing possibilities for evaluation of the juvenile court system), we can clearly assess the rights and duties as well as the powers and disabilities of the several parties to the agreement.

The compact authorizes the juvenile court, in its discretion, to substitute State control for parental control. But such an intrusion of governmental supervision is premised on the assumption that the State will act in the best interests of the child and that its intervenion will affirmatively enhance the child's welfare. Applying the contractual analogy, it follows that unless the State satisfactorily performs its obligations under the compact, the juvenile and his parents should have a right to consider the agreement broken and to repossess their full constitutional rights. In other words, if the State fails to make good its promise to act for the improvement of the child's welfare, the child and his parents may demand the full protection of criminal due process afforded adults charged with crime.

McCrea has pointed out that "The first two decades of the juvenile court movement produced a wealth of philosophical comment so sound in conception and so modern in tone that it has scarcely been modified or improved upon since that time." But, after six decades of comment and legislation, as he went on to say, most courts dealing with children are still "not equipped to diagnose their problems, prescribe remedies suited to their individual needs, or provide the treatment necessary to help them." [16] Mere expressions of good intention are not enough. Performance, rather than good intentions, must be the standard for judging the success of the courts. The State, through its juvenile courts, must demonstrate that it is conscientiously striving to achieve the rehabilitation it promises, and that (though it makes no promise to actually bring about the reformation of the child) it will seek to employ the best institutional, probationary, medical, psychiatric, and other techniques in providing an opportunity for each child to develop into a mature and law-abiding citizen. The State has no right to substitute governmental for parental neglect.

The remainder of this article will examine the actual performance by the State acting in loco parentis, to determine whether the compact between child and State (elimination of the protections of criminal due process in return for nonpunitive, rehabilitative, and protective social procedures) has been kept. If it has been abrogated—if the State has failed to keep its legislative promises—the circumvention of constitutional protections and the assertion of State control in the name of parens patriae are neither legally nor morally justified.

PROMISE VERSUS PERFORMANCE

Before the full import of relinquishment by the child and his parents of their constitutional protections can be understood, a closer examination must be made not only of the State's specific obligations under the compact but also of the extent to which these obligations have been met. Five subsidiary promises by the State can be distinguished:

First, the promise that the consequences of a finding of delinquency will, in fact, be noncriminal and that the stigma of a criminal record will not obtain.

Second, the promise that the hearing itself will be promptly held, easily understood, fair, and compatible with, if not a part of, the treatment process.

Third, the promise that family ties will be strengthened and the child removed from his home only when his welfare or the interests of the community demand such action.

Fourth, the promise that the child's treatment subsequent to a finding of delinquency will approximate as closely as possible that which he should have received from his parents.

Fifth, in cases where removal from home and close supervision are required, the promise that the deleterious effects of imprisonment upon habits, attitudes, and aspirations will be minimized by therapeutically rather than punitively oriented restrictions.

Implied in each of these five promises is a complex of duties toward the child which requires implementation if these promises are to be more than specious declarations of intention. I propose now to examine in some detail the actualities of this implementation and to present pertinent statistics and such research findings as seem most accurately to describe the current situation.

Of necessity, the national picture must be painted with broad strokes. In some instances, exceptions and variations substantially qualify the account presented here. American juvenile courts and their adjunctive agencies and institutions vary enormously in the degree to which they perform the duties of a State under the compact. There is a world of difference between the court in a small county seat where juvenile hearings are held 1 day a week and the vast operations of a specialized juvenile court in a city of a million or more population. And there certainly is no assurance that the larger the operation the more compliance there will be with the basic tenets of the compact. But discussions of such ramifications are beyond the scope of this article; the reader interested in obtaining a more comprehensive picture is urged to consult the sources cited below.

Confidentiality

The State engages that its actions will be nonpunitive, that no child found to be within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court will be deemed a criminal or considered to be convicted of a crime,[17] and that no civil disabilities will be imposed.[18] It further promises that juvenile court findings will not be admissible as evidence against the child in any case or proceeding,[19] and that legal and social record will be confidential, except that the judge may allow inspection to persons having a legitimate interest in the child or the work of the court.[20]

Despite these promises, police records of juvenile arrests are generally kept on the same blotters as those of adults without any special confidentiality.[21] Fingerprinting and, to a lesser extent, photographing of arrested juveniles are likewise common practices, and criticism of such police procedures is resisted vigorously by many law enforcement officials.[22] Since approximately 70 percent of all juvenile court referrals throughout the country are made by police officers,[23] these criminal-like procedures take on significance. Happily, in cities where special police units for dealing with juveniles have been established, such practices are far less frequent.

Despite the promise of confidentiality of juvenile court dockets and records, the exceptions made for persons or agencies deemed to have a legitimate need to inspect are so numerous that they hardly qualify as exceptions. The Armed Forces, for example, are generally given the right to inquire into delinquency adjudications in the cases of persons being investigated for security clearances,[24] and the more sought-after services erect stringent enlistment barriers to anyone having a juvenile court record.[25] A study of the New York City children's court revealed that the FBI, the Civil Service, the Army, the Red Cross, the hack license bureau, the department of public welfare, the National Travelers Aid Association, and various other social agencies had access to the court's legal records despite the usual statutory provision that "No adjudication under the provisions of this act shall operate as a disqualification of any child." [26]

In view of the punitive purposes that dominate the sentencing of adult criminals,[27] a recent report on adult presentence investigation practices in the Federal probation system causes special concern. It reveals that, of the 97 reporting offices, the staff of 92 have access to juvenile court records for use in drawing up presentence reports. In 30 of these districts, the presentence reports are available to interested parties (including the U.S. attorney in 28 and various Federal investigative agencies in 3). In 11 districts, counsel for the defense has access to them. In 12 districts, the judges occasionally read the reports aloud, in part or in their entirety, in open court. In seven districts, the reports are filed with the clerk of the court, thus becoming available to public inspection to the same extent as all other criminal court records.[28] I do not know of any survey of State practices in the use of juvenile court records in adult presentence investigations, but I have no reason to believe that State courts respect the confidentiality of a juvenile's record any more than the Federal court system does.

For the most part, then, the State does not achieve its aim of securing court adjudication and treatment without at the same time clouding the child's future social and legal adjustment with a notoriety similar to that produced by criminal proceedings. These unfortunate consequences do not necessarily represent the State's deliberate repudiation of its promise. If the record is of significant assistance to the demanding agency in the performance of its duties, the request for information may be quite legitimate. But however valid the reasons for the disclosure of such records to other State or Federal agencies may be, in this competition the interests of the delinquent child most often give way to the needs of the various governmental and nongovernmental agencies.

[16] McCrea, "Juvenile Courts and Juvenile Probation," 3 NPPA Journal 385, 389 (1957).

[17] Sussman, "Law of Juvenile Delinquency," Chart b at 33–34 (revised ed. 1959).

[18] Ibid.

[19] Id. at 35.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Kahn, "The Untried Weapon Against Delinquency," 22 Fed. Prob. 11, 13 (1958).

[22] "Police Services for Juveniles," report of a conference sponsored by the children's bureau in cooperation with the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the special juvenile delinquent project, 27–31 (1954). See also Gronewold, "Presentence Investigation Practices in the Federal Probation System," 22 Fed. Prob. 27, 29 (1958).

[23] Taken from figures compiled by the U.S. Children's Bureau as reported in Teeters and Reinemann, "The Challenge of Delinquency," 218 (1950).

[24] DD Form 398 (18).

[25] E.g., AFM 39–9 (11)(c)(I) and RECRTGWG supplement 6 to AFM 39–9, July 1, 1957.

[26] Kahn, "A Court for Children 59–60" (1942) quoting the Domestic Relations Act of New York City, § 84.

[27] Wechsler and Michael, "A Rationale of the Laws of Homicide," 37 Col. L. Rev. 1261 (1937).

[28] Gronewold, supra, note 22, at 30.

Special quality of hearing

Impinging on this problem of untoward publicity is the agreement made by the State with respect to the conduct of the juvenile court hearing itself. Specifically, it promises nonpublic,[29] informal, dispassionate, and sympathetic hearings[30] at which the procedure will be understandable, equitable, and fairly administered.[31]

The promise of a nonpublic hearing is probably lived up to in the majority of juvenile courts insofar as casual visitors are excluded from the courtroom.[32] On the other hand, the bustle of staff, witnesses, and guests is not very much different from the turmoil of an adult court.[33] Moreover, even in juvenile courts which remain closed to the general public, it is by no means true that juveniles are regularly protected from newspaper publicity. In 1957, for example, four States amended their juvenile court laws in ways designed to permit the same notoriety as attends criminal proceedings.[34]

Another promise which most juvenile courts keep after a fashion is informality of procedures;[35] in many of them, not only traditional procedure but basic orderliness has been abandoned almost to the point of chaos. Thus the implicit aim of equitable, understandable, and wise adjudication is defeated.[36] Compared with most other administrative and judicial tribunals, the juvenile court is extraordinarily free from effective checks and balances.[37] For example, a probation officer (who in most jurisdictions is a court appointee[38]) represents the child before the court while simultaneously presenting charges and evidence which may result in severe and long-term restrictions upon his client's liberty.[39]

The high degree of autonomy which the juvenile court judge typically enjoys has the corollary effect of focusing upon him virtually the total responsibility for a just adjudication and an astute disposition. In the great majority of jurisdictions, however, he is hampered not only by his own lack of training in the necessarily specialized skills demanded by his job[40] and by overloaded calendars,[41] but also by administrative duties and essential extracurricular activities far beyond those demanded of judges in other courts.[42] His task is further complicated in many jurisdictions by intake and probation staffs that are overworked, underpaid, and poorly trained.[43] According to a recent study by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,[44] less than half of the 3,000 counties in the United States have juvenile probation services and only one-tenth of the probation officers have had specialized training.

Legal counsel rarely appear in most juvenile courts.[45] And often, on the rare occasions when they do, their lack of understanding of the juvenile court philosophy and their puzzlement concerning the absence of legal procedures make them more of a hindrance than a help to the judge.[46] Many courts, particularly those stressing social welfare in contrast with their adjudication functions, discourage the presence of lawyers.[47] No figures are available on the subject, but it is reasonable to assume that the indigency of most juveniles hailed before the court further lessens their chances of obtaining legal representation.[48]

Stenographic recording of the court's proceedings is far from a universal practice, and it is unusual for a juvenile court judge to note his reasons for a particular disposition.[49] Consequently, in most jurisdictions it is a singular occasion when an appeal is taken.[50]

In practice, then, the aim of a simplified, easily understood, yet fair hearing at which the remedial efforts of the State should formally begin is frustrated. Doubtless there are many judges, lawyers, and social workers who, despite the problems confronting them, are capable of meeting the intricate and unusual demands of their duties with vigor and imagination. Where juvenile courts are staffed with such persons they are sometimes able to create and maintain a court system, even without the aid of carefully developed procedures, which fulfills in good measure the State's promise. Too often, however, the structure of a juvenile court hearing is jerry-built, a hodgepodge of traditional, criminal-type procedures, values, and attitudes on the one hand, and airy altruism, confusing informality, and noblesse oblige on the other. Such a court structure usually results in denying to the juvenile the benefits promised by the State without granting him the protections generally afforded criminals. Where such is the situation the best interests of the youthful delinquent are dubiously served.

Custody

Both before and after a formal judicial determination that the child comes within the court's jurisdiction, the child may experience interrogation, detention, and other forms of treatment out of the presence of his parents which would be of questionable legality were he an adult criminal suspect. But such treatment is routinely justified on the grounds that the State promises to secure for the child such care and guidance, preferably in his own home, as will serve his welfare,[51] and to conserve and strengthen the family ties wherever possible, removing him from the custody of his parents only when his welfare cannot be adequately provided for without such removal.[52]

Although nearly every juvenile court act provides that any interested party may file a petition to institute a proceeding against a juvenile, the great majority of such actions are commenced by police officers.[53] If the policeman has not been specifically trained or is not inclined toward sympathetic handling of juvenile offenders, his attitudes and actions are likely to be the same as those he displays in dealing with an adult criminal suspect.[54] Thus the child, in his first contact with the juvenile court, often finds himself cast in the role of a junior criminal.

In some jurisdictions, moreover, a police officer or a superintendent of correction who operates the detention home without court supervision decides whether the arrested child should be detained.[55] In either case, considerations peripheral, if not contrary, to that of the child's welfare are likely to predominate.[56] Feelings of misunderstanding, hostility, and resentment which may have been produced in the child by his first contact with law enforcement officials are not likely to be mitigated by incarceration in a detention home pending the adjudication and disposition of his case. One authority has summed up the conditions he will probably face in such an institution as follows:

"Most detention homes violate the very principles of mental hygiene which were violated in the child's own home—denial of love and emotional security, lack of meaningful activity, little opportunity to make successful choices, and so forth.[57]"

Outright cruelty is not unknown in some of the country's detention centers,[58] to say nothing of dismal, crowded quarters and a staff calloused in spirit by overwork and inadequate program and equipment. For children detained there who are charged but not yet adjudicated as delinquents, the mockery is deplorable enough. It is outrageous when the children there are detained on charges of neglect and dependency—yet such occurrences are not infrequent.[59]

In accordance with the promise not to treat the child as a criminal, the right to release under bail bond is denied or strictly

---

[29] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 32.

[30] Mack, supra note 6, at 119–120.

[31] Schramm, "The Court Hearing as Part of the Treatment Process" in Glueck, the Problem of Delinquency 562 (1959).

[32] Tappan, op. cit. supra note 12, at 188.

[33] Kahn, op. cit. supra note 26, at 98.

[34] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 80.

[35] Tappan, op. cit. supra note 12, at 188 and Note, 58 Col. L. Rev. 702, 716 (1958).

[36] For illustrations see Kahn, op. cit. supra note 26, at 102; Diana, "The Rights of Juvenile Delinquents: An Appraisal of Juvenile Court Procedures," 47 J. Crim. L., Crim. and Pol. Sci. 561 (1957).

[37] Pound, Foreword in Young, Social Treatment in Probation and Delinquency, xiv (1952).

[38] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 56.

[39] Note, supra note 35, at 717–721 and Paulsen, supra note 14, at 565–568 discuss possible abuses in the use of social reports in juvenile court hearings. See also Cheriff, "Correct Use of Background Reports in Juvenile Delinquency Cases," 5 Syracuse L. Rev. 67 (1953).

[40] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 51; Deutsch, Our Rejected Children 225–227 (1950); Gelhorn, Children and Families in the Courts of New York 99–104 (1954); Ellrod and Melaney, "Juvenile Justice; Treatment or Travesty?" 11 U. Pitt. L. Rev. 277, 285–286 (1950).

[41] E.g., the annual reports of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia for 1957–1959; Brecher and Brecher, "Better Courts for Kids," Saturday Evening Post, Oct. 25, 1958.

[42] Alexander, "Of Juvenile Court Justice and Judges" in NPPA Yearbook, Redirecting the Delinquent, 187, 201 (1947).

[43] For a study of factors affecting the efficiency of probationary practices see the report by Hengerer, "Organizing Probation Services," in NPPA Yearbook Reappraising Crime Treatment 45 (1953).

[44] Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, Programs, and Services in the Field of Juvenile Delinquency 4 (1958).

[45] Teeters and Reinemann, op. cit. supra note 23, at 326. See also the discussion of case in Note, supra, note 35, at 716.

[46] Paulsen, supra note 14, at 570.

[47] Diana, supra note 36, at 565–566; see also discussions and citations in Paulsen, supra note 14, at 568–70.

[48] The extent to which legal assistance is generally available in civil and criminal cases is reported by Brownell, Legal Aid in the United States (1951).

[49] Gelhorn, op. cit. supra note 40, at 97.

[50] Note, supra note 35 at 716, footnote 118.

[51] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 38–39.

[52] Id. at 45–50.

[53] Supra footnotes 23, 41.

[54] Consider the following: "Police said their tall, dark-haired, soft-spoken suspect [i.e., a 13-year old] denied involvement through more than 4 hours of questioning. They said he 'broke,' however, when he was confronted by a classmate who said he watched him [commit the alleged arson] * * * [H]e calmly reenacted his incendiary role before a group of school, fire department, and police authorities." Washington Post, Oct. 16, 1959, p. 1. See also Teeters and Reinemann, op. cit. supra note 23, at 219–221.

[55] Teeters and Reinemann, op. cit. supra note 23, at 228.

[56] See Paulsen's comments on *Myers* v. *Collett*, 1 Utah 2d 406, 268 P. 2d 432 (1954) in Paulsen supra note 14, at 552.

[57] Norman, "The Detention Home," 261 Annals 158, 161 (1949). See also Edwards, "Meeting the Challenge of a Juvenile Code," in NPPA Yearbook Reappraising Crime Treatment 94, 97–99 (1953).

[58] Deutsch, op. cit. supra note 40, at 242.

[59] Norman, supra note 57, at 159.

limited by most courts.[60] As a result, in jurisdictions with crowded calendars, children are frequently detained for protracted periods.[61] In the light of the conditions cited above, the denial of bond—though worthy in intent and potentially sound—has little justification.

Incarceration and other forms of treatment traditionally used with criminals may be fully justified in the case of those older or hardened youths whose only qualification for being treated as juveniles is their chronologic age. But the proportion of such mature hoodlums in the total group of delinquents is usually very small and is scant vindication for the general use of such procedures. It certainly cannot justify this kind of treatment for children whose involvement in the offense has not been determined or whose culpability is largely in having been born to neglectful or irresponsible parents.

Juvenile institutions

The State promises that when a child must be removed from his family, it will secure for him custody, care, training, and discipline as nearly as possible equivalent to that which should have been given him by his parents, including any special care made necessary by his mental condition.[62]

In 1950 Albert Deutsch published the results of his investigation of public and private training schools, detention facilities, and juvenile court systems in States "ranking highest in wealth and culture." His findings were endorsed by Austin MacCormick, executive director of the Osborne Association and an internationally recognized penologist.[63] On juvenile reformatories Deutsch summarized his conclusions as follows: "With notable exceptions, the rule in most so-called public training schools I visited was one of fear and repression." [64] Apart from the grounds and buildings—which, in many cases, resembled those of expensive boarding schools—the institutions, Deutsch implied, were little better than prisons, and, in view of the widespread use of corporal and other degrading punishments, were considerably worse than the average maximum-security prison. Not surprisingly, his findings are corroborated by a number of investigations into the recidivism rates (65 to 85 percent) of graduates of such reformatories and training schools.[65]

An equally disheartening observation has been made about the main motive for commitment:

"In actual practice, institutional commitments are frequently made for reasons quite different from security and training. A major persisting motive is punishment—the retributive drive that sustains much of society's attack upon the offender, regardless of age. The intense punitive reaction of the courts, even those specialized to deal with children and adolescents, is a matter of too-common observation." [66]

Even the most sympathetic of judges, those who do not contribute to the prevalence of misplaced motives, have a dilemma of their own to contend with: Should the delinquent be committed to a training school where his chances of reformation are statistically slight, or should he be returned to the pernicious environment of his home and neighborhood with only the weekly visit to a probation officer for supervision? Foster home placement is not suited to the needs of many children; [67] in any event, it is not generally available for delinquents.[68]

Many qualifications might be made to these comments, which seem to state that all juvenile institutions are deplorably operated or in short supply. This generalization does a serious injustice to a number of well-run, privately financed rehabilitation centers and to a few communities which have developed adequate rehabilitation centers or foster home placement facilities. But the proportion of foster homes and publicly supported training schools which make positive contributions to the welfare of their charges remains depressingly small.

CHILDREN IN JAILS AND PRISONS

Close contact between an adult and an adolescent—who is, above everything else, at a stage in life when he is most impressionable—can be either good or bad, depending on the proclivities of the adult. With this in mind, the State promises that no child will be placed in a prison, a jail, or a lockup lest the State abet his downfall by confining him with adult offenders. It also promises that the child will not otherwise be brought into contact with adult criminals or commingled with vicious or immoral persons.[69]

Most juvenile court acts expressly prohibit the detention of children under specified ages in jails and police stations; nevertheless, 50,000 to 100,000 children are confined each year in our county jails.[70] A U.S. Children's Bureau study of 380 courts indicated that "jail detention had been used in 11 percent of all children's cases in 1944 and 12 percent in 1945." [71] A study in California showed that during 1945 more than 11,000 children were confined in city and county jails in the State. The same report indicated that the period of detention ranged from 1 day to 230 days for boys and from 1 day to 69 days for girls; the average length of incarceration for all children during the year was about 12 days.[72] Most jails are destructive not only for the children illegally confined there but also for the adult prisoners: more than 90 percent of the jails inspected by the Federal Bureau of Prisons throughout the country are rated under 60 on a scale of 100.[73]

The reason for this widespread, blatant repudiation of both the letter and the spirit of the juvenile court law is, in large part, the absence of suitable juvenile facilities.[74] But questionable statutory draftsmanship also plays a part. Under some statutes placement in a detention home exclusively for juveniles is not mandatory; few acts provide for the punishment of persons who violate the sections forbidding jail detention of children; [75] in some enactments the scope of the prohibition is obscure.[76]

In the great majority of juvenile court acts the court's exclusive jurisdiction is subject to certain exceptions which give criminal courts concurrent and, in a few instances, exclusive jurisdiction over specific categories of juvenile cases. Other acts provide that the juvenile court may, in its discretion, waive jurisdiction to criminal courts. These exceptions are usually described in terms of the age of the child and the nature of the offense.[77] Thus, there is legal justification for the imprisonment of a certain number of children and youths; however, the degree to which the philosophy of the juvenile court has failed in application is indicated by the large number of juveniles who are serving sentences in State and Federal prisons.[78] Finally, in a number of jurisdictions, it has been possible for a child committed to a training school by a juvenile court to be thereafter transferred to a penal institution without a court order.[79] The effect, of course, is that the juvenile is incarcerated as a criminal without benefit of arraignment, trial by jury, or any of the other protections usually secured by the U.S. Constitution to a person accused of crime.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The cornerstone of parens patriae is the concept that the interests of the State and the welfare of the child are in harmony, not in conflict. From this the presumption arises that the State, acting as a substitute parent, will act considerately in the best interests of the child and will competently control and rear the child. Upon the truth of these promises rests the justification for invoking the doctrine.

By the same token, if the State fails to keep the promises upon which the mutual compact theory of the American juvenile court is based, juvenile courts cannot justifiably abrogate the constitutional protections of criminal due process or intervene in the lives of children without a finding of criminal guilt. Unless the State is required to make good its promises, American juveniles will have exchanged the precious heritage of individual freedom under law for the tyranny of State intervention whenever the State considers that its interests are affected.

Those interested in justice for children, as well as those concerned with their social welfare now and in the future, cannot afford to be complacent about the outcome of this issue. They must insist that the State take prompt steps to perform on its promises. If the juvenile court is not to be swept away by the tide of legal history, those interested in its philosophy must strongly urge (1) that legislatures provide juvenile courts with sufficient trained judges and adequate professional staff to dispose patiently yet expeditiously of all cases referred to them; (2) that juvenile court procedures which afford due process and fair treatment for the child and his parents, and which prevent the unwarranted intervention of overzealous representatives of the State in their private lives, be formulated by bar associations and put into universal application; (3) that systematic procedures for assessing the needs of children coming before these courts be developed by behavioral scientists; and (4) that the State appropriate sufficient funds for the construction and adequate staffing of institutions expressly designed to provide for delinquent juveniles the care, guidance, and discipline that should have been pro-

---

[60] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 38.

[61] Reporting on a study of 68 detention facilities in 22 States, a field consultant for NCCD found children who had been detained prior to trial from 6 months to over a year. Norman, "Detention Facilities for Children," in NPPA Yearbook, Society's Stake in the Offender 86, 87 (1946).

[62] Compare Ill. Laws, 41st Gen. Ass., 1899, the Juvenile Court Act, § 21 at 137, the model for similar provisions in most later acts.

[63] Deutsch, op. cit. supra note 40, Foreword.

[64] Id. at xix, Introduction.

[65] Reported in Tappan, op. cit. supra note 12, at 430. The futility of efforts aimed at achieving rehabilitation in an institution whose primary functions are to maximize internal order and to minimize escapes is well analyzed in Sykes, Society of Captives (1958).

[66] Tappan, op. cit. supra note 12, at 428.

[67] Id. at 418.

[68] Gelhorn, op. cit. supra note 40, at 134.

[69] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 39–40.

[70] Id. at 41.

[71] Id.

[72] Tolman and Wales, Juvenile Detention in California 11 and tables 4, 5 (1946).

[73] Reported in Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 41.

[74] Ellrod and Melaney, supra note 40, at 287.

[75] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 42–43.

[76] Cosulich, Juvenile Court Laws of the United States 60 (1939).

[77] Tappan, "Children and Youth in the Criminal Court," 261 Annals 128, 129–130 (1949).

[78] Tappan, op. cit. supra note 12, at 427, table 25.

[79] Rubin, "Protecting the Child in the Juvenile Court," 43 J. Crim L., Crim. and Pol. Sci. 425, 439 (1952).

vided by their parents. Unless these things are done, and done promptly, the juvenile court movement is in grave danger of foundering. Dean Roscoe Pound regarded the establishment of the juvenile court in America as one of the most significant advances in the administration of justice since the Magna Charta.[50] But the bright hope of this new form of jurisprudence could be snuffed out by failure of legislatures to support the juvenile courts and to carry through on their promises.

Who, then, must insist that the State make good on its obligations; who shall "catch the conscience of the King"? Parents and children have the most at stake; but the parents of delinquent youths and antisocial children are the least adequate of all the breed and their children are inarticulate and unorganized. Unselfish persons and organizations devoted to the welfare of children abound, but only occasionally do State and Federal legislators pay heed to their requests. If the compact is to be enforced, the persons who will have to require compliance by the State with its juvenile court obligations are the juvenile court judges themselves.

These men and women were elected or appointed to judicial office and sworn to carry out the juvenile court law, the mutual compact previously described. On the one hand, they must protect the child and his parents from the community's vengeance or the unwarranted encroachment of the State on the family's individual rights; on the other hand, they must give due consideration to law enforcement and the safety of the community. The strength of the juvenile court movement depends upon their ability to discharge this dual role effectively. In behalf of children in trouble—and an unpopular responsibility it may be—they must insist that the State keep its promises.

"We have to think of the right of the court to probation service, and the responsibility of the legislature to guarantee its adequacy in the courts."[51] The same principle applies to all of the other areas of the compact for which the State has responsibility. Judges should request appropriations for trained staff, psychiatric clinics, and research projects as necessities rather than as alms and benevolent gratuities.

All those who are concerned about the advancement of the juvenile court philosophy should press for prompt State action and should support appropriate legislation on behalf of juvenile courts. But, in the last analysis, the mantle of leadership in this cause must fall onto the shoulders of juvenile court judges. They must require that any invocation of the doctrine of parens patriae be supported by a quid pro quo in the interests of the child. It is the obligation and duty of each juvenile court judge to demand, unequivocally and consistently, that the State keep its part of the bargain.

[50] Guides for Juvenile Court Judges 127 (1957).

[51] Turnbladh, "Half Justice," 2 NPPA Jóurnal 306 (1956), emphasis supplied in original.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ROOSEVELT for the duration of the meeting of International Labor Organization, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. BARRY) for 15 minutes on June 8.

Mr. SCHERER (at the request of Mr. BARRY) for 15 minutes on June 7.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for 15 minutes on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PASSMAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. BOLAND) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN to include tables and extend his material in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole on the agriculture appropriation bill today.

Mr. DONOHUE, in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS, the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today, and to include a table and extraneous matter.

Mr. ROBISON.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARRY) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. FINDLEY.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. BOYKIN.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1346. An act for the relief of John Napoli; and

H.R. 5178. An act for the relief of the Reynolds Feal Corp., New York, N.Y., and the Lydick Roofing Co., Fort Worth, Tex.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 133. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States;

S. 1941. An act to authorize construction of community support facilities at Los Alamos County, N. Mex.; and

S.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9–15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 7, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

990. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the leasing of Government-owned aircraft test engines by the Department of the Air Force to General Electric Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, during the period January 1, 1959, to December 31, 1960; to the Committee on Government Operations.

991. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 17(a) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands pertaining to the salary of the Government Comptroller"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

992. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives, pursuant to section 1(f) of the act of June 1, 1960 (74 Stat. 151); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

993. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the accounting system and related matters of the Office of the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA); to the Committee on Government Operations.

994. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7189. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the compact or agreement between the States of North Dakota and Minnesota with respect to the boundary between such States; without amendment (Rept. No. 451). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 7475. A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications, travel, and other

areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer U.S. Antarctic programs in the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 7476. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission on problems of small towns and rural counties; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 7477. A bill to repeal section 409 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949, requiring the submission of a report to the Congress concerning eligible public building projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 7478. A bill to amend section 170(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 7479. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 7480. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 7481. A bill to amend section 170(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 7482. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia approved June 19, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 7483. A bill to provide for the establishment of cooperative outdoor recreation research centers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 7484. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to legislative proposals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 7485. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that property found on premises owned or leased by the United States may be returned to the finder if the owner cannot be found; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 7486. A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer U.S. Antarctic programs in the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 7487. A bill to establish the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 7488. A bill to amend part IV of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to develop the South Barrow gasfield, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, for the purpose of making gas available for sale to the native village of Barrow and to other non-Federal communities and installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 7489. A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer U.S. Antarctic programs in the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7490. A bill for the protection of marine mammals on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 7491. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H.R. 7492. A bill to amend Public Law 86-506, 86th Congress (74 Stat. 199), approved June 11, 1960; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 7493. A bill to authorize the making and enforcement of regulations at water supply projects in the District of Columbia and environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 7494. A bill to provide direct aid to the States and territories for educational purposes only for the benefit of the taxpayers and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7495. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus personal property to union locals for use in apprentice training program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 7496. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that certain distributions of stock made pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as dividend distributions but shall be treated as a return of basis and result in gain only to the extent basis of the underlying stock is exceeded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 7497. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common carrier property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 7498. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the southern interstate nuclear compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 7499. A bill to authorize the appropriation to the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission, of $7,500,000, to be used to carry out the provisions of the act of August 5, 1953, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 7500. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 7501. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 7502. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 7503. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 7504. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 7505. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 7506. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 7507. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 7508. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 7509. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7510. A bill to clarify the intent of Congress in the act of September 2, 1958, relating to the exchange of lands between the United States and the Navajo Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 7511. A bill to revise the effective dates of certain increases in compensation granted to employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 7512. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for a class of supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 7513. A bill to restate terms of the grants covering the Rockefeller Wildlife Refuge and Game Preserve to permit it to comply with current Louisiana law; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 441. Joint resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H. Con. Res. 325. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the con-

struction of an interstate highway in Montana; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Res. 326. Resolution to express the sense of the House on tax-exempt contributions to secure release of persons held in custody by the Government of Cuba; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Res. 327. Resolution to express the sense of the House on the application of the Logan Act to private correspondence with foreign governments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Arab League boycott of American citizens, business and industry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to House Concurrent Resolution 15 of the Legislature of Louisiana, which relates to Federal aid to public schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7514. A bill for the relief of Mercedes Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COAD:

H.R. 7515. A bill for the relief of John L. Toth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 7516. A bill for the relief of Angeliki Psychari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7517. A bill for the relief of Georgia Kollintza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7518. A bill for the relief of Christos John Kyriakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7519. A bill for the relief of Gin Gim Hang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7520. A bill for the relief of Jorge Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 7521. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ng Kam Ore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 7522. A bill for the relief of Col. Harold S. Morton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7523. A bill for the relief of Eva Laner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 7524. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hanna Diderman Rosental; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 7525. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarita M. Respicio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 7526. A bill for the relief of Edith Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 7527. A bill for the relief of Victoria Kendall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 7528. A bill for the relief of Ki Su (Theresa) Moun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

166. By Mr. LIBONATI: House Joint Resolution No. 48 adopted in the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, relative to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service requiring payment of income taxes without permitting deductions of expenses of members of legislatures who have no other occupation by reason of retirement, or otherwise; and that the Honorable GEORGE AIKEN, U.S. Senator from Vermont, has introduced a bill in the U.S. Senate (S. 587) to remedy this situation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

167. By Mr. MONAGAN: Petition of the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission regarding the extent of participation of the General Services Administration in proceedings before regulatory agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

168. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Eisho Oshiro, Naha City, Okinawa, relative to requesting legislation for payment of U.S. funds for compensation for certain damages; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

169. Also, petition of Harumasa Irei, mayor of Kadena Son, Okinawa, relative to requesting legislation for settlement of Ryukyuan pre-treaty claims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

170. Also, petition of Eisho Kawasaki and Kihei Shiroma, mayors of Tamagusuku and Iheya Son, Okinawa, relative to requesting legislation for compensation for certain damages; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

171. Also, petition of Hajime Takara, Naha City, Ryukyus, relative to requesting compensation for certain damages to the Ryukyuan people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Our Debt to Our War Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last May 30, 1961, appropriate Memorial Day exercises, honoring the heroic dead of all our wars, were held on the Common in my home city of Worcester, Mass.

The exercises were principally sponsored by the Willie Grout Camp, Sons of Union Veterans, and were very well attended by local citizens and members of the various veterans organizations in the area.

It was my privilege to speak at these exercises and I have been asked to include here the address I delivered, which follows:

MEMORIAL DAY EXERCISES, WORCESTER COMMON, MAY 30, 1961

It is a high privilege to join with you today in paying tribute to the heroic dead of all our wars.

This ceremony very vividly and timely reminds us that the individuals we commemorate today willingly gave up their lives for their beliefs. In dwelling upon their sufferings and deaths in combat against the enemy we are virtually forced to ask ourselves, what are we willing to give up to further preserve the beliefs for which they died?

This question realistically recalls the great obligations we have to our living veterans and those whom our departed heroes have left behind.

A grateful and blessed country will not, I am sure, ever permit our history books to show that the widows and family members of those who died in war were denied a good measure of the material assistance which would have been provided for them by devoted husbands and fathers had they lived.

I am certain that the people of this Nation will never allow it to be said that our handicapped war veterans were forgotten and neglected in their rehabilitation needs or denied the medical and hospital facilities to which they are legally and morally entitled.

The best guarantee for the promotion of genuine patriotism among those who could possibly be called in the future is a demonstration of how we have met our obligations to those who have served in the past.

It is well for us, also, to emphasize today the beliefs of those who have served and are gone. In summary, they believed in the dignity of the individual and his possession of inalienable rights and liberties granted by the Creator.

By their deaths, those we commemorate today retained these beliefs and rights for us.

Just as in the day of those to whom we are paying tribute here, we are now again challenged by an enemy that has openly declared their determination to take away the God-given rights we, and the other free peoples, enjoy and place us all under the tyrannical yoke of atheistic communism.

The scheme of their accomplishment has not yet reached the point of open military aggression, and may God grant that it never will.

Instead, they are projecting a cold war strategy, with which we are becoming increasingly familiar, of provoking irritation on one day and hypocritical gestures for peaceful negotiation on the next.

Their obvious, ultimate hope is that by inciting prolonged discouragement, division, dissension, and peaceful yearning among ourselves and our allies we will finally become so frustrated, so soft, so exhausted, and so spiritless, they will be able to subjugate us all without any violent struggle.

Their indictment of us, in brief, is that we have lost the genuine character for national patriotism, that our traditional unified courage has been dissipated and that our historical capacity for sacrifice has disappeared. We must then urgently and promptly show them that the charges in their indictment are false.

The President of the United States has issued a renewed call for all Americans to join in concerted action to meet and defeat the Russian cold war strategy. He has voiced a most solemn warning for all individuals and segments of American society to unite in demonstrating willingness to undergo the sacrifices necessary to show the