

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>st</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 17

JULY 1, 1970, TO JULY 10, 1970

(PAGES 22355 TO 23818)

## NAYS—35

|          |           |                |
|----------|-----------|----------------|
| Aiken    | Ervin     | McClellan      |
| Allen    | Fannin    | Metcalf        |
| Baker    | Fong      | Miller         |
| Bellmon  | Fulbright | Montoya        |
| Bennett  | Goldwater | Pearson        |
| Burdick  | Gurney    | Stennis        |
| Cooper   | Hansen    | Talmadge       |
| Cranston | Holland   | Thurmond       |
| Doie     | Hollings  | Thorner        |
| Eagleton | Hruska    | Yarborough     |
| Eastland | Inouye    | Young, N. Dak. |
| Ellender | Long      |                |

## NOT VOTING—25

|          |              |              |
|----------|--------------|--------------|
| Anderson | Jordan, N.C. | Russell      |
| Cook     | Magnuson     | Smith, Maine |
| Curtis   | McCarthy     | Sparkman     |
| Dodd     | McGee        | Stevens      |
| Gore     | Moss         | Symington    |
| Gravel   | Mundt        | Tydings      |
| Harris   | Murphy       | Young, Ohio  |
| Hartke   | Percy        |              |
| Javits   | Ribicoff     |              |

So the amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Illinois for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES ACT OF 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 3215.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3215) to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes which was to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That section 2(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: "in order to achieve a better understanding of the past, a better analysis of the present, and a better view of the future".

SEC. 2. Section 3(a) of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 is amended by inserting "comparative religion; ethics;" after "archeology;" and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "with particular attention to the relevance of the humanities to the current conditions of national life".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 5(c)(3) of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after "enable them" the following: "to achieve wider distribution of their works, to work in residence at an educational or cultural institution, or".

(b) Section 5(h)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Funds allocated to carry out the purpose of this subsection for any fiscal year shall be equally allotted among the States, but no State shall receive less than \$75,000 for any fiscal year."

(c) Section 6(b) of the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Upon expiration of his term of office the Chairman shall serve until his successor shall have been appointed and shall have qualified."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 6 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act

of 1965 is amended by inserting a new subsection "(c)" to read as follows:

"(c) (1) The Council may establish an Executive Committee which shall be composed of five members and shall exercise such powers and functions as may be delegated to it by the Council. The Chairman of the Council shall be one of the five members and shall be chairman of the Executive Committee.

"(2) The Council may select four members to serve on the Executive Committee along with the Chairman of the Council, two of whom shall serve for a term of one year and two for a term of two years. Thereafter each member of the Executive Committee shall serve for a term of two years so long as an Executive Committee exists. The Executive Committee may be discontinued by the Council at any meeting and thereafter reestablished. Any person, other than the Chairman, who has been a member of the Executive Committee for four consecutive years shall be ineligible for service as a member of the Committee during the one-year period following the expiration of such fourth year.

"(3) Any person selected as a member of the Executive Committee to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was selected shall serve for the remainder of such term.

"(4) The Executive Committee shall report its actions for review to the next meeting of the Council."

(b) Section 8 of the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "exceeding \$75 per diem" and inserting in lieu thereof "to exceed the per diem equivalent of the rate authorized for grade GS-18 by section 5332 of title 5, United States Code" and by striking out "(5 U.S.C. 73b-2)" and inserting "(5 U.S.C. 5703)".

SEC. 5. Section 7 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 is amended by:

(a) amending subsection (b) (2) by adding at the end thereof the following: "Upon expiration of his term of office the Chairman shall serve until his successor shall have been appointed and shall have qualified."

(b) amending subsection (c) (2) to read as follows:

"(2) initiate and support research and programs to strengthen the research and teaching potential of the United States in the humanities by making arrangements (including contracts, grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) with individuals or groups to support such activities."

(c) amending subsection (c) (5) by inserting after "groups," the following: "education in".

SEC. 6. Section 8 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 is amended by—

(a) amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) Members shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Chairman but not to exceed the per diem equivalent of the rate authorized for grade GS-18 by section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code and be allowed travel expenses including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently."

(b) adding a new subsection (g) to read as follows:

"(g) (1) The Council may establish an Executive Committee which shall be composed of five members and shall exercise such powers and functions as may be delegated to it by the Council. The Chairman of the Council shall be one of the five members and shall be Chairman of the Executive Committee.

"(2) The Council may select four members to serve on the Executive Committee along with the Chairman of the Council, two of whom shall serve for a term of one year and two for a term of two years. Thereafter each

member of the Executive Committee shall serve for a term of two years so long as an Executive Committee exists. The Executive Committee may be discontinued by the Council at any meeting and thereafter reestablished. Any person, other than the Chairman, who has been a member of the Executive Committee for four consecutive years shall be ineligible for service as a member of the Committee during the one-year period following the expiration of such fourth year.

"(3) Any person selected as a member of the Executive Committee to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was selected shall serve for the remainder of such a term.

"(4) The Executive Committee shall report its actions for review to the next meeting of the Council."

SEC. 7. Section 10 of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, is amended by—

(a) inserting a new subparagraph "(a) (7)" to read as follows:

"(7) to make advance, progress, and other payments without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529)."

(b) redesignating former subparagraph "(a) (7)" as subparagraph "(a) (8)".

SEC. 8. Section 11 of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 is amended by—

(a) repealing subsections (a) and (c), effective June 30, 1970, and substituting therefor the following:

"(a) For the purpose of enabling the Foundation to carry out its responsibilities, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years such sums as the Congress may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Sums appropriated under the authority of this subsection shall remain available until expended."

(b) amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) In addition to the sums authorized by subsection (a), there is authorized to be appropriated to each Endowment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years an amount equal to the total of amounts received by that Endowment under section 10(a) (2) of this Act. Amounts appropriated to an Endowment under this subsection shall remain available until expended."

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives and request a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MURPHY conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17923) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the bill now under consideration, H.R. 17923, contains an appropriation of 200,000 to operate the U.S. Department of Agricul-

ture Poultry Research Laboratory near Georgetown, Del.

This figure represents only little more than one-third of the full operational cost of \$580,000 a year for the laboratory. It will provide for four scientific personnel and their supporting technicians and overhead.

Mr. President, the operational funding of this laboratory is most important, I believe, in terms of the good of the poultry industry and in terms of common-sense in Government spending. This laboratory, built with more than \$500,000 of Federal money, has stood idle since its completion more than a year ago. Without operational funding, the facility would represent a monument to lack of governmental foresight.

The budget estimates for fiscal year 1971 provided funding to the tune of \$53,000 for the laboratory. This would have provided only one scientist—less than 10 percent of the laboratory's full operational capability.

This will be the only poultry laboratory in the country to emphasize research on meat and egg quality. Research projects will include studies on nutritional, genetic, physiological and management factors affecting breast blister, bruising, pigmentation, flavor, tenderness, juiciness, and eggshell quality. This research should result in improved acceptance of poultry products by the consumer, as well as reduced losses to the producer and processing industry.

It is estimated that industry losses due to downgrading of broilers, reduced prices for mature chickens and old turkeys and similar losses related to meat quality amount to at least \$211 million annually in the United States. In addition, losses due to poor eggshell results in losses to the industry of about \$292 million annually.

Mr. President, this laboratory is vitally important to the State of Delaware and the entire Delmarva Peninsula, which produces 13 percent of the Nation's broilers. But it is equally important to the poultry industry nationally and to the millions of American consumers.

#### TROPICAL FRUIT FLY PILOT RESEARCH PROGRAM

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I appreciate the action of the Appropriations Committee in including in the pending agriculture appropriations bill (H.R. 17923) my request for \$500,000 for an expanded tropical fruit fly research program in Hawaii. This will permit a pilot program to be undertaken in the current 1971 fiscal year.

This research project is under the Agricultural Research Service and is described on page 5 of the committee report as "Cooperatively financed research to eliminate the Mediterranean fruit fly and melon fly from Hawaii."

I have received assurance from Gov. John A. Burns of Hawaii that the State will continue to share the cost of the tropical fruit fly research program. In a letter dated July 1, Governor Burns wrote me:

As for cost-sharing by the State, we have and will continue to furnish the services of personnel and facilities totaling \$50,000 to \$100,000 per year.

I have also received assurance orally from Dean C. Peairs Wilson of the University of Hawaii College of Tropical Agriculture that his college will continue its contribution of \$200,000 toward the cost of this research program. I understand a letter is en route to me from Dean Wilson confirming this.

As I explained in my May 27 letter to my able and distinguished colleague, Senator SPSSARD L. HOLLAND, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, on which I serve, the \$500,000 per year research expansion would be programed for 3 to 5 years.

The sum would be expended approximately as follows:

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Construction of temporary rearing facilities for the Mediterranean fruit and melon fly----- | \$100,000 |
| Rearing equipment and supplies to produce 125 million flies per week-----                   | 162,500   |
| Specific baits and lures for the three species of fruit flies-----                          | 114,000   |
| Distribution of lures and sterile flies-----  | 63,500    |
| Seasonal labor for sterile fly releases, air drop of lures, and trapping operations-----    | 60,000    |
| Total-----  | 500,000   |

Construction funds would not be needed after the first year. This amount in subsequent years would be used to increase the production of flies and to expand all operations to the maximum level for the conduct of adequate pilot tests.

To conduct this proposed large-scale pilot test, the present facilities at Honolulu and Hilo would be made available. Also, construction of a temporary mass rearing building and rental of temporary office and laboratory space on islands encompassing the pilot areas would be made.

Funds are urgently needed in fiscal 1971 as a first important step in determining and planning whether a statewide eradication campaign against the Mediterranean fruit fly, *Ceratitis capitata*, the oriental fruit fly, *Dacus dorsalis*, and the melon fly, *Dacus cucurbitae*, in Hawaii can be successfully carried out in the foreseeable future. In determining and planning this, one of the islands would be selected for establishing pilot field tests. The entire island would be used for the purpose.

Time is of the essence for this interim research. The risk of fruit fly infestation becoming established in mainland crops is rapidly growing. Because of the increasing speed and volume of interstate commerce of passengers and fresh produce between Hawaii and California, the threat of accidental introduction of these harmful insects into the mainland has intensified. Plant quarantine inspectors at the Honolulu International Airport are busy trying their best to prevent accidental escapes. But the current practice of selective inspection of baggage for fresh produce, while speeding inspection, has not proved wholly effective in stopping fruit flies to California. In September of 1969 eight oriental fruit flies were found in the El Monte area of Los Angeles County. The county agricultural

commissioner said the flies probably came from Hawaii.

Currently, the Entomology Research Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, conducts three fruit fly investigation programs in the State of Hawaii—one in Hilo, and the other two in Honolulu.

The Hilo program has both small field and laboratory projects on the environmental and biological studies of the three species of fruit flies, which is financed by a \$97,450 annual budget. One Honolulu laboratory program on the study of developing new eradication methods for these flies is financed by a \$326,950 annual budget. The other Honolulu program is on the commodity treatment of fresh produce shipments to the mainland United States, and is financed by a \$107,500 annual budget.

During the past 15 years, the Hawaii fruit fly investigations, among other projects, have been programed at developing more selective techniques for the eradication of the three tropical fruit flies. They have developed laboratory techniques which it is believed could be applied to populated areas without danger to the public and without dangerous pesticide residues in the environment. However, pilot operations are needed to test the feasibility of these techniques.

Federal entomologists have developed a highly effective eradication technique, the male annihilation, for the oriental fruit fly. This technique involves the use of a selective lure to which only the males are susceptible. The lure is combined with a minute amount of a nonpersistent insecticide as a bait. The technique has reduced the cost of eradication of the oriental fruit fly by about 90 percent on the islands of Rota, Saipan, and Tinian.

The male annihilation technique is also being developed for the eradication of the melon fly. But large-scale pilot tests must be conducted to prove the feasibility of this method for melon fly.

The Mediterranean fruit fly cannot now be eradicated by the male annihilation method. Further research on methods of eradicating this species is needed.

Of interest is that Federal entomologists have developed a sterilized male insect release technique involving the sterilization of males by irradiation and the release of such males in the open. This technique can be used for all three species of flies—the oriental, the melon, and the Mediterranean fruit flies.

I understand a weekly distribution of about 125 million sterilized males is required for pilot testing under the proposed expanded research. Current facilities in Hawaii for survey, rearing, irradiation, and distribution of such insects are woefully inadequate.

Already, the three flies are causing the Hawaii fresh produce industry a yearly damage loss amounting to about \$1.5 million. I am deeply concerned about the infestation in Hawaii, and I am deeply concerned that establishment of the fruit flies in California, Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and other States cultivating subtropical and tropical crops, would result in an estimated annual loss of \$150 million to citrus, deciduous fruits, and vegetables.

Eradication of the three species of fruit flies from Hawaii would relieve the constant hazard of these flies being accidentally introduced to the mainland United States. On the basis of the two newly developed eradication techniques, I have been greatly encouraged that these fruit fly species can be eliminated from the State of Hawaii.

A statewide campaign in Hawaii, to be carried out after the interim research, would be far less costly than an eradication campaign on the mainland United States if fruit fly infestations became established in some of the States.

Therefore, I request that the sum of \$500,000 be included in the 1971 Department of Agriculture appropriation bill so that pilot tests on integration and use of the new eradication techniques for the three tropical fruit flies can be started in Hawaii during the fiscal year which began July 1.

Mr. President, additional information on the need and justification for this tropical fruit fly research program is contained in a memorandum prepared this spring by the Entomology Research Division of the Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that the entire memorandum be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

HAWAIIAN FRUIT FLIES INVESTIGATIONS, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, HONOLULU AND HILO, HAWAII

The Department's Entomology Research Division, Hawaiian Fruit Flies Investigations, is composed of three programs; one at Hilo and two at Honolulu. The objective of our Hilo program is to study techniques and develop methods for control and eradication of Mediterranean fruit fly, *Ceratitis capitata* (Wiedemann), melon fly, *Dacus cucurbitae* Coquillett, and oriental fruit fly, *Dacus dorsalis* Hendel. Our research approach is to obtain information on host preferences, behavior, biology, and interspecific competition of fruit flies in relation to the control of these pests in large area tests. Bait spray combinations, lures, sterilization, insecticides, male annihilation, and other techniques for control or eradication of these three species of tropical fruit flies need to be evaluated in large plot field tests. Lures for fruit flies are now screened under field conditions.

The major objective of our Honolulu research group is to improve present methods and develop new methods for detection, suppression, or eradication of oriental fruit fly, Mediterranean fruit fly, melon fly, and other pests of subtropical fruits in Hawaii that threaten crops of the mainland United States. Their approach to this objective is to develop more effective and cheaper bait sprays and ultra low volume insecticidal control methods, sterilization and biological control methods, to suppress or eradicate fruit flies in Hawaii and incipient infestations that may occur in mainland U.S. Cheaper and more efficient methods for mass rearing fruit flies and more efficient lures with greater specificity for detection of fruit flies and for use in the elimination of isolated fruit fly populations are developed. Ecology, behavior, food preferences, population dynamics, and other biological information on fruit flies are determined.

The program on Hilo is supported by \$97,450. The program at Honolulu is supported by \$326,950.

A second major objective of our Honolulu research group is to develop and improve methods for treating fruits and vegetables infested with insect pests to permit movement without risk of introduction of these pests into mainland United States or other uninfested areas. The approach of this group is to determine dosages, exposure periods and temperatures with various fumigants that will destroy all life stages of the pest species in the product and also tolerance of commodity to the treatment. Effectiveness of new chemicals as fumigants and new techniques individually and in combination are evaluated. Effectiveness of irradiation and dosages required for destruction of fruit insect pests are determined. Chemical residues and rate of disappearance in fumigant commodities are determined. The research on treatment of commodities to meet quarantine requirements involves 2 scientific man years of research and funds totaling \$107,500.

STAFF AND FACILITIES FOR LARGE-SCALE PILOT TESTS TO DEVELOP ALTERNATIVE METHODS FOR THE ERADICATION OF HAWAIIAN FRUIT FLIES

In order to conduct large scale pilot test of new eradication techniques an increase of \$500,000/year for an estimated period of 4 years would be required. This estimate is based on the realization that eradication techniques must be developed for each of three species of fruit flies before a total fruit fly eradication effort can be undertaken in Hawaii. Construction of a temporary mass rearing building and rental of temporary office and laboratory space on islands encompassing the experimental areas would be needed. Scientific personnel would be assigned from other projects to conduct this research and existing vacancies in our staff would be filled.

The requirements for funds to support the proposed large scale pilot tests would be expended approximately as follows:

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Construction of temporary rearing facilities for the Mediterranean fruit fly and melon fly..... | \$100,000 |
| Rearing equipment and supplies to product 125 million flies/week....                            | 162,500   |
| Specific baits and lures for the three species of fruit flies.....                              | 114,000   |
| Distribution of lures and sterile flies.....  | 63,500    |
| Seasonal labor for sterile fly releases, air drop of lures, and trapping operations.....        | 60,000    |
| Total.....  | 500,000   |

<sup>1</sup> After the first year these funds would be used to increase the production of flies and to expand all operations to the maximum level for the conduct of adequate pilot tests.

The above data is provided for information only and should not be considered as a request by this Service or the Department for additional funds not included in the President's 1971 budget.

RESEARCH REQUIREMENTS TO DEVELOP ALTERNATIVE METHODS FOR THE ERADICATION OF HAWAIIAN FRUIT FLIES

Statement of problem

ARS research on tropical fruit flies in Hawaii during the past 15 years has been aimed at producing biological and highly selective alternative methods for eradication of the oriental and Mediterranean fruit flies and the melon fly from Hawaii. A new eradication technique (male annihilation) was demonstrated to be effective in experimental eradication of the oriental fruit fly from Rota, Saipan, and Tinian in the Mariana Islands. This technique involves the use of a highly selective lure combined with a minute amount of a nonpersistent insecticide. Research on the use of sterile insect releases for the eradication of all three species has been promising. Many basic and applied

phases of this research have been completed on a laboratory and small-plot scale. However, certain aspects of research on the sterility and the male annihilation techniques need further development. Large-scale pilot tests are necessary to perfect these two alternative methods for eradication of all three species under Hawaii conditions.

Because of the increasing speed and volume of interstate commerce of airline passenger and fresh produce between Hawaii and California, the threat of accidental introduction of these harmful insects into the mainland has intensified. The practice of selective inspection of baggage for fresh produce, while speeding inspection, has not proved wholly effective in stopping the movement of fruit flies to California. An incipient infestation of the oriental fruit fly was found in the El Monte area of Los Angeles County during the fall of 1969 that required regulatory and control action to eliminate the infestation.

A meeting held January 22, 1970, in Senator Inouye's office, attended by the entire Hawaii Congressional delegation and representatives of Regulatory, Control, and Research Divisions of Agricultural Research Service concluded that eradication of the three species of fruit flies from Hawaii is needed to eliminate the constant hazard of these flies being imported to the mainland. Establishment of the three species of fruit flies on the mainland would result in an estimated annual loss of \$150 million to citrus, deciduous fruit, and vegetable crops.

The House of Representatives Fifth Legislature, 1970, State of Hawaii House Concurrent Resolution No. 24 requests action to provide assistance to the United States Department of Agriculture Fruit Fly Laboratory in Hawaii for the eradication of fruit flies in Hawaii.

Nature of research required

Based on present knowledge, methods, and experience in fruit fly eradication, it is believed that it would be possible to eradicate all three of the Hawaiian fruit fly species at a cost of \$15-25 million. The procedure requires application of low volume formulations of insecticide combined with a protein bait. However, wide scale use of this technique, necessary for the success of such a program, would be objectionable. Not only would it be incompatible with biological control programs, but it probably would not have public acceptance because of the present public concern with respect to environmental hazards involving the extensive use of insecticides.

The goal of ARS research is to develop procedures that will either not require the use of chemical insecticides or will require a minimum use in an integrated program involving noninsecticidal methods. The male annihilation technique has reduced the cost of eradication of the oriental fruit fly by about 90%. The development of this technique for the melon fly or Mediterranean fruit fly would greatly reduce the cost of eradication of all three species. The development of the sterile insect release technique would provide an eradication method that is highly selective in action against fruit fly species and will not pollute the environment with hazardous insecticide residues that affect non-target organisms. The use of attractants and sterile insects simultaneous or in sequence may be more effective and practical than either method employed alone.

Staff and facilities needed

In order to conduct this research an increase of \$500,000/year for 3-5 years is proposed. This estimate is based on the realization that eradication techniques must be developed for each of three species of fruit flies before a total fruit fly eradication effort can be undertaken in Hawaii. Facilities will be made available by reallocation of present space, constructing a temporary mass rearing building, and renting temporary office and

laboratory space on islands encompassing the experimental areas. Scientific personnel will be assigned to conduct this research from other projects, or by filling existing vacancies on our staff.

#### SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION IN MINNESOTA

Mr. MONDALE: Mr. President, I support H.R. 17923, the agriculture appropriations bill. I particularly commend the distinguished Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) and the other Senators for their actions regarding the agricultural conservation program, the Soil Conservation Service, and the rural electrification program.

Earlier in this session I spoke to the Senate on the value of retaining the ACP and funding REA. I am pleased that the committee has not eliminated the agricultural conservation program as suggested by the administration. Their action in increasing funds for rural electrification and rural telephone loans is also commendable.

Although I would have liked to see the committee stress the need for a continued rural development effort—and I have not given up on a concerted USDA effort in this area—the measure before us today offers a reasonable budget for rural America.

Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of Senators the good work in soil and water conservation which is going on in the State of Minnesota.

The efforts in conservation of soil, water, forests, and related resources have done much to improve the quality of the environment in my State.

Minnesota is blanketed by 90 soil and water conservation districts. They cover 49 million acres of land. Each district has a conservation program to fit its local problems. It uses a combination of local, State, and Federal services to put its own program into effect on individual farms and in communitywide projects.

Each district is self-governed. Each has authority to enter into working agreements with other governmental agencies and with private concerns to carry out its purposes.

Some 500 dedicated lay leaders in Minnesota are giving inspired and strong direction as the governing bodies of Minnesota's 90 soil and water conservation districts. Their primary source of assistance from the Federal Government is from the Soil Conservation Service and its dedicated corps of soil conservation scientists and technicians.

The Soil Conservation Service is furnishing assistance to the citizens of Minnesota through three primary sources:

First. Onsite technical assistance to individuals and groups in preparing and applying conservation plans for their land.

Second. The watershed protection and flood prevention authority under Public Law 566.

Third. The resource conservation and development projects authorized by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

#### CONSERVATION PROTECTS YOUR ENVIRONMENT

The technically trained conservationist is the key to the effective assistance from the Soil Conservation Service. In Minnesota these conservationists are

counseling 58,000 soil and water conservation district cooperators on land-use decisions, erosion control, water management, and other natural resource management problems. The foundation for technical advice is the scientific soil survey, prepared by soil scientists. They interpret the information for use by rural and urban landowners. The data is useful for such land uses as crop production, building sites, waste disposal, recreation, wildlife and land use planning and zoning.

A major benefit of conservation practices is pollution abatement. Conservation practices help improve the quality of man's environment.

Mud is the largest pollutant, by volume, of our streams, lakes, and harbors. Mud comes from erosion. It is the soil that washes from unprotected land. Improved tillage practices, terraces, trees, crop rotations, and grass on bare land and roadsides help keep soil at home. Pollution is reduced, and all water users benefit.

The Soil Conservation Service also helps towns, industries, and others to locate sites and install sewage lagoons, sanitary landfills, living screens of trees, and other measures to help eliminate ugliness and pollution.

#### WATERSHED PROJECTS CREATE MORE DESIRABLE COMMUNITIES

The Minnesota State Soil and Water Conservation Commission has received 66 applications for assistance under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. Of these 24 have received planning authorization, 14 are approved for operations and four have been completed.

The estimated project installation cost for the 14 watersheds approved for operations includes \$4 million Federal construction costs, \$1.9 million local construction costs, a half million dollars technical assistance for land treatment, and \$3.8 million local costs.

In those watersheds completed, landowners have indicated they are providing the protection from flooding and erosion that was projected at the time the watershed work plan was approved. When there are floods crops are destroyed, and fences, bridges, and highways swept away. Homes, schools, and factories are damaged. Communities in watershed projects are protected from flood damage because their surplus water is held back, then released at a controlled rate, by watershed structures.

To the basic watershed protection pattern of small watershed projects, features can be added for municipal water, recreation, wildlife, agricultural water, beautification, and other benefits that enhance the quality of living. Land which was once flooded is returned to food, forest, and wildlife production or developed for recreation use.

Land in a protected watershed rises in value, and so does the tax base. Conservation treatment of all land including the watershed lakes and stream channels cuts down soil erosion and results in less sediment and pollution from silt. Watershed ponds and lakes add new, clear water areas for farm and home and industrial uses, recreation, and fish and wildlife production.

#### RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Residents of two areas in Minnesota are working together in resource conservation and development projects. Guidance and financial aid is furnished by the Soil Conservation Service and other agencies under authority of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

Resource conservation and development goals are the conservation and balanced development of the natural resources of the area to create a better, safer place to live, more employment and increased income, and other benefits. All segments of the community—rural, urban and suburban—work together to improve the quality of the environment. Conservation projects increase opportunities for wholesome outdoor recreation.

The west central Minnesota resource conservation and development project includes Swift, Pope, Wadena, Kandiyohi, Otter Tail, Grant, Douglas, Stevens, and the Todd Soil and Water Conservation Districts. The Onanogozie project in east central Minnesota includes the Aitkins, Carlton, Kanabee, and Pine Soil Water Conservation Districts.

These two projects initially included 257 project measures. Fifty-five of these project measures have been completed and are in operation. This supplies 144 man-years of installation labor and 256 man-years of annual employment.

The gross annual income of measures already established is estimated at \$1.6 million. The active project measures in the two resource conservation and development projects now in operation in Minnesota will provide an estimated 2,430 man-years of installation employment, 1,677 man-years of employment annually, with an increase of annual gross income of \$36 million.

#### STATE AND LOCAL SUPPORT

In order to have a greater role in improving the quality of the environment, Minnesota Soil and Water Conservation Districts worked with the State legislature to update their enabling act and provide ways and means for districts to work with more people. This resulted in enabling legislation where the county boards of commissioners and soil and water conservation district boards can now enter into agreements for the sponsorship, application and maintenance of projects. It also provides for district boards to present a budget and receive up to \$15,000 annually from the county commissioners to carry out their program.

The Minnesota Legislature also passed enabling legislation to provide county governing bodies with the power to develop zoning ordinances for flood plains and shorelines. It has become evident that guidelines for developing this type of ordinances need to be tied to soil survey and proper land use. They have called on Soil Conservation Service personnel for help.

#### RESEARCH

I must also add a comment about the research program of the North Central Soil Conservation Research Center at Morris, Minn.

This research program is continuing to meet a need for soil and water conservation research in an area encom-

passing parts of Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, and South Dakota. This is an area where major concern is now focused on agriculture's role in the maintenance of clean water. It is an area where fresh, cool, clear lakes are an important economic resource.

I have legislation pending now which would provide a massive national effort toward the restoration and preservation of our fresh water community lakes. My previous clean lakes legislation, now part of the Water Quality Improvement Act, focuses on the kind of research which is possible through such centers.

All of the research at the North Central Soil Conservation Research Center relates either directly or indirectly to environmental quality. The total effort is directed toward soil and water conservation.

The program includes water quality studies which will evaluate management practices in terms of their influence on nutrient levels of both surface and ground waters and will develop practices which will insure maximum efficiency in water use consistent with minimization of nutrient enrichment.

Irrigation research will develop principles of water application and fertilization that will minimize the contribution that fertilizer materials make to surface and ground water. Fragipan soils present problems with excessive surface water runoff and the danger of surface water enrichment from animal wastes and fertilizer.

#### IN SUMMARY

The control of pollutants from agriculture is inseparably related to soil and water conservation. The only receptacles for the growing quantities of unwanted materials which foul the environment are soil, water, and air.

The Soil Conservation Service is increasingly emphasizing sediment control, measures that contribute to pollution abatement, and the prevention of offsite damages that affect streams and urban areas. Wind erosion control, terracing, contour plowing, streambank protection, reservoirs, ponds and control of critically erodible areas are examples of conservation work which have a significant effect in reducing pollutants.

The Soil Conservation Service is now in a position to contribute many kinds of basic technical information about natural resources and improving the quality of the environment. It provides technical help to landowners and communities in solving resource problems. It provides assistance in achieving more positive aims such as new recreation, new job opportunities, more pleasant scenery, and more wildlife to enjoy.

So I suggest to my colleagues this. If we are really serious about improving the quality of the environment, and if we are really serious about attacking pollution in this country, then we should strengthen substantially the Federal appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service.

The bill before us provides much of this effort.

Mr. President, to further explain the extent of SCS activities in Minnesota, I ask unanimous consent that a breakdown of the program by counties and program payments, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE PROGRAM PAYMENTS TO MINNESOTA COUNTIES, FISCAL YEAR 1969

| County                 | Conservation technical assistance | Soil surveys | River basin surveys and investigations | Watershed planning | Watershed works of improvement | Watershed protection | Resource conservation and development | Emergency conservation measures | Soil Conservation Service programs, fiscal year 1969 total |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--|--------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Aitkin.....            | \$17,922                          |              |  |                    |                                |                      | \$1,489                               |                                 | \$19,411   |
| Anoka.....             | 8,794                             |              |  |                    | \$437,667                      |                      |                                       |                                 | 446,461  |
| Becker.....            | 24,100                            |              | \$61                                   |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 24,161   |
| Beltrami.....          | 19,713                            |              | 90                                     |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 19,803   |
| Benton.....            | 19,623                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 19,623   |
| Big Stone.....         | 21,855                            |              | 73                                     |                    |                                |                      | 4                                     |                                 | 21,742   |
| Blue Earth.....        | 15,809                            |              |  | \$134              | 123                            |                      |                                       |                                 | 20,066   |
| Brown.....             | 17,530                            |              |  | 208                |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 17,738   |
| Carlton.....           | 16,412                            | \$20,120     | 93                                     |                    |                                |                      | 3,207                                 |                                 | 39,832   |
| Carver.....            | 19,468                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 19,468   |
| Cass.....              | 10,687                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 10,687   |
| Cass.....              | 18,045                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 18,045   |
| Chippewa.....          | 12,760                            | 49           |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 12,809   |
| Chisago.....           | 21,492                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 21,492   |
| Clay.....              | 9,997                             |              | 46                                     |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 10,043   |
| Clearwater.....        |                                   |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 |  |
| Cook.....              | 20,101                            |              |  | 305                |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 20,406   |
| Cottonwood.....        | 12,374                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      | 46                                    |                                 | 12,420   |
| Crow Wing.....         | 18,729                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 18,729   |
| Dakota.....            | 10,049                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 10,049   |
| Dodge.....             | 21,660                            | 23,884       | 45                                     |                    |                                |                      | 4                                     |                                 | 45,593   |
| Douglas.....           | 14,668                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 14,668   |
| Faribault.....         | 33,469                            |              |  |                    | 547                            |                      |                                       |                                 | 34,016   |
| Fillmore.....          | 41,292                            | 14,883       |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       | \$1,713                         | 57,888   |
| Freeborn.....          | 30,843                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      | 11                                    |                                 | 30,843   |
| Grant.....             | 15,579                            |              | 17                                     |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 15,607   |
| Hennepin.....          | 22,589                            | 33,037       |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 55,626   |
| Houston.....           | 29,544                            |              | 13                                     | 1,366              | 352,082                        |                      |                                       |                                 | 383,005  |
| Hubbard.....           |                                   |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 |  |
| Isanti.....            | 12,255                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 12,255   |
| Itasca.....            | 27,771                            | 8,017        | 114                                    |                    |                                |                      | 1,164                                 |                                 | 37,066   |
| Jackson.....           | 21,159                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 21,159   |
| Kanabec.....           | 18,508                            | 75           |  |                    |                                |                      | 3,270                                 |                                 | 21,853   |
| Kandiyohi.....         | 22,531                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      | 16,103                                |                                 | 38,634   |
| Kittson.....           | 28,661                            |              | 169                                    |                    | 45,775                         |                      |                                       |                                 | 74,605   |
| Koochiching.....       | 631                               |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 631  |
| Lac qui Parle.....     | 17,431                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 17,431   |
| Lake.....              |                                   |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 |  |
| Lake of the Woods..... | 9,730                             |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 9,730  |
| Le Sueur.....          | 20,851                            |              |  |                    | 12                             |                      |                                       |                                 | 20,863   |
| Lincoln.....           | 21,553                            |              |  |                    | 709                            |                      |                                       |                                 | 22,262   |
| Lyon.....              | 80,429                            | 13,610       |  | 841                | 13,572                         |                      |                                       |                                 | 108,452  |
| McLeod.....            | 17,557                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 17,557   |
| Mahnomen.....          | 10,675                            |              | 19                                     |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 10,694   |
| Marshall.....          | 31,303                            |              | 142                                    |                    | 5,885                          |                      |                                       |                                 | 37,330   |
| Martin.....            | 18,301                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 18,301   |
| Meeker.....            | 16,544                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 16,544   |
| Mille Lacs.....        | 11,472                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 11,472   |
| Morrison.....          | 23,882                            | 33           |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 23,915   |
| Mower.....             | 22,084                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 22,084   |
| Murray.....            | 14,690                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 14,690   |
| Nicollet.....          | 91,281                            | 30,418       |  | 940                | 11,519                         |                      |                                       |                                 | 134,158  |
| Nobles.....            | 23,849                            | 14,458       |  |                    | 78,643                         |                      |                                       |                                 | 116,993  |
| Norman.....            | 30,226                            | 10           | 42                                     |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 30,278   |
| Olmsted.....           | 95,048                            | 19,087       |  | 10,361             | 7,658                          |                      |                                       |                                 | 132,154  |
| Otter Tail.....        | 98,221                            | 12,797       | 97                                     |                    |                                |                      | 43,485                                |                                 | 154,570  |
| Pennington.....        | 74,048                            | 34,402       | 189                                    | 503                | 20,912                         |                      |                                       |                                 | 130,054  |
| Pine.....              | 18,044                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      | 34,002                                |                                 | 52,046   |
| Pipestone.....         | 15,962                            | 17           |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 15,979   |
| Polk.....              | 41,100                            |              | 169                                    | 240                |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 41,509   |
| Pope.....              | 17,055                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      | 7,521                                 |                                 | 24,576   |
| Ramsey.....            | 301,581                           | 72,810       | 28,831                                 | 106,780            | 50,039                         |                      | 48,715                                |                                 | 608,756  |
| Red Lake.....          | 9,182                             |              | 31                                     |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 9,213  |

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE PROGRAM PAYMENTS TO MINNESOTA COUNTIES, FISCAL YEAR 1969—Continued

| County          | Conservation technical assistance | Soil surveys | River basin surveys and investigations | Watershed planning | Watershed works of improvement | Watershed protection | Resource conservation and development | Emergency conservation measures | Soil Conservation Service programs, fiscal year 1969 total |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--|--------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Redwood         |                                   |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 |  |
| Renville        | \$14,864                          |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | \$14,864   |
| Rice            | 18,794                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 18,794   |
| Rock            | 21,623                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 21,623   |
| Roseau          | 22,082                            |              | \$104                                  |                    | \$7                            |                      |                                       |                                 | 22,193   |
| St. Louis       | 73,284                            | \$11,612     | 131                                    |                    |                                |                      | \$7,136                               |                                 | 92,163   |
| Scott           | 18,248                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 18,248   |
| Sherburne       | 2,414                             | 17           |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 2,431  |
| Sibley          | 21,518                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 21,518   |
| Stearns         | 93,012                            | 31,042       |  |                    | 227                            |                      | 1,107                                 |                                 | 125,388  |
| Steele          | 30,314                            | 13,240       |  |                    | 1,800                          |                      |                                       | \$970                           | 46,324   |
| Stevens         | 20,295                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      | 6                                     |                                 | 20,301   |
| Swift           | 20,075                            | 235          |  |                    |                                |                      | 60,512                                |                                 | 80,822   |
| Todd            | 20,590                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 20,590   |
| Traverse        | 18,460                            | 6            | 48                                     |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 18,514   |
| Wabasha         | 23,510                            |              |  |                    | 232                            |                      |                                       |                                 | 23,742   |
| Wadena          | 12,669                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      | 22,963                                |                                 | 35,632   |
| Waseca          | 27,577                            |              |  |                    | 39,852                         |                      |                                       | 6,374                           | 73,803   |
| Washington      | 20,763                            | 547          |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 21,310   |
| Watonwan        | 19,698                            |              |  | \$297              |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 19,995   |
| Wilkin          | 15,715                            |              | 92                                     |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 15,807   |
| Winona          | 24,193                            |              |  |                    | 194                            |                      |                                       |                                 | 24,387   |
| Wright          | 22,404                            |              |  |                    |                                |                      |                                       |                                 | 22,404   |
| Yellow Medicine | 18,624                            |              |  | 2,124              |                                |                      | 144                                   |                                 | 20,892   |
| State total     | 2,373,288                         | 354,406      | 30,586                                 | 124,099            | 1,067,455                      |                      | 250,889                               | 9,057                           | 4,209,780  |

Source: Federal outlays in Minnesota, fiscal year 1969, compiled for the Executive Office of the President by the Office of Economic Opportunity, 1969.

LIMIT PAYMENTS TO WEALTHY FARM CORPORATIONS

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I will vote for the agricultural appropriations bill because the need for funding the many, varied and important functions of the Agriculture Department is clear and continuing.

I supported the amendment to limit payments under the price support program because I believe such limitations are important.

I am a cosponsor of the amendment, S. 3068, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), which would provide such limitations at \$10,000 per individual producer of cotton, wheat, and feed grains.

I have been told by agricultural economists in this area that the \$20,000 limitation we have adopted will save as much as \$150 million a year, and we all know there are plenty of places where that \$150 million could be put to better use than fattening the pocketbooks of the country's biggest and wealthiest farmers and farm corporations. The need is to assist the small producer, not the big producers.

I recognize that the basic purpose of farm subsidies is to compensate producers for limiting production. Unlimited production, most of us appreciate, would produce a glut which would, in turn, destroy the entire farm economy.

But I have said on many occasions that I do not believe the bulk of farm subsidies should wind up in the bank accounts of just the major producers. And this is becoming more and more the pattern.

In the single year from 1968 to 1969 the number of producers getting farm payments of \$25,000 or more for all crops increased by 30 percent. And the increase since 1966 has been at least 60 percent.

Unless we impose limitations this trend can only accelerate. The big producers collect most of the farm payments. Compensated so generously, they are then able to buy out smaller producers and collect even larger subsidies on even larger acreage.

This is an unfair, economically wasteful and discriminating cycle that can

only be broken by imposing equitable payment limitations.

I am convinced, Mr. President, that we can achieve the same production restraint under payment limitations as we do without limitations. If this is true, and I am certain it is, then there is absolutely no justification for continuing to give more to the "haves" than to the "have-nots."

LIMITATION OF AGRICULTURAL PAYMENTS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as we consider today the agricultural appropriations bill, the enormous amounts proposed to fund the farm subsidy program highlight once again the need for a limitation on the payments which can be made to any one farmer.

On May 5 of this year I introduced an amendment to the coalition farm bill, S. 3068, which would establish a \$10,000 per program limitation. The Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) and eight other Senators joined me in this effort.

As I noted at that time, this amendment was motivated by the desire to re-order our national priorities—to trim the "fat" from the President's budget in order to free funds for vitally needed human resource programs. I believed then and I believe now, that a portion of the farm subsidy program could be trimmed without jeopardizing the true goals of a rational farm policy.

On June 4, 1969, in testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Secretary Hardin estimated that 65 percent of the cotton payments, 40 percent of the wheat payments, and 11 percent of the feed grains payments represented income supplements rather than payments for actual acreage diversion. These estimates indicate that a large portion of the funds expended under this program do not contribute to the reduction of crop surpluses. Instead, these funds are utilized to supplement the incomes of farm producers.

Mr. President, I would not strongly object to supplementing the incomes of

small- and medium-sized farms if in fact there is a need to do so and if supplementary payments rather than surplus reduction was the expressed aim of the program. In reality, however, a large portion of these income supplement payments are not made to small- or medium-sized producers but to large farm corporations, banks, and even State prisons and governments. This should not be allowed to continue.

Mr. President, the enactment of our amendment as part of the basic authorizing legislation would do much to end what the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) has termed a "national scandal." I am pleased that the Senate agreed to amend the agricultural appropriations bill so that no single producer could receive more than \$20,000 in subsidy benefits. While this should prove helpful during this fiscal year, it is still my intention, at the appropriate time, to press vigorously for the incorporation of this amendment in the permanent enabling legislation.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 759

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 759.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) proposes amendments (No. 759) as follows:

On page 32, line 11, strike out "\$83,000,000" and insert the following: "\$355,000,000".

On page 33, line 2, strike out "\$60,000,000" and insert the following: "\$100,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask that his amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, this amendment would provide \$100 million in development and planning grants and