

U.S. Congress



UNITED STATES

OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 8

APRIL 1, 1970, TO APRIL 10, 1970

(PAGES 9923 TO 11270)

can be re-elected only if they push steadily for wage increases. In a sense they are prompted by what may be called "labor union politics."

Employers recognize often that the union leaders would at times welcome some outside panel to pass judgment on their demands because strikes are costly and occasionally do not yield the anticipated benefits.

Labor unions have steadily grown in size until today the membership is approximately 19 million. The entire labor force is estimated at about 82 million. The unorganized labor population, however, is largely in rural districts and in occupations in which it would be difficult to effect organization.

Broadly speaking, labor union leaders feel that over the years they have benefited by collective bargaining, and that they have in many cases prevented the passage of legislation unfavorable to their own interests.

The power of the national labor union has grown extensively in recent decades. When a strike is called, an entire industry can be shut down because the local unions obey the orders of the leaders of the national union with which they are affiliated. Workers in the skilled trades are almost completely unionized. They have a monopoly in virtually all the manufacturing industries.

Nineteen states have what are known as "right-to-work" laws. These prohibit any labor union from compelling a worker to join a labor organization as a means of getting a job or remaining in a job. The labor groups, however, have managed to prevent the spread of such laws to other states.

What is surprising, of course, is that with all the talk about "liberalism" and "individual rights," a worker in numerous industries must join a union after 30 days in order to keep his job. The employer, moreover, has agreed to the mandate. The courts have never ruled against this obvious invasion of individual rights.

The argument usually heard is that the nonmembers can hardly bargain by themselves and that the labor union represents the only organized body which can conduct collective bargaining negotiations. But the compulsion nevertheless remains, and it is this factor which has led to the development of a National Right-to-Work Committee, which carries on a continuous crusade against any form of compulsory unionization.

NEED TO RETAIN ACP

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in recent weeks I have received a number of letters protesting the elimination of authority to continue the agricultural conservation program in the 1971 agricultural budget. I hope we can restore this highly effective, low cost, and popular conservation program.

In my State of Minnesota 18,746 farms participated in the program last year, 28,806 participated in 1968, and a total of 92,983 participated in the program at least once in the last 5 years. Approximately \$10 million in conservation practices were performed on the 18,746 farms in 1969 with the Government share of the costs paid by the ACP program \$5 million.

By far the most important conservation practice undertaken in Minnesota was the establishment of permanent cover, six thousand farms in 76 counties established permanent cover on 105,619 acres in 1969 with the Government making cost-sharing payment of \$1,342,255 to the cooperating farmers.

683—Part 8

In my State of Minnesota, over 1,000 farmers in 50 counties planted trees or shrubs for forestry and erosion prevention purposes on over 6,000 acres, with the Government sharing the cost of these plantings in the amount of \$141,000.

Another 1,016 farmers in 84 counties established reservoirs for agricultural uses, with the ACP program sharing the cost to the extent of \$386,000.

Mr. James T. Shields, executive director of the Minnesota Conservation Federation, wrote me a few weeks ago about the close cooperation between the ASCS committees and the Minnesota Conservation Department, Division of Game and Fish. He reported that over 17 percent of the total ACP payments in Minnesota in 1968 were made for conservation practices primarily beneficial to wildlife.

The preliminary 1969 report indicates that 1,865 farmers in 81 Minnesota counties planted wildlife food plots last year, averaging about 5 acres per farm, with the Government sharing the cost to the extent of \$78,972, or about \$40 per co-operating farm. Some 712 farms established or improved shallow water areas and wildlife ponds in cooperation with the Minnesota Department of Game and Fish and received ACP cost-sharing payments of \$233,000.

The average payment per farm in Minnesota for all ACP practices performed in 1968 was a modest \$186 and in 1969, \$269.

Our experience with the ACP program and the cooperation between the county ASCS committees and the State Department of Conservation in Minnesota is not an isolated case. I am told that similar cooperative relationships exist in most States with the result that some 277,000 farmers in the United States in 1969 established permanent cover or planted shrubs and trees for forestry purposes and to prevent erosion. These permanent conservation practices covered 4,300,000 acres, with the ACP program cost-share payments amounting to over \$42 million.

After reviewing the wide range of conservation practices encouraged by the ACP program in my own State of Minnesota and in the entire United States, I think this country gets more benefit from the \$185 to \$200 million ACP program funds spent each year than for many other Federal expenditures. I urge that authorization for the continuation of this highly beneficial program be continued in the 1971 agriculture budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a portion of a recent address by Edwin Christianson, president of the Minnesota Farmers Union and vice president of the National Farmers Union, concerning the agriculture conservation program.

Mr. Christianson, speaking to the 68th annual NFU convention, said:

If the \$195 million ACP appropriation is killed, then you endanger about \$600 million in conservation work.

Also, I ask unanimous consent that several letters in support of this program and a series of tables which summarize the effectiveness of the ACP also be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS OF EDWIN CHRISTIANSON

The President of the United States recently sent a message to Congress advocating some budget reductions, \$2 billion in all, which he said could be saved because these were "sacred cow" programs of importance only to some special interest groups.

In this list of recommended savings, the President included the elimination of the ACP program in 1971, the termination of the special milk program in schools, nurseries and camps, and the inclusion of the Federal Crop Insurance program administrative costs in the rate structure paid by farmers.

"These are not special programs for vested interests, but programs which are of value and benefit to everyone in our society.

"It is inconsistent in our opinion to stir the hopes of the hungry and poorly-nourished that hunger is going to be wiped out and then to seek to end the school milk program which has been such a mainstay in our national child nutrition effort.

"It is unfortunate to cast reflections upon the Federal Crop Insurance program, when in truth, it is as important to agricultural lenders, bankers, main street businessmen and cooperatives as it is to the producer himself. Federal Crop Insurance is an important protection of the cash investment of the farmer in his crops—and important to everyone who has a stake in any of the inputs which the farmer uses in production.

The Agricultural Conservation Program (ACP) is another example of how the public might get an unfortunate impression from the President's remarks.

For a long time, farm people and particularly those of us in Farmers Union have been concerned about the land, water, forest and wildlife resources of our nation.

We have had to fight some difficult battles for enough appropriations for ACP, for Soil Conservation Services, for Great Plains conservation, for watersheds and flood control.

So, we are delighted when the public finally starts to take an interest in the environment. We welcome the great wave of public discussion of the quality of our environment and hope that the new federal programs to safeguard the environment will become a reality.

But, we must disagree when the President of the United States or any other policy-making official proposes to set back the entire pollution control effort by recommending the elimination of federal funds for the ACP program.

People who are familiar with pollution problems, recognize sediment as the No. 1 pollutant in our nation.

Nothing is more important than sediment control to reduction of the run-off of fertilizers, farm chemicals and pesticides in surface waters than the ACP program.

Now perhaps some might say that the ACP program pays farmers to do something which they ought to be doing on their own anyway.

It is not that simple. The government only makes cost-sharing assistance available on conservation practices with a lasting value, practices from which the farmer received no immediate return, and practices which he could not undertake without this assistance.

The government offers cost-sharing up to 50% and the farmer supplies the materials and the labor. Farmers are investing about \$2 in labor and materials for each dollar of assistance from the government. So, if the \$195 million ACP appropriation is killed, then you endanger about \$600 millions in conservation work.

Recently, a National Inventory of Soil

and Water Conservation needs was made public. It indicated that 59% of our national cropland, 66% of the range-land, 68% of the pasture land and 71% of the commercial forest land are in need of conservation treatment.

It may be true that some of this work could be put off, but don't forget that we are falling behind in soil conservation even at present rates—and that we will fall further behind if we cut out the ACP program.

If we choose to delay this conservation work now, it is going to cost much more in the future.

It is relatively cheap to control erosion if you do it at the initial source—on the farm and range lands of the nation.

You can keep soil in its place on the farm with a relatively modest expenditure. The soil specialists feel it takes an expenditure of only 3 to 5 cents a cubic yard to control the sediment on the land.

But, just let erosion take its toll—and when you get downstream and start to dredge it out of the lakes and waterways, it is going to cost you \$1 per cubic yard. You are going to have a loss of topsoil on the farm—and it is going to cost you 20 times more downstream to repair things than it would have to maintain the soil where it belonged.

So, we cannot help being disappointed to hear all the big talk about environmental programs coming out of Washington and the White House and then to hear a recommendation which would cut the heart out of the conservation effort.

The whole problem of stabilizing the soil is crucial to the whole controversy about pesticides and chemical and fertilizer runoff. It is only if you have a serious erosion and runoff, that you are going to have a significant movement of pesticides and chemicals off the farm.

SHAFFER, MINN.,
March 13, 1970.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I am very distressed over the recent budget proposals recommending the dropping of the Agriculture Conservation Program funds. This worthwhile project has provided assistance to farmers and the public in general in conserving natural resources, pollution abatement and sediment control. I cannot understand the idea of administering money for pollu-

tion abatement on the one hand and dropping a good conservation practice at the same time.

I sincerely hope that you do everything in your power to maintain and increase funds for ACP.

Sincerely,

DEWEY ROUSH.

JACOBSON, MINN.,
March 14, 1970.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would just like to write to you and express my sincere belief in the different farm programs, in my simple way.

I'm a small dairy farmer on 164 acres. I know how much the gov't programs mean to me and the rest of the farmers here in Aitken Co. and all over the Nation.

I would like to urge you very strongly to support especially the Agriculture Stabilization program which is in Congress at present for consideration. The A.C.P.

I am very sure if the A.C.P. is discontinued, the other programs like the Soil and Water Cons program and also the R.C.D. in our areas will be falling to wayside very shortly. These programs are very much dependent on the A.C.P. cost sharing.

Also if the farmer is not protected by the A.C.P. by cost sharing on many different practices, many of us will soon be out of business also.

We are losing the family farmer in my opinion very fast, dangerously fast. I'm beginning to think and I also feel our Senators and Congressmen should think what will be the outcome of this in the next 5 years. I'm afraid our farm commodities are going to be very short and very high in price for the consumer.

I am sure you Mr. Mondale do understand the farm problems, but there are so many that are so ignorant about our farm problems in Washington, and all over the Nation.

Sincerely,

VUPIKE NORDBURG.

ZIMMERMAN, MINN.,
February 28, 1970.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I understand the President intends to cut out the Federal Agricultural Conservation Program (ACP).

I am a forester for the State of Minnesota, and part of my job is to make needs and

compliance checks on ACP forestry practices. I am convinced that without the cost sharing incentive, the amount of forestry and wildlife projects would fall off drastically. I deal personally with the applicants, and a large percentage of them can't afford these extra projects without help. We must keep this program to continue to improve our private woodlands, wildlife habitat and field erosion problems.

Cut more spending from military spending, and leave this program alone.

Sincerely yours,

BRIAN L. GARVEY.

REDWOOD FALLS, MINN.,
March 4, 1970.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing in regard to the reported efforts of the Nixon administration to kill A.C.P.

Men, in general, tend to exploit, rather than conserve which is why the administration contention that soil conservation practices should be privately carried out is absurd to say the least.

I contend that the time is here for compulsory soil conservation practices because our cropland is an irreplaceable national resource, which may have to be used for longer than can be seen ahead. Had we continued to exploit our timber resources, as was done in northern Minnesota, there would not be a forest left standing in the country. This analogy, while not perfect, is a legitimate one and makes a valid point.

The need for increased soil conservation practices out here is becoming more obvious every year. Higher places on rolling cropland are largely devoid of topsoil. Land of this type should be terraced. Grass waterways for runoff should be constructed. Ponds to impound waste runoff from feedlots must be built to lessen pollution of our streams. Shelter-belts to prevent wind erosion and to protect wild life must be planted.

Farmers in general have neither the resources nor the will to carry out these practices without assistance. Furthermore, if cropland is to be considered an irreplaceable national resource, it should be more in the public interest to spend this one-fifth of a billion dollars for A.C.P. than for the S.S.T. for example, which is not vital to this generation, much less to future generations. This should be a matter of high priority.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. BUCKLEY.

1969 AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM SUMMARY OF PARTICIPATION AND ASSISTANCE BY COUNTIES

PART F—STATE MINNESOTA

County	Participating farms					Regular practices			Pooling agreements			ECM practices	
	Regular	Once in last 5 years	ECM only	ECM and regular	ECM acres served (acre)	Agreements	Farms	Cost—shares (dollars)	Agreements	Farms	Cost—shares (dollars)		
												(1)	(2)
Aitkin	201	608				1	8	7,200					
Anoka	204	614											
Becker	327	1,351											
Beltrami	297	859											
Benton	208	719											
Big Stone	20	616											
Blue Earth	131	2,849				3	14	1,639					
Brown	148	1,003				1	2	1,118					
Carlton	141	559				6	13	12,278					
Carver	127	455											
Cass	221	695				1	2	1,045					
Chippewa	161	563											
Chisago	201	708											
Clay	362	959											
Clearwater	250	799				1	18	8,000					
Cook	2	6											
Cottonwood	105	859				1	5	420					
Crow Wing	126	374											
Dakota	174	200				1	3	4,370					
Dodge	145	738				12	58	13,645					
Douglas	297	1,316											
Faribault	86	1,351				1	2	968					
Fillmore	240	1,350				1	2	1,507					

1969 AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM SUMMARY OF PARTICIPATION AND ASSISTANCE BY COUNTIES—Continued

PART F—STATE MINNESOTA—Continued

County	Participating farms					Pooling agreements					
					ECM acres served (acre)	Regular practices			ECM practices		
	Regular	Once in last 5 years	ECM only	ECM and regular		Agreements	Farms	Cost—shares (dollars)	Agreements	Farms	Cost—shares (dollars)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	
Freeborn.....	275	1,128				3	22	6,617			
Goodhue.....	194	1,040				6	14	11,735			
Grant.....	244	661									
Hennepin.....	93	437									
Houston.....	207	947				2	4	5,497			
Hubbard.....	184	523									
Isanti.....	175	705									
Itasca.....	146	756									
Jackson.....	126	1,332									
Kanabec.....	134	740				2	4	4,690			
Kandiyochi.....	270	1,563				14	33	3,819			
Kittson.....	344	812				11	33	2,350			
Koochiching.....	183	389									
Lac qui Parle.....	171	1,693									
Lake.....	24	58									
Lake of the Woods.....	100	294									
Le Sueur.....	124	1,013									
Lincoln.....	176	744									
Lyon.....	132	955									
McLeod.....	118	824				1	3	217			
Mahnomen.....	150	438									
Marshall.....	798	1,575				2	4	585			
Martin.....	114	1,364									
Meeker.....	186	1,082									
Mille Lacs.....	232	741									
Morrison.....	298	1,327									
Mower.....	170	882				9	38	11,910			
Murray.....	83	1,468									
Nicollet.....	199	871				3	11	6,943			
Nobles.....	66	1,181									
Norman.....	391	1,117									
Olmsted.....	145	1,083									
West Otter Tail.....	384	1,723									
Pennington.....	322	982					12	30	4,627		
Pine.....	302	1,007									
Pipestone.....	102	752					1	2	4,508		
West Polk.....	409	1,277					5	16	1,002		
Pope.....	269	968					1	4	2,353		
Ramsey.....	3	26									
Red Lake.....	149	583					8	23	8,002		
Redwood.....	224	1,619					2	8	1,155		
Renville.....	593	1,038					7	15	2,449		
Rice.....	209	786									
Rock.....	84	433									
Roseau.....	417	1,167					12	28	2,264		
South St. Louis.....	158	436									
Scott.....	128	670									
Sherburne.....	236	672									
Sibley.....	116	858					1	3	381		
Stearns.....	393	1,402					1	3	6,153		
Steele.....	246	1,318					3	11	1,032		
Stevens.....	169	882									
Swift.....	271	1,226									
Sword.....	304	1,660									
Traverse.....	232	565				2	4	548			
Wabasha.....	159	688									
Wadena.....	183	603									
Waseca.....	130	631				1	2	3,150			
Washington.....	231	865									
Watonwan.....	13	804									
Wilkin.....	268	848				1	4	298			
Winona.....	286	1,126				1	3	6,300			
Wright.....	167	1,675									
Yellow Medicine.....	275	1,421				4	19	7,303			
East Otter Tail.....	506	1,578									
East Polk.....	209	849									
North St. Louis.....	173	551									
State total.....	18,746	82,983				144	468	158,078			

PART G—STATE MINNESOTA

County	Low-income farmers			Regular ACP					
	Number	Cost—shares (dollars)	Net assistance before SGI (dollars)	Amount of SGI (dollars)	Gross assistance to farmers (dollars)	Amount transferred to SCS (dollars)	Amount transferred to other agencies (dollars)	Amount for program services (dollars)	Total gross assistance (dollars)
Aitkin.....	11	10,736	57,967	1,120	59,087	2,294	398		61,779
Anoka.....			47,761	1,190	48,951	2,000	266		51,217
Becker.....			70,046	2,601	72,647	3,510	690		76,847
Beltrami.....	68	20,901	75,243	2,303	77,546	2,529	456		80,531
Benton.....			49,544	1,081	50,625	2,097	402		53,124
Big Stone.....			15,278	732	16,010	2,605			18,615
Blue Earth.....			42,635	571	43,206	3,757			46,963
Brown.....			66,186	630	66,816	4,100			70,916
Carlton.....			45,765	685	46,450	1,915	361		48,729
Carver.....	1	2,500	24,788	724	25,512	1,888	200		27,600

PART G—STATE MINNESOTA—Continued

County	Low-income farmers			Regular ACP					Total gross assistance (dollars)
	Number	Cost-shares (dollars)	Net assistance before SCI (dollars)	Amount of SCI (dollars)	Gross assistance to farmers (dollars)	Amount transferred to SCS (dollars)	Amount transferred to other agencies (dollars)	Amount for program services (dollars)	
	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
Cass			78,093	261	78,354	1,572	150		80,076
Chippewa			31,891	866	32,757	2,885			35,642
Chisago			36,984	1,606	38,590	1,709	341		40,640
Clay			57,195	3,448	60,643	4,269			64,912
Clearwater	1	6	64,721	1,440	66,161	2,082	390		68,633
Cook			2,981		2,981		41		3,022
Cottonwood			41,202	981	42,183	3,313			45,496
Crow Wing			35,752	796	36,548	1,421	345		38,314
Dakota			49,151	1,223	50,374	3,261	400		54,035
Dodge			57,258	1,794	59,052	3,633	125		61,883
Douglas	4	52	47,531	1,599	49,130	2,381	375		51,866
Faribault			39,665	315	39,980	2,982			42,962
Fillmore			93,925	1,569	95,494	6,000	375		101,869
Freeborn			104,921	1,088	106,009	4,150	80		110,239
Goodhue			96,661	1,449	98,110	5,608	500		104,218
Grant			25,449	2,001	27,450	2,479	496		30,425
Hennepin			22,095	612	22,707	1,387	280		24,374
Houston	3	124	57,169	1,852	59,021	3,101	225		62,347
Hubbard			49,355	1,141	50,496		313		50,809
Isanti			46,290	1,092	47,382	1,739	300		49,421
Itasca			38,696	789	39,485	596	419		40,500
Jackson			35,727	729	36,456	3,535			39,991
Kanabec			41,500	608	42,108	1,854	377		44,339
Kandiyohi			60,652	1,882	62,534	4,015	240		66,789
Kittson			72,117	1,672	73,789	4,224			78,013
Koochiching	2	26	36,700	823	37,523	984	330		38,837
Lac qui Parle			35,713	1,437	37,150	3,795			40,945
Lake			8,427	121	8,548	521	104		9,173
Lake of the Woods			24,095	606	24,701	1,313	240		26,254
Le Sueur			33,658	597	34,255	2,376	40		36,671
Lincoln			39,825	816	40,641	3,089			43,730
Lyon			48,983	428	49,411	3,934			53,345
McLeod			23,666	766	24,432	2,486	125		27,043
Mahnomen			39,880	1,094	40,974	1,436	320		42,730
Marshall	2	28	138,371	6,520	144,891	6,446	120		151,457
Martin			37,597	580	38,177	3,653			41,830
Meeker	3	72	31,002	1,039	32,041	2,904	200		35,145
Mille Lacs	1	135	62,935	1,355	64,290	2,038	225		66,553
Morrison			98,427	1,049	99,476	4,126	787		104,389
Mower			57,428	678	58,106	5,335	120		63,561
Murray			38,094	296	38,390	3,818			42,208
Nicollet			69,204	1,663	70,867	3,211	80		74,158
Nobles			27,888	282	28,170	3,355			31,525
Norman			65,892	3,479	69,371	3,617			72,988
Olmsted			52,108	733	52,841	4,582	600		58,023
West Otter Tail			53,070	3,648	56,718	3,281	500		60,499
Pennington			75,505	2,096	77,601	2,981			80,582
Pine			68,511	1,832	70,343	2,237	605		73,185
Pipestone			45,243	499	45,742	2,897			48,639
West Polk			61,220	3,742	64,962	5,577			70,539
Pope			40,021	2,154	42,175	2,699	100		44,974
Ramsey			1,819		1,819	141	28		1,960
Red Lake			50,990	1,111	52,101	2,237			54,338
Redwood			92,804	894	93,698	4,597	120		98,415
Renville			57,267	2,332	59,599	5,080			64,679
Rice			47,013	1,394	48,407	3,239	200		51,846
Rock			33,011	187	33,198	2,884			36,082
Roseau	5	71	113,063	2,298	115,361	4,605	375		120,341
South St. Louis			45,660	791	46,451	1,773	355		48,579
Scott			33,096	763	33,859	2,314	363		36,536
Sherburne			46,332	1,513	47,845	2,283	457		50,585
Sibley			40,977	402	41,379	3,092	250		44,721
Stearns			128,463	2,017	130,480	6,017	600		137,097
Steele			59,236	1,048	60,284	2,729	60		63,073
Stevens			41,264	1,139	42,403	2,452			44,855
Swift			33,085	1,975	34,060	3,757	60		38,877
Todd			59,181	2,062	61,243	3,831	300		65,374
Traverse			27,472	2,173	29,645	2,625	25		32,295
Wabasha			65,375	972	66,347	4,644	500		71,491
Wadena	3	379	62,916	848	63,764	2,124	300		66,188
Waseca			39,533	751	40,284	2,648	160		43,052
Washington			37,741	1,327	39,068	1,915	351		41,334
Watsonwan			16,703	331	17,034	2,199			19,233
Wikin			42,474	2,732	45,206	3,505			48,711
Winona			79,547	1,707	81,254	4,297	640		86,191
Wright	2	64	40,590	778	41,368	3,588	120		45,076
Yellow Medicine			69,724	2,162	71,886	3,940			75,826
East Otter Tail	6	65	93,222	3,514	96,736	1,640	300		98,676
East Polk			51,930	1,545	53,475	2,882	150		56,507
North St. Louis			37,628	1,572	39,200	2,087	495		41,782
State total	112	35,159	4,643,773	120,121	4,763,894	266,707	19,250		5,049,698

Note.—Those farmers who established eligibility for increased rates of cost-sharing under the special provision for low income farmers.

MINNESOTA

PRELIMINARY—TABLE 2.—SUMMARY OF THE 1969 AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

SEC. 1—PARTICIPATION AND PAYMENTS

Item	Unit	Regular ACP	Naval stores program	ECM F-4	Total regular, NSCP and ECM
Participating farms	Number	18,746			18,746
Farms participating at least once during 1965-69	do	82,983			82,983
Cost-shares	Dollar	4,643,773			4,643,773
Small cost-share increase	do	120,121			120,121

Item	Unit	Regular ACP	Naval stores program	ECM F-4	Total regular, NSCP and ECM
Amount transferred to SCS	Dollar	266,707			266,707
Amount transferred to other agencies	do	19,250			19,250
Amount used or to be used for program services	do				
Total gross assistance	do	5,049,698			5,049,698
Average per farm	do	269			269
Participating low-income farmers ¹	Number	112			112
Cost-shares for low-income farmers ¹	Dollar	35,159			35,159
Pooling agreements:					
Counties	Number	37			37
Agreements	do	144			144
Farms	do	468			468
Cost-shares	Dollar	158,078			158,078

¹ Those farmers who established eligibility for increased rates of cost-sharing under the special provision for low-income farmers.

MINNESOTA

SEC. 2.—CONSERVATION PRACTICES—REGULAR

Practice name	Practice Number	Number of counties	Number of farms	Units	Extent	Cost-shares	Percent of State total	Average rate per unit
Permanent cover	A-2	76	6,031	Acre	105,619	1,342,255	28.92	12.71
Increased acreages of rotation cover	A-3	41	1,476	do	35,498	294,193	6.34	8.29
Contour stripcropping	A-5	41	244	do	8,349	31,211	.67	3.74
Field stripcropping	A-6	21	47	do	3,694	7,579	.16	2.05
Trees or shrubs for forestry purposes	A-7	50	631	do	5,364	103,039	2.22	19.21
Trees or shrubs to prevent erosion	A-8	50	460	do	916	37,842	.81	41.31
				Acres served	22,069			1.71
Improvement of cover for soil protection	B-1	8	12	Acres	195	2,011	.04	10.31
Reservoirs for agricultural uses	B-7	84	1,016	Number	1,048	386,307	8.32	368.61
				Acres served	74,327			5.20
Timber stand improvement	B-10	24	48	Acres	505	6,392	.14	12.66
Permanent sod waterways	C-1	68	830	do	1,251	267,320	5.76	213.69
				Acres served	21,309			12.54
Permanent cover on dams and other problem areas	C-2	35	97	Acres	1,848	3,836	.08	15.47
				Acres served	1,848			2.08
Terraces	C-4	36	119	do	2,006	85,469	1.84	42.61
Diversion terraces, ditches, or dikes	C-5	43	226	do	3,851	78,733	1.70	20.44
Erosion control dams storage type	C-6	12	50	Number	47	74,741	1.61	1,590.23
				Acres served	5,006			14.93
Erosion control dams other	C-6	8	14	Number	14	10,287	.22	734.79
				Acres served	375			27.43
Mechanical protection of inlets or outlets	C-7	50	378	Number	638	231,048	4.98	362.14
				Acres served	36,080			6.40
Streambank or shore protection	C-8	13	23	do	736	10,798	.23	14.67
Permanent open drainage	C-9	55	866	do	51,198	158,671	3.42	3.10
Underground drainage	C-10	43	1,887	do	44,111	489,221	10.53	11.09
Shaping or land grading to permit drainage	C-11	8	145	do	7,292	22,325	.48	3.06
Winter cover	D-1	37	1,000	Acres	71,119	104,093	2.24	1.46
Stubble mulching	E-1	36	1,425	do	152,013	77,549	1.67	.51
Contour farming	E-2	19	51	do	1,738	2,930	.06	1.69
Wind erosion control operations	E-3	3	274	do	30,427	22,820	.49	.75
Home gardens	E-5	11	31	do	24	599	.01	24.96
County conservation practices	F-2	5	69	Acres served	1,170	13,585	.29	11.61
Practices to meet new conservation problems	F-3	18	656	do	34,228	184,303	3.97	5.38
Wildlife food plots or habitat	G-1	81	1,865	Acres	9,394	78,972	1.70	8.41
				Acres served	145,569			.54
Shallow water areas for wildlife	G-2	67	662	Number	1,181	175,573	3.78	148.66
				Acres served	13,809			12.71
Wildlife ponds	G-3	25	50	Number	49	58,511	1.26	1,194.10
				Acres served	1,109			52.76
Other wildlife practices	G-4	7	13	do	1,671	990	.02	.59
Conservation practices to enhance natural beauty	H	73	1,286	do	12,388	280,570	6.04	22.65
Total regular		90				4,643,773	100.00	

THE POLITICS OF OCEANS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, yesterday Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., former executive secretary of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development and now professor of engineering and public affairs at the University of Washington, presented a talk on "The Politics of the Oceans" before the National Association of Broadcasters in Chicago.

Dr. Wenk spoke eloquently of the importance of the oceans to the United States and of the recent history of oceanic affairs in the United States. He pointed out that "it was the Congress rather than the executive branch that exercised the leadership of seeking not only more intensive study but also more productive use of the sea." But despite the clear definition of the benefits to be extracted from the oceans to meet our needs and aspirations, our oceans programs are funded on a base "equal only to the interest on the investment in space."

Dr. Wenk said:

Where are we today? We certainly aren't moving. A superlative guidance system cannot compensate for deficiencies in thrust.

Despite the congressional leadership of the last 10 years, and despite the fact that our ocean programs have probably studied more than any other subject in the past with countless reviews, Dr. Wenk expressed his concern that the Advisory Council on Executive Organization would do the President a disservice. He said:

I am concerned that the Ash Council will inadvertently do him a disservice in not giving the attention to the oceans they deserve, simply because there has not been political pressure to act. . . . The management of marine agencies could be accomplished now by accepting the Stratton Commission recommendations.

Mr. President, we await the recommendation of our Federal civil oceanic and atmospheric affairs. Let us hope that he takes the opportunity to strengthen those programs, by taking the best step that has been offered to date, the creation of an independent National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Wenk's speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE POLITICS OF THE OCEANS

(By Edward Wenk, Jr.)

Members of the National Association of Broadcasters, I am singularly honored by this platform and by your invitation to address this distinguished audience. And I am pleased to have received an assignment to discuss "Oceanography." I realize that the term "oceanography" stimulates rich and enjoyable images for most of us: A seductive blue-green background; playful schools of brilliantly colored fish; sunsets mirrored in emerald-cool tropical waters; earnest sailboats tacking in Long Island Sound or a grizzled mariner in oilskins victorious over a howling gale. In a technological age, additional excitement may be generated by visions of research submarines with Owl-like eyes and fantastic mechanized arms at work on the previously inaccessible sea bed.

This audience has seen these photogenic portraits often. As men close to communications media, I can imagine your asking "what's new?"

I intend to answer that question. But to