

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 111—PART 12

JULY 7, 1965, TO JULY 16, 1965

(PAGES 15705 TO 17174)

Their stay here has been a true practical contribution toward better international understanding, often on people's lips but rarely translated into action. Again, accept our inadequate word of thanks. We wish you the best of luck, success, and prosperity in all your future endeavors.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONDALE ON CONTINUED SUPPORT OF NATIONWIDE CONSERVATION EFFORTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the importance of providing continued support of our conservation efforts throughout the country should be of primary concern to every Member of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that my statement before the Subcommittee on Agriculture, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONDALE BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, JUNE 10, 1965

Mr. Chairman, the recent heavy floods in Minnesota and elsewhere in the Mississippi Valley have been a tragic reminder to all of us that the uncontrolled forces of nature can do incredible damage. There is one agency of the Federal Government whose particular function has been to control and harness these potentially destructive forces of nature. For 30 years, the Soil Conservation Service has worked to make nature work for the good of man—and not for evil purposes.

This committee has before it the budget estimates for fiscal 1966 which, I believe, do not give adequate consideration to some of the urgent requirements for soil and water conservation in the United States. I know the committee is well aware of the highly controversial proposal to establish a revolving user fee fund for soil and water conservation practices. I wish to be on record as firmly opposed to the \$20 million reduction in appropriations for conservation operations and to the substitution of user fees levied upon farmers.

I oppose this proposal because it denies an established policy that for 30 years has benefited all the people through sound soil and water conservation practices. Many of these advances could not have been made if individual farmers had been expected to pay for the technical services provided by the Soil Conservation Service. Landowners and operators should not be expected to bear alone the financial burden of conserving natural resources, where these measures benefit the public at large and future generations on the land and in urban areas.

I respectfully urge that this committee reject the Budget Bureau's proposal as a backward step that would prove costly to the Nation. I wish to join with my distinguished colleagues in the Senate who strongly support an increase in appropriations to permit more SCS technical assistance in support of local conservation endeavors. I want to see that program strengthened, because it is a sound investment in the future of this dynamic country.

I also ask that the following two letters be made a part of my statement before this committee. The first is a letter to the President of the United States from the Honorable Karl F. Rolvaag, Governor, State of Minnesota, urging that he consider the impact on soil and water conservation in Minnesota resulting from the proposed SCS reductions. The second letter, directed to the President

again, from Mr. Alvin Payne, vice chairman of the State of Minnesota Water Resources Board, points out succinctly that conservation is a continuing process, from which benefits may be expected to be realized after many years and for future generations.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you very much for this opportunity to testify in opposition to reductions in soil conservation assistance programs.

MARCH 3, 1965.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have recently been reviewing the proposed cut in funds to the USDA and its impact on soil and water conservation in this State. I am dismayed at this possible reduction in services to the farmers of Minnesota and the hardship it would impose on them. This State is fully exerting itself in a program to conserve its natural resources, specific laws have been enacted to cooperate with the Federal service to achieve a balanced program of soil and water conservation, resource and recreational land use planning. The proposed budget cutback would seriously endanger the programs we have and are planning; the wonderful work that has already been accomplished would wither. I personally feel that rather than curtailing these funds, they should be increased in order that we will have a better land for the people of tomorrow.

Very truly yours,

KARL F. ROLVAAG,
Governor.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
WATER RESOURCES BOARD,
St. Paul, Minn., May 14, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your budget proposals for soil conservation activities, a departure from past practice, now being considered by the 89th Congress, causes us to comment.

The Minnesota Water Resources Board, in its experience of the past decade in establishing State watershed districts within our State, has witnessed the devotion of the soil conservation district supervisors in carrying out their task of motivating fellow landowners to apply to their land soil conservation practices. It has further observed that this group of community leaders are knowledgeable of soil conservation principles, and more than other groups, soundly aware of related resource problems of their community and of this State.

Soil conservation district supervisors performed their duties with the technical support of the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. After a quarter of a century of development, the need for soil and water land use care still remains on much of the Nation's acres. The continued teamwork of a local district governing body and of the above-mentioned Federal agency is still of utmost importance to the public interest of the Nation's urban dwellers, and to the welfare and security of our country.

It appears to us that your proposals of shifting costs of land capital improvements to landowners, will have the effect of killing the existing satisfactory method of placing conservation practices on the land. It must be remembered that the benefits to the landowner from conservation practices applied to the land, do not accrue immediately to the owner, but flow to him over the long run. In recognition of this situation the current governmental program is proper, since there are immediate benefits secured by the public, for its investment as well as a return over the long run.

The board does state its opposition to your new approach to Soil Conservation Service

operational needs as well as the innovation of requiring landowners to pay for services. In our judgment an excellent existing public policy in this matter, which you, no doubt, shaped and agreed to in your early political life, should not be changed.

ALVIN PAYNE,
Vice Chairman.

CITATION AWARDED TO JAMES R. YOUNG, OF ANDERSON, S.C.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, on June 19, James R. Young, associate editor of the Daily Mail, of Anderson, S.C., was awarded, by the editors of Who's Who in the South and Southwest, a citation in recognition of his outstanding contribution in the field of journalism. I wish to insert in the RECORD the full text of the citation made to Mr. Young on that occasion:

James R. Young's own life has contained the elements of which news stories are made—for example, his pre-Pearl Harbor imprisonment by the Japanese for his trenchant articles on military developments. He has remained an authority on the Far East, has done a syndicated column about it, meanwhile concerning himself with the welfare and progress of the southern region. He is a man of mission and purpose and a devotee of southern welfare and progress.

In commenting on the citation, the news accounts added:

He and Mr. Kimbrell, in the early 1950's, inaugurated a series of Savannah Valley Booster meetings around Thomason and Clarks Hill area, and later in support of the Hartwell dam and the comprehensive economic river development. For this, Young later received a citation from the Southern Association of Science and Industry, at Houston, Tex. Another industrial award was from the Southern Optometry Association for his news articles on eye-saving programs and the prevention of blindness in industry.

Two years ago he was named to the Johns Hopkins University Committee of 100 on National Resources among the alumni, to evaluate financial support for the university and the Johns Hopkins hospital. Last year he published an 800-page book on textile pioneers of the South, representing 10 years of editorial research of the industry and its founders.

THE CRISIS IN OUR STATE CAPITALS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in my judgment, the most important domestic crisis facing the Nation today is the quiet, but persistent, deterioration of our State governments.

Virtually every serious critic of American government recognizes that State government is a weak link in our Federal System. Many States have simply failed or refused to solve such essentially local problems as education, pollution, welfare assistance, housing and urban development, law enforcement, racial discrimination, and a host of other matters. As a result, Congress has been called upon to legislate in these areas, which once were the exclusive responsibility of our State and local governments.

The reasons why our States have failed to meet the needs of their citizens are complex. The readily identifiable causes are antiquated constitutions; lack