

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19889

Monsignor McDonald, your own rector, made a plea of great importance at the Catholic University's June commencement, this year. He called for a national foundation based on the National Science Foundation, which would provide aid to outstanding young men and women who chose the arts and humanities as their field of graduate research; similar financial support as is today given to those who dedicate themselves to research in the sciences. I welcome the thoughtful suggestion of the rector of the Catholic University of America. It is a most constructive suggestion, worthy of every consideration.

The battle for the future will be, as has been said before, a battle for men's minds. To the nation with the greatest understanding of the truth—of the whole truth—of the truth in science and the truth in culture, to this nation belongs tomorrow. And today's struggle is to prepare the minds of our young men and women with a grasp of knowledge and understanding which is balanced enough to meet the challenges of an evolving science without losing its roots in a culture that still appreciates the value of the human person. I commend the Catholic University of America for its never-flagging dedication to this ideal. It captures my imagination, and I commend highly your right reverend rector for advancing these constructive proposals.

We are living in an important and trying period of the world's history. As you and I are present this evening, history is being made. Despite the cooling voice of peaceful coexistence, the forces of evil are bent on world domination.

While we must be powerful militarily, we must also be strong spiritually; all persons everywhere who believe in God and His law. For deep faith is the affirmative strength that could well be the difference between victory and defeat.

One of the great events of history is taking place now in Rome—instituted by Pope John and followed and emphasized in his own right by Pope Paul—the Ecumenical Council.

This is not only a great event in the history of the Catholic Church, and more broadly, of religion, but it is one of the historic events of mankind. For from it will flow great beneficial results.

It is evident to everyone that the Ecumenical Council is affirmative and positive. The growth of the ecumenical spirit throughout the world has already strongly evidenced itself. The religious understanding and spirit is stronger today than it has been for generations, and that understanding and spirit will grow stronger in generations that lie ahead.

While military power is necessary as a deterrent to Communist aggression, the ecumenical spirit everywhere is necessary for a future world of peace. For in a sense, military strength is negative—responding to the law of self-preservation—to deter, and in case of attack and war, to win and survive. In the world of today it is absolutely necessary. And our country has great military strength and power. But it is the word of God in the minds of men and women that is our real strength, our affirmative strength, animating their thoughts and actions, and looking forward with faith and confidence to a world of peace.

As we project our minds into the foreseeable future the results that will flow from the work of the Ecumenical Council, makes it one of the most notable events of world history.

As Cardinal Cushing recently and so well said, "The present Ecumenical Council will accept the challenge of those who contend that we are on the threshold of an atheistic era."

It is in the spirit of James Cardinal Gibbons, who in America many years ago, preached and practiced the ecumenical spirit, that I accept this year's award of the Cardinal Gibbons Medal.

J. N. file

THE UNITED STATES AND RECENT EVENTS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been with deep concern and sorrow that I have viewed the events of the past few days in South Vietnam. I have been concerned about the ruthless way in which the Diem government was deposed and grieved at the assassination of President Diem himself.

Just 4 weeks ago today seven other Members of this body and I sat in the President's palace in Saigon, exchanging views with President Diem.

At that time we advised Diem of the anxiety evident in the United States and elsewhere in the free world over the domestic political problems which had plagued his administration. We emphasized the fear that these difficulties might adversely affect the military campaign against the Vietcong if they continued.

We cautioned him that political unrest in the form of dissident groups, vocal opponents at home and abroad, uprisings by students, dissatisfaction among the intelligentsia and antagonism from Buddhists would continue to harass his government unless reforms were made soon.

At that time President Diem promised that reforms would be made, that civil liberties would be restored to his people as soon as hostilities with the Vietcong had subsided. Of course, he had made such promises before and nothing had been done. I am satisfied, however, that Diem meant what he said. He impressed us as a dedicated nationalist, sincere, incorruptible, and determined to defeat the Communist Vietcong.

From our conversation, it was evident that President Diem and his brother, Nhu, were conscious of the possibility of a coup. There had been, it should be remembered, five previous unsuccessful attempts to oust the Diem regime. But Diem indicated no fear of his political opponents.

For whatever his adversaries might say about him, they cannot deny the honesty, the courage, or ability of Ngo Dinh Diem.

A fervent champion of Vietnamese nationalism, Diem returned in 1954 from 4 years of exile to lead the Government of South Vietnam, a country which at that time had no national feeling or identity.

Almost singlehandedly, with few resources at his command, Diem created a nation-state of Vietnam and solidified the rule of his government. To do this he was forced to crush the opposition of dissident sects, subdue pirate bands

roving the delta and coastal regions, and began the campaign to recapture the countryside from the Communist guerillas. At the same time he effectively accomplished the absorbing of hundreds of thousands of refugees from North Vietnam who had streamed into South Vietnam at the end of the Indochina war.

It is safe to say that had there been no Diem in South Vietnam, the situation there would have been even more chaotic than it has been, and the Communist Vietcong would be in a stronger position than they are today.

Yet we have heard from many individuals that the war against the Vietcong could not be won with Diem. Our study mission found that the war against the Vietcong was being won. The Vietnamese, we reported, are determined to maintain their independence and their forces have been fighting well.

However, it cannot be denied that the reputation as a national leader and hero which Diem earned by his early actions as Vietnam's President, in recent months, had fallen because of the repressive measures which had been taken against opponents of his regime. His popularity, particularly in the large cities, had been dissipated in a series of government actions against the people attributed largely to his brother, Nhu and Mdm. Nhu.

As a result of these actions U.S. economic and military assistance was curtailed.

In part, this withholding of assistance was justified. Particularly aid which went to the regime's "special forces" who misused U.S. assistance in their raids on Buddhist pagodas.

But there can be little doubt that this curtailment of aid also heartened Diem's opponents and helped trigger the coup. It was a signal to the military leaders of Vietnam that the United States would support the overthrow of the Diem regime.

Further, there will be some who will say that the United States openly encouraged the coup.

Whatever the case, Mr. Speaker, the military junta which now rules Vietnam has not shown itself to be any less ruthless or any less autocratic than the former regime. One of its first acts was the reprehensible slaying of President Diem.

For those of us reared in the Judeo-Christian tradition and schooled in Anglo-Saxon law, this act of assassination is repulsive. It is made even more horrible by the attempt to make the killing seem a suicide. Even in military action, killing those who surrender is massacre.

The State Department has officially deplored the assassination of Diem while disclaiming any prior knowledge of the plot to overthrow him. Yet subsequently we have learned that members of the American press corp in Saigon were aware that a coup was imminent.

Can we believe then that the State Department did not know that a coup

19890

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

November 4

was likely? Were steps taken to warn President Diem of pending danger?

And what of the CIA? Did its agents in Vietnam know of the coup? Did, in fact, the CIA play a part in it? These questions remain to be answered.

But one thing is clear. If officials of the U.S. Government knew of the coup, and failed to exert every possible pressure to gain assurances of safe conduct out of the country for President Diem, then the shadow of blame falls on our Nation. Mr. Speaker, only time will tell what really happened in Vietnam. I hope the authorities will soon advise the Congress and our Nation so that faith can be kept in our executive departments.

What has happened in Vietnam must cause troubled thoughts for the leaders of other nations allied with the United States in the fight against world Communist aggression, in southeast Asia, in Europe, and most particularly in Latin America.

Further, Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that before the United States recognizes the junta in Vietnam as being the legitimate government in that country, we should receive some definite commitments from its leaders. We have learned hard lessons in other parts of the world when a military junta supplanted civilian rule.

Some formula should be agreed upon to return control of Vietnam to civilian rule as soon as possible. Further, similar requirements such as we are awaiting in the Dominican Republic and Honduras are in order. Finally, we should insist on reforms such as requested of the prior regime in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that we continue our efforts to defeat the Vietcong. We should continue to cooperate with the ruling junta in Vietnam in pressing the war against the Vietcong.

However, let us closely examine the request of the junta, as reported in the press, for double our present level of assistance—both economic and military.

According to some individuals Diem was the main stumbling block in the way of winning the war against the Vietcong. Diem is gone now, cruelly slain. Why then, now that the obstacle is gone, is substantially increased assistance necessary?

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I want to serve notice now that Congress will be taking a close and careful look at any forthcoming requests for massive increased aid to Vietnam. Further, the occurrences in Vietnam and elsewhere indicate the reevaluation, reassessment, and redirection of present policies concerning assistance to foreign nations is necessary.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I know of the long interest of the gentleman from Wisconsin in the problems of Vietnam and the conduct of the United States in its efforts to stop communism in that section of the world. I think that the report that the gentleman has made today is indeed a very fine report. I would

like to ask him one question, and that is, Does not the gentleman believe that there were commitments made by the United States, to the military junta that took over in Vietnam prior to the time of the rioting and the takeover by the junta?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman knows the answer to that question far better than I. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman is deeply interested in the defeat of the Communist menace throughout the world. He knows the answer.

Mr. LAIRD. I could not tell from the gentleman's remarks what he thought as chairman of the Investigating Committee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I was trying to get his best judgment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. My best judgment, I might say to the gentleman, is that there must have been some encouragement.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman. Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the gentleman's observation with regard to military coups. The gentleman very rightly pointed out that the cases of Honduras and the Dominican Republic are situations of two military coups. I understand the gentleman's position is that there should be considerable reservation about recognition of this military junta in South Vietnam unless adequate assurances are given with regard to elections, and other matters which the gentleman mentioned. According to the press the State Department is ready, willing, and anxious to give immediate recognition to the junta there, in South Vietnam, but just the last weekend they announced their intentions to withdraw all semblance of recognition, even practically all of the military missions from the Dominican Republic and from Honduras. Does not the gentleman feel that that position of the administration is slightly inconsistent?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I definitely agree that there is an inconsistency. In my opinion the same formula, similar requirements, as I said earlier, should be followed in both instances. I believe that agreements and commitments on the part of the military junta in Vietnam must be had now, before recognition, so that we may be more certain of the return of a civilian government to Vietnam.

I agree with the gentleman. Basically, there are no differences in the situation in Vietnam.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman agrees that the principle is the same, does he not?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I agree.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I would be glad to yield further to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I understand that there are obviously communications going on at the present time between the Vietnam junta and this Government re-

lating to what the junta's intentions are in the future; is that not correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. I have been rather disturbed by the fact, and I understand it is a fact, because I was informed by the ambassador to the OAS from the Dominican Republic, Ambassador Bonilla, just last week, that he cannot even get in to see anybody in the State Department to discuss pledges that the triumvirate ruling government in the Dominican Republic is willing to give to the United States relating to elections as soon as possible and relating to other assurances such as concerning the return to constitutional government in the Dominican Republic.

I am sure the gentleman is fully aware that a few days after the military junta took over, the government was turned over to the civilian triumvirate which is now governing it and the country is not now governed by the military.

The gentleman is familiar with the fact that the military forces are no longer patrolling the streets, imposing martial law, and that there is a substantial degree of freedom even now in the Dominican Republic. Yet the U.S. Government will not even talk to Mr. Bonilla in this country nor are they willing to send an official or unofficial emissary to discuss with the triumvirate in the Dominican Republic what their plans are or what assurances they are willing to give.

Does not the gentleman from Wisconsin feel that is totally inconsistent? How are we going to help settle the very serious, critical, and explosive situation in the Dominican Republic? We specifically made recommendations and did certain things in this other crisis in South Vietnam. Can the gentleman understand why our Government will not even set up communications between the United States and the Dominican Republic?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I will say to the gentleman from Florida that I am unable to reply to the question which he is asking. I agree that the transitional governments in the Dominican Republic and Honduras should be given at least an opportunity to present their case. Yes, the issues are similar. That is why in the conclusion of my prepared statement I stated that there should be a reevaluation, reassessment, and a rededication of our military and economic assistance, not only in the case of Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, but in other areas.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman yield for one additional question?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I know you are familiar with the fact that for some time I have been concerned over the fact that in Latin America the Communists are continuing to infiltrate and gain ever stronger positions in many countries. In many of the Latin American countries our Alliance for Progress program and foreign aid program efforts apparently are not successfully directed toward preventing Communist growth and the taking over of some of these countries by the Communists.

1963

Why is it that the United States takes the inconsistent position that the State Department, when it comes to Latin America and this hemisphere, cannot become involved in matters within the sovereignty of these other countries and we cannot impose our will upon these other nations, when according to the answer given by the gentleman in the well to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] just a moment ago, it appears we are imposing our will on South Vietnam? Of course, it is common knowledge that we did in Guatemala, in 1954, when there was a Communist government. That was a case in which we rendered assistance to oust the Communists.

It seems to me that we have either got to fish or cut bait. In one situation we intervene supposedly to strengthen our anti-Communist efforts but in another situation where the Communist threaten we say that we have got to recognize their sovereignty and we cannot intervene.

If we are to be consistent, should not our basic policy be that we fight communism wherever it occurs, if it justifies interference in one case should not it justify the same thing in another?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. At the moment I cannot give to the gentleman an answer to his question. I submit the gentleman had better ask it of the proper authorities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman headed a committee that returned only a few days ago from Vietnam.

Do I understand correctly that the gentleman in his committee talked to President Diem personally?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We did.

Mr. GROSS. And his brother, Nhu?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We did.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman and his committee also talked to the military commanders, American and Vietnamese?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes, as well as legislators of the Vietnam National Assembly, including the President of the National Assembly.

Mr. GROSS. At that time did the gentleman or his committee have information that this coup would be carried out or was imminent and would be carried out in the near future? Was there any indication of that?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If there were indications we would have reported to the full Committee on Foreign Affairs and included it in our report. There were no such indications.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I think that was the report the gentleman made to the committee.

FARMERS AND THE NEW FRONTIER—A REPORT ON THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, now that the 1st session of the 88th Congress is

drawing to a close, I think it would be appropriate for us all to pause a moment to review again the agricultural record of the New Frontier.

I am sorry to say that for both farmers and taxpayers this record continues to get worse.

Here is what we have seen recently:

The parity ratio for 1962 at 79, the lowest level for a year since 1939—Economic Indicators, U.S. Government Printing Office, September 1963, page 28.

Farm debt at the highest level in history—Farm debt, 1919-63, ERS, USDA, July 1963.

Farming costs at the highest level in history—"Agricultural Prices," Crop Reporting Board, U.S. Department of Agriculture, September 30, 1963, page 1.

Total expenditures of \$8.4 billion by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, an all-time high, in fiscal year 1964—appropriations, REA and FHA loan authorizations, fiscal years 1933 through 1964, Office of Budget and Finance, USDA, February 1963.

The greatest number of employees—116,268—in the history of the U.S. Department of Agriculture—"U.S. Budget, Fiscal Year 1964," page 422.

The fewest number of farmers—14.3 million—in the history of our Nation—"Farm Income Situation," FIS 191, USDA, July 1963, page 37.

An alltime low—3.6 million—in the number of farms in this country—"Statistical Reporting Service," U.S. Department of Agriculture, February 28, 1963.

Farm surpluses at continued high levels—USDA press release 3309-63, October 3, 1963, shows CCC investment in farm commodities at \$7,256,551,380 as of June 30, 1963. This compares to \$6,657,026,599 a year earlier.

Farm income sliding—Ibid, 7, page 2. Seasonally adjusted second quarter for 1963 shows net farm income at \$12.6 billion or \$700 million less than 1962 and \$200 million less than 1961. Page 34 shows that realized net income from farming after excluding government payments was lower in 1962 than in 17 of the previous 19 years starting in 1943.

Farm legislation bogged down in Congress with only one major bill being enacted into law.

Farmers rejecting the administration's strict two-price wheat control scheme by an overwhelming margin.

HOW DID IT HAPPEN?

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, to cause all these events to transpire? While I realize that an endless argument can follow from this simple question, I think it suffices to say that the impact of technology and change in agriculture is by far the most important single reason. Farmers have been able to master the weather, the soil, seeds, fertilizers and Government officials, and still produce the greatest bounty on earth.

Nostalgic remembrances are from time to time heard concerning the so-called golden era of agriculture when the parity ratio was in excess of 100. World War II, the postwar period and the Korean war were, of course, the years of this golden era when American men were fighting and dying for their country.

The wheat fields of France and the rice paddies of Korea were growing land

mines in the golden era and the mere fact that the total volume of world consumption is now higher than it was during the 1940's and 1950's is testimonial only to the fact that there are millions of more people on this planet now than there were just a decade ago.

The actual record of the New Frontier on farm legislation has been dismal.

Do you remember what the 1960 Democratic platform on agriculture said?

The Democratic administration will work to bring about full parity of income for farmers in all segments of agriculture by helping them to balance farm production with the expanding needs of the Nation and the world.

Measures to this end include production and marketing quotas measured in terms of barrels, bushels, and bales, loans on basic commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity, production payments, commodity purchases, and marketing orders and agreements.

What happened to this promise of high prices and strict controls? Present law is clear on the authority of Secretary Freeman to set price supports at 90 percent of parity on the basics now grown under crop controls such as rice, peanuts, cotton and wheat.

He could set these crops at 90 percent of parity with a stroke of his pen. Yet he has not—in fact, not one single farm commodity is now or has been supported at 90 percent of parity by the Kennedy administration.

Why? The reason is simple. The Democratic Party has repudiated 90 percent of parity in practice but not in promise.

Do you remember what Candidate John F. Kennedy said in 1960?

Speaking at the Farmers Union GTA Convention, St. Paul, Minn., October 2, 1960, he said:

Third, I would support farm programs which will raise farm income to full parity levels as soon as it is feasible to do so. By parity income, I mean an income which will give average farm producers a return on their farming investment, their labor, and their managerial effort equal to the returns that are earned by comparable resources in other industries.

That, of course, was another promise which falls far short when measured against performance.

As to the parity principle as a bedrock of farm policy, let me point out that the present tobacco price support program which is generally cited as a paragon of virtue by advocates of "supply management" or controls for agriculture is based on a formula apart and distinct from the parity formula. It is a formula designed to prevent a rise in tobacco price supports. It is a frozen ceiling on support prices. Measured in terms of parity, tobacco supports are now in the low 80 range.

Another recent example of this administration abandoning the parity principle is found in the pending cotton bill which calls for substantial new subsidies to textile mills. Under the terms of that legislation the price support for cotton would in future years no longer be related to parity, but would be tied to the cost of production.

WHAT IS HAPPENING?

During this session of Congress only one major farm bill, a 2-year extension

19892

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

November 4

of the feed grain program, has been enacted into law.

We all recall how hastily it was forced through Congress in an effort to persuade wheat farmers to vote "right" in last May's referendum.

As things turned out this last-minute effort which prevented the Senate from even correcting a typographical error was as equally futile as the months of high-pressure sales tactics used by Secretary Freeman and the Department of Agriculture to promote the certificate wheat plan.

As a result of numerous abuses, the Secretary was legislatively scolded by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees with the Senate adding this language to the fiscal year 1964 appropriations bill:

Provided further, That no part of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act shall be used, (1) to influence the vote in any referendum; (2) to influence agricultural legislation except as permitted in 18 U.S.C. 1913; or (3) for salaries or other expenses of members of county and community committees established pursuant to section 3(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for engaging in any activities other than advisory and supervisory duties and delegated program functions prescribed in administrative regulations.

As a result of further congressional disapproval, the Secretary also withdrew the loyalty pledge that he had required of all farmer-elected committeemen.

In spite of all the high-pressure tactics a majority of wheat farmers voted down the strict control plan designed for them by Messrs. Kennedy, Cochrane, and Freeman.

Prior to the referendum many wheat State Members of Congress began to work on a constructive alternative to the administration's "rule or ruin" plan. After the referendum's defeat, over 50 wheat bills were introduced in Congress, but up to the present time the administration has remained adamant in refusing to consider remedial wheat legislation while preferring to let the wheat farmer "stew in his own juice."

The reason most often cited by the Secretary is that wheat farmers are divided on a program. That argument, however, did not dissuade the Secretary from pushing the 40-year-old, oft rejected, two-price wheat plan through Congress and to a referendum where farmers in only five States found it acceptable.

LIVESTOCK VENDETTA

The administration's displeasure with wheat farmers as a result of the referendum is mild compared to the continuing vendetta it is carrying out against livestock farmers.

Let us recall for just one moment that the livestock industry is, by far, free from government control and subsidy. It has historically been the bulwark of opposition to the fancy control schemes of the New Frontier.

Among other things here are some of the things the administration has been doing to livestock farmers.

First. This administration proposed in 1961 that there be hen, heifer, and hog quotas.

Do you remember section 360(a) of H.R. 6400, the administration's 1961 farm proposal?

It provided:

SUBTITLE C—MARKETING QUOTAS

Part VII—Marketing quotas for specified agricultural commodities

SEC. 360(a). This part covers any agricultural commodity including but not limited to the following: corn, tobacco, wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, barley, oats, rye, grain sorghums, flaxseed, soybeans, dry edible beans, grass seeds, vegetables (including potatoes), fruits, tree nuts and seeds, hogs, cattle, lamb, chicken, turkeys, whole milk, butterfat, eggs, hops, honey, and gum naval stores. Any regional or market classification, type or grade of any agricultural commodity covered by this part may be treated as a separate commodity hereunder.

Happily, this provision was rejected by Congress.

Second. Do you remember section 440 of H.R. 10010, the administration's 1962 farm proposal?

It provided:

SUBTITLE C—DAIRY

Reports and records

SEC. 440. Each first processor and producer shall keep such records for such period of time and shall make such reports as the Secretary shall prescribe for the purposes of this subtitle. The Secretary is hereby authorized to examine such records and any other records, accounts, documents, and other papers which he has reason to believe are relevant for the purposes of this subtitle and which are in the custody or control of such first processor or producer. Any person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by the Secretary, pursuant to this subtitle, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$2,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Happily, this provision too was rejected by Congress, but a proposal to imprison a dairy farmer in a Federal penitentiary for failing to keep a record or for refusing to let a Federal official snoop about his personal records or any other material deemed relevant by the Secretary would seem preposterous had it not been recommended by the President of the United States.

Third. Do you remember H.R. 6491 and H.R. 7154, the administration's 1963 proposals on land retirement?

These bills would have removed the \$10 million ceiling on the cropland conversion program and allowed unrestrained grazing of new cropland as well as on the formerly idle land coming out of the cropland reserve program. Needless to say, this would mean a severe hardship for all livestock farmers if Government subsidized grazing were allowed.

Fourth. Do you realize the extent of livestock imports at this time?

Four hundred and eighty-one million dollars' worth of meat products were imported into the United States in 1962, and 1963 imports are running at the same high rate.

Imports of boneless beef and veal, for example, have risen from 88 million pounds in 1957 to 819 million pounds in 1962—an increase of 1,000 percent. The October 28 issue of the USDA publication, "Foreign Agriculture," also shows these figures for 1963:

U.S. imports of red meat in the January-August period of 1963 totaled 929 million pounds, up 18 percent from the same period last year.

U.S. imports of boneless beef, the major category, rose by 20 percent to 605 million pounds, and those of canned meat by about 50 percent to 75 million pounds.

Nine ships left Australia during the month of September, with 27,301,120 pounds of beef, 403,200 pounds of mutton, 51,520 pounds of lamb, and 24,640 pounds of variety meats, to the United States.

Meat shipments to the United States from New Zealand totaled 203 million pounds in the 11-month period beginning October 1, 1962. Beef and veal accounted for 94 percent of these shipments.

Many livestock producers wish that the administration would devote as much effort to control harmful and excessive imports as it does to controlling the American farmer.

In spite of this serious situation nothing is being done to stop it.

Fifth. Do you remember the chicken war in the European Common Market? That is still going on and we are losing it. The Europeans have made no real concessions and they have, in fact, raised U.S. pork levies from 9.5 to 20 percent ad valorem and have raised U.S. lard duties from 1.6 cents a pound to 4.6 cents a pound, thus substantially reducing these exports to Europe.

I am sorry to see the hostile attitude that this administration has against the livestock industry which is of such prime importance to our Nation's agriculture.

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

The farm program is heading for a fall unless something is done to bring it back into sensible perspective. The pure and simple fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the present crazy-quilt price support and control program held together by Mr. Freeman was born in depression, matured in war and is now in a faltering position.

The change from rural to urban dominance of both the national Congress and the State legislatures is becoming more and more pronounced.

If farmers of the 1960's and 1970's are going to continue to provide Americans and the world with food and fiber, a new concept of abundance must be formed.

We must forget the foolishness that the New Frontier espouses on agriculture. Ski lifts and snow machines financed by subsidized Government loans, 31 farms for every U.S. Department of Agriculture bureaucrat, and only 140 acres out of a 140,000-acre cropland conversion program sold to the public as a recreation activity are but a few of the wastes and extravagances that must be curtailed if the general public and the Congress are ever to look on farm programs as something more than a multi-billion-dollar boondoggle.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I call upon all segments and shades of opinion within the agricultural community to give immediate attention to a sound and rational farm program. The Kennedy administration, having complete control of Congress, has the votes to bring this about. The responsibility for the enactment of sound and realistic farm programs, therefore, should be placed where it belongs.

Handwritten initials

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19889

Monsignor McDonald, your own rector, made a plea of great importance at the Catholic University's June commencement, this year. He called for a national foundation based on the National Science Foundation, which would provide aid to outstanding young men and women who chose the arts and humanities as their field of graduate research; similar financial support as is today given to those who dedicate themselves to research in the sciences. I welcome the thoughtful suggestion of the rector of the Catholic University of America. It is a most constructive suggestion, worthy of every consideration.

The battle for the future will be, as has been said before, a battle for men's minds. To the nation with the greatest understanding of the truth—of the whole truth—of the truth in science and the truth in culture, to this nation belongs tomorrow. And today's struggle is to prepare the minds of our young men and women with a grasp of knowledge and understanding which is balanced enough to meet the challenges of an evolving science without losing its roots in a culture that still appreciates the value of the human person. I commend the Catholic University of America for its never-flagging dedication to this ideal. It captures my imagination, and I commend highly your right reverend rector for advancing these constructive proposals.

We are living in an important and trying period of the world's history. As you and I are present this evening, history is being made. Despite the cooling voice of peaceful coexistence, the forces of evil are bent on world domination.

While we must be powerful militarily, we must also be strong spiritually; all persons everywhere who believe in God and His law. For deep faith is the affirmative strength that could well be the difference between victory and defeat.

One of the great events of history is taking place now in Rome—instituted by Pope John and followed and emphasized in his own right by Pope Paul—the Ecumenical Council.

This is not only a great event in the history of the Catholic Church, and more broadly, of religion, but it is one of the historic events of mankind. For from it will flow great beneficial results.

It is evident to everyone that the Ecumenical Council is affirmative and positive. The growth of the ecumenical spirit throughout the world has already strongly evidenced itself. The religious understanding and spirit is stronger today than it has been for generations, and that understanding and spirit will grow stronger in generations that lie ahead.

While military power is necessary as a deterrent to Communist aggression, the ecumenical spirit everywhere is necessary for a future world of peace. For in a sense, military strength is negative—responding to the law of self-preservation—to deter, and in case of attack and war, to win and survive. In the world of today it is absolutely necessary. And our country has great military strength and power. But it is the word of God in the minds of men and women that is our real strength, our affirmative strength, animating their thoughts and actions, and looking forward with faith and confidence to a world of peace.

As we project our minds into the foreseeable future the results that will flow from the work of the Ecumenical Council, makes it one of the most notable events of world history.

As Cardinal Cushing recently and so well said, "The present Ecumenical Council will accept the challenge of those who contend that we are on the threshold of an atheistic era."

It is in the spirit of James Cardinal Gibbons, who in America many years ago, preached and practiced the ecumenical spirit, that I accept this year's award of the Cardinal Gibbons Medal.

Handwritten signature

THE UNITED STATES AND RECENT EVENTS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been with deep concern and sorrow that I have viewed the events of the past few days in South Vietnam. I have been concerned about the ruthless way in which the Diem government was deposed and grieved at the assassination of President Diem himself.

Just 4 weeks ago today seven other Members of this body and I sat in the President's palace in Saigon, exchanging views with President Diem.

At that time we advised Diem of the anxiety evident in the United States and elsewhere in the free world over the domestic political problems which had plagued his administration. We emphasized the fear that these difficulties might adversely affect the military campaign against the Vietcong if they continued.

We cautioned him that political unrest in the form of dissident groups, vocal opponents at home and abroad, uprisings by students, dissatisfaction among the intelligentsia and antagonism from Buddhists would continue to harass his government unless reforms were made soon.

At that time President Diem promised that reforms would be made, that civil liberties would be restored to his people as soon as hostilities with the Vietcong had subsided. Of course, he had made such promises before and nothing had been done. I am satisfied, however, that Diem meant what he said. He impressed us as a dedicated nationalist, sincere, incorruptible, and determined to defeat the Communist Vietcong.

From our conversation, it was evident that President Diem and his brother, Nhu, were conscious of the possibility of a coup. There had been, it should be remembered, five previous unsuccessful attempts to oust the Diem regime. But Diem indicated no fear of his political opponents.

For whatever his adversaries might say about him, they cannot deny the honesty, the courage, or ability of Ngo Dinh Diem.

A fervent champion of Vietnamese nationalism, Diem returned in 1954 from 4 years of exile to lead the Government of South Vietnam, a country which at that time had no national feeling or identity.

Almost singlehandedly, with few resources at his command, Diem created a nation-state of Vietnam and solidified the rule of his government. To do this he was forced to crush the opposition of dissident sects, subdue pirate bands

roving the delta and coastal regions, and began the campaign to recapture the countryside from the Communist guerillas. At the same time he effectively accomplished the absorbing of hundreds of thousands of refugees from North Vietnam who had streamed into South Vietnam at the end of the Indochina war.

It is safe to say that had there been no Diem in South Vietnam, the situation there would have been even more chaotic than it has been, and the Communist Vietcong would be in a stronger position than they are today.

Yet we have heard from many individuals that the war against the Vietcong could not be won with Diem. Our study mission found that the war against the Vietcong was being won. The Vietnamese, we reported, are determined to maintain their independence and their forces have been fighting well.

However, it cannot be denied that the reputation as a national leader and hero which Diem earned by his early actions as Vietnam's President, in recent months, had fallen because of the repressive measures which had been taken against opponents of his regime. His popularity, particularly in the large cities, had been dissipated in a series of government actions against the people attributed largely to his brother, Nhu and Mdm. Nhu.

As a result of these actions U.S. economic and military assistance was curtailed.

In part, this withholding of assistance was justified. Particularly aid which went to the regime's "special forces" who misused U.S. assistance in their raids on Buddhist pagodas.

But there can be little doubt that this curtailment of aid also heartened Diem's opponents and helped trigger the coup. It was a signal to the military leaders of Vietnam that the United States would support the overthrow of the Diem regime.

Further, there will be some who will say that the United States openly encouraged the coup.

Whatever the case, Mr. Speaker, the military junta which now rules Vietnam has not shown itself to be any less ruthless or any less autocratic than the former regime. One of its first acts was the reprehensible slaying of President Diem.

For those of us reared in the Judeo-Christian tradition and schooled in Anglo-Saxon law, this act of assassination is repulsive. It is made even more horrible by the attempt to make the killing seem a suicide. Even in military action, killing those who surrender is massacre.

The State Department has officially deplored the assassination of Diem while disclaiming any prior knowledge of the plot to overthrow him. Yet subsequently we have learned that members of the American press corp in Saigon were aware that a coup was imminent.

Can we believe then that the State Department did not know that a coup

19890

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

November 4

was likely? Were steps taken to warn President Diem of pending danger?

And what of the CIA? Did its agents in Vietnam know of the coup? Did, in fact, the CIA play a part in it? These questions remain to be answered.

But one thing is clear. If officials of the U.S. Government knew of the coup, and failed to exert every possible pressure to gain assurances of safe conduct out of the country for President Diem, then the shadow of blame falls on our Nation. Mr. Speaker, only time will tell what really happened in Vietnam. I hope the authorities will soon advise the Congress and our Nation so that faith can be kept in our executive departments.

What has happened in Vietnam must cause troubled thoughts for the leaders of other nations allied with the United States in the fight against world Communist aggression, in southeast Asia, in Europe, and most particularly in Latin America.

Further, Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that before the United States recognizes the junta in Vietnam as being the legitimate government in that country, we should receive some definite commitments from its leaders. We have learned hard lessons in other parts of the world when a military junta supplanted civilian rule.

Some formula should be agreed upon to return control of Vietnam to civilian rule as soon as possible. Further, similar requirements such as we are awaiting in the Dominican Republic and Honduras are in order. Finally, we should insist on reforms such as requested of the prior regime in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that we continue our efforts to defeat the Vietcong. We should continue to cooperate with the ruling junta in Vietnam in pressing the war against the Vietcong.

However, let us closely examine the request of the junta, as reported in the press, for double our present level of assistance—both economic and military.

According to some individuals Diem was the main stumbling block in the way of winning the war against the Vietcong. Diem is gone now, cruelly slain. Why then, now that the obstacle is gone, is substantially increased assistance necessary?

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I want to serve notice now that Congress will be taking a close and careful look at any forthcoming requests for massive increased aid to Vietnam. Further, the occurrences in Vietnam and elsewhere indicate the reevaluation, reassessment, and redirection of present policies concerning assistance to foreign nations is necessary.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I know of the long interest of the gentleman from Wisconsin in the problems of Vietnam and the conduct of the United States in its efforts to stop communism in that section of the world. I think that the report that the gentleman has made today is indeed a very fine report. I would

like to ask him one question, and that is, Does not the gentleman believe that there were commitments made by the United States, to the military junta that took over in Vietnam prior to the time of the rioting and the takeover by the junta?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman knows the answer to that question far better than I. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman is deeply interested in the defeat of the Communist menace throughout the world. He knows the answer.

Mr. LAIRD. I could not tell from the gentleman's remarks what he thought as chairman of the Investigating Committee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I was trying to get his best judgment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. My best judgment, I might say to the gentleman, is that there must have been some encouragement.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman. Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the gentleman's observation with regard to military coups. The gentleman very rightly pointed out that the cases of Honduras and the Dominican Republic are situations of two military coups. I understand the gentleman's position is that there should be considerable reservation about recognition of this military junta in South Vietnam unless adequate assurances are given with regard to elections, and other matters which the gentleman mentioned. According to the press the State Department is ready, willing, and anxious to give immediate recognition to the junta there, in South Vietnam, but just the last weekend they announced their intentions to withdraw all semblance of recognition, even practically all of the military missions from the Dominican Republic and from Honduras. Does not the gentleman feel that that position of the administration is slightly inconsistent?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I definitely agree that there is an inconsistency. In my opinion the same formula, similar requirements, as I said earlier, should be followed in both instances. I believe that agreements and commitments on the part of the military junta in Vietnam must be had now, before recognition, so that we may be more certain of the return of a civilian government to Vietnam.

I agree with the gentleman. Basically, there are no differences in the situation in Vietnam.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman agrees that the principle is the same, does he not?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I agree.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I would be glad to yield further to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I understand that there are obviously communications going on at the present time between the Vietnam junta and this Government re-

lating to what the junta's intentions are in the future; is that not correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. I have been rather disturbed by the fact, and I understand it is a fact, because I was informed by the ambassador to the OAS from the Dominican Republic, Ambassador Bonilla, just last week, that he cannot even get in to see anybody in the State Department to discuss pledges that the triumvirate ruling government in the Dominican Republic is willing to give to the United States relating to elections as soon as possible and relating to other assurances such as concerning the return to constitutional government in the Dominican Republic.

I am sure the gentleman is fully aware that a few days after the military junta took over, the government was turned over to the civilian triumvirate which is now governing it and the country is not now governed by the military.

The gentleman is familiar with the fact that the military forces are no longer patrolling the streets, imposing martial law, and that there is a substantial degree of freedom even now in the Dominican Republic. Yet the U.S. Government will not even talk to Mr. Bonilla in this country nor are they willing to send an official or unofficial emissary to discuss with the triumvirate in the Dominican Republic what their plans are or what assurances they are willing to give.

Does not the gentleman from Wisconsin feel that is totally inconsistent? How are we going to help settle the very serious, critical, and explosive situation in the Dominican Republic? We specifically made recommendations and did certain things in this other crisis in South Vietnam. Can the gentleman understand why our Government will not even set up communications between the United States and the Dominican Republic?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I will say to the gentleman from Florida that I am unable to reply to the question which he is asking. I agree that the transitional governments in the Dominican Republic and Honduras should be given at least an opportunity to present their case. Yes, the issues are similar. That is why in the conclusion of my prepared statement I stated that there should be a reevaluation, reassessment, and a rededication of our military and economic assistance, not only in the case of Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, but in other areas.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman yield for one additional question?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I know you are familiar with the fact that for some time I have been concerned over the fact that in Latin America the Communists are continuing to infiltrate and gain ever stronger positions in many countries. In many of the Latin American countries our Alliance for Progress program and foreign aid program efforts apparently are not successfully directed toward preventing Communist growth and the taking over of some of these countries by the Communists.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19891

Why is it that the United States takes the inconsistent position that the State Department, when it comes to Latin America and this hemisphere, cannot become involved in matters within the sovereignty of these other countries and we cannot impose our will upon these other nations, when according to the answer given by the gentleman in the well to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] just a moment ago, it appears we are imposing our will on South Vietnam? Of course, it is common knowledge that we did in Guatemala, in 1954, when there was a Communist government. That was a case in which we rendered assistance to oust the Communists.

It seems to me that we have either got to fish or cut bait. In one situation we intervene supposedly to strengthen our anti-Communist efforts but in another situation where the Communist threaten we say that we have got to recognize their sovereignty and we cannot intervene.

If we are to be consistent, should not our basic policy be that we fight communism wherever it occurs, if it justifies interference in one case should not it justify the same thing in another?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. At the moment I cannot give to the gentleman an answer to his question. I submit the gentleman had better ask it of the proper authorities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman headed a committee that returned only a few days ago from Vietnam.

Do I understand correctly that the gentleman in his committee talked to President Diem personally?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We did.

Mr. GROSS. And his brother, Nhu?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We did.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman and his committee also talked to the military commanders, American and Vietnamese?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes, as well as legislators of the Vietnam National Assembly, including the President of the National Assembly.

Mr. GROSS. At that time did the gentleman or his committee have information that this coup would be carried out or was imminent and would be carried out in the near future? Was there any indication of that?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If there were indications we would have reported to the full Committee on Foreign Affairs and included it in our report. There were no such indications.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I think that was the report the gentleman made to the committee.

FARMERS AND THE NEW FRONTIER—A REPORT ON THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, now that the 1st session of the 88th Congress is

drawing to a close, I think it would be appropriate for us all to pause a moment to review again the agricultural record of the New Frontier.

I am sorry to say that for both farmers and taxpayers this record continues to get worse.

Here is what we have seen recently:

The parity ratio for 1962 at 79, the lowest level for a year since 1939—Economic Indicators, U.S. Government Printing Office, September 1963, page 28.

Farm debt at the highest level in history—Farm debt, 1919–63, ERS, USDA, July 1963.

Farming costs at the highest level in history—"Agricultural Prices," Crop Reporting Board, U.S. Department of Agriculture, September 30, 1963, page 1.

Total expenditures of \$8.4 billion by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, an all-time high, in fiscal year 1964—appropriations, REA and FHA loan authorizations, fiscal years 1933 through 1964, Office of Budget and Finance, USDA, February 1963.

The greatest number of employees—116,268—in the history of the U.S. Department of Agriculture—"U.S. Budget, Fiscal Year 1964," page 422.

The fewest number of farmers—14.3 million—in the history of our Nation—"Farm Income Situation," FIS 191, USDA, July 1963, page 37.

An alltime low—3.6 million—in the number of farms in this country—"Statistical Reporting Service," U.S. Department of Agriculture, February 28, 1963.

Farm surpluses at continued high levels—USDA press release 3309–63, October 3, 1963, shows CCC investment in farm commodities at \$7,256,551,380 as of June 30, 1963. This compares to \$6,657,026,599 a year earlier.

Farm income sliding—Ibid, 7, page 2. Seasonally adjusted second quarter for 1963 shows net farm income at \$12.6 billion or \$700 million less than 1962 and \$200 million less than 1961. Page 34 shows that realized net income from farming after excluding government payments was lower in 1962 than in 17 of the previous 19 years starting in 1943.

Farm legislation bogged down in Congress with only one major bill being enacted into law.

Farmers rejecting the administration's strict two-price wheat control scheme by an overwhelming margin.

HOW DID IT HAPPEN?

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, to cause all these events to transpire? While I realize that an endless argument can follow from this simple question, I think it suffices to say that the impact of technology and change in agriculture is by far the most important single reason. Farmers have been able to master the weather, the soil, seeds, fertilizers and Government officials, and still produce the greatest bounty on earth.

Nostalgic remembrances are from time to time heard concerning the so-called golden era of agriculture when the parity ratio was in excess of 100. World War II, the postwar period and the Korean war were, of course, the years of this golden era when American men were fighting and dying for their country.

The wheat fields of France and the rice paddies of Korea were growing land

mines in the golden era and the mere fact that the total volume of world consumption is now higher than it was during the 1940's and 1950's is testimonial only to the fact that there are millions of more people on this planet now than there were just a decade ago.

The actual record of the New Frontier on farm legislation has been dismal.

Do you remember what the 1960 Democratic platform on agriculture said?

The Democratic administration will work to bring about full parity of income for farmers in all segments of agriculture by helping them to balance farm production with the expanding needs of the Nation and the world.

Measures to this end include production and marketing quotas measured in terms of barrels, bushels, and bales, loans on basic commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity, production payments, commodity purchases, and marketing orders and agreements.

What happened to this promise of high prices and strict controls? Present law is clear on the authority of Secretary Freeman to set price supports at 90 percent of parity on the basics now grown under crop controls such as rice, peanuts, cotton and wheat.

He could set these crops at 90 percent of parity with a stroke of his pen. Yet he has not—in fact, not one single farm commodity is now or has been supported at 90 percent of parity by the Kennedy administration.

Why? The reason is simple. The Democratic Party has repudiated 90 percent of parity in practice but not in promise.

Do you remember what Candidate John F. Kennedy said in 1960?

Speaking at the Farmers Union GTA Convention, St. Paul, Minn., October 2, 1960, he said:

Third, I would support farm programs which will raise farm income to full parity levels as soon as it is feasible to do so. By parity income, I mean an income which will give average farm producers a return on their farming investment, their labor, and their managerial effort equal to the returns that are earned by comparable resources in other industries.

That, of course, was another promise which falls far short when measured against performance.

As to the parity principle as a bedrock of farm policy, let me point out that the present tobacco price support program which is generally cited as a paragon of virtue by advocates of "supply management" or controls for agriculture is based on a formula apart and distinct from the parity formula. It is a formula designed to prevent a rise in tobacco price supports. It is a frozen ceiling on support prices. Measured in terms of parity, tobacco supports are now in the low 80 range.

Another recent example of this administration abandoning the parity principle is found in the pending cotton bill which calls for substantial new subsidies to textile mills. Under the terms of that legislation the price support for cotton would in future years no longer be related to parity, but would be tied to the cost of production.

WHAT IS HAPPENING?

During this session of Congress only one major farm bill, a 2-year extension

19892

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

November 4

of the feed grain program, has been enacted into law.

We all recall how hastily it was forced through Congress in an effort to persuade wheat farmers to vote "right" in last May's referendum.

As things turned out this last-minute effort which prevented the Senate from even correcting a typographical error was as equally futile as the months of high-pressure sales tactics used by Secretary Freeman and the Department of Agriculture to promote the certificate wheat plan.

As a result of numerous abuses, the Secretary was legislatively scolded by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees with the Senate adding this language to the fiscal year 1964 appropriations bill:

Provided further, That no part of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act shall be used, (1) to influence the vote in any referendum; (2) to influence agricultural legislation except as permitted in 18 U.S.C. 1913; or (3) for salaries or other expenses of members of county and community committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for engaging in any activities other than advisory and supervisory duties and delegated program functions prescribed in administrative regulations.

As a result of further congressional disapproval, the Secretary also withdrew the loyalty pledge that he had required of all farmer-elected committeemen.

In spite of all the high-pressure tactics a majority of wheat farmers voted down the strict control plan designed for them by Messrs. Kennedy, Cochrane, and Freeman.

Prior to the referendum many wheat State Members of Congress began to work on a constructive alternative to the administration's "rule or ruin" plan. After the referendum's defeat, over 50 wheat bills were introduced in Congress, but up to the present time the administration has remained adamant in refusing to consider remedial wheat legislation while preferring to let the wheat farmer "stew in his own juice."

The reason most often cited by the Secretary is that wheat farmers are divided on a program. That argument, however, did not dissuade the Secretary from pushing the 40-year-old, oft rejected, two-price wheat plan through Congress and to a referendum where farmers in only five States found it acceptable.

LIVESTOCK VENDETTA

The administration's displeasure with wheat farmers as a result of the referendum is mild compared to the continuing vendetta it is carrying out against livestock farmers.

Let us recall for just one moment that the livestock industry is, by far, free from government control and subsidy. It has historically been the bulwark of opposition to the fancy control schemes of the New Frontier.

Among other things here are some of the things the administration has been doing to livestock farmers.

First. This administration proposed in 1961 that there be hen, heifer, and hog quotas.

Do you remember section 360(a) of H.R. 6400, the administration's 1961 farm proposal?

It provided:

SUBTITLE C—MARKETING QUOTAS

Part VII—Marketing quotas for specified agricultural commodities

Sec. 360(a). This part covers any agricultural commodity including but not limited to the following: corn, tobacco, wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, barley, oats, rye, grain sorghums, flaxseed, soybeans, dry edible beans, grass seeds, vegetables (including potatoes), fruits, tree nuts and seeds, hogs, cattle, lamb, chicken, turkeys, whole milk, butterfat, eggs, hops, honey, and gum naval stores. Any regional or market classification, type or grade of any agricultural commodity covered by this part may be treated as a separate commodity hereunder.

Happily, this provision was rejected by Congress.

Second. Do you remember section 440 of H.R. 10010, the administration's 1962 farm proposal?

It provided:

SUBTITLE C—DAIRY

Reports and records

Sec. 440. Each first processor and producer shall keep such records for such period of time and shall make such reports as the Secretary shall prescribe for the purposes of this subtitle. The Secretary is hereby authorized to examine such records and any other records, accounts, documents, and other papers which he has reason to believe are relevant for the purposes of this subtitle and which are in the custody or control of such first processor or producer. Any person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by the Secretary, pursuant to this subtitle, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$2,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Happily, this provision too was rejected by Congress, but a proposal to imprison a dairy farmer in a Federal penitentiary for failing to keep a record or for refusing to let a Federal official snoop about his personal records or any other material deemed relevant by the Secretary would seem preposterous had it not been recommended by the President of the United States.

Third. Do you remember H.R. 6491 and H.R. 7154, the administration's 1963 proposals on land retirement?

These bills would have removed the \$10 million ceiling on the cropland conversion program and allowed unrestrained grazing of new cropland as well as on the formerly idle land coming out of the cropland reserve program. Needless to say, this would mean a severe hardship for all livestock farmers if Government subsidized grazing were allowed.

Fourth. Do you realize the extent of livestock imports at this time?

Four hundred and eighty-one million dollars' worth of meat products were imported into the United States in 1962, and 1963 imports are running at the same high rate.

Imports of boneless beef and veal, for example, have risen from 88 million pounds in 1957 to 819 million pounds in 1962—an increase of 1,000 percent. The October 28 issue of the USDA publication, "Foreign Agriculture," also shows these figures for 1963:

U.S. imports of red meat in the January–August period of 1963 totaled 929 million pounds, up 18 percent from the same period last year.

U.S. imports of boneless beef, the major category, rose by 20 percent to 605 million pounds, and those of canned meat by about 50 percent to 75 million pounds.

Nine ships left Australia during the month of September, with 27,301,120 pounds of beef, 403,200 pounds of mutton, 51,520 pounds of lamb, and 24,640 pounds of variety meats, to the United States.

Meat shipments to the United States from New Zealand totaled 203 million pounds in the 11-month period beginning October 1, 1962. Beef and veal accounted for 94 percent of these shipments.

Many livestock producers wish that the administration would devote as much effort to control harmful and excessive imports as it does to controlling the American farmer.

In spite of this serious situation nothing is being done to stop it.

Fifth. Do you remember the chicken war in the European Common Market? That is still going on and we are losing it. The Europeans have made no real concessions and they have, in fact, raised U.S. pork levies from 9.5 to 20 percent ad valorem and have raised U.S. lard duties from 1.6 cents a pound to 4.6 cents a pound, thus substantially reducing these exports to Europe.

I am sorry to see the hostile attitude that this administration has against the livestock industry which is of such prime importance to our Nation's agriculture.

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

The farm program is heading for a fall unless something is done to bring it back into sensible perspective. The pure and simple fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the present crazy-quilt price support and control program held together by Mr. Freeman was born in depression, matured in war and is now in a faltering position.

The change from rural to urban dominance of both the national Congress and the State legislatures is becoming more and more pronounced.

If farmers of the 1960's and 1970's are going to continue to provide Americans and the world with food and fiber, a new concept of abundance must be formed.

We must forget the foolishness that the New Frontier espouses on agriculture. Ski lifts and snow machines financed by subsidized Government loans, 31 farms for every U.S. Department of Agriculture bureaucrat, and only 140 acres out of a 140,000-acre cropland conversion program sold to the public as a recreation activity are but a few of the wastes and extravagances that must be curtailed if the general public and the Congress are ever to look on farm programs as something more than a multi-billion-dollar boondoggle.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I call upon all segments and shades of opinion within the agricultural community to give immediate attention to a sound and rational farm program. The Kennedy administration, having complete control of Congress, has the votes to bring this about. The responsibility for the enactment of sound and realistic farm programs, therefore, should be placed where it belongs.