SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1954

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Clyde H. Freed, Jr., D. D., minister, the First Baptist Church, Williamsburg, Ky., offered the following prayer:

Unto Thee, eternal God and Heavenly Father, we lift our hearts to Thee to ask that Thy profoundest blessing rest upon these who stand in places of leadership within our land. May Thy blessings be manifest upon our Nation as they have been in years past. May we as citizens and leaders be keenly conscious and aware that we as a nation are what we are by Thy goodness and mercy; and that good government comes not by might nor power, nor atomic weapons, but from Thee.

Even as our Nation stands at the crossroads of decisions of destiny, we pray that these our leaders may be led aright. Even as we pray for these, our leaders, we would pray for those who lead in other nations that the day may come when the hearts of men may be governed by peace.

These things we ask in the name of Thy Son, who came to this earth to show us the pathway of peace and the way of eternal life and abundant living. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 4, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 46. An act for the relief of E. S. Berney;

S. 555. An act for the relief of Charles W. Gallagher;

S. 1702. An act for the relief of Emilia Pavan;

S. 2147. An act for the relief of Terrence Waller;

S. 2553. An act for the relief of Joseph V. Crimi, father of the minor child, Joseph Crimi;

S. 2693. An act for the relief of Robert Lee Williams;

S. 3245. An act to provide emergency credit; and

S. 3303. An act granting to Basic Management, Inc., a private corporation organized under the laws of the State of Nevada, certain public lands of the United States in the State of Nevada.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 16. An act to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees;

S. 541. An act to extend detention benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948 to employees of contractors with the United States; and

S. 2266. An act for the relief of Walter P. Sylvester.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 92) favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 267) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy relative to the contribution of atomic energy to medicine, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3520. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erna Rosita Pont (formerly Erna Rosita Michel);

H. R. 3566. An act for the relief of Pimen Maximovitch Safronov;

H. R. 3750. An act for the relief of Inge Beckmann;

H. R. 3869. An act for the relief of Gilbert Elkanah Richards, Adelaide Gertrude Richards, and Anthony Gilbert Richards;

H. R. 3874. An act for the relief of Roberto Johnson;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Alberto D'Agliano;

H. R. 4185. An act for the relief of John G. Zeros;

H. R. 4426. An act for the relief of Andrea Paulette Quatrehomme and her child;

H. R. 4437. An act for the relief of Louise Rank;

H. R. 4581. An act for the relief of Solomon Joseph Sadakne;

H. R. 4815. An act for the relief of Alexander Petsche;

H. R. 4866. An act for the relief of George S. Ridner;

H. R. 5119. An act for the relief of Augusta Oppacher Bialek;

H. R. 5125. An act for the relief of the estate of Mateo Ortiz Vazquez, deceased;

H. R. 5193. An act for the relief of Dr. Jalal Elahi;

H. R. 5319. An act for the relief of Henry (also known as Heinrich) Schor, Sally (also known as Sali) Schor, and Gita (also known as Gitta Aviva) Schor;

H. R. 5459. An act for the relief of Takeko Ishiki;

H. R. 5553. An act for the relief of Dr. Lu Jen-hung;

H. R. 5586. An act for the relief of Constantine Nitsas;

H. R. 5807. An act for the relief of Mary Rose and Mrs. Alcie Rose Spittler;

H. R. 5841. An act for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow;

H. R. 6149. An act for the relief of Ekea Jahns;

H. R. 6324. An act for the relief of Orlando Lucarini;

H. R. 6355. An act for the relief of Elena Scarpetti Savelli;

H. R. 6367. An act for the relief of Nobu Nogawa Nitta;

H. R. 6442. An act for the relief of Tamiko Fujiwara;

H. R. 6451. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Utah to the occupants of the land;

H. R. 6492. An act for the relief of Rodolfo Navarro;

H. R. 6498. An act for the relief of Elfriede Lina Avitable, nee Roser;

H. R. 6526. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Parrish;

H. R. 6697. An act for the relief of J. B. Phipps;

H. R. 6752. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Giuseppa De Lisa Quagliano;

H. R. 6762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irmgard (Chrapko) Broughman;

H. R. 6978. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui);

H. R. 7053. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Stiegler Lewis;

H. R. 7093. An act for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co.;

H. R. 7099. An act for the relief of Eugene Spitzer;

H. R. 7217. An act for the relief of Astor Vergata;

H. R. 7243. An act for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh;

H. R. 7245. An act for the relief of Miss Martha Kantelberg;

H. R. 7246. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi;

H. R. 7352. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sonja Ries Kock;

H. R. 7406. An act for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds;

H. R. 7881. An act to validate a conveyance of certain lands by Southern Pacific Railroad Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to Morgan Hopkins, Inc.;

H. R. 7947. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erika (Hohenleitner) Stapleton;

H. R. 8115. An act for the relief of Tannous Estephan;

H. R. 8244. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Nell Woolgar Allen;

H. R. 8281. An act for the relief of the estate of William B. Rice;

H. R. 8307. An act for the relief of Virginia Hell;

H. R. 8371. An act for the relief of Mrs. Diana P. Kittrell;

H. R. 8554. An act for the relief of Maria M. Khoe;

H. R. 8736. An act to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situate in the county of Kauai, T. H., for school purposes;

H. R. 8859. An act to convey the reversionary interest of the United States in certain lands to the city of Pawnee, Okla.;

H. R. 9029. An act for the relief of Paul James Patrie;

H. R. 9261. An act for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse;

H. R. 9440. An act for the relief of Ingeborg Elizabeth Davis (nee Eisenreider);

H. R. 9512. An act for the relief of Mrs. Franziska (Han) Rigau;

H. R. 9814. An act for the relief of Alfio Capizzi;

H. R. 9844. An act for the relief of Gabriella Sardo;

H. R. 9889. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute an amendatory contract with American Falls Reservoir District No. 2, Idaho, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9962. An act to increase by 5 percent the rates of pension payable to veterans and their dependents; and

H. R. 10067. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Routine business is in order.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of Ernest Paul, of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to old-age insurance, and so forth, which was ordered to lie on the table.

SAFEGUARDING THE RIGHTS OF WISCONSIN LANDOWNERS—TELEGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on August 3, the House passed H. R. 8006, to safeguard the rights of certain landowners in Wisconsin whose title to property has been brought into question by reason of errors in the original survey and grant.

This bill is extremely important to a great many Wisconsin landowners.

I earnestly hope that our colleagues on the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will find it possible to report it promptly to the full Senate for action by the Senate prior to adjournment.

I send to the desk now one of the representative messages which I have received endorsing this bill which, incidentally, had been introduced by my colleague, Representative ALVIN E. O'KONSKI.

I ask unanimous consent that this telegram message from the president of the Oneida County Bar Association, Mr. Walter F. Kaye, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RHINELANDER, WIS., *August 5, 1954.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,

United States Senate:

I, having had long experience with utterly deplorable conditions of all Wisconsin lake frontage titles, ask that before the present Congress adjourns it is imperative that the Senate pass House-approved H. R. 8006 to greatly improve such titles. The bar association, real-estate board, and all public bodies unanimously urge passage now.

WALTER F. KAYE,
President, Oneida County Bar Association.

TELEGRAM FROM WISCONSIN AUTOMOTIVE TRADES ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of a telegram which I have just received from Mr. Louis Milan, executive vice president of the Wisconsin Automotive Trades Association, in which he urges prompt, favorable action on House-approved legislation which auto dealers feel is necessary in order to assure justice for automotive franchise dealers throughout our country.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this telegram be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD and be thereafter referred to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which, I trust, will report to the Senate promptly on this overall issue.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADISON, WIS., *August 5, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building:

House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed automobile antibootlegging bill H. R. 9769. Strongly and sincerely urge that you request bill to be put to vote and vote in favor of passage of H. R. 9769. This legislation essential to orderly and profitable conductance of new car merchandising. On behalf of our 1,800 new car member dealers we respectfully ask your support. This bill is companion bill of S. 3596. These duplicate bills urgently needed regardless of action of Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on resolutions calling for sweeping investigation in factories and dealer relations.

LOUIS MILAN,
Executive Vice President, Wisconsin Automotive Trades Association.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KUCHEL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 3708. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell and convey certain Parker-Davis transmission facilities and related property in the States of Arizona and California, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2217).

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H. R. 4118. A bill to authorize the preparation of rolls of persons of Indian blood whose ancestors were members of certain tribes or bands in the State of Oregon, and to provide for per capita distribution of funds arising from certain judgments in favor of such tribes or bands (Rept. No. 2219).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 8897. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer 40 acres of land in the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Mont., to School District No. 6, Rosebud County, Mont. (Rept. No. 2220).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 3570. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands situated in Utah (Rept. No. 2221).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 9821. A bill to amend titles 18 and 28 of the United States Code (Rept. No. 2223).

By Mr. DWORSHAK, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H. R. 6814. A bill to facilitate the acquisition of non-Federal land within areas of the National Park System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2224).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 3774. A bill to extend the benefits of the Watershed and Flood Prevention Act to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico (Rept. No. 2218).

AMENDMENTS TO RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT, RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT, AND RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 7840) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and I submit a report (No. 2222) thereon, together with the views of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I request that the report be printed, including the minority views of the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the report will be printed as requested by the Senator from Kentucky.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3840. A bill for the relief of Klyce Motors, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3841. A bill for the relief of Hildegard L. Schlang and her minor child, Norma Jean Schlang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 3842. A bill for the relief of Andraes Kafarakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1954—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARTHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 345 OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1951

Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. FERGUSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 6440) to amend section 345 of the Revenue Act of 1951, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1954—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARTHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3052) to encourage a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3052, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LEHMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3052, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3520. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erna Rosita Pont (formerly Erna Rosita Michel);

H. R. 3566. An act for the relief of Pimen Maximovitch Safronov;

H. R. 3750. An act for the relief of Inge Beckmann;

H. R. 3869. An act for the relief of Gilbert Elkanah Richards, Adelaide Gertrude Richards, and Anthony Gilbert Richards;

H. R. 3874. An act for the relief of Roberto Johnson;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Alberto D'Agliano;

H. R. 4185. An act for the relief of John G. Zeros;

H. R. 4426. An act for the relief of Andrea Paulette Quatrehomme and her child;

H. R. 4437. An act for the relief of Louise Rank;

H. R. 4581. An act for the relief of Solomon Joseph Sadakne;

H. R. 4815. An act for the relief of Alexander Petsche;

H. R. 4866. An act for the relief of George S. Ridner;

H. R. 5119. An act for the relief of Augusta Oppacher Bialek;

H. R. 5125. An act for the relief of the estate of Mateo Ortiz Vazquez, deceased;

H. R. 5193. An act for the relief of Dr. Jalal Elahi;

H. R. 5319. An act for the relief of Henry (also known as Heinrich) Schor, Sally (also known as Sali) Schor, and Gita (also known as Gitta Aviva) Schor;

H. R. 5459. An act for the relief of Takeko Ishiki;

H. R. 5553. An act for the relief of Dr. Lu Jen-hung;

H. R. 5586. An act for the relief of Constantine Nitsas;

H. R. 5807. An act for the relief of Mary Rose and Mrs. Alcie Rose Spittler;

H. R. 5841. An act for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow;

H. R. 6149. An act for the relief of Ekea Jahns;

H. R. 6324. An act for the relief of Orlando Lucarini;

H. R. 6355. An act for the relief of Elena Scarpetti Savelli;

H. R. 6367. An act for the relief of Nobu Nogawa Nitta;

H. R. 6442. An act for the relief of Tamiko Fujiwara;

H. R. 6492. An act for the relief of Rodolfo Navarro;

H. R. 6498. An act for the relief of Elfriede Lina Avitable, nee Roser;

H. R. 6526. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the eastern district of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Parrish;

H. R. 6697. An act for the relief of J. B. Phipps;

H. R. 6752. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Giuseppa De Lisa Quagliano;

H. R. 6762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irmgard (Chrapko) Broughman;

H. R. 6978. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui);

H. R. 7053. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Stiegler Lewis;

H. R. 7093. An act for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co.;

H. R. 7099. An act for the relief of Eugene Spitzer;

H. R. 7217. An act for the relief of Astor Vergata;

H. R. 7243. An act for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh;

H. R. 7245. An act for the relief of Miss Martha Kantelberg;

H. R. 7246. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi;

H. R. 7352. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sonja Ries Kock;

H. R. 7406. An act for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds;

H. R. 7947. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erika (Hohenleitner) Stapleton;

H. R. 8115. An act for the relief of Tannous Estephan;

H. R. 8244. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Nell Woolgar Allen;

H. R. 8281. An act for the relief of the estate of William B. Rice;

H. R. 8307. An act for the relief of Virginia Hell;

H. R. 8371. An act for the relief of Mrs. Diana P. Kittrell;

H. R. 8554. An act for the relief of Maria M. Khoe;

H. R. 9029. An act for the relief of Paul James Patrie;

H. R. 9261. An act for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse;

H. R. 9440. An act for the relief of Ingeborg Elizabeth Davis (nee Eisenreider);

H. R. 9512. An act for the relief of Mrs. Franziska (Han) Rigau;

H. R. 9814. An act for the relief of Alfio Capizzi;

H. R. 9844. An act for the relief of Gabriella Sardo; and

H. R. 10067. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6451. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Utah to the occupants of the land;

H. R. 7881. An act to validate a conveyance of certain lands by Southern Pacific Railroad Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to Morgan Hopkins, Inc.;

H. R. 8736. An act to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situate in the county of Kauai, T. H., for school purposes;

H. R. 8859. An act to convey the reversionary interest of the United States in certain lands to the city of Pawnee, Okla.; and

H. R. 9889. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute an amendatory contract with American Falls Reservoir District No. 2, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9962. An act to increase by 5 percent the rates of pension payable to veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 267), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy 15,000 additional copies of the hearings held by the said joint committee during the current Congress, relative to the contribution of atomic energy to medicine.

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when that great Marine leader, Gen. John A. Lejeune, holder of the highest decorations his Government could bestow for military valor, was Superintendent of the Virginia Military Institute, he said at VMI, "We teach no ism except patriotism." That principle has characterized the training at VMI throughout its long and illustrious history.

From the time of the unfortunate War Between the States down to the present time VMI has furnished to the Nation more outstanding military leaders than any school in the Nation with the exception of the United States Military Academy.

Since 1908 I have lived in the shadows of VMI, and I have known many of the men whom VMI has graduated during that period. One of the brightest of them was Frank McCarthy, of Richmond, who was a colonel in the Army during World War II, and the personal aide of the then Chief of Staff, George C. Marshall. After retiring from military service, Col. Frank McCarthy went to Europe as the representative of a number of motion picture companies interested in expanding their markets abroad. At the present time he is with a large movie company in Los Angeles.

This morning I received from him a telegram, which I shall now read to the Senate with my full endorsement and strong approval:

DEAR WILLIS: The President's comments on General Marshall today were magnificent. I wonder whether you would consider giving them your public endorsement in order to remind General Marshall that we Virginians and particularly we Lexingtonians hold him and will always hold him in highest regard for the matchless services he has rendered us all. Best to you and Mrs. Robertson.

FRANK MCCARTHY.

WINDFALL PROFITS UNDER FHA LOANS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today I shall incorporate in the RECORD a report showing how 8 individuals formed 4 corporations with the total amount of

initial capital investment for all 4 corporations being $4,000. They then obtained 4 FHA mortgages amounting to $8,826,400. According to the FHA records, the total construction cost of these 4 projects was $7,772,046, leaving a windfall profit for the 8 individuals on their initial $4,000 investment of $1,054,345, of which amount $762,654.53 was distributed.

I shall also incorporate in the RECORD a breakdown of the investment of each stockholder in the different corporations, along with their proportionate share of the distribution of the $762,654.53 windfall profits as made on July 26, 1952.

The 4 projects to which I refer were constructed in Columbus, Ohio, under the name of the Beverly Manor Apartments. These 4 projects contain respectively, 264, 550, 264, and 264 units, or a total of 1,342. Mr. Don Loftus appears as the president of each of the 4 corporations. Each corporation was organized with 200 shares of common stock, $5 par value, representing a capitalization of $1,000. Each company had 100 shares of preferred stock, $1 par value. The preferred stock was all issued to the FHA.

The FHA furnished a list of the stockholders in each of these corporations, as follows:

Stockholders	Number of shares ($5 par)	Investment
Don Loftus, trustee	100	$500.00
Don Loftus, president	25	125.00
D. E. Ryan	12½	62.50
Jack F. Chrysler	20	100.00
Webster R. Robinson	10	50.00
Cyril J. Ryan	12½	62.50
Helen Robinson	15	75.00
Webster R. Robinson, Jr	5	25.00
Total	200	1,000.00

With his 25-share interest in each of the four corporations, the total cost of which was $500, Mr. Don Loftus received $95,331.82 as his share of distributed windfall profits.

In addition to Mr. Loftus' personal account, as above, he held 100 shares in each corporation, under his name as trustee. This trustee account represented an investment of $500 in each corporation, or a total investment of $2,000. This trust account received as its share of distributed windfall profits, on its $2,000 investment, a total of $381,327.27.

D. E. Ryan owned 12½ shares in each of the four companies, representing a total investment in all four companies of $250. He collected as his share of distributed windfall profits $47,665.91.

Jack F. Chrysler owned 20 shares in each of the four companies, his total investment being $400. His share of the distributed windfall profits amounted to $76,265.45.

Walter R. Robinson had 10 shares or $50 invested in each company, representing a total investment of $200. His windfall dividend was $38,132.73.

Cyril J. Ryan owned 12½ shares in each company, at $5 a share. His investment in each company was $62.50, or a total of $250. On this $250 investment he collected $47,665.90 windfall profits.

Helen Robinson owned 15 shares in each of the four companies, representing a total investment of $300. She collected $57,199.10.

Walter R. Robinson, Jr., was assigned five shares, representing an investment of $25 in each company, or a $100 total investment. His four windfall distributions totaled $19,066.35.

After distributing the windfall profits as described above in the amounts of $762,654.53, the company still had remaining undistributed windfall profits approximating another fourth of a million dollars.

Another significant point which should be emphasized in relation to these overvalued projects is that not only did the sponsors reap over three-fourths of a million dollars in windfall profits, but also it must be remembered that with these projects, financed by the Government at from 111 percent to 114 percent of their cost, the tenants of these apartment houses will, during the years of the amortization of this mortgage, be required to pay increased rentals ranging from 11 percent to 14 percent.

I now ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, certain letters from the FHA substantiating this report, along with a breakdown of the distribution by stockholders and by projects.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1954.

Mr. NORMAN P. BOWSER,
Acting Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWSER: I have been advised that in Columbus, Ohio, a large rental apartment unit was constructed by Mr. Don Loftis, Mr. D. E. Ryan, Mr. Jack Chrysler, and Mr. Robinson, with the loan being insured by the Prudential Life Insurance Co.

Will you please furnish me with the complete details on this project; that is:

1. The number of units.
2. The date and the total amount of each loan.
3. The present status of the loans.
4. The total amount of investment by the owners in the project.
5. The percentage of the loan in relation to the cost.
6. The total cost of the project.
7. The cost of the land both to the project and to the participants when originally purchased, if different.
8. The amount of the so-called windfall profits and the dates of distribution.

Yours, sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Under date of June 1, 1954, I advised you that an analysis of our records was being undertaken in order to provide you with the information requested in your letter of May 14. The information we have been able to develop follows:

1. The development to which you refer consists of the 4 projects identified above which contain respectively 264, 550, 264, and 264 units, or a total of 1,342.

2. The mortgage notes were all dated September 1, 1950, and the amounts were:

Project No.:	
043-42105	$1,742,400
043-42106	3,630,000
043-42107	1,726,500
043-42115	1,727,500
Total	8,826,400

3. According to our records the loans are current in all respects.

4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. As you know an investigation of the section 608 program under which these mortgages were insured is now being conducted by Administrator Cole of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The investigative staff working under the supervision of Mr. William F. McKenna, Deputy Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency might be in a position to answer these questions and I would suggest that you may wish to get in touch with Mr. McKenna.

I am always glad to hear from you and to be of every possible assistance.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN P. MASON,
Acting Commissioner.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., August 3, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reply to your letter of June 28, 1954, addressed to Mr. William F. McKenna, requesting certain information regarding the construction of Beverly Manor Apartments in Columbus, Ohio. You have indicated that answers have been received from Mr. Norman P. Mason, Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, to questions 1, 2, and 3, of your letter of May 14, 1954, to Mr. Mason.

The following data is submitted in response to the remaining questions 4 to 8, inclusive:

Question 4:

"The total amount of investment by the owners in the project."

The development consisted of four projects, for each of which a separate corporation was formed. The authorized capital stock for each corporation was 200 shares of common stock at $5 par value, and 100 shares of preferred stock at $1 par value. All of the preferred stock was issued to FHA. Since all of the stock was issued, it is indicated that a total of $4,000 was the initial capital investment by the stockholders, exclusive of FHA, for all four corporations.

The minutes of the first meetings of the boards of directors indicate that in addition to the purchase of stock by the stockholders, the following sums, from sources not shown, had been advanced to each corporation for the purchase of land and other organization purposes:

043-42105	$85,000
043-42106	170,000
043-42107	75,000
043-42115	85,000
Total	415,000

Questions 5, 6, and 8:

5. "The percentage of the loan in relation to the cost."

6. "The total cost of the project."

8. "The amount of the so-called 'windfall' profits and the dates of distribution."

Project	Mortgage	Cost	Mortgaging out	Percent loan/cost
043-42105	$1,742,400	$1,519,612	$222,788	114.1
043-42106	3,630,000	3,163,872	466,128	114.7
043-42107	1,726,500	1,543,370	183,130	111.8
043-42115	1,727,500	1,545,192	182,308	111.7
Total	8,826,400	7,772,046	1,054,345	

Distribution to stockholders was made by each of the corporations on July 26, 1952, in the following amounts:

043-42105	$169,216.95
043-42106	332,539.58
043-42107	126,911.56
043-42115	133,986.44
Total	762,654.53

Question 7:

"The cost of the land both to the project and to the participants when originally purchased, if different."

The land was purchased from Don A. Loftus Associates, Inc., which was also the building contractor. Don A. Loftus was president of both Don A. Loftus Associates, Inc., and the Beverly Manor projects. The cost of the land to Don A. Loftus Associates, Inc., is not known. The following table shows the cost of the land to the Beverly Manor projects and the FHA estimates:

Project	Cost	FHA estimate
043-42105	$18,550	$34,725
043-42106	32,710	61,000
043-42107	14,550	27,350
043-42115	14,690	27,625
Total	80,500	150,700

I am pleased to be of assistance in providing the above information.

Sincerely yours,

AL COLE,
Administrator.

Project No. 043-42105

Mortgage	$1,742,400
Cost	$1,519,612
Mortgaging out	$222,788
Percent, loan/cost	114.1
Distribution to stockholders	$169,216.95

Date of distribution: July 26, 1952.

Stockholders	Number of shares	Investment ($5 par)	Profits distribution
Don Loftus, trustee	100	$500.00	$84,608.48
Don Loftus, president	25	125.00	21,152.12
D. E. Ryan	12½	62.50	10,576.06
Jack F. Chrysler	20	100.00	16,921.69
Webster R. Robinson	10	50.00	8,460.84
Cyril J. Ryan	12½	62.50	10,576.06
Helen Robinson	15	75.00	12,691.27
Webster R. Robinson, Jr	5	25.00	4,230.43
Total	200	1,000.00	169,216.95

Project No. 043-42106

Mortgage	$3,630,000
Cost	$3,163,872
Mortgaging out	$466.128
Percent loan/cost	114.7
Distribution to stockholders	$332,539.58

Date of distribution: July 26, 1952

Stockholders	Number of shares	Investment ($5 par)	Profits distribution
Don Loftus, trustee	100	$500.00	$166,269.79
Don Loftus, president	25	125.00	41,567.45
D. E. Ryan	12½	62.50	20,783.73
Jack F. Chrysler	20	100.00	33,253.96
Webster R. Robinson	10	50.00	16,626.98
Cyril J. Ryan	12½	62.50	20,783.72
Helen Robinson	15	75.00	24,940.47
Webster R. Robinson, Jr	5	25.00	8,313.48
Total	200	1,000.00	332,539.58

Project No. 043-42107

Mortgage	$1,726,500
Cost	$1,543,370
Mortgaging out	$183,130
Percent loan/cost	111.8
Distribution to stockholders	$126,911.56

Date of distribution: July 26, 1952.

Stockholders	Number of shares	Investment ($5 par)	Profits distribution
Don Loftus, trustee	100	$500.00	$63,455.78
Don Loftus, president	25	125.00	15,863.95
D. E. Ryan	12½	62.50	7,931.97
Jack F. Chrysler	20	100.00	12,691.15
Webster R. Robinson	10	50.00	6,345.58
Cyril J. Ryan	12½	62.50	7,931.97
Helen Robinson	15	75.00	9,518.38
Webster R. Robinson, Jr	5	25.00	3,172.78
Total	200	1,000.00	126,911.56

Project No. 043-42115

Mortgage	$1,727,500
Cost	$1,545,192
Mortgaging out	$182,308
Percent loan/cost	111.7
Distribution to stockholders	$133,986.44

Date of distribution: July 26, 1952.

Stockholders	Number of shares	Investment ($5 par)	Profits distribution
Don Loftus, trustee	100	$500.00	$66,993.22
Don Loftus, president	25	125.00	16,748.30
D. E. Ryan	12½	62.50	8,374.15
Jack F. Chrysler	20	100.00	13,398.65
Webster R. Robinson	10	50.00	6,699.33
Cyril J. Ryan	12½	62.50	8,374.15
Helen Robinson	15	75.00	10,048.98
Webster R. Robinson, Jr	5	25.00	3,349.66
Total	200	1,000.00	133,986.44

OPPOSITION TO ANTISEGREGATION ACTIVITIES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on Wednesday, July 14, 1954, the Honorable Hugh G. Grant, former member of the staff of the State Department and United States Minister to Albania, made a very fine address on the subject of racial segregation, in addressing the Lions International, at Birmingham, Ala.

On May 17, 1954, Mr. Grant sent a telegram to one Hugo L. Black, an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Mr. Grant at one time was secretary to Justice Black when Justice Black was a States' rights Democrat and southerner; that was after the time when he was a member in good standing of the Ku Klux Klan and was one of the leaders of the Ku Klux Klan in Alabama, and at that time was a racial and religious bigot of the first order.

I ask unanimous consent that the telegram from his former secretary to Associate Justice Black be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

AUGUSTA, GA., *May 17, 1954.*

The Honorable HUGO L. BLACK,
Associate Justice, United States Supreme Court, Washington, D. C.:

It is incomprehensible to me that you, a native Alabamian and a stanch supporter of States' rights when you were elected to the United States Senate by the white people of Alabama, could join in the political and, in my judgment, unconstitutional Supreme Court decree against segregation of the races in the public schools of the States. I am sure a way will be found to circumvent the enforcement of the Court's decree, and I will join the forces working toward this end.

HUGH G. GRANT.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in the very able address delivered by Mr. Grant, he suggested that the people set up in each county, and, in particular, in Jefferson County, Alabama, where the city of Birmingham is located, a county-wide organization to preserve their liberties under the Constitution of the United States. I think a county-wide organization in Jefferson County, Ala., is inadequate, Mr. President.

I should like to say that in the month of September, a nationwide organization will be set up to promote an amendment to the Constitution to curb the power of the Supreme Court and to return to the genius of the American system of government, which is local government, by the people of the communities, of their own local affairs. This organization will fight the NAACP, the CIO, the Americans for Democratic Action, and other left-wing groups which are attempting to destroy racial segregation in the South. In fact, the organization will be set up on a nationwide basis, and will make a fight to retain the present culture and institutions of the people of the South.

I ask unanimous consent that the very fine address delivered by Mr. Grant be printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY HUGH G. GRANT

Mr. President, members of Lions International of Birmingham, fellow Alabamians, it is a great privilege for me to return to the city where I was born and reared and where I received my early education. I regard it as a very high honor to be invited to address this distinguished group of business and professional men of Birmingham. Returning to my native city I would like to indulge in some reminiscences but time does not permit it. I must get on with my talk on a subject which poses the gravest problem that has confronted the people of Alabama and the South since the tragic days of Reconstruction. Our civilization, as developed by our forbears through centuries of struggle, has been placed in jeopardy by the action of nine black-robed men constituting the United States Supreme Court.

On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court declared that racial segregation in the public schools of the Nation is unconstitutional. A week later the Court rendered other decisions which in effect extend the ban on segregation. In reaching these decisions the Court threw to the 4 winds 5 previous Supreme Court decisions, 13 Federal Court decisions, and 59 State Court decisions covering more than half a century. In effect the Supreme Court declared a new national social policy of racial integration on the basis of certain dubious psychological and social concepts rather than on the basis of law and the Constitution. James Reston, well known correspondent for the New York Times, reporting from Washington, on the day of the decision outlawing public school segregation, declared that: "The Court's opinion read more like a paper on sociology than a Supreme Court decision."

The Court decision of May 17 emphasized so-called moral and sociological factors more than legal arguments. In fact the only legal basis for the decision outlawing segregation in the public schools of 17 States is the 14th amendment to the Constitution under the equal-protection clause. But the 14th amendment, in the opinion of many legal authorities, is itself unconstitutional since it was ratified through fraud and coercion. First rejected by all of the Southern States except Tennessee in 1866, it was finally ratified in 1868 while the South was

under rigid military rule with its white citizens disfranchised and Negroes and carpetbaggers in control of the State legislatures.

The southern white people successfully resisted the effort of the radical Republicans in the Congress to destroy their civilization and finally regained control of their State and local governments. The pattern of racial segregation was confirmed in the famous Louisiana case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* in 1896, the separate but equal doctrine in racial relationship being definitely established. Since that ruling the Supreme Court has applied the separate but equal doctrine in six cases relating to public education. Pursuant to the doctrine of separate but equal facilities the Southern States, despite the heavy burden imposed upon them by low taxpaying Negro citizens, have made tremendous efforts in recent years to improve Negro education. It is significant that the South today spends 3 percent of its budget for schools as compared with 2.5 percent for the rest of the Nation.

As Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, pointed out, "The Supreme Court in its segregation ruling has usurped the legislative powers of the Congress and of the legislatures of the separate States." The plain fact is that the Court has attacked the principle of States rights, nullifying not only laws and regulations dealing with the local affairs of the people but also abrogating vital sections of State constitutions.

As Editor Bob Parks, of the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, one of the oldest daily newspapers in the United States, having been established in 1787, declared editorially: "If the Supreme Court—on the question of segregation—can nullify the State Constitutions abrogating the rights of the States (reserved to them specifically in both the Articles of Confederation and the ratification of the Constitution of the United States) then the Court can further destroy the foundations of representative government in future decisions dealing with matters other than integrating the races in the schools."

The Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in the public schools is political in character and should be dealt with as such by the people in the States affected by the decree. It is my belief that the Court decision is itself a violation of the Constitution of the United States and therefore the people are fully justified in adopting methods designed to circumvent the decree. As an American citizen who believes strongly that the people of each of the 48 States of the Union have the right under the Constitution of the United States to establish and maintain, as they see fit, their educational and social systems, I have no qualms on this score.

I have no desire to be personal in my remarks, but the action of the three southern members of the Supreme Court, including an Alabamian, gave me a very great shock. I refer to Associate Justices Reed of Kentucky, Clark of Texas, and Black of Alabama. It so happens that after the Alabama senatorial election in November 1926, I was invited by Senator-elect Hugo Black to accompany him to Washington as his assistant. I had been personally acquainted with Hugo Black for several years. I remained with him during his first term in the Senate. I knew him as a defender of States' rights, with a fear of Federal encroachment on the affairs of the people of the States. Justice Black's participation in the decision of May 17, 1954, outlawing segregation in the public schools, is therefore incomprehensible to me—so much so that on the day of the decision I sent him a telegram followed by a letter of protest.

In all candor it seems to me that Senator EASTLAND of Mississippi, addressing the Senate on May 27, on the subject of the Court decree, sized up the situation when he declared that the Court has been "indoctrinated and brainwashed by left-wing pressure groups."

Let us take a brief look at some aspects of the long and insidious propaganda campaign for the end of segregation which has been carried on by a minority group in this country. Spearheading the campaign has been the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People which was organized back in 1909. Its headquarters are in New York City. Among its foremost leaders are colored men, many of whom are more white than Negro. Walter White, executive secretary of the association over a long period of years, is of this type. Thurgood Marshall, special counsel for the NAACP, who argued the case against segregation before the Supreme Court, is another. These men and their kind are desirous of mixing and mingling freely with members of the white race on a basis of complete social equality involving every phase of life in the United States. One can understand their deep-seated emotions, but the welfare of society cannot be sacrificed for a group of frustrated individuals. I cannot bring myself to believe that the rank and file of pure-blooded Negroes regard these colored individuals as their true representatives.

Some years ago while I was a member of the Alabama State Department of Education, here in Montgomery, I had several interesting contacts with the late Dr. Robert R. Moton, president of Tuskegee Institute for Negroes and successor to the founder of the institute, Booker T. Washington. I recall vividly one particular conversation. Dr. Moton, a fine looking pure-blooded Negro, told me that he took pride in the fact that he was a member of the Negro race, that his ambition was to make a contribution toward the development of his race here in America. Dr. Moton said he believed strongly that the best way to accomplish this was through segregation which would enable the Negro to develop his own talents and capabilities, through competition with his own kind. He added that he had no desire for social equality with the white people.

In recent years the NAACP has become a powerful political organization. It has more than 1,600 branches in 44 States, the District of Columbia and the Territory of Hawaii. It is heavily financed with a combined (legal fund) annual budget of $500,000. The NAACP has set 1963, the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, as a target date for complete racial equality in every walk of life in the United States.

The objectives include employment under FEPC coercion, housing, education, voting, transportation facilities, hotels, recreation facilities, theaters, etc. Furthermore, according to the Congressional Quarterly published in Washington, the NAACP is now working in field units to build up a bloc of 3 million Negro voters in the Southern States by the 1956 presidential election. A youth movement in colleges and universities is also being organized across the country. A church project designed to increase cooperation between the NAACP in all denominations and in social work is under way. It is anticipated that the NAACP will also attack the laws of a number of States banning intermarriage between the races.

The NAACP has been materially aided in its campaign by influential white organizations and individuals. Among these are the so-called intellectual liberals, such as Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who says sorrowfully that she has been greatly embarrassed as a delegate to the United Nations because of the segregation system in the United States. The so-called Southern Conference for Human Welfare is one of the organizations aggressively interested in opposing segregation. This organization has been charged with being a notorious Communist-front organization.

There is a strong belief in certain responsible circles in this country, based on documentary evidence compiled by congressional committees investigating subversive activities, that the Communists have played an important role, behind the scenes, in the campaign for the elimination of segregation in the United States. This appears to be a part of their subtle technique to weaken this Nation by fomenting internal strife among the American people.

White politicians in both the national Democratic and Republican parties in certain northern population centers have aided the Negro campaigners for the end of segregation—their objective, the Negro vote. The CIO–PAC (Political Action Committee) under the leadership of the late Sidney Hillman, native of Lithuania, with the support of the Negro bloc vote in the large industrial centers, was an important factor in the fourth-term reelection of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1944. President Harry Truman made a big bid for this Negro vote in 1948 by vigorously sponsoring most of the objectives of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, including the notorious FEPC. Among the Republican candidates Gov. Tom Dewey of New York has been regarded by the NAACP as having the best performance on racial issues.

The latest Presidential recruit by the NAACP is President Dwight D. Eisenhower who, according to a recent Life magazine editorial, has done more for the Negroes than any President since Abraham Lincoln. Mr. Eisenhower was quoted as telling the NAACP in Washington a few months ago that, "by and large the mass of Americans want to be decent, good, and just, and don't want to make a difference based on the inconsequential fact of color or race."

I daresay that few of the thousands of southern white people who voted for Mr. Eisenhower for President in 1952 regard racial distinctions as inconsequential.

In the segregation cases the Supreme Court assumed the role as the arm of the executive branch of the Federal Government, since the Court followed, almost to the letter, the advice of the Attorney General, Mr. Herbert Brownell. Invited as a friend of the Court, the Attorney General warned the Court against upholding legislation by the Congress under the 14th amendment in the field of civil rights because of the long line of precedents. Brownell told the Court that it had the judicial power itself to outlaw segregation in the public schools of the States. And that is just what the Supreme Court did in its decision declaring public-school segregation unconstitutional, involving approximately 40 percent of the Nation's public-school children.

It is significant that it was Attorney General Brownell, friend and adviser to the Supreme Court in the segregation cases, who recommended Gov. Earl Warren for Chief Justice following a secret flight to California shortly before the final hearings of the segregation cases last December. The purpose of Brownell's flight, the news of which leaked out, was to consult with Warren in regard to appointment on the Supreme Court. In due time President Eisenhower appointed Governor Warren as Chief Justice, and on May 17, 1954, it was Chief Justice Warren who read the decision of the Court declaring public-school segregation unconstitutional. On May 23, 1954, the New York Times published a special dispatch from Washington giving Chief Justice Warren the credit for bringing about the unanimous opinion of the Court against segregation in the schools.

I pose the question for your consideration: Is it possible that there was an agreement or understanding between Brownell and Warren in this California conference, involving the appointment to the Supreme Court and the then pending segregation cases before the Court? This possible phase of the Warren appointment as Chief Justice should have been thoroughly explored by the Senate

Judiciary Committee before confirmation of the appointment, in my judgment.

I have mentioned above the so-called white intellectual liberals and certain political leaders of both major parties who have given aid and comfort to the Negro agitators for the end of segregation. There are other groups whose numbers cannot be determined accurately. Among these are white church members of several religious denominations who have been led to believe, through subtle propaganda in Sunday school and other religious literature, that racial segregation is a violation of the Christian concept of the brotherhood of man. There is no greater fallacy than this theory, in my judgment. If there is anything in the teachings of Jesus Christ that requires integration of races in a society of people, I am not familiar with it. Race is a biological fact—God-made and not man-made. Its recognition is inescapable. No Supreme Court decree or church committee resolution can eradicate the sharp distinctions between the white and Negro races. I am of the opinion that the church assemblies and conventions which have adopted resolutions upholding the Supreme Court decision against segregation were certainly getting off the reservation of their own jurisdictions and at the same time definitely violating one of the fundamental tenets of the church, namely, "separation of church and State." The Christian people who voted for these resolutions at the Southern Presbyterian Assembly at Montreat, N. C., and a week later at the Southern Baptist Convention at St. Louis, Mo., were motivated by their emotions and not by their mentalities. Unfortunately, these good but misguided people played right into the hands of the Negro propagandists who, in reaching for their objectives, would bring strife and discord between the races and ultimately destroy the racial integrity of both the white and Negro people.

We Southerners are an easygoing unsuspicious people, inclined to be hospitable to the extent of welcoming into our society individuals from other sections of the country whose ideas about race, based on theory, do not coincide with ours. You will find these people in some of our social organizations and on our public school, college, and university faculties. Through their influence many of our Southern young people have been indoctrinated with false theories concerning race which the Negro propagandists are utilizing today in their drive for the breaking down of all color lines and full social equality.

If I held membership on a county board of education or on a board of trustees of a college or university here in Alabama, I would immediately sponsor an investigation of the personnel of these faculties with a view to determining whether or not any of these people are teaching theories that violate our State and local laws relating to racial segregation. People holding such theories should be requested to seek jobs in the States and communities from which they came, where they may theorize on race to their heart's content.

The time has come for the white people of Alabama and other States where segregation is practiced to stand up and be counted on the issue. I know from recent contacts and correspondence that there has been pussyfooting in high places right here in my native State of Alabama. One is either for segregation or against it. There is no middle ground.

Powerful forces are arrayed against the South. The Negro agitators for the end of segregation, with the backing of the Supreme Court and the executive department of the Government, are boastful and defiant. Following the Court decision they held big meetings in Atlanta and in Dallas. They boldly announced that if State officials made any attempts to maintain segregation in the schools they would go into the courts the next day. It is indicated that they are counting on the full support of the Federal Department of Justice headed by Attorney General Herbert Brownell who advised the Supreme Court what to do about school segregation.

We can meet this assault only through counterattack and that must be achieved through effective organization. This organization should be open and above board, with opportunity for public forums, through which the realities of the situation which confront us may be revealed to those who do not comprehend the dangers ahead. There is much more than integration of the races in the public schools involved. The inherent rights of the people of the States to establish and maintain their social order, in accordance with their own laws and customs, is under sharp attack.

Isn't it absurd that at the very moment when American taxpayers are sending billions of dollars around the world to help millions of people to achieve self-determination that nine men, constituting the Supreme Court of the United States, have issued an edict designed to destroy the self-determination of approximately one-third of the people here at home?

Gentlemen, the time has come for the people of Alabama and of the other Southern States to become active, aggressive, and militant in an all-out effort to protect their rights as citizens of a free country. I suggest that the white people of Jefferson County and every other county in Alabama take immediate steps to organize on a countywide basis a States' rights movement with a view to preserving their liberties under the Constitution of the United States.

EXPEDITION TO THE ANTARCTIC

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, by action in executive session a week ago today, the Senate Committee on Armed Services advised the President that it favors an early expedition to the Antarctic to be undertaken under his direction.

The resolution was adopted, Mr. President, as the outgrowth of S. 3381 which I introduced April 29, 1954. A like bill was introduced by Representative THOR TOLLEFSON in the House of Representatives at that time.

Hearings were held on July 1 at which time reports were entered by the Department of the Navy, the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

When the matter was taken up for consideration in executive session last week, further reports were presented to the committee orally, and on my motion, seconded by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, recognizing the immediate need for further exploration on the Antarctic Continent, urges and commends that an expedition be undertaken at the earliest possible date, under the direction of the President, for the purpose of validating the territorial claims of the United States and thereby increasing the security of this Nation, exploring the mineral resources of the area, and accomplishing any possible advancements with respect to mapping surveys and scientific observations.

The committee had been advised that the expedition could be handled as an operation of the executive branch of the Government through the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy thereby avoiding the need for any special legislation or appropriation. It was indicated, however, that the President would welcome an expression of whatever the feeling of the committee was on the subject. Hence, adoption of the resolution, as set forth. It was then transmitted to the President last Saturday by letter of the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

I have made this statement, Mr. President, because of the numerous inquiries that are being received as to what action, if any, would be taken at this session.

The adoption of the resolution as related can be regarded as affirmative action on the purposes of the bill.

My active interest in the Antarctic, Mr. President, began a little over 5 years ago when I chanced to meet then commander, now captain, Finn Ronne who had been in the Antarctic on three expeditions. In 1933–35 he was a member of the second Byrd expedition. In 1939–41, he was second in command of the east base on Palmer Peninsula of the United States Antarctic service expedition and from 1946 to 1948 Captain Ronne organized and conducted the most recent American expedition to the Antarctic.

Captain Ronne's interest in the Antarctic stemmed from early childhood when his father, an officer in the Norwegian Navy, accompanied Capt. Roald Amundsen in his famous dash to the pole.

During the past 5 years there has been a growing interest throughout our country in the possibilities of Antarctic exploration. Reports of Admiral Byrd on his several trips, have indicated that tremendous deposits of coal exist and that the region has many sources of potential wealth for the centuries ahead. Captain Ronne's field operations studies revealed mountains with very definite mineralization. In the current worldwide search for materials of fissionable qualities to overlook the possibilities of the Antarctic would, in my judgment, be to fail the responsibilities of our generation. We would be derelict in our duties if we failed to heed the advice of Admiral Eyrd and Captain Ronne; and, also, if we failed to utilize their resources of experience and knowledge and their proven qualities of leadership.

Yesterday I received, and I presume other Senators received, a copy of three resolutions adopted by the 7,500 delegates to the national convention of the junior chambers of commerce held in June. One of those three resolutions cited the possibilities of the Antarctic and called upon Congress to authorize an expedition. This and other expressions of interest prompted me to make this public statement today—as I know all who have expressed this interest will be glad to know of the affirmative action that has been taken.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a copy of the committee print of the bill, S. 3381, as I proposed to have it adopted by the committee prior to agreement upon the resolution for the advice of the President as set forth, together with an editorial on the subject from the Washington Post

of July 22, 1954, and the resolution adopted by the national convention of the junior chambers of commerce previously mentioned.

There being no objection, the text of the bill, the editorial, and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to provide assistance in accordance with the provisions of this act to the American Antarctic Association, Inc., a nonprofit, scientific organization incorporated under the laws of the State of Maryland, in order to enable such association, in consultation with the Antarctic Advisory Council hereinafter provided for, to carry out an expedition to the Antarctic at an appropriate time between the dates of December 1, 1954, and May 31, 1958, for the purposes of—

(1) advancing the legitimate claims of the United States in the territory and resources of the Antarctic Continent;

(2) determining the mineral and other resources available on such continent;

(3) establishing geodetic control points for the purpose of facilitating the utilization in mapmaking of the aerial photographs taken in the course of the United States Navy Antarctic development project, 1946–47;

(4) making aerial trimetrogon photographs of the unknown portions of the Antarctic Continent for use in making maps of such portions;

(5) exploring unknown portions of such continent; and

(6) making scientific observations and surveys in the Antarctic, including, but not limited to, records of tidal movements, magnetism, gravimetric measurements, and seismology.

SEC. 2. The assistance provided under this act by the President shall be furnished upon such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate in order to assure that the benefits to be derived by the United States from the making of such expedition shall be sufficient to justify any expenditures of public funds, any utilization of the services of Government civilian or military personnel, and any consumption or use of Government property or supplies which he may authorize for the purpose of enabling such expedition to be carried out.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act the President is authorized to—

(1) provide for the transfer to the American Antarctic Association, Inc., for use in connection with such expedition of not to exceed two naval vessels or other Government vessels of the AGB or N3–M–A1 class, of not to exceed four Government aircraft, of such Government motor vehicles and other facilities for surface transportation as may be necessary for transportation of the expedition parties on the Antarctic Continent, and of such related and necessary equipment as may be required for the operation and maintenance of such vessels, aircraft, and facilities for surface transportation;

(2) provide for the use by such association in connection with such expedition of such Government clothing, emergency gear, scientific instruments, cameras, and related equipment, communications equipment, housing, and other supplies and equipment as he may deem necessary for the purposes of the expedition and as he may determine can be loaned for the purposes of such expedition without jeopardizing the national security;

(3) provide for the furnishing to the association for consumption in the course of such expedition, such food, gasoline, oil, and other supplies from Government stocks as he may deem necessary;

(4) provide for the procurement by any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government with funds appropriated pursuant to section 6 of this act and for the furnishing to such association for use or consumption for the purposes of such expedition of any articles, materials, supplies, or equipment which he may determine to be unavailable in, or inadvisable to supply from, Government stocks;

(5) make grants to such association from funds appropriated pursuant to section 6 for such purposes in connection with the furtherance of such expedition as he may deem advisable;

(6) permit Government military and civilian personnel, with their own consent, to accompany and to participate in the activities of such expedition while in a duty status; and

(7) name an Antarctic Advisory Council to advise the American Antarctic Association in its plans for the expedition herein authorized, such advisory council to consist of one representative from each of the following departments or agencies: Department of State, Department of Defense, Department of Commerce, Department of the Interior, Central Intelligence Agency, Atomic Energy Commission, Bureau of the Budget, and National Science Foundation. Members of the Council shall be officials or employees of the department or agency they represent and shall serve without additional compensation. The Director of the National Science Foundation shall serve as the chairman of the Council and shall arrange for meetings of the Council with the directors of the American Antarctic Association in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. The President is authorized to impose as a condition upon the transfer or loan of any vessel, aircraft, vehicle, or equipment under the provisions of this act a requirement that the American Antarctic Association, Inc., deposit with such official of the Government as the President may specify a bond with good and sufficient sureties to guarantee payment to the United States of such nominal charges as may be specified for the use of, and to reimburse the United States for damage to or loss of, any such vessel, aircraft, vehicle, or other equipment.

SEC. 5. The President shall make a full and complete report to the Congress on or before January 31, 1959, drawing on reports and material furnished him by the association on or before July 1, 1958, with respect to the administration of this act and the results and accomplishments of the expedition assisted under its provisions.

SEC. 6. The appropriation of such sums, not in excess of $200,000, as may be necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of this act is hereby authorized.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 22, 1954]

UNITED STATES AND THE ANTARCTIC

The Senate Armed Services Committee will have a last chance today, at the present session of Congress, to start another American expedition rolling toward the Antarctic. Senator CASE will bring up his bill to lend Government vessels, airplanes, supplies, and equipment to the American Antarctic Association, which proposes to send an expedition of 36 men under Capt. Finn Ronne to spend a couple of years in the Gould Bay area. The explorers would give their first attention to mapping a huge unknown region about the size of the United States.

Captain Ronne is an old hand at Antarctic exploration. His father was with Amundsen when he discovered the South Pole in 1911, and Captain Ronne himself has been a member of three expeditions to the frozen polar continent. The most recent American expedition in 1946–48 was under his leadership. Obviously Captain Ronne is well qualified to direct the new venture, and it is merely a question of whether Congress wishes to support the expedition to the extent of lending equipment and authorizing an expenditure of $200,000.

The Antarctic is still a land of mystery, but enough is known about it to indicate that it may have great value in the future. Some coal has been discovered, and a large copper deposit with higher grade ore than that yielded by the great open-cut mine in Utah. Geological exploration is an important part of Captain Ronne's proposal, with the hope that new sources of uranium as well as other minerals may be found.

The United States has never taken an imperialistic attitude toward the Antarctic. In 1948 this country proposed internationalization of the area, but got no favorable response from other interested nations. The State Department is not now proposing to stake out any official claims, but it does recognize the need for continuing exploration by Americans in the frozen continent. Great Britain, Australia, France, Norway, Chile, and Argentina are occupying Antarctic bases and conducting research there. As a means of protecting its interests and adding to general knowledge about the Antarctic, the United States needs to send a competent group of explorers there, and Captain Ronne has offered a reasonable opportunity of doing so.

[Resolution adopted by the national convention of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce in Colorado Springs, June 18, 1954, and transmitted to the Members of the United States House and Senate by E. LaMar Buckner, president, by letter, July 28, 1954]

ANNEXATION OF ANTARCTIC REGIONS AND ECONOMY AND SECURITY

Whereas there exists in the Antarctic region some 6 million square miles of land with natural resources of strategic materials invaluable to the interests, economy, and security of the United States of America, yet unpossessed; and

Whereas while there is an international race to claim this area, no claim has been officially adjudicated by decision of an international tribunal; and

Whereas the United States has explored more territory in this region than all the other nations of the world combined, and hundreds of thousands of square miles have been charted and explored by Admiral Byrd; and

Whereas Adm. Richard E. Byrd has stated that it is not too late for the United States to press her rightful claim, but as of now we are doing nothing at all about same, and we cannot afford to underestimate Antarctica; and

Whereas the strategic values of this area would prove a greater asset to America should the Panama Canal be destroyed, thereby sending American ships the long voyage around the southern tip of South America; and

Whereas to deny immediate action would let our claims for the South Pole go by default: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce in convention assembled this 18th day of June 1954 in Colorado Springs, Colo., That this body does hereby recommend that the United States Government take immediate and necessary steps to continue charting the Antarctic regions, and establish its rightful and just claims to all areas explored by the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed by the president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and all Members of the entire Congress of the United States.

(Adopted by two-thirds majority vote.)

(Submitted by Maryland Jaycees.)

RESTORATION OF U. N. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, when the House of Representatives deleted U. N. technical assistance funds, there was a spontaneous reaction of protest all over our country.

If the Senate were to fail to restore such funds and/or fail to insist upon such restoration in conference committee, our failure to do so would, I am sorry to say, echo to our harm and chagrin throughout the world.

With all the respect, therefore, to my colleagues on the House side, I most respectfully urge them individually to reconsider their position and to support what I hope will be the ultimate action of the conference committee in restoring these appropriations.

Soviet Russia is belatedly but craftily trying to get into the U. N. technical assistance act. She would play up to the hilt any action on our part in withdrawing from U. N. technical programs.

Why should we give such propaganda fuel to the Reds?

But even more important, why should we disappoint our friends in the United Nations by turning our backs to the very U. N. programs which have been praised throughout the world and which have become some of the most shining assets of the United Nations and affiliated Organizations?

As Mr. Roderick Stephens, of New York, wrote to my colleagues and myself:

> The returns to this Nation in terms of friendships created throughout the free world by technical assistance more than justifies the full appropriation of the comparatively small amounts urged for this Government's own program and for the technical cooperation program of the U. N.

I have in my hand a sample of the many grassroots messages which have come to me from my own State, urging restoration of the assistance funds. I send them to the desk now, preceded by the text of a letter which I have received from Mr. Wallace Campbell, director of the Washington office of the Cooperative League of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that all of these letters and messages be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., July 28, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The House action yesterday eliminating completely the appropriation for technical assistance through the United Nations came to us as a great shock. Our people have looked upon the technical assistance program, both United States and United Nations, as among the most constructive parts of our foreign policy. The appropriation through the United Nations, representing as it does only a small part of our overall appropriation for technical assistance work, is a symbol of America's willingness to cooperate with other countries on this vital program.

Elimination of the $17.9 million appropriation will cripple severely the important work of the World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization and other specialized agencies. There is also the grave danger that American withdrawal from the United Nations technical assistance program would allow the Soviet Union to move into this field with a comparatively small expenditure and win an important but unwarranted moral victory in the underdeveloped countries.

We have found a great enthusiasm for this program among the members of our own organizations and other farm, labor, religious, civic, and educational organizations throughout the country. They know we cannot achieve a permanent peace with guns alone.

We are sure your support of this vital program will be appreciated by all of our members.

Sincerely yours,
THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE,
WALLACE J. CAMPBELL.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, Wis., July 31, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER J. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The League of Women Voters of Wisconsin urges your active support of the proposed appropriation of $17,958,000 for the United States pledge to the U. N. technical-assistance program.

We regard this program as of utmost importance to America, as well as to the nations concerned. This Nation is daily and hourly preoccupied with the struggle against communism. We are spending billions of dollars to build our military strength. Yet it becomes increasingly apparent with each passing day that Communist leaders are exploiting the hopes of depressed peoples for a better life, with grim success.

If we leave this field wide open to Communist propaganda, we may someday have to face the tragic realization that we have lost countless millions of people to the Communist cause. The relatively insignificant appropriations for the U. N. technical-assistance program give underdeveloped countries a chance to break out of the vicious circle of poverty, disease, and illiteracy. It is when there is no prospect for a way out of their misery that peoples grasp the false hopes held out by communism.

We urge you to continue the program that may be more effective than any other we could devise in joining the underdeveloped countries with the free world.

Respectfully yours,
JANE P. BEAUGRAND
Mrs. Marshall E. Beaugrand,
President.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *August 3, 1954.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY:

The League of Women Voters of Milwaukee considers it imperative to maintain the program of technical assistance as requested by the administration, and urges passage of the Senate bill with the full $17,958,000 retained.

HELEN RIPLEY CLOUGH,
President.

OCONOMOWOC, WIS., *August 2, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Deeply concerned over House cut of technical assistance. Will appreciate your vote to support measure.

Mrs. ERVIN KINKEL,
President, Wisconsin Conference,
Women's Society of Christian Service.

MADISON, WIS., *August 4, 1954.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

United Nations technical-assistance program continuation essential for world peace. Urgently request your active support and restoration of funds for this program.

Mrs. HERBERT P. EVANS,
State Legislative Chairman, American Association of University Women.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEELY

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a press release which I have addressed to the matchless Democratic voters of West Virginia.

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

PRESS STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEELY

To the Peerless Democratic Voters of West Virginia:

If my gratitude to you for the unsurpassable service you rendered me yesterday at the ballot box were wealth, you would all be millionaires today. For the seventh time you have nominated me for United States Senator by a landslide majority. This is an honor that has never been conferred upon any other West Virginian—living or dead. To my deep regret my debt of gratitude to you for the fidelity of your friendship, the magnitude of your generosity, and the success of your efforts can never be fully paid.

This latest demonstration of your habitual kindness to me is peculiarly heartwarming for two reasons: First, you supplied it notwithstanding the fact that the demands of official duty prevented me from delivering a single address, or writing a single letter to you in behalf of my candidacy; second, you chose me in a contest in which three such popular, distinguished, and deserving lifelong Democratic friends as Sam Chilton, "Pete" May, and Roy Warden were competitors for the nomination which you have most benevolently bestowed upon me. The total inadequacy of my language on this occasion impels me to content myself by simply and sincerely thanking you again and again, and assuring you that in the days to come, I shall diligently strive to demonstrate by actions as well as words my unfeigned gratitude to you.

Please let me appeal to you to join with me soon after the adjournment of the present session of the Congress in healing Democratic primary wounds, if any there be, in promoting Democratic harmony in every county, and in organizing the Democratic voters of every precinct into planning, working, fighting battalions to win on the second of November for all the people of West Virginia a victory more decisive and beneficent than any other ever won for them by the oldest, greatest, wisest, and best of all political parties—the incomparable Democratic Party—founded by Thomas Jefferson, vitalized by Andrew Jackson, liberalized by Woodrow Wilson, and immortalized by Franklin Roosevelt. In return for rendering this priceless service, "your honor, name, and praise shall never die."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further routine business?

If not, morning business is closed.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1954

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume consideration of the unfinished business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the

bill (S. 3052) to encourage a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate is now in the second day of the debate on one of the most important questions to face this Congress; namely, the general agricultural policy and the type of legislation on that subject we shall finally have as public law. As we know, there is before us Senate bill 3052, which has been reported by a majority of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Accompanying the bill is a report which gives both the majority and the minority views.

I should like to discuss in general terms the structure and outline of the bill, and I shall make some basic observations on the entire subject matter of agricultural legislation.

First of all, Mr. President, I wish to make my position clear. What I have to say is in full conformity with the pledges, the promises, and the platform commitments of both of the major political parties. For example, I hold in my hand a copy of the platforms of the Democratic and Republican Parties; and at this time I shall read from page 69 of a publication known as Factual Campaign Information. That publication includes pertinent data relating to the Democratic and Republican Parties. On page 69, the Democratic platform is quoted, as follows:

> Under the present farm program, our farmers have performed magnificently, and have achieved unprecedented production. We applaud the recent congressional action in setting aside the sliding scale for price support through 1954, and we will continue to protect the producers of basic agricultural commodities under the terms of a mandatory price-support program at not less than 90 percent of parity.
>
> We continue to advocate practical methods for extending price supports to other storables and to the producers of perishable commodities, which account for three-fourths of all farm income.

That is the statement of policy of the Democratic Party, as adopted in convention at Chicago in 1952.

The Republican platform of 1952 was not nearly so specific. I shall read into the record in a moment the Republican platform and its commitments. But what was most significant was the development throughout the campaign of 1952 of the commitments which were made as the campaign progressed.

First of all, speaking now of the Republican platform, I read from page 41 of Factual Campaign Information, a document compiled under the direction of J. Mark Trice, Secretary of the United States Senate:

> We favor a farm program aimed at full parity prices for all farm products in the market place. Our program includes commodity loans on nonperishable products, on-the-farm storage, sufficient farm credit, and voluntary self-supporting crop insurance. Where Government action on perishable commodities is desirable, we recommend locally controlled marketing agreements and other voluntary methods.

That is the basic statement of the Republican platform.

However, that was interpreted, and finally expanded and made much more understandable to the people of the United States in three historic speeches. They have been mentioned again and again on the floor of the Senate. One of them was made on September 6, 1952, in the State of Minnesota at Kasson, the great Kasson, Minn., speech. Another one was made on October 4 at Brookings, S. Dak., and another was made at Fargo, N. Dak. I see the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] here. I cannot recall the date of that speech, but as I recall, it was also in October.

What was said in those speeches?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I do not remember the exact date, but it was in October.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator from North Dakota was there to hear it because, as a champion of agriculture, he would have been present at any important statement on agricultural policy.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. It was the same day as the Brookings speech. The President was in Brookings in the afternoon and in Fargo in the evening.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then it was on the 4th day of October.

I have in my hand a photostatic copy of the front page sheet of the Minneapolis Star, which is the largest publication in the Midwest. I think it is one of the largest publications outside of Chicago between the west coast and the east coast. This publication had as headlines on September 6, 1952, "Eisenhower's Farm Program," and then "Asks 100 Percent Parity With Less Government Control." Then below, as my colleagues can see, it says: "Stevenson To Defend Plank."

Then, the subheadline is, "Ike and Adlai Bid at Kasson. Eisenhower Rides First at Farm Festival."

Then there is a second subheadline, "General Lashes at Agricrats. Says Democrats Treat Farmers As Political Captives."

The next issue of this newspaper—what I have quoted was in the first edition, and I now refer to the second edition which came out after the Eisenhower speech—states this:

> Ike and Adlai outline farm programs. Eisenhower calls for 100 percent of parity. Stevenson supports Democratic Party's plank.

It is obvious from that headline what the general understanding was. There has been a good deal of talk of late to the effect that the President did not really say that—that is, the candidate for office really did not say he was for 100 percent of parity.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Was that prior to the first Tuesday in November, which was election day?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; it was prior to the first Tuesday in November 1952.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Prior to the first Tuesday of November 1952, nobody ever suggested that the President did not mean 90 percent supports or 100 percent supports, if they could be obtained?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should say not.

I may say to my distinguished colleague from Kentucky that Congressman after Congressman and spokesman after spokesman of both political parties said publicly, for the press and for their own constituents: "It is clear now that Candidate Eisenhower stands for not less than 90 percent of parity."

Listen to what the Associated Press had to say—and I do not suppose the Associated Press, one of the great press services of our land, was particularly prejudiced or had been particularly prejudged about farm policy. It was reporting the news.

I shall quote what the Associated Press had to say. I have a few notations of some of its comments. Harold S. Milner, Associated Press reporter, covering the Brookings speech at South Dakota, reported, and I quote him, as follows:

> Dwight D. Eisenhower told a South Dakota audience here today, October 4, he wanted to make it clear that he promised full acceptance of the present 90 percent of parity program. He also wanted it understood that he would work for full parity when the present 90-percent program ends in 1954.

The Associated Press had also sent Don Whitehead, one of their great reporters into the Midwest to cover the President's speech. Don Whitehead in his dispatch which he filed from Kasson to the Associated Press News Services quoted Candidate Eisenhower as follows:

> "I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair full share of the national income," Eisenhower said, "and a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity but full parity."

Let me refer now to a few other news services.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I assure the Senator from Minnesota, as one who has known Don Whitehead for many, many years, that he can be trusted. Certainly in the dispatch which he wrote he was interpreting the news as he saw it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the distinguished Senator; and I may point out, that one of the reasons why some of our distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle are fighting against the administration's farm program is that they honestly believe that program repudiates the promises which were made.

I know that that is a fair statement, because I have seen, as have my other colleagues, Senators from the Midwest States who heard these speeches, stand up and say that they felt the policy that we are now being asked to accept was a repudiation of the basic program which was promised in 1952.

I quote now from the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, which is one of the leading newspapers of the State of South Dakota. It is edited by a very fine man, Mr. Christiansen. Its editorial policy is basically conservative and Republican,

but it is one of the leading newspapers in that part of the Nation.

Recently in an editorial, referring to one of the Minnesota Representatives from the Seventh Congressional District, which borders on the South Dakota frontier, this newspaper said:

Representative ANDERSEN favors a price-support law guaranteeing farmers 90 percent of parity. In this he is in agreement with the stand taken by Dwight D. Eisenhower at Kasson, Minn., and at Brookings, S. Dak., during the 1952 presidential campaign.

So I think it is about time we made the record clear that, insofar as anyone of the public was led to believe anything with reference to agricultural policy, it was that the programs of both parties, Democratic and Republican, stood for not less than 90 percent of parity.

I have here a photostatic copy——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. As a matter of fact, of course, both parties believe in at least 90 percent of parity. But, in the case of wheat, when the promises of the Republican Party are put into action, what is that party offering the wheat farmer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to be accurate in my statistics, and I have in one of my folders a clipping which reveals that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, promises the wheat farmer 80 percent of parity on wheat next year.

Mr. EASTLAND. He was promised 100 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In 1952 he was promised 100 percent.

Mr. EASTLAND. One hundred percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; but 3 years later, according to the Secretary of Agriculture, what he will get will be about 80 percent.

Mr. EASTLAND. In 1952 he was promised 100 percent. The promise was that in 1955 the wheat crop would bring 100 percent of parity; is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct, the promise was full parity after the expiration of the law providing 90 percent.

Mr. EASTLAND. Now the Secretary of Agriculture is offering the wheat farmer in practice 80 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Does the Senator see in the newspaper I hold in my hand the headline which says, "Benson Sees Wheat Props Hold at 80 Percent"? That is from one of the great newspapers of the Midwest, the St. Paul Dispatch of July 19, 1954.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

BENSON SEES WHEAT PROPS HOLD AT 80 PERCENT

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of Agriculture Benson indicated today that even under present law he does not expect price supports on the 1955 wheat crop to fall below 80 percent.

Benson told a news conference he regards 80-percent price supports for wheat as a pretty good judgment. That level would drop the support price from the present $2.24 to $1.99 a bushel.

Wheat and other basic crops are now supported at 90 percent of parity, but unless Congress changes the law—as it is in the process of doing—Benson could fix next year's level anywhere between 75 and 90 percent of parity.

Parity is a price determined by farm law to be fair to farmers in relation to the cost of things they must buy.

Benson predicted wheat growers in a referendum Friday will approve stringent marketing quotas for next year to qualify for price supports. They will not know, however, exactly what the supports will be because Congress still is considering farm legislation.

The administration is asking for flexible price supports for basic crops ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity. The House has voted for supports between 82½ and 90 percent of parity. The Senate Agriculture Committee favors a 1-year extension of 90-percent supports, but the Senate still must act.

Benson predicted that the Senate will not vote to increase the present 75-percent price supports for dairy products. Its Agriculture Committee has recommended a boost to 85 percent, and the House has approved an 80-percent support level.

Benson said he felt an increase in dairy supports would be a serious mistake and would result in the Government having to buy much more butter.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, let us take the case of corn. Corn grown in 1955 was promised 100 percent of parity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. When it comes to performance, what is the Republican Party giving?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only reason why the producers are getting 90 percent now is because of the program adopted in 1949.

Mr. EASTLAND. Under a Democratic Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; under a Democratic Congress, and extended since then. In the future, I believe it is fair to say, the price support will surely be below 90 percent—if the administration has its way. It will be 80 or 90 percent, under a sliding scale.

Mr. EASTLAND. Next year, as a matter of performance, corn producers will get about 80 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; that is a rough approximation, if the Aiken amendment is adopted.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let us take the case of cotton. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota knows, does he not, that when we reduce the support price of cotton we do not increase the consumption of cotton by so much as one bale?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand. I am going to direct my remarks later to that very point.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not a fact that if consumption is not increased, but the support price is reduced, all that is accomplished is to lower the standard of living of the farmer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; the result is to reduce the income of the farmer, and to push his standard of living down. The Senator from Mississippi is absolutely right.

Mr. EASTLAND. Has it not always been sound Republican doctrine to take care of big business and high-tariff commerce; and did not that policy give us the Smoot-Hawley tariff and the great depression?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. My only reason for taking the time of the Senate to discuss the position of the two parties is that there has been an effort on the part of some to wriggle out of promises made. There will be further wriggling; but the commitment was made, and the commitment must stand.

I have before me a photostatic copy of Look magazine entitled "Where They Stand." It quotes both candidates. The subtitle reads:

Now both candidates have had their say, and the voter, obliged to make a choice between them, can look at their records.

Look magazine is a Cowles publication, and the Cowles are a great newspaper and journalistic family. They are also the owners of the Minneapolis Star-Tribune and the Des Moines Register, I believe. Look magazine is considered to be one of our most prominent and interesting publications. Surely Look magazine cannot be attacked as a Democratic publication. I should prefer not to label it with any partisan tag at all. In other words, let it stand on its own merits as a good magazine. What did Look magazine say at the time of the presidential election in 1952? Where did the candidates stand on farm policy? I read from a photostatic copy of an article in Look magazine. This is what Look magazine has to say, quoting Eisenhower on farm policy:

Ike: "Without any ifs or buts, I stand behind the price-support laws now on the books. * * * These price supports are only fair to the farmer, to underwrite the exceptional risk he is now taking. They are a moral and legal commitment which must be upheld. * * * Our goal will be sound farmer-run programs that safeguard agriculture—but do not regiment you, do not put the Federal Government in charge of your farms. * * * I believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income, and a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity—it is full parity."

No matter how that statement may be interpreted, the words are there. Full parity means exactly what it says, namely, 100 percent parity. It was because of this promise by the Republican candidate that a very honorable headline writer wrote: "Eisenhower Calls for 100 Percent Parity After 1954—Up to 1954, 90 Percent Parity." The 90 percent was the law. After 1954, there would be full parity. It was to that very point that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] was directing his remarks.

What did Look magazine say about Mr. Stevenson's point of view on agriculture? Look magazine quoted Mr. Stevenson as follows:

Adlai: "It has been a constant objective of our Democratic farm programs to maintain farm income. The way we have chosen to do this is to support farm prices. Our platform lays this out in clear language: 'We will continue to protect the producers of basic agricultural commodities under the

terms of a mandatory price-support program at not less than 90 percent of parity.'

"What our program does is to place a floor under our agricultural economy in order to protect the farmer against sudden and violent price drops * * *. But when the general proposed that we should go up to 100 percent, I think he may have misunderstood his audience. The farmers of America have too vivid a memory of the Republicans in the House voting against the 90-percent support law last spring to be impressed by big talk about 100 percent today."

Those statements were made by two very honorable men. They were made by the then Republican candidate and now our President, and by the candidate of the Democratic Party, the governor of Illinois, who is now a very distinguished private citizen.

I make this record only because continuous efforts have been made in recent months—even in the Senate—to try to dissociate the administration from the pledges it made. Those pledges were made. I charge this morning in the Senate that the administration's agricultural policy is a betrayal of the promises that were given to the American people in 1952.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota has observed the efforts being made to give the impression that what the President meant in his various speeches was parity in the market place. What is a farmer interested in except his own market place? What is meant by the market place? Is it South Africa or Istanbul? I believe the market place is where he receives his pay. One hundred percent is 100 percent in his market place, not anywhere else.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, the practical application of the principle of agricultural economics is as the Senator from Iowa has stated, namely, that "in the market place" means in Des Moines, Iowa, if the farmer happens to live near Des Moines, Iowa——

Mr. GILLETTE. It is where the farmer lives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. Or in Davenport, if the farmer lives near Davenport, or in St. Paul or Mankato, Minn.

Let us not have an agricultural policy based on theoretical vision or fiction. Let us have it based on practical demonstration and application. That is what we are trying to have.

I did not mean to take so much time for these preliminary remarks. I was merely trying to explain what I thought were the conscientious and honorably stated and publicly accepted expressions of the two candidates and of their respective political parties.

What I am trying to do, and what I have been trying to do ever since 1952—in fact, ever since I have been in public life—is to obtain for our farm population the objective which President Eisenhower expressed as a candidate, namely, full parity.

That has been the objective of the Democratic Party. The only difference is that the Democratic Party is in favor of at least 90 percent Government supports. The present administration, in its agricultural policy today, says, "We will make it from 75 percent to 90 percent."

I have been quite intrigued, I may say in passing, with this "numbers" game. First it was from 60 percent to 90 percent. The flex was a bigger kink in the accordion, and a bigger swing. It was from 60 percent to 90 percent. Then it worked up to from 75 percent to 90 percent. Then the House of Representatives made it from 82½ percent to 90 percent.

How they got that lower figure, no one will ever know. I do not know what the 82½-percent figure is based on as an economic calculation. Apparently it was pulled out of a grab bag. Someone reached into the grab bag with his left hand and pulled out a number, and it was 82½ percent. They said, "We will make that the minimum figure; and, of course, 90 percent will be the maximum."

Now we come to the amendment before the Senate to amend the bill, as reported by the majority of the committee. I wish to make quite clear that the majority of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported by an 8-to-7 vote a bill that fulfills the commitments and the pledges of both the Republicans and the Democrats. There were 5 Democrats and 3 Republicans supporting the pledges of both Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Eisenhower. That bill provides 90 percent of parity on the basic commodities. The amendment before the Senate now provides from 80 to 90 percent.

What kind of jigsaw puzzle is this? This is the most amazing kind of agricultural economics. I think it reveals that what is being attempted is to weaken the farm program. If 75 to 90 has real credence and validity, then stick with it. If 82½ to 90 is what should be a good program, stick with it. If 60 to 90 is the kind of flexing that is wanted, stick with it.

I notice various kinds of proposals are made. We go from 60 to 90, 80 to 90, 82½ to 90, 75 to 90. "Take your choice, Mr. Farmer, but you are not going to get 90," says the administration.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Has the Senator given consideration to a support price of 84⅝ or 86⅛? Has the Senator considered those figures?

Mr. HUMPHREY. My distinguished colleague from Iowa has been a great friend of the farmer throughout his whole public life. I pause for a moment to pay him much deserved tribute. We have a situation where we could get almost any figure if it was left in the hands of those who are determined at any cost not to give what they promised.

Mr. GILLETTE. Figures based on nothing. They seem to reach into the air and pick out a figure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Based upon some sort of economic mythology.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senator sure that it is not based on the golden promise at Kasson, Minn.?

Mr. HUMPHREY. While the Senator was momentarily detained in other work a moment ago, I was mentioning some of the commitments that were made by both political parties, and particularly the promises made by Candidate Eisenhower at Kasson, Brookings, and Fasco.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What was the minimum when the golden promise was made?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Ninety percent was the minimum?

Mr. MANSFIELD. And what was the maximum?

Mr. HUMPHREY. One hundred percent.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator is wrong. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The minimum promise made by the Republicans was 100 percent of parity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Ninety percent up to 1954, and after that, 100 percent.

Mr. EASTLAND. That was under the Democratic law. After that it was to be 100 percent. That was the minimum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. If flexibility is the magic word, if that is the word we must have to get some people off the hook or to please somebody or to have a face-saving effect, then I suggest we have flexibility from 90 to 100. That is flexing. That is just as good as flexing from 80 to 90, except that people are not flexed out of business.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Which way can they flex besides down?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The flexible price support program is called a sliding scale. I give the Senator the answer to his question by asking him a question. Did the Senator ever hear of anybody sliding uphill?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, I did not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One can slide downhill, but it is tough to slide uphill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Who made this golden promise of at least 90-percent parity up to 1954, and eventually full parity, or 100 percent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. Eisenhower, of course.

Mr. EASTLAND. Not the Democratic candidate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. Mr. Eisenhower made that promise.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Could the Senator explain to the Senate how it is that this administration can lower price supports for dairy products to 75 percent and advocate price supports up to 115 percent for the wool industry, which I favor, but at the same time try to go behind this promise and knock down price supports for the basic crops to somewhere between 80 and 90 percent?

How can this kind of flexibility be explained?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I cannot explain it, except to say that it is very disappointing and very discouraging. As the Senator will recall, when Mr. Eisenhower made his political commitments on agricultural policy—and I want my colleagues to remember this—not only did he promise full parity for the storables and the basic commodities, but he challenged the Democratic Party and its leadership on what they had done with the nonstorables, with the so-called perishable commodities. He promised that we would have a perishable commodity program that would do for perishable commodities what was done for the storable commodities. I have read this promise into the RECORD again and again, and I shall soon read the exact words. The President made very clear that he knew that many of the products of agriculture were not basic commodities, that many of them were in the perishable category, such as dairy products, chickens, eggs, and meat products. In areas of the United States where those products mean so much to the farmers' income, he made a commitment that there would be a program to take care of them at not less than 90 percent of parity.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That promise will not be forgotten.

Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from Mississippi; then I shall yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the distinguished Senator from Minnesota know that farm prices today average 18.8 percent below those of 1951?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do know that.

Mr. EASTLAND. And that food prices are 1 percent higher than they were in 1951?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do know that.

Mr. EASTLAND. Then why could we not have at least a 90-percent support price, without increasing the cost of food?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is going to be the burden of my argument. I think that one of the greatest disservices ever done to the American people, one of the most unfortunate bits of political chicanery that has ever been perpetrated upon the American people, is the fraudulent argument that 90 percent of parity price support is responsible for high food costs and is responsible for the high cost of living.

I have so many clippings on that point that it is hard to know where to start and stop, but here is a quotation from the Washington Star for July 23, 1954: "Food Cost Rise Pushes Up Price Index for Second Month." Then the news item goes on to point out a little later that, while food prices are going up, the farmer's prices for what he sells are going down.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator agree with me that, with the foreign situation as it is, we need great surpluses of farm commodities of all kinds? If we should lose 2 cities where the farm-implement industry is situated, there would be starvation in this country before we could restore agricultural production.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not a fact that we have spent billions of dollars on guns, planes, and tanks—that are now obsolete?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have indeed.

Mr. EASTLAND. We are having to build others at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true.

Mr. EASTLAND. Food does not become obsolete, but is a necessity. It certainly is sound judgment and sound sense to retain, because of the atomic and hydrogen bomb threat, great surpluses of farm commodities of all kinds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator would be interested in some figures I have, if he will bear with me. I have been doing a good deal of research work on this subject. Would the Senator be interested in the figures as to what is in storage at the present time? The latest figures I was able to get which are accurate are for May 31, 1954. I ask the Senator to bear with me for a moment. I think this information is as basic and important to the debate as anything else I can contribute.

We read constantly in the press about the surplus of corn, the surplus of wheat—surpluses, surpluses. Mr. Benson and the Department of Agriculture should be ashamed of themselves for the propagandizing they have done—immoral propagandizing. I am fed up with the moral piety they constantly seek to demonstrate, and then have them act in an immoral manner.

Listen to this. Let us talk about corn. How much corn do we have in storage? We have in storage up to May 31, 1954, corn for 3 months and 1½ days at the current rate of consumption. That is from the Department of Agriculture.

I say to my associates in the Senate that the whole basis of American industry is based upon inventory. Apparently it is wrong for farmers to have inventories. When there are no inventories, it is the speculator's paradise, and the consumer is at the mercy of the unscrupulous men in the market place.

Inventory is the very foundation of a good free-enterprise system.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator speaks of speculators. Does he agree that when support prices are reduced, it is made very much easier for speculators to manipulate the markets?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course that is true. It is made much easier. Manipulation of the markets was one of the crimes of the past.

Mr. EASTLAND. If wheat support prices are reduced, how much will that reduce the price of bread?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If wheat price supports are reduced 15 percent, the price of bread would be reduced approximately a half cent or four-tenths of a cent.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator believe that the price of bread would be reduced?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course not. What is more, I may say to the Senator from Mississippi, the price of wheat has fallen as much as 35 or 40 cents, but the price of bread has not gone down a tenth of a cent. The best protection for the consumer is abundance. The worst thing that could happen to him would be to have a scarcity. The argument for scarcity is an argument in favor of the profiteer. The argument for scarcity and reduced supplies is the argument of the finagler, the unscrupulous man in the market place.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 3 or 4 questions?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, with reference to the point raised by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi as to whether there was any flexibility which could go forward, and as to whether the flexibility must always go downward, I ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota if he does not know, in the case of naval stores, a very important agricultural and strategic product which is under the price-support program, that the price went from a little above 60 percent to 90 percent, because of the fact that great surpluses were not created?

Does not the Senator further know that in this year, when all this debate has taken place, because of the restraint on the part of the naval stores industry, and the fact that they had not built up a huge surplus, the Secretary of Agriculture again continued 90 percent of parity as the price support for that particular industry?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have asked a question of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I hope that he will be frank enough to answer.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I desire to have an answer from the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Are there marketing quotas in effect in that area of production? Are there marketing agreements?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; there are no marketing agreements.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Are there not marketing agreements on grapefruit?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am talking about naval stores. I have asked the distinguished Senator from Minnesota a specific question, and I should like to have an answer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Naval stores?

Mr. HOLLAND. Naval stores—rosin, turpentine, and such products, which come from pine trees.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us be specific.

Under the designation "naval stores" there could be battleships or rowboats. I do not know about parity price supports on them. Is the Senator talking about turpentine?

Mr. HOLLAND. Naval stores are an agricultural product, including rosin, turpentine, and the like. The Senator well knows that his reference to rowboats and battleships has no relation to what I am speaking of.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I confess that I do not know.

Mr. HOLLAND. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in the recent debate on the floor I advised him of that fact.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate that.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator seemed to be completely aware of it at that time. Certainly he has not forgotten it since then. My question was very simple. It pointed up the simple fact, namely, that in the case of naval stores, which are subject to the flexible price support structure of from 60 to 90 percent, the support price actually has gone up from a point in the 60's to 90 percent and this year has been held at 90 percent, because under the principles relating to the flexible pricing structure, no great surplus had been created, and that important industry was entitled to a continuance of the 90-percent support price.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, the number of producers in this area of production is infinitesimal, as the Senator well knows. Secondly, the matter of production control is very simple, as the Senator also well knows.

When there are millions of producers of a product throughout the land, there is not the same ease of control as there is in connection with the production of rosin. Is Congress to base its farm policy on the price of rosin for violin strings? Is that what the farm policy is to be based on?

We can get along without resin; but try to get along without wheat, cheese, butter, milk, cotton, and corn for a while.

I think the Senator from Florida has reached out for a gnat. He has tried to grab a mountain on which to argue, and apparently has ended with an ant hole. He is trying to pin down his argument with the weight of an elephant, and has ended with a mite.

Mr. HOLLAND. The conclusion of the Senator from Minnesota is not justified by the importance of the naval stores industry or its actual size, because there are tens of thousands of producers of naval stores, who are mighty good people, just as good as the people of Minnesota. The State of Georgia produces about 70 percent of the naval stores crop; Florida produces about 20 percent. Naval stores also are produced in the States of Mississippi and Alabama and the eastern part of Texas, and to a very limited degree in California.

The Senator from Minnesota is evading the question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I am not.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator know that instead of there being an always downward course under the flexible price support structure, the instance I have given him is a specific demonstration of the fact that the flexible price support structure can go up, and then can stay up, when there is an absence of huge surpluses, such as have been created to the tune of more than half a billion dollars in the dairy industry, and to the tune of almost a billion bushels of wheat which it appears there will be at the end of this season, and in each case making such terrible surpluses that, instead of its being immoral, as has been suggested by the Senator from Minnesota, for the Secretary of Agriculture to call the attention of Congress and the Nation to the fact such a situation exists, I think it is highly moral and highly necessary that the Secretary advise us that the law which was written for wartime, and which we have insisted on continuing during peacetime, is not functioning well, but is resulting in huge waste and huge expense, and is discouraging the very program in which the Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from Florida believe—that is, a necessary but reasonable support price program for the basics.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not wish to be unkind to my distinguished friend from Florida, but yesterday, when I got warmed up under the collar, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], said, "I will no longer yield for another tirade." I read that in the New York Times this morning.

I do not believe the Senator from Florida is making a tirade. I think he is making a bad argument. He has gone all through the spectrum of agricultural products and has said, "I think I can find one product where flexible price supports have worked."

What do you think it is, Mr. President? Rosin.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Minnesota agreed to yield to me for several questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Florida has commented on the production of rosin. Does not the Senator from Florida realize that we are talking about basic farm commodities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course the Senator from Florida realizes that; but he wanted us to get off on Willow Lane, down by the creek, to some sort of picnic, to discuss something which is not basic.

Mr. EASTLAND. Naval stores are very important commodities. But again I ask the Senator, so far as basic farm commodities are concerned, when a flexible support system is placed in operation, what is the only way it can flex?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It cannot flex, so far as the price-support program is concerned, above 90 percent. It will most likely flex downward.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course. As a matter of fact, for the next few years it will flex downward.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that even the advocates of the program admit that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I come to the very field suggested by my friend, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. Is it not true that in 1951, under the flexible price support program, the support price for peanuts, which is a basic commodity, was 88 percent; and because of the failure to build up a huge surplus, the support price went to 90 percent in 1952? Is it not a fact that the record so shows?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I imagine that is a fact. But I do not understand what pertinency this has to the argument. But if the Senator from Florida desires to ask me questions, I shall be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am trying to show how completely far from the historic facts it is to say that there is no course upward under the flexible price-support program for basics, because in the case of peanuts it has been shown that the contrary is true; and there is no need for any of us to deny it, because that is a fact.

Mr. EASTLAND. I would like——

Mr. HOLLAND. No; the Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

I have a third question I should like to ask.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to answer the second question, before we come to the third. Let us not be too impatient with each other. Let us proceed in order.

The important thing about this flexible price-support program, as I see it, is that when we do not need a price-support program we get one.

If there is a shortage of supply, as the Senator points out, and if we keep cutting down the supply, we are not going to get lower than 90 percent of parity. The price-support program is made and designed for the times when it is needed. It is like an umbrella: An umbrella is not needed when it is not raining. The flexible price-support program is like the man who is given an umbrella on a nice sunshiny day, where there is not a cloud in the sky, but the minute the rain comes down the umbrella is taken away.

This flexible price-support program, which I am going to talk about in more detail, is agricultural economics standing on its head. What is the purpose of the price-support program?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at this minute. I will yield in a moment.

What is the purpose of the price-support program? Orderly marketing. Orderly marketing and fair returns for the products.

How does the price-support program work generally? It works through loans and purchases.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. With acreage controls.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is right. What loans are made by the Commodity Credit Corporation? What is the purpose of them? Why store? In order to bring about orderly marketing.

How does a farmer get orderly marketing? He gets it by being able to put his product into the market place without dumping, without saturating the market, and without breaking the market.

This is why we have a 90-percent parity price-support program, so that we can get fair prices for our commodities. The time the farmers need price-support laws is when there are more commodities at the moment than are needed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not also true we have to have acreage controls along with that program, which cut back production and bring the whole thing into line?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course we have acreage controls on the production of some products. That is a part of the technique of what may be called production adjustment.

One of the feelings which seems to be quite prevalent throughout the country is that if anything gets out of line for a year it is necessary to pull the curtain on the whole thing, to quit, and to change it.

I want to say the flexible price-support program will always work when there is a scarcity, but a flexible price-support program is not needed in the case of a scarcity. If there is less butter than is needed, the price of butter will be $1 a pound. If there are less peanuts than people want, the price of peanuts will go up. If there is less rosin than there are violins, the price of rosin will go up. In such cases legislation is not needed. Adam Smith took care of all that a long time ago. He took care of that in his great work upon the nature of capitalistic economics.

The purpose of the price-support program is to afford help when farmers are in trouble. I am amazed to hear Senators talk about the price-support program as if it were to be used when it was not needed.

It is like having a life-insurance policy, which one pays on every day he is alive, but when he dies the value of the policy is not paid to him; or it is like having a fire-insurance policy which is worth $10,000, which is good all of the time when there is no fire, but when there is a fire only $5,000 is paid on the policy. The time to have life insurance is when one is alive, not when he is dead. Life insurance is for a person's loved ones.

The time when we need price supports, I may say to the Senator from Florida, is the time when we have an abundance, not a scarcity. Goodness gracious, the time we need it is when we have adversity and when we have abundance.

Now I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was wondering if the Senator would comment in the course of his able speech, which I am enjoying, particularly with regard to his indication that the naval-stores industry largely devotes itself to supplying rosin for fiddle strings——

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a much more important industry than that, but at least that pinpoints it for many people who do not have too much familiarity with it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder if the distinguished Senator would state in his able debate how he explains the fact that almost all the present surpluses, which are huge, come from 4 products, 3 of which are basic, supported by the 90-percent rigid supports—that is, wheat, cotton, and corn—and 1 of which has been at 90 percent, though it comes under the 90-percent flexible support program—that is, milk and milk products; whereas in the case of those products which are supported at lower levels and with less inducement for overproduction, there is very little contribution to the huge store of surpluses. I wonder how the distinguished Senator could answer that.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will yield in a moment, but I want to help my friend from Florida. He is a marvelous man. He is one of the most able men in this body and he is also a reasonable man.

Now we are going to get down to cases. We are going to quit talking about figures. We are going to apply these figures to reality. I will get my blotter out here. Just bear with me for a minute. Just take a look at this information which comes from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. EASTLAND. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator ought to be allowed to answer in proper measure. I have not interfered when he has sought to answer questions from my distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and others, and I think I am entitled to have the courtesy of an unprompted answer from the Senator from Minnesota, who I think is well able to take care of himself.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course he is. Certainly he is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Now that we have settled this, may I point out to my good friend from Florida, first of all, that the very commodities he has mentioned, with the exception of butterfat, have been income-producing commodities insofar as the Commodity Credit Corporation is concerned.

I think the Senator knows that with regard to corn, wheat, and cotton we have made substantial sums of money. I think the committee report so reveals. I forget the exact amount, but there is a very substantial realized gain upon the so-called storable basics.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is talking about a period of time prior to the last 2 years. His remarks would not be true with reference to the recent past.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The statement would be true up to May 31 of this year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator will find there has been a total loss of $130,739,501 from October 17, 1933, through May 31, 1954, for the following commodities: Corn; cotton; cotton, Puerto Rican; cotton, export differential; cotton-rubber barter; peanuts; rice; tobacco; and wheat.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator state whether or not prior to 2 years ago there was a profit from those same commodities, and whether in the last 2 years the loss has been materially greater than the $130 million which the Senator has mentioned?

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say to my good friend, who is an able businessman, that a corporation does not go out of business because it happens to have a bad month. I am amazed. Here is a man who apparently has little faith in the American economic system. So we get a bad year. Are we now going to close up shop?

Such an attitude is as unwarranted as to expect that if General Motors had a bad year they would say, "We had better quit making cars and start making bicycles. We are in trouble. We had better get out of business."

General Motors has had some bad years, but they did all right this year—which I want to comment upon—while the farmers did not.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Wait a moment.

"Halt ye, my friends, and let us reason together," quoth the prophet. Let us conduct ourselves in a genteel manner, and get down to the facts.

Let us consider corn. We are talking about surpluses. Does the Senator think it is right for the United States of America to have only a 3 months and 1½ days' corn supply on hand? That is what we have today, based on the 1952 requirements.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, may I ask a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let us come to wheat.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us consider wheat. On May 31, 1954, we had 10 months and 14 days' supply of wheat on hand, on the basis of 1952 requirements. Is that too much wheat to have on hand, in the kind of world in which we live? May I point out in addition the fact that we have cut back on wheat production over 30 percent, in acreage.

Mr. HOLLAND. And in spite of that cutback we are adding to the surplus?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have not yet gotten the crop in, Senator. We have not harvested the crop yet. Do not count these chickens or these kernels of wheat before they are in the bin.

The wheat-producing section of Minnesota just went through an army worm infestation last week. And we happen to have a rust problem in our section of the country, in the Red River Valley.

The Senator is an expert on the subject of wheat, but he has not heard about the last infestation of army worms and he has not heard about the drought. He came to the Capitol this morning and it was raining. I hope it is raining all over the Nation. The Nation needs it. Every State needs it. Possibly it did not rain every place.

Let us move along now. We have enough corn, I want my colleagues to know, for 3 months and 1½ days. Do my colleagues wish to know who wants less corn than that? The people who have control over certain corn stocks, the people who would like options on certain corn production want less corn than that, so they can make a fast dollar without being in the corn business. Some people who have never seen a cornfield, make more money from handling corn than the corn farmer ever made.

I say to my good friend from Florida, if he wants to advocate having less than 3 months of corn supply, then I sharply disagree with him.

I remember when the Senator from Florida was complaining about the ammunition shortage, in Korea. Does the Senator remember? We had 90 days' supply of ammunition in storage in Korea. There was 90 days of ammunition, and Senators were complaining to high

heaven because we did not have more ammunition.

I wish to say to my colleagues that while corn may not be as important as ammunition, it is surprising how much it helps to have a little corn around if one wishes to remain long alive.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Minnesota does not think the 90-percent parity system builds up the surpluses, does he? The Senator from Minnesota realizes, does he not, that it was the policy of the Government to have the 90-percent parity system and also to build up the surpluses, and that is why we have the surpluses.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, this is why we have the inventory.

Mr. President, I spent most of my life in the retail business. Instead of putting money in the bank, a merchant puts his money into inventory. Any merchant who is worth his salt is interested in inventory. Inventory is the heart and core of the American enterprise system, except when it comes to the farmer, because if they can keep the farmer from having an inventory they can really run him through the wringer. I say that the philosophy which permeates the flexible parity principle program is the speculators' philosophy, not the philosophy of the grain producer.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOWRING in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at the moment.

Madam President, I wish to let my colleagues meditate for a moment and consider whether they wish to have our country proceed with less than 3 months' supply of corn in storage, although the number of pigs being raised this year will eat up the corn almost as fast as the sun in Florida dries up the earth.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me at this point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Minnesota mean to tell the Senate that he understands that the 3 to 4 months' supply of corn in storage, of our surplus national supply, is all that is in storage anywhere at the present time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the quantity pledged for Commodity Credit Corporation loans, and owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In view of the cash price of corn, most of the farmers have put their corn under seal. If any of my colleagues does not believe that, let him look at the storage bins in the Midwest. Of course, the farmers are putting their corn under seal, because they want to be sure they get 90 percent. The Department of Agriculture keeps talking down the price; every time the Department of Agriculture issues a bulletin, the price gets a little less firm and more unusual.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield at this point, so I may answer the point he has just made?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not yield at this point, Madam President.

We now have wheat in storage. By the way, most of it is under Commodity Credit Corporation loan, because the support price is better than the cash price. We have in storage a supply of wheat sufficient for 10 months and 14 days. We have in storage enough dried milk to supply us for 7 months and 14 days. We have cheese in storage—although cheese is often referred to as if it were the worst curse of all times. We have 3 months and 27 days' supply of cheese in storage. We have in storage sufficient butter for 3 months and 11 days. That is the total amount in storage.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me at this point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Minnesota does not regard any of the huge amounts of stored commodities which he is mentioning, which now are costing the Government $700,000 a day for the storage alone, as surpluses? The Senator from Minnesota said he did not regard them as surpluses. I should like to have him elaborate on that point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I regard them as inventory.

Does my friend, the Senator from Florida, consider that the airplanes we have that are not now shooting down Communists are surplus? Does the Senator from Florida believe that the 3 million men in our Armed Forces, who are not today fighting on the battleline, are surplus? Does the Senator from Florida believe that the .30-caliber and .50-caliber ammunition we have for machine guns—some of it in storage in Florida, no doubt, with some good warehousemen being paid good money for storing—is surplus; or does he call it inventory? After all, the Government stores its ammunition supply in various parts of the country.

Furthermore, as all of us know, the Government has on hand large numbers of tanks and trucks, and also great quantities of metals, to the tune of $4½ billion, and we are going to purchase $1,500,000,000 to $2 billion more for the national stockpile. We do not call that surplus; we call those supplies strategic reserves. So I am getting tired of the dirty little word "surplus."

Mr. MAGNUSON. And let us not forget the mothball fleet.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, with literally block after block and mile after mile of ships kept in reserve. Does the Senator from Florida think we should dispose of them because they are "surplus"?

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Minnesota mean to state seriously on the floor of the Senate that he regards the supply of butter, which is literally running out of our ears and has become a national scandal, as a strategic reserve?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It could very well be; and if we had a little imagination around here, that butter could very well do us more good than some of the things we have done. I think in that connection of a foreign-aid program in the areas of the world where aid is needed, a program of helping some of the underprivileged in those areas, and also some of the underprivileged in the United States.

In a few days we shall have before us a social security bill, and I understand it provides for a minimum payment of approximately $40 a month. I should like to ask my fine-fed senatorial friends to try to live for a while on $40 a month. Perhaps a couple of pounds of butter on the side would not hurt. Perhaps we could use the butter as part of a strategic program of compassion and kindness at home, and of aid abroad, if we have some imagination, instead of running around with a hood pulled over our head all the time, blind as a bat, unwilling to think about what we should do or could do. Of course there will be problems; but I am shocked to hear my friend, the Senator from Florida, talk about the program as a scandal. What is scandalous about the dairy program?

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate very much what the Senator from Minnesota has said. In my own State I find that many of those who are conducting the school-lunch program, which from time to time has been called socialistic, are forced to spend the small amounts of money they are able to raise locally to buy oleomargarine, because they cannot obtain an adequate supply of butter, although we have this terrific surplus. Yet the children of the country cannot have the butter that is needed for the school-lunch program. I think we had better look into the Department of Agriculture and find whether these huge surpluses have been built up for political purposes, in an attempt to do away with the farm program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course they have.

Mr. MONRONEY. Instead of going into the channels of use, as Congress intended them to do, in connection with the school-lunch program, when that program was enacted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to my friend the Senator from Oklahoma that the American people and our Government should be ashamed of the loose talk that occurs about our abundance of supply, in a world of hunger and sickness, in a world where communism is spreading from one country to another—communism that finds recruits in poverty, sickness, and disease.

Yet we complain before God and man about the greatest material blessing God Almighty can give—food and fiber. We sit here crying crocodile tears because we have too much. But the day may come when we will have too little. That will be the time to be complaining.

What about the milk and the butter which we have in such abundance? Some say it cannot be used. Is not that interesting, Madam President? Why cannot it be used? Some say it is too expensive. Yet every Member of this

body knows that frequently the Armed Forces purchase highly expensive equipment because, they say, they want the best for the men and women who serve in the Armed Forces. The Armed Forces do not take the cheapest; they take the best. When we build a Government hospital for veterans, the best materials are used so that the hospital will last anywhere from 50 to 100 years.

Yet in this case we have one of the most valuable foods in the world—milk and milk products—but it is said to be too expensive.

After all, Madam President, water is cheaper, as we know. As a matter of fact, advice is cheaper, too—the bad advice we are getting.

What about the surplus? We can use it for our school-lunch programs and for our aged people.

By the way, Madam President, the substitute legislation being proposed—the counterproposals made by a majority of the committee—having nothing to do with a surplus disposal or an inventory disposal program. It is amazing to me. I have been reading, for example, that recently the military have been selling billions of dollars' worth of so-called surplus equipment. They have been having sales all over the country. The other day I read they had a sale of surplus equipment in Pennsylvania, and at that time sold, among other things, even an extra set of false teeth, an extra pair of "china clippers." Billions of dollars' worth of so-called surplus equipment were sold. However, not a voice has been raised in Congress about the losses the Government incurred as a result of selling those billions of dollars' worth of surplus equipment. It is said that surplus was accumulated for purposes of defense. However, one of the most important items of defense is basic foodstuffs. So I am a little shocked.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me at this point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator from Minnesota well recall, in connection with the use of butter by the Armed Forces, that the largest item in the total of more than $600 million which we were asked to write off last year, and which we did write off, as a loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation, represented a sale of butter by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Army at a price of 20-odd cents a pound, which was a little more than one-third of what the Commodity Credit Corporation had paid for its accumulated stocks of butter. Does not the Senator from Minnesota remember that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remember it, and I think the man who sold it should have been brought before a committee of the Congress and chastised for being one of the worst businessmen the country ever saw. It does not take any brains to sell butter at 20 cents a pound. Anybody can give away $5 for $2.50.

We should have sold the Army the butter like it was sold to anybody else. At the time that sale was made, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] was on the floor of the Senate criticizing the Department, and pointing out that when he was Secretary of Agriculture he did not engage in that kind of cut-rate mail-order business practices. I thought we were supposed to have businessmen down here.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. I want to talk a little bit more about the principle I have been discussing.

What did we do? We took good butter, for which the average housewife in this country would be glad to pay 50 cents a pound, and sold it to the British at 41 cents a pound. I have not heard the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] say anything about that. He has been as silent as a tomb; he has not said a word about the 41-cent butter sold to the British. He did not say too much about it when the Department was talking of selling butter—perhaps behind the Iron Curtain, and willing to give everybody else in the world a break except the folks back home—the folks who really need it in this country.

The Secretary of Agriculture sold butter to the Department of Defense for from 15 to 20 cents a pound, so it was sold at a loss. As a matter of fact, I may say to the Senator from Florida I am not sure but that there was a violation of the law because, if I recall correctly, though my memory may be a bit hazy on this, the law requires that the commodity be sold at market value, and I think that perhaps what we need now is a checkup and a little investigation as to whether or not the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Agriculture did not violate the law, rather than to be here saying that we incurred such a big loss in agricultural commodities.

We also took a little loss on the synthetic rubber plants not too long ago, if I recall correctly. We were getting ready to dispose of them at less than what they were worth. We took a loss on many items. We sold billions of dollars worth of war surplus items and are still selling surplus items at a loss. We were willing to take a little loss here not long ago; we have bill after bill in Congress to get the Government, so-called, out of business. We have taken losses.

The only time a loss seems to be significant, if we can call it that, is when Mr. Farmer and the farm economy are in the squeeze. I have yet to witness a campaign of downright vilification and outright misrepresentation such as has been waged against this agricultural program. The officials have tried to use the dairy situation to point up the terrific cost of price supports, and the terrible surpluses that result.

Yet they refuse to use any imagination toward a solution. Bill after bill dealing with this subject has been introduced, but not reported to the Senate. There are food stamp plans, dairy diet dividends; the Kerr bill, the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Montana, and the Senator from Louisiana, and several other bills in committee; but there has been no action on them.

Let us take a brief look at the rest of this inventory.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I ask the Senator to yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will yield in a moment.

Let us take a look. Here on the list is rice. How much rice do we have in surplus under the 90 percent parity rate? The Senator from Florida likes to use the word "surplus." I call it inventory. In a world where rice is highly important we have an 11 days supply. Can we not feel the burden of the rice surplus on our back? Eleven days supply of rice. I say we ought to thank God that we have 11 days supply, and we should pray for 25 days supply of it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us see how much of a supply of tobacco there is. We have 3 months and 18 days supply, with 90 percent price support.

I stated that there was 10 months and 14 days supply of wheat.

Next is butter. "Butter" used to be a nice word until Secretary Benson and his Department of Agriculture and some of their advocates started working it over. People used to think of bread and butter as the mark of family wholesomeness, of bread and butter, as the great food of the multitude, like the loaves and fishes of Biblical days. But since we have gotten into the situation where we are being badgered and harassed because of so-called surpluses, butter has become a nasty word. In my book it has not. Butter is still a great food, and if we had a little intelligent participation on the part of some government officials we would not be faced with the problems now confronting us.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is 3 months supply of cheese in surplus, which is under 1952 requirements. And, by the way, since 1952, there are 5 million more people in this country.

Sometimes we Senators, particularly as we get along in years, forget that there are new people in this country. Our population is growing by the millions, an average of 2,700,000 every year, and I shall comment upon the need for more food rather than less.

How about wool? We do not have any extra wool. We have honey, which is under a price support program—that is, under the 0 to 90 percent program. We have a half day's supply of honey in stock. I recall reading not long ago a list of all the stocks the Government owned, and upon which the Government had made loans, and honey was included. I could imagine people saying, "Oh, look, the Government even owns honey from bees." We have only a half day's supply of honey. May I say that things get so sour sometimes in the world in which we live that the sweetness of honey, at least a full day's supply of it, may be of great help.

How about barley, which is a seed grain? We have barley in surplus this year, under Commodity Credit loans or under pledge or Commodity Credit ownership, in the amount of 1 month and 7 days' supply, on the basis of 1952 requirements.

Edible beans. Well, I am sorry, folks, we are running short. We have none extra.

Cottonseed. I believe that we have less than a thousand tons.

Cottonseed meal. We have 12 days' supply of cottonseed meal; and, by the way, cottonseed meal is going to be in great need as a feed.

Cottonseed oil. Well, we have 8 months' and 12 days' supply of cottonseed oils.

Flaxseed. When this report was prepared, we had 5 months and 7 day's supply of flaxseed, and the Senator from Minnesota hereby states that we are running out of flaxseed. The protein feeds are in short supply today. Protein foods are in short supply. I know I am speaking accurately when I say protein feeds are in short supply in terms of the needs of our economy.

Oats. We have 10 days' supply of oats—a 10-day supply of oats. We are just buried in a mountain of oats—10 days' supply.

Rye. We have 2 months' and 26 days' supply.

As to soybeans, when this report was prepared we had 2¾ days' surplus of soy beans, based on 1952 requirements.

Now, I look at my good friend from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and I point out to him that soybeans are as short in supply as hens' teeth, and the soybean price has gone skyhigh.

May I point out to my friend from Florida that soybeans sold in the market at $2.18 a bushel cash, and they are $3.75 now. When the farmers harvested their crops, many of them had to sell for cash because of the delay in processing of Commodity Credit loans, and the man who obtained those soybeans is now getting $3.75.

I will now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator realize that in reading this list of flexible price-supported commodities which are not in heavy supply, and some of which are not in supply at all, the Senator is making, in the best possible way, a case for flexible price supports, because it is a fact—and the Senator, I am sure, will have to recognize it—that the huge surpluses which he likes to term inventories, come from those commodities which are 90-percent price supported?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. The worst surplus, I may say to the Senator from Florida, the one over which the Senator from Florida has cried and has complained, is the one that is flexed to pieces—the surplus of butter. That is the one about which the Senator was complaining, with a parity of 75 percent to 90 percent; that is the one that does not work. That is the one with from 75 to 90 percent of parity, the program the Senator from Florida favors, which disrupted the entire program. That is the program about which he is unhappy; that is the flexible price support program, and when the flex worked, how did it work? It worked down. When the farmer was in trouble, where did his help go? It went out the back door.

Now, let us take a look at the 90 percent, and see who got hurt. There was 3 months' supply of corn. I ask my good friend from Florida, is he willing to stand on this floor and say that we ought not to have a 3 months' supply of corn?

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator wish me to respond?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I want the Senator to tell us, does he want to advocate less than a 3 months' corn supply?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida knows that is not the total supply of corn on hand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Those are the Commodity Credit Corporation figures.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida also knows—because the information has come before the committee of which he is a member—that corn in that surplus supply is spoiling.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Where is it spoiling?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida knows likewise that when the corn crop this year, as it is estimated, is marketed, there will be an ever larger supply on hand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There will be——

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will permit me to finish my answer, I should like to say that with respect to wheat also, in spite of the drought, the latest estimate shows a steadily rising surplus. These heavy surpluses exist as to commodities which are 90 percent price supported.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Like rice?

Mr. HOLLAND. In the case of rice, if the Senator from Minnesota will yield further, the Senator from Minnesota must know that rice is in short supply the world over, and he must also know that the domestic acreage of rice has been more than doubled in the postwar years because of that situation. He must further know—or at least I hope he knows—that rice has been selling during the last several years at much over 100 percent of parity, and is still well above 90 percent of parity. I believe the Senator knows that the reason is the tieup of the principal source of rice, Indochina, in the war that has been in progress there for several years.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF MEMBERS OF THE JAPANESE DIET

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam President, I should like to present to the Senate five members of the Japanese House of Representatives, who are visiting the United States as delegates of the Japanese Diet. The members of the delegation are Kosaku Shinoda, Liberal, chairman; Hisao Kodaira, Liberal; Mikiji Mori, Social Democrat; Einosuke Maeda, Social Democrat; Yukichi Yamano, secretary.

I am sure all of us welcome the members of the delegation to the floor of the Senate.

As they can understand from the debate to which they have been listening, the Senate is discussing a very important subject, our agricultural program. We are glad to welcome the members of the Diet, and hope they will enjoy their visit to the Senate of the United States. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the members of the Japanese Diet will be very much interested in the subject of our debate, particularly as it relates to the question of what we should do with our surplus food. I would suggest that if those Members of the Senate who have any doubts will discuss the matter with the members of the delegation, they will soon discover what could be done with some of the surplus food we have on hand. There are none so blind as those who will not see; none so deaf as those who will not hear. I am very glad to extend to our visitors the hand of Christian compassion. I am sure they are very much interested in food surpluses.

AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3052) to encourage a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a table which I had prepared, relating to the quantity of commodities pledged to commodity credit loans, giving figures as to the months and days the supply will last, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Quantity of commodities pledged for CCC loans and owned by CCC and months and days present supply will last, based on 1952 requirements as of May 31, 1954

Commodity	Pledged for loans	Owned by CCC	Total	Domestic disappearance plus gross exports, 1952	Quantity used per month, 1952	Months and days present supply will last based on 1952 requirements
Corn ... thousand bushels	393,463	410,154	803,617	[1] 3,152,920	[1] 262,743	3 months, 1½ days.
Cotton, upland ... thousand bales	7,098	132	7,230	12,190	1,015	7 months 3 days.
Peanuts, farmers stocks and shelled ... thousand pounds	133,480	12,808	156,288	[1] 607,449	[1] 50,620	3 months 2 days.
Rice ... thousand hundredweights	1,070	302	1,372	[1] 46,103	[1] 3,842	0 months 11 days.
Tobacco ... thousand pounds	606,208	4,184	610,392	2,043,012	170,251	3 months 18 days.
Wheat ... thousand bushels	205,642	672,978	878,620	1,009,284	84,107	10 months 14 days.
Butter ... thousand pounds		385,364	385,364	1,389,000	115,750	3 months 18 days.
Cheese ... do		392,276	392,276	1,227,000	102,250	3 months 27 days.
Milk, dried ... do		644,460	644,460	1,035,000	86,250	7 months, 14 days.
Honey ... do	688	410	1,098	281,254	23,438	14 days.
Wool ... do	12,857	122,618	135,475			

[1] 1951.

Quantity of commodities pledged for CCC loans and owned by CCC and months and days present supply will last, based on 1952 requirements as of May 31, 1954—Continued

Commodity	Pledged for loans	Owned by CCC	Total	Domestic disappearance plus gross exports, 1952	Quantity used per month, 1952	Months and days present supply will last based on 1952 requirements
Barley ... thousand bushels	18,393	9,813	28,206	273,956	22,830	1 month, 7 days.
Beans, dry edible ... thousand hundredweight	369	1,681	2,050			
Cottonseed ... thousand tons	(2)		(2)			
Cottonseed meal ... thousand pounds		171,651	171,651	5,290,000	440,833	12 days.
Cottonseed oil ... do		951,784	951,784	1,359,000	113,250	8 months, 12 days.
Flaxseed ... thousand bushels	5,388	9,494	14,882	35,465	2,955	5 months, 1 day.
Grain, sorghum ... thousand hundredweight	2,151	19,901	22,052	1,188,357	15,696	1 month, 12 days.
Linseed oil ... thousand pounds		43,094	43,094	553,000	46,083	29 days.
Oats ... thousand bushels	30,198	6,580	36,778	1,364,441	113,703	10 days.
Rye ... do	2,935	1,616	4,551	19,112	1,593	2 months, 26 days.
Soybeans ... do	2,179	19	2,198	[1] 283,001	23,588	2¾ days.
Tung oil ... thousand pounds	22,328	5,770	28,098	51,295	4,274	7 months.

[1] 1951.

[2] Less than a thousand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, a few moments ago we were engaged in discussion about the cost of the surpluses, or the inventory, and there was, of course, rather sharp debate and commentary, and disagreement over the extent of the inventory supplies. I should like to have my colleagues remember that in the foreign aid bill which was passed by the Senate this week, we pledged $1,300,000,000 for a country for which we did not even have a program—Indochina. With the carryover from last year, and the new authorization of this year, there is $1,300,000,000 for Indochina, and yet we do not even have a blueprint of what is going to be done with the money which is available.

The total realized loss on basic commodities supported at 90 percent from October 1933 to May 1954 was $131 million. So the sum total of the loss on commodity-credit basic supplies for 21 years, was one-tenth of the 1-year authorization for Indochina.

Stated another way, the amount we have made available for Indochina in fiscal 1955 is $1,300,000,000—mark my words, Madam President—without even a blueprint of action, not even knowing what we are going to do with it. We just gave it to the President to spend, to give away, to use for whatever purposes he may deem necessary for our defense and security.

The total realized loss on all price-supported commodities — everything from tung nuts to cotton, from honey to wheat, oats, barley, rye, grain sorghums—was $1,164,000,000, less than the fiscal 1955 authorizations for Indochina.

I think it is a little out of character to complain about a program which has cost so little and has yielded such favorable economic results and such splendid internal strength for America.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In my opinion, the Senator from Minnesota is making an outstanding speech on the farm problem. Can he tell the Senate how much the price-support program as to dairy products has affected the price of milk to the consumer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We were discussing that yesterday. As the Senator knows, when the price-support program on dairy products was reduced, instead of its affecting the retail price to the city dweller, to the consumer, in a downward manner, reducing the price, the price went up.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The price went up. So the flexible price-support program below 90 percent for the dairy industry was of no benefit to the consumer in the city.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Except as to butter. In the case of butter it was of slight benefit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, except as to butter. So far as milk is concerned, the price rose and there are still applications in various parts of the country seeking a still higher price.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope the Senator will today point out that the subsidies paid to the farmer are not the only subsidies paid to segments of the American economy, since the airlines, the steamships, the railroads, and other segments of the economy likewise receive subsidies. I hope he will also point out that the imposition of a tariff which has been in effect for over 150 years is also a subsidy to big business. I hope especially the Senator will point out to the people and to the Senate the amount of subsidies paid to the big magazines and newspapers, which have taken it upon themselves to point out just how bad the subsidy program is, without at the same time telling their readers that they likewise are the recipients of subsidies in far greater amounts and over a far longer period of time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall do that. I mentioned last evening to the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] that I took sharp issue with the thesis and philosophy which he advanced last night insofar as it pertained to agriculture. He was underlining what he thought were the basic ingredients of a free-enterprise program. I agree that the idea and the philosophy were beautiful and good, except that they were not practical in the realities of the world in which we live. As the Senator from Montana has pointed out, there are many administered areas of our economy, there are many firmed-up areas of our economy. There are the tariffs which the Senator mentioned, and the Federal Reserve Board, which controls credits and reserve requirements for our monetary policy. I shall go into that in some detail.

We do not live in the ideal Adam Smith economy of the theoretician or the theoretical economist. We live in a world of practical reality.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not quite possible to assume that with the flexible price-support program in effect, with diverted acreage and the like, there will be, not less production, but more production, at a far cheaper price to the farmer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that so far as the farm population is concerned, there has been a steady exodous from rural areas into urban centers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; the Senator is, of course, correct. I point out to the Senator that one of our serious problems for the future is how we are to maintain on the land a sufficient number of family units or agricultural producers to meet the food and fiber needs of our country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Exactly. If my understanding is correct, whereas today 1 farmer feeds 4 people, by 1975 he will feed 5; but there is an exodus from the farm.

We are complaining about the surpluses. I am amazed that the surpluses are so small as indicated by the figures given to the Senate this morning by the Senator from Minnesota. Certainly, a 3-month supply of corn is not too much to expect in the way of an inventory.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us go further. Let us say we had a 6-month supply of corn.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would not be too much. A year's supply would not be too much.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator think, for example, that a great corporation like duPont or General Motors does not have inventories of material for months ahead?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course they have, and so has the Government, in the line of defense and security items.

Mr. HUMPHREY. These great industries must have inventories. That is

the security that they have in the market place. Inventory gives regularity of price structure. Inventory gives regularity of production flow. Inventory is the balance wheel. It is the gyroscope which keeps the economic ship of state in balance.

I have never heard such nonsense in my life as the concern about inventory. The time to be concerned about inventory is when there is none.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. Inventory is just as much a safeguard to the farmer as it is to the businessman. It gives him, as it does the businessman, a sense of security.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator recall the debates we have had on military procurement and on foreign aid and the use of the term "pipeline?"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What does the term "pipeline" mean? It means the flow of goods through the long pipeline of inventory.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, covering supplies for 2 or 3 years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have as much as 15 or 16 billion dollars of unexpended but obligated funds for military procurement. When the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was handling the Defense Department appropriation bill, he pointed out that we had over $15 billion of unobligated funds, making a total of from 30 to 40 billion dollars of obligated and unobligated funds. We were considering the foreign aid bill the other day, with billions of dollars of unexpended but obligated funds.

What does this mean? This means building inventory. Our main worry in defense is inventory, and when the inventory gets low we become unhappy.

In the days of the Korean war Senator after Senator arose on the floor and complained about the fact that there was a shortage of ammunition, that we had only a 90 days' supply of ammunition, and they gave the Defense Department a working-over the like of which the Department had not had before. But when the Commodity Credit Corporation has a 90-day supply of corn, one would think it was a mortal sin, and the wrath of God would come down upon the earth and destroy fragile human beings; that we ought to be ashamed of ourselves.

I say to the Senator that the Department of Agriculture, under the administration of Mr. Benson, by propaganda, by distortion, by wrong emphasis, and by misrepresentation, has tried to make the American people feel that one of the great assets of our time, namely, an abundance of food and fiber, is a disaster and a crime.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In line with what the Senator has just said, is it not true that farm prices have declined between 15 and 20 percent, mostly in the last 2 years, 19 months of which were under the Republican administration but that farmers' costs have gone up and the costs of the consumers, those who eat the commodities the farmers produce, have likewise gone up? So who has got rich on this particular kind of transaction? Not the farmer. Not the consumer. Who has been raking in the dough?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have trying to have a study made of that for the last year. I have been asking for a study of the price spread between the consumer and the farmer. My requests have fallen on deaf ears. Fortunately, the House Committee on Agriculture made a report. That report was attacked yesterday on the floor of the Senate. But whether the report is fully complete or not, at least it is a report; it is an effort.

I have written letters to the Department of Agriculture and to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, asking that a study be made of the price spread between the producer and the consumer.

Does the Senator from Montana know that the Senate knocked out an appropriation for funds to have a study made of such a price spread?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have heard much talk about the costs of storage and the problem of surpluses. Does the Senator think that our textile industry could operate without a knowledge of the inventory of cotton in reserve? Does the Senator think there could be a textile industry in the United States without reserves of cotton?

In discussing storage costs, is it not deliberate misrepresentation not to separate the costs of carrying the normal reserves, which the law pinpoints—the law says there must be a certain amount of normal reserves for our country—and the costs of any actual surpluses beyond a foreseeable demand?

Can the Department of Agriculture provide such cost figures with respect to storage costs, separating the cost of the normal reserves from the excess reserves? Congress has laid down the law as to normal reserves.

Does the Department of Defense try to frighten the people with statements of the cost of storing materiel and munitions? Have the people of America been propagandized into thinking it is a crime for the Department of Defense to spend millions and millions of dollars every year for the storage of defense commodities?

Does the Office of Defense Mobilization tell us how much it costs daily and hourly to stockpile our strategic materials?

I am here to say that the Secretary of Agriculture and this administration have deliberately, willfully, and premeditatedly tried to frighten the American people away from a successful agricultural program by distortion of the facts and by misrepresentation of the truth.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Minnesota has anticipated the question I had intended to raise. But, with reference to the matter of costs, it was my impression that the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the proper committees of the Senate and House and tried to create the impression, by citing the costs of the entire agricultural program, that the parity program was costing the consumer in the neighborhood of $16 billion when, as a matter of fact, over a 21-year period, the cost, as I recall, was $2,100,000,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was $1,194,000,000. I misstated the figure a short time ago when I said it was $1,164,000,- It is $1,194,000,000. That is the amount of the realized loss from 1933, in the month of October, until the end of May 1954.

That is the realized loss, through a worldwide depression, through the Second World War, through the postwar readjustment time, through a cold war, through the Korean war, in a country which has gone from the bottom of the pit of economic disaster to the heights of inflation. That is the realized loss.

I say that the Secretary of Agriculture ought to be ashamed of himself, and his Department ought to be ashamed of itself, for going up and down the land, trying to make the American people believe that the agricultural plan is a menace to our economic solvency; that it is undermining the moral fiber of the people.

The American farmer has moral fiber, and he does a pretty good job with it. If any moral fiber needs to be improved, it is in the administration in Washington.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Some of the finest moral fiber was developed by the people who had to go through the depression in the 1930's. It is not only the farmers alone; it is the rest of the economy; and in the case of the 1930's, it was the rest of the world.

The Senator mentioned costs. He cited a figure of $1,194,000,000 over a 21-year period.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What does that sum mean when it is applied to every man, woman, and child in the United States, over that entire period?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It means 35 cents a year for each man, woman, and child. It is the equivalent of the price of two packages of cigarettes before the price went up. It is the equivalent of 1 gallon of high-octane gasoline, with a 3-cent tip. That is the cost. That is what some persons are complaining about.

This is the terrible agricultural program which has got to be emasculated and weakened, rather than strengthened.

It has cost an average of 35 cents a year for every member of the Mansfield family, and 35 cents a year for every member of the Humphrey family, for 21 years.

If this country cannot afford 35 cents a year for each man, woman, and child so as to have a stable market, I do not know what we can expect.

One would think that the support program is for the benefit only of farmers. Apparently some persons have very short memories.

Does not every Member of the Senate know that farm income and factory employment go up and down together? That problem has been studied recently. There was a bill before the Senate which

the administration sponsored to strengthen unemployment compensation, so as to put about $100 million in the unemployment compensation fund. Why? Because of a lack of jobs. A lack of jobs can be traced to a depressed farm income.

Senators can examine the statistical records of the United States for a half century, and the records are in existence, ever since the establishment of the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, and even before that, and it will be found that as agricultural income goes down the amount of workers' income and the number of jobs go down. But when agricultural income goes up, then the workers' income, jobs, and hours worked will go up.

Who are the consumers? The consumers are the great rank and file of the American people. Some of the persons who oppose the price-support program will not consume pork chops. They have ulcers. They have been too successful, while they have been worrying so much about the speculative. They have been conniving too much.

The real consumer in America is the man who drives a little car to the factory gate. The real consumers in America are the housewives, the fathers, and the children of the American families. Those people represent the real consumers. Eighty percent of the taxpayers of this country are persons having incomes of less than $5,000 a year. Those are the persons who consume farm commodities. When they see an agricultural decline, they know that their income will be cut.

Madam President, we are living in that period today. I am not talking theory; I am talking facts, as of 12 o'clock noon today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that farmers are also consumers? Is it not true also that there are today in the United States approximately 1,400,000 farm families who are earning less than $1,000 a year in this era of high prices and high wages?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I have some material which most likely I shall not have an opportunity to discuss with respect to farm income, but it is shocking.

What is the average income of a farm family as compared with the average family income throughout the Nation?

I learned, for example, that farmers used more steel in 1952 than did all the automobile manufacturers combined.

Farmers consumed more rubber than all the rubber which went onto 6 million automobiles, including spare tires.

Farmers consumed more petroleum products than did any other single industry in the United States.

Farmers consumed more electricity than did the cities of Houston, Baltimore, Detroit, and Chicago.

Farmers are big consumers. I think the record will bear out that statement. I have clippings, which I shall introduce for the RECORD, indicating that the International Harvester Co. has laid off hundreds of employees, and is planning to lay off another 5,000. International Harvester does not like to lay off its workers. The workers are being laid off for the simple reason that farmers are not buying farm equipment. That is a part of our problem.

Much has been said about the cost of storage. Why does not the Department of Defense have banner headlines emblazoned across the newspapers showing how much it costs to store tanks, ammunition, and atom bombs?

I should like to ask my good friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] if I am not correct when I state that in September or October 1953 there was a meeting of the Supreme Soviet in Moscow, at which Mr. Malenkov announced that the Soviet had exploded a hydrogen bomb. For 8 days the fact of the explosion was denied officially in this country. Then it was admitted. However, the most significant thing about Mr. Malenkov's speech was the announcement that the major problem in the Soviet Union was the lack of sufficient production in Soviet agriculture. The Soviet Government has been trying to reorganize its agricultural economy.

The leaders of the Soviet Union recognize that their agricultural production is not sufficient. It is my opinion that that factor is one of the reasons why the Soviet Union has not sent its own troops to many areas of the world. The Soviet Union simply does not have enough food. It has the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb, and has many more men in uniform than we have. It has sufficient military power and equipment of all kinds, except for the one basic ingredient of food. Napoleon knew a great many things about fighting wars and military tactics, and he said that an army travels on its stomach, which means that a nation cannot fight without sufficient food. A nation cannot be secure without sufficient food.

I am amazed and shocked to think that some of us are so blind that we are seeing to it that there is a sufficient supply of critical metals and materials on hand, as well as all kinds of other military equipment, but the minute there is on hand a 3 months' supply of corn, it is averred that the price support program must be changed, and that it is a terrible program.

A 3 months' stockpile of dairy products is created because of many unusual circumstances, such as good weather, good pasture, the failure of farmers to cull their herds because of low beef prices, and unusual production. Immediately some say that we must get rid of the price support program because it has not worked.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Getting back to the statement of the Senator from Minnesota about the hydrogen bomb and the announcement by the Soviet Union that the Russians had exploded one, it is true that such an announcement was made in August 1953, and it is also true that we refused to recognize that event, officially at least, for several days. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if it is not true that the Soviet Union has also made an announcement that it has successfully built the first 5,000-kilowatt reactor plant. Is that not true?

Mr. HUMPHREY. To the best of my knowledge, that is true.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yesterday the Soviet Union made a further announcement to the effect that they were building 25,000- and 50,000-kilowatt reactor plants, which indicates how far ahead the Soviet Union is going in the hydrogen field. As the Senator from Minnesota has so ably pointed out, it is true that the only factor holding back the Soviet Union at the present time is their lagging behind in farm production.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Montana is eminently correct. In fact, if my colleagues have been reading the newspapers, they may have noticed a statement recently made by Mr. Krushchev, the Secretary of the Communist Party, who is really a coming, important official in the Soviet Union. He stated a tremendous improvement has been made in the Soviet Union in the direction of moving hundreds of thousands of young Russians to other areas of Russia in order to stimulate agricultural production. The Soviet Union has put millions of rubles into an agricultural expansion program in order to make its economy tighter. Here we sit in America with the blessings of an abundance of food for ourselves and our allies, if need be, and for the peoples throughout the world, and Senator after Senator rises on the floor of the Senate and states that that is bad. I wonder if Senators would say it is bad to have a surplus of savings. Every once in a while I hear Senators mention how many billions of dollars in savings we have. That is good. Dollars, however, are not the only things that represent savings. Savings are represented in inventories. An inventory is a form of saving. An inventory of commodities in the agricultural field is a form of saving. It is a form of good economic health.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not peculiar that in this country, so far as the farm situation is concerned, we are developing a fear of plenty, when instead there should be a fear of scarcity? We cannot have too much food, in view of our growing population and world needs, based on the position of this Government in the world. I think the Senator is making an extremely able speech today in an attempt to bring home facts which the American people should know. It is my hope that his statement will receive wide publicity, so the other side of the farm picture can be shown and the people can make up their own minds.

I hope Congress will exercise its good judgment and see to it that the 90 percent support program is extended for another year. I should like to see a 100-percent program extended not only for another year, but for a number of years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Montana for his kind remarks.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks copies of two letters, one dated July 16, 1954, and the other dated October 2, 1953, with reference to the study I have suggested on the price spread from the producer to the consumer.

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

JULY 16, 1954.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: You may recall that last October 2 I wrote you urging that your committee undertake an immediate and thorough investigation of meat price spreads between producers and retailers.

At that time I said I believed this was a proper matter for congressional inquiry, and not something to be left to the Department of Agriculture to do on its own.

I was pleased that you concurred and announced such an inquiry would be made, broadened to cover all price spreads between farm producers and consumers. If I recall rightly you appointed Senator WILLIAMS to head a special subcommittee for that purpose.

Since that time it has been my pleasure to rejoin you as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. My interest in this price spread situation continues, particularly during a period when unfair efforts are being put forth to convince consumers farmers are responsible for high food prices when the record of falling farm returns proves that is untrue.

However, since its appointment, I have heard no more about the inquiry by your subcommittee. I have seen no report brought before our full committee for consideration. May I inquire what happened to this investigation? Was it in fact ever conducted? Have any hearings been held about which I have not been informed?

It would seem most helpful to have findings of such an inquiry available for consideration of America's consumers at this time, so they could know the real relationship between prices producers get and prices consumers pay. It might help clarify some of the widespread misunderstanding resulting from propaganda blaming farmers and our price-support programs for high food prices. I'm sure it would help consumers to better understand the present problems of America's farmers, and the importance to agriculture of an effective price-support program.

I would welcome your assurance that the inquiry has not been forgotten and will be pushed to completion as originally intended.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

OCTOBER 2, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: My own observations and overwhelming complaints from stockmen during the recess of the Congress prompt me to urge your committee to undertake an immediate and thorough investigation of the unusual and seemingly unjustified spread between prices cattle producers are receiving for beef and prices consumers are being compelled to pay for beef in the retail markets.

It is difficult for me to reconcile the continued increase in meat costs to consumers at a time when prices paid to the producers are still falling.

As the level of retail prices affects consumer consumption, unreasonable prices in the market place can only act to further depress the already low prices to producers. I think the producers and the public as consumers are entitled to know the facts as to where the profits in the meat industry are going, so as to better judge whether or not the farmer is receiving a fair return in comparison with that realized by others handling his product.

I believe any such investigation should consider carefully the effect meat grading has on price spreads, particularly as to comparing the differences between different grades of meat at the retail level with the differences between different grades on the hoof when the producer sends his cattle to market.

I am sure you would find such an inquiry welcomed by beef producers and by meat consumers, as a contribution of fact toward developing some stability in the meat market that would serve the best interests of consumer and producer alike.

I believe this is a proper matter for congressional inquiry, and not something to be left to the Department of Agriculture to do on its own, particularly in view of the Secretary of Agriculture's recent action in naming an official of the American Meat Institute as one of his key aids in the Department. I am sure you will agree that producers and the public alike can only have confidence in findings of an inquiry kept free of any undue influence from executives of the meat packing industry directly involved in that inquiry.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I say regretfully that nothing has been done about these requests either at the top levels in the administration or at the committee level in the Senate. I wish publicly to commend the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives for its work in making the study on food costs.

Mr. MAYBANK. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct when he speaks of the rising cost of living and the plight of the farmer who is faced with decreasing prices for his products. The Senator from Minnesota is also quite correct when he refers to others who receive subsidies. In fact, almost every one except the farmers is subsidized 100 percent.

With the Senator's permission, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the subsidies paid to steamship lines from 1934 through last year, not including this year. The total amount paid to the steamship lines in the form of subsidies up to last year was $228,330,915.25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

EXHIBIT 1

U. S. Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration—Summary of operating-differential subsidy paid and recaptured under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, cumulative to June 30, 1954

	Temporary agreements [1]			Long-range agreements			Total		
	Paid	Recaptured	Net paid	Paid	Recaptured	Net paid	Paid	Recaptured	Net paid
American Diamond Lines, Inc	$185,802.06	$28,491.89	$157,310.17	0	0	0	$185,802.06	$28,491.89	$157,310.17
American Export Lines, Inc	568,103.39	112,950.46	455,152.93	$32,132,899.72	$5,252,628.66	$26,880,271.06	32,701,003.11	5,365,579.12	27,335,423.99
American Mail Line, Ltd	479,198.39	0	479,198.39	7,995,839.26	145,870.61	7,849,968.65	8,475,037.65	145,870.61	8,329,167.04
American President Lines, Ltd	1,407,355.50	0	1,407,355.50	38,035,183.15	6,102,000.00	31,933,183.15	39,442,538.65	6,102,000.00	33,340,538.65
Atlantic, Caribbean Steam Navigation Co	63,208.64	45,495.77	17,712.87	0	0	0	63,208.64	45,495.77	17,712.87
Baltimore Mail Steamship Co	416,269.35	0	416,269.35	0	0	0	416,269.35	0	416,269.35
Farrell Lines, Inc. (formerly American South African Line)	140,314.15	0	140,314.15	15,318,202.95	923,162.48	14,395,040.47	15,458,517.10	923,162.48	14,535,354.62
Grace Line, Inc	654,294.80	116,829.53	537,465.27	20,499,916.08	2,333,206.92	18,166,709.16	21,154,210.88	2,450,036.45	18,704,174.43
Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	735,615.85	720,443.43	15,172.42	15,946,117.23	5,726,980.86	10,219,136.37	16,681,733.08	6,447,424.29	10,234,308.79
Mississippi Shipping Co., Inc	147,002.57	147,002.57	0	14,235,289.61	1,792,643.73	12,442,645.88	14,382,292.18	1,939,646.30	12,442,645.88
Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc	933,286.49	0	933,286.49	36,546,837.33	3,699,397.87	32,847,439.46	37,480,123.82	3,699,397.87	33,780,725.95
New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co	215,320.80	0	215,320.80	5,626,240.54	819,303.30	4,806,937.24	5,841,561.34	819,303.30	5,022,258.04
Oceanic Steamship Co., Inc	265,902.46	2,682.85	263,219.61	5,673,578.18	557,285.82	5,116,292.36	5,939,480.64	559,968.67	5,379,511.97
Pacific Argentine Brazil Line, Inc	271,074.61	264,951.28	6,123.33	2,755,022.03	0	2,755,022.03	3,026,096.64	264,951.28	2,761,145.36
Pacific Far East Line, Inc	0	0	0	1,105,372.60	0	1,105,372.60	1,105,372.60	0	1,105,372.60
Pacific Transport Line, Inc	0	0	0	518,895.20	0	518,895.20	518,895.20	0	518,895.20
Seas Shipping Co., Inc	0	0	0	9,692,686.44	1,167,548.10	8,525,138.34	9,692,686.44	1,167,548.10	8,525,138.34
South Atlantic Steamship Co	96,373.72	84,691.65	11,682.07	0	0	0	96,373.72	84,691.65	11,682.07
United States Lines Co	901,111.14	0	901,111.14	46,212,383.91	1,400,215.12	44,812,168.79	47,113,495.05	1,400,215.12	45,713,279.93
Total	7,480,233.92	1,523,539.43	5,956,694.49	252,294,464.23	29,920,243.47	222,374,220.76	259,774,698.15	31,443,782.90	228,330,915.25

[1] Temporary agreements in effect in 1937–39 prior to execution of long-range agreements.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not opposed to steamship lines receiving subsidies, because Congress authorized the subsidies. I wish to mention the amounts that a few of the steamship lines received. The American Diamond Lines, Inc., received $157,310.17. The American Export Lines, Inc., received $27,335,423.99. The American Mail Line, Ltd., received $8,329,-167.04. The American President Lines, Ltd., received $33,340,538.65.

The table I have asked to have printed in the RECORD lists the remainder of the lines, and I shall not read further from the table. The taxpayers have had to pay the amounts set forth. I think it was the right thing to do, because we want to have American ships at sea, and we need a strong maritime organization. However, why should we approve the payment of $228 million to steamship lines, which I admit is necessary, but refuse to pay anything to the farmers? I remind by colleagues that nothing has been lost on the major crops.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for making the contribution which he has made. I recognize the necessity of subsidies for ships for our American security, but I also recognize the necessity of supports for American farmers.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota will yield to me, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor, in order that we may have a brief executive session.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield under those conditions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOWRING in the Chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Ira A. Dixon, of Indiana, to be a member of the Home Loan Bank Board; and

C. Canby Balderston, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Lorene W. Bowlus, of Maryland, to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at Baltimore, Md., to fill an existing vacancy; and

Frank Peska, of Illinois, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 39, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill., to fill an existing vacancy.

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Cale J. Holder, of Indiana, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Indiana, to fill a new position; and

Hon. W. Lynn Parkinson, of Indiana, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Indiana, to fill a new position.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joe McDonald Ingraham, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Texas, vice Thomas M. Kennerly, retired;

Whitney Gilliland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States;

Mrs. Pearl Carter Pace, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States;

Henry J. Clay, of New York, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States;

Harry R. Hewitt, of Hawaii, to be fifth judge, first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii; and

Louis B. Blissard, of Hawaii, to be United States attorney for the district of Hawaii, vice Albert William Barlow resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS—NOMINATIONS PREVIOUSLY PASSED OVER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I noticed that on today's Executive Calendar, the nomination of Thomas W. Robison, of Lecompte, La., is included by error, inasmuch as that nomination was cleared and taken care of yesterday.

With the exception of the postmaster nomination of Harry H. Seylaz, of Lincroft, New Jersey, I ask unanimous consent that the other nomination in this group be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hoy C. Correll, to be postmaster at China Grove, N. C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS—NEW REPORTS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry new reports of postmaster nominations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that these postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McCarran
Anderson	George	McCarthy
Barrett	Gillette	McClellan
Beall	Goldwater	Millikin
Bennett	Green	Monroney
Bowring	Hayden	Morse
Bricker	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bridges	Hennings	Murray
Burke	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bush	Hill	Pastore
Butler	Holland	Payne
Byrd	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Reynolds
Case	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Crippa	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Knowland	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Symington
Duff	Lehman	Thye
Dworshak	Lennon	Upton
Eastland	Long	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Welker
Ervin	Malone	Wiley
Ferguson	Mansfield	Williams
Flanders	Martin	Young
Frear	Maybank	

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. GORE and Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 5, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 1244. An act relating to the renewal of star-route and screen vehicle service contracts;

S. 2027. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue quitclaim deeds to the States for certain lands;

S. 2389. An act to amend the act of December 3, 1942;

S. 2408. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes;

S. 2453. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to implementing the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea relating to radio equipment and radio operators on board ship;

S. 2864. An act to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the North Unit irrigation district, to authorize construction of Haystack Reservoir on the Deschutes Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes;

S. 3137. An act to amend the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and

to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of the said act, and for other purposes;

S. 3464. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to make certain provision for the carrying out of the agreement for the promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio;

S. 3681. An act to authorize the Civil Service Commission to make available group life insurance for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service, and for other purposes;

S. 3697. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1937, as amended, to include cooperation with the Governments of Canada or Mexico or local Canadian or Mexican authorities for the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases;

S. 3699. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Louisiana and Texas and relating to the waters of the Sabine River;

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to repeal certain World War II laws relating to return of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution designating the month of September 1955 as John Marshall Bicentennial Month, and creating a commission to supervise and direct the observance of such month.

THE JUNIOR SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN—APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the order of the Senate to refer Senate Resolution 301 to a select committee to study, the Chair, acting on the recommendations of the majority leader and the minority leader, has made the following appointments of Members to serve on that committee. From the majority, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. From the minority, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe the majority leader submitted the resolution providing for the select committee, and I ask unanimous consent that I may ask him a few questions relative to the intention of his resolution in an endeavor to get some indication or understanding of the legislative intent of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? Without objection, he may proceed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall not detain the Senate very long. I merely wish to ask the majority leader his understanding of the purpose and function of the committee. As I pointed out several times, the committee in the Bingham case did not make a recommendation to the Senate for or against censure. It did not mention censure at all. It found a specific fact. The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] confirmed that fact very clearly in his statement about the Bingham case.

It occurs to me that the proper function, or at least the intention, as I see it—for whatever it may be worth—of the committee is to examine into the bill of particulars, the individual specific facts alleged, and report to the Senate regarding them, rather than to examine them and then merely report to the Senate what its conclusion is as to whether there should be censure.

I ask the majority leader if that is in accord with his understanding of the purpose of the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, all I wish to say is that I believe the order of the Senate and the resolution speak for themselves. I should like to read the order as it is entered in the official RECORD of the Senate. It reads as follows:

Ordered, That Senate Resolution 301, to censure the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. MCCARTHY, submitted by Senator FLANDERS on July 30, and amendments proposed thereto, be referred to a select committee as provided in the motion set forth below and agreed to by the Senate on Monday, August 2 (legislative day, Friday, July 2, 1954):

"Mr. President, I move to refer the pending resolution (S. Res. 301) together with all amendments proposed thereto, to a select committee to be composed of 3 Republicans and 3 Democrats who shall be named by the Vice President: *And ordered further*, That the committee, which shall be authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable, and that the committee be instructed to act and make a report to this body prior to the adjournment sine die of the Senate in the 2d session of the 83d Congress."

The resolution and the order speak for themselves. The determination as to the type of report and the nature of the report and the findings of the committee are matters which the committee itself will have to determine after due deliberations and after gathering such testimony and information as the members of the committee determine in their judgment they should gather.

Let me say to the Senator from Arkansas that the six members of the committee are men of the highest caliber and of judicial temperament. Personally, I would be willing to go on trial for my life before the group as a whole or before any individual member of the group, be he Democrat or Republican. That is the confidence I have in the caliber, character, and impartiality of every one of the members of the committee, regardless of the side of the aisle from which any member of the committee comes from.

So far as I am concerned, I am prepared to give great weight, after the committee shall have concluded its deliberations, to its judgment as to what type of report it shall make and when it shall submit it to the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I deny as forcibly as I can the implication of the latter remarks of the Senator from California, the majority leader. I certainly had no intention in any way to cast any reflection upon the membership of the committee. So far as I am concerned, they are extremely able men.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I was not even remotely implying that the Senator from Arkansas had any other idea.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know what other reason the Senator from California could have had in mind. I said nothing about the membership of the committee. I intended to make my remarks before the announcement about the membership was made. I did not understand what the procedure would be. The Chair announced the membership.

It was not my purpose by my question to raise any question about the membership of the committee. I know intimately every member of the committee, except the new Member, whom few of us know very well.

I have the greatest confidence in the members of the committee. That is not the point of my inquiry. The point is, as I have said before, that I believe in matters of this kind precedents in this body are extremely important, partly because there are so few precedents. In the last precedent the Senate did not delegate to a committee the question of drawing conclusions with regard to a fellow member.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the first place, I should like to say to the Senator from Arkansas—and I wish this to be very clear—that I was not implying, directly or indirectly, and the thought never even entered my mind, that the Senator from Arkansas was casting any reflection on the committee.

He had addressed an inquiry to me as majority leader, which, at least to me, had the implication that as a matter of legislative history I might be circumscribing the responsibilities and duties and powers of the committee. Those responsibilities and duties and powers are clearly set forth in the resolution of the Senate and in the order of the Senate.

I was merely saying that with that caliber of committee, made up of Members from both sides of the aisle, I am willing to let the members of the committee deliberate and make determination as to the type of report and the time of the report to the Senate, within the four walls, so to speak, of the resolution, which I believe is very clear. That was my only reason for making the statement I made.

If the Senator will bear with me, he mentioned the so-called Bingham case. I well remember that the Senator himself argued on the floor of the Senate that in the Bingham case, while testimony had been taken before a committee, that testimony had been taken prior to the introduction of a resolution of censure, and, therefore, that case is not on all fours with the present situation before the Senate.

In the situation before the Senate, the resolution was introduced first. Pursuant to that resolution, and the amendments thereto and the substitute therefor, the Senate, acting with the full knowledge of the facts, created the committee. Under the circumstances, I do not believe that the committee must necessarily be bound by the procedure in the Bingham case.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is such an important and unusual matter that I would not want to be a party—and I do

not believe the Senate would want to be, either—to delegating to a body consisting of less than the whole membership of the Senate—that is, to any committee—the power, or, I should say, perhaps, the function, because there is no question that the committee has the power to make such a report; but I believe the question of the propriety of its bringing in a recommendation should be reserved for decision by this body as a whole.

Inasmuch as we have no precedent for a committee—whether it be a committee of 6 members or 8 members, but consisting of less than the whole body of the Senate—making a recommendation directly on the point of censure, I hope this committee will not do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in the circumstances of this case, with the resolution which has been adopted by the Senate, when the resolution and the background of the whole matter are clear, and in view of the high caliber of the committee which has been appointed, I do not believe that, as a part of the legislative history, we should now try to circumscribe the committee, which has not even had an opportunity to hold its initial meeting to discuss its preliminary procedures.

So far as the Senate having control of the case is concerned, whatever course of action the committee in its wisdom and judicial determination shall finally determine upon, under the terms of the resolution, when the committee reports to the Senate—whatever it may report to the Senate—the final decision, of course, will be in the hands of the Senate. The Senate may then either agree with the report or reject the report. I suppose it could even send the report back to the committee. In any event, the power ultimately rests in the 96 Members of the Senate.

I do not believe that as a part of the legislative history which is not in particular keeping with the terms of the resolution itself, we should seek to circumscribe the able and conscientious committee which has been appointed.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question. I should like to have an opportunity to finish what I have to say, and then to sit down.

Mr. FLANDERS. I shall seek the floor when the Senator has concluded.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall take only a minute.

I was hoping that this particular matter could be considered in the light of its importance. To illustrate my meaning, it was publicized the other day that the Democratic policy committee had a meeting to consider the question—and decided, after due consideration, that this was not the kind of question which should be made a party matter. I agree, for I do not think it is a party matter, as distinguished from the many run-of-mine legislative matters which come before the Senate, that is, matters involving all kinds of legislation. As I recall the statement of the minority leader was that this is the type of question which is peculiarly for the conscience of the individual Member, not a matter for party action, with which I agree.

In this case, while the finding as to whether or not the facts stated in the bill of particulars occurred as set forth therein is the function of the committee, so far as I am concerned, I should think it would not be the proper function of a small committee, no matter what the quality of the committee—that is not the question at all—to take upon themselves the question of deciding whether or not there should be a censure. If such a precedent as that were established, then I presume future committees would take similar action based upon such a precedent, whereas as of now there is no precedent for such a conclusion being made or presented to the Senate except by the Senate itself.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like first to express my great satisfaction with the choice of personnel of the committee nominated by the majority and minority leaders and announced by the Chair. I think it is an excellent committee.

I wish next to say that no committee, however judicious and however high in integrity, is the keeper of my conscience. I alone am responsible for my conscience. I judge from the action taken by the minority conference that that is also the opinion of the great body of Senators on the Democratic side. I should suppose that if each one of us on the Republican side thought the matter over, he would be unwilling to turn over to anyone else the responsibility of his conscience—again, no matter how judicious he might be and no matter how great his integrity.

I feel, Mr. President, that this does in a certain sense circumscribe the useful activity of the committee. It can do what it pleases, but it cannot expect to act as the conscience for individual Senators or for the Senate as a whole. That would seem to me to leave a clear field for the investigation of the facts of the allegations made. There can be no question of the committee's usefulness in that particular field. So my suggestion is that that would naturally, normally, and, in the nature of things, be the principal field of activity for this committee.

The seven amendments offered to the resolution by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are well documented. The facts can easily be ascertained from the documents. Among the 33 points which I offered as an amendment, there are many that can be easily documented.

I suggest, for instance, No. 6:

He has attempted to intimidate the press and single out individual journalists who have been critical of him or whose reports he has regarded with disfavor, and either threatened them with subpena or forced them to testify in such a manner as to raise the possibility of a breach of the first amendment of the Constitution.

Names are given. Murray Marder of the Washington Post and Times Herald, the Alsops, and James Wechsler.

This is another serious one:

He has attempted "economic coercion" against the press and radio, particularly the case of Time magazine, the Milwaukee Journal, and Madison Capital Times. On June 16, 1952, McCARTHY sent letters to advertisers in Time magazine urging them to withdraw their ads.

Those are questions of fact, Mr. President, to which the committee may very well, properly and inevitably, address itself.

There is the question of receiving valuable classified documents and permitting the documents to fall into the hands of a gossip columnist, Walter Winchell. That is in No. 13.

No. 17, of course, is:

He has continued to show contempt for the Senate by failing to explain in any manner the six charges contained in the Hennings-Hayden-Hendrickson report.

All the specifications I have mentioned, and others, are capable of immediate, and not long-drawn-out, investigation as to facts.

So it seems to me that that must be the primary purpose and primary undertaking of this committee, and that the facts should then be reported to the Senate so that each Member of the Senate, under the guidance of his own conscience, can vote the motion of censure up or down.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber when the announcement of the members of the committee was made, so I did not hear the announcement. I should like to meet with the members of the committee at the earliest opportunity to make sure that our investigating committee's work does not conflict with the work of this special committee. For example, we have some 6 or 8 witnesses slated for Friday. I should not want to have the committee meet on a day when I had an executive session scheduled with a large number of witnesses called.

Is the Vice President to select the chairman of the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee will select its own chairman.

Mr. McCARTHY. If possible, I should like to sit down this afternoon with the committee and work out with them an arrangement whereby I shall not have a number of witnesses here for our investigating committee on a day they might want me to appear before them. I should like to discuss with the committee other matters, such as the methods of proof, the nature of proof, and what they want. So I hope they will agree that I may meet with them this afternoon.

AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3052) to encourage a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, to get back to the debate on the farm bill, as I said earlier today, we are at last faced with a showdown in the great farm-policy debate which has been underway throughout the United States during the past several years.

I should like my position to be quite clear. There are many areas of the bill now before the Senate which are truly noncontroversial. There are provisions

which will be supported overwhelmingly by the Members of the Senate, and were supported unanimously by the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

We are faced with serious decisions, upon which the future course of our economy may hinge. Therefore, it is fair to say that, despite the colloquy and debate in the Senate, these are not solely political decisions which are being made. They are bread-and-butter decisions. They are economic decisions which affect the livelihood and purchasing power of American farm families, including the dairy products industry.

So I desire to have the RECORD show very clearly that I oppose most vigorously the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], primarily because it would lower the existing price support for basic commodities to 80 percent.

As I have noted earlier, the sliding scale is from 80 to 90 percent. It seems very peculiar to me that the bottom figure is shifted so often. Every time there is another discussion of the farm price-support program, a new figure is arrived at, such as 75 percent, 90 percent, 82½ percent, or 60 percent.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that in all honesty the figure should be 100 percent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. The legitimate goal should be 100 percent.

Mr. LANGER. There is no reason why the figure should have been 80 percent or 90 percent. It should be 100 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The Department of Agriculture maintains, for the measurement of prices, what it calls effective parity. Effective parity, of course, is the 100-percent-of-parity measuring stick, so to speak. There is a great deal of difference between effective parity and price. The difference between the so-called full parity and the actual cost gives a perfectly balanced relationship between industry and agriculture.

Mr. LANGER. During the years I have been associated with the Senator from Minnesota, time and again I have witnessed the splendid fight he has made on the floor of the Senate for the farmers, not only of the Northwest, but also of the entire country. I remember distinctly when he spoke about the subsidy being given to business under the Marshall plan, which was clearly and distinctly for the benefit of the businessmen of the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. At least, it had that effect.

Mr. LANGER. As the Senator knows, it had that effect. I compliment the Senator upon the very fine fight he has made, not only in recent months, but throughout all the years he has been a Member of the Senate. He has made one continuous, unending fight to obtain justice for the farmers of the Nation, and particularly those of the Northwest, where wheat is grown.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate what the Senator has said. He is most kind.

I am a newcomer in this area, compared with the Senator from North Dakota, who has been fighting this battle for 25 or 30 years, or longer. I am happy to stand with him in this effort.

Mr. LANGER. I am particularly eager to have the people of the country know exactly what the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is, in view of the fact that in Minneapolis and some other places in his own State there are those who operate grain exchanges and other facilities—and this is true of my own State of North Dakota, also—who desire to keep prices as low as they possibly can.

The farmers of the State of North Dakota owe a debt of gratitude to the Senator from Minnesota for the help he has given. Not only is this true of the farmers of North Dakota, but it is likewise true of the farmers of Montana and some of the other States.

I observe in the Chamber the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I am certain that he will bear me out in the statement that year after year the farmers in that locality have known of the assistance they have received from the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MURPHEY. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to say to the able Senator from Minnesota, since the Senator from North Dakota was so kind and complimentary toward him, that while I disagree very greatly with him as to many of the things which are being advocated, and while we shall be on opposite sides on a great many issues, I know how sincerely he advocates those measures which he thinks will most surely help the farmers of his State and the farmers of the Nation.

I do not always agree with the Senator from Minnesota with respect to the proposals he supports. I may differ with my very able and dear friend from North Dakota, also, with respect to the measures which he may support. But I pay tribute to him and to the Senator from Minnesota for their sincere interest in the welfare of the farmer.

While many times in the course of the debate the Senator from Minnesota and I may find ourselves on opposite sides, I wish to state for the record that I know the unwavering interest of the Senator from Minnesota is the welfare of the farmers of his State.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico very much.

The Senator may be interested to know that one of the most comprehensive and outstanding bits of testimony ever to be given before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was the testimony which the Senator from New Mexico gave when he was Secretary of Agriculture. I have been reviewing that testimony. With the exception of the flexible principle with respect to the so-called basic commodities, I think in most instances we are in general agreement.

Before I enter into any further colloquy with any Senator, I wish to make it clear that we are not accusing each other. What we are trying to do is to arrive at a decision as to policy. I believe that in the main our objectives are identical. The means we use to arrive at the objectives will be different in some instances. But I shall make note, as the debate progresses, of some of the testimony of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I think he recalls it. I believe it was given in 1947.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. At that time the Senator, who was then Secretary of Agriculture, laid out a broad, comprehensive national program of goals for agriculture. Am I not correct in that statement?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was an excellent presentation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to confirm everything which the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has said with reference to the work of the able Senator from Minnesota. Unlike my friend, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, I find myself uniformly on the same side as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota with respect to the various questions he has discussed in the Senate.

I believe that the Senator from Minnesota is logical, fair, and just. I have never been able to find an instance in which he has varied from a sense of justice and fair play in discussing various subjects on the floor of the Senate. I agree with him that the farmers of America should not be regarded as second-class citizens. They are entitled to the same justice and fair play to which industry is entitled, but the farmers have not been getting it. I assure the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from North Dakota that I am on their side in fighting this battle for the farmers of America.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Montana. For many years he has been a stalwart soldier in the fight for parity for agriculture.

Mr. LANGER. When the distinguished Senator from New Mexico was Secretary of Agriculture, we had various discussions from time to time. There is one principle upon which the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Montana, the Senator from New Mexico, and I have always agreed on, and that is that unless the farmer can get a fair price for his products the small-business man and the laboring man can not prosper.

I know that the Senator from Minnesota is interested not only in the farmers, but in the small-business men of the State of Minnesota it has been the attitude of the Senator from Minnesota that unless the farmer receives fair and adequate prices for his produce, labor and small business in the State of Minnesota cannot prosper either.

As I said before, it has always delighted and pleased the Senator from North Dakota to see the very fine atti-

tude of the Senator from Minnesota toward not merely one class, the farmer, but toward the people as a whole, including the small-business man and the laboring man.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator very much. I do not like to sail under false banners or under false colors. When I have spoken to the farm people of Minnesota, I have told them frankly what they already know, that I am not a farmer. I lay no claim to being one. But I have also said that all my life I have lived in a rural community. Even during the days when I was mayor of Minneapolis, I spent a great deal of my time traveling to other communities of Minnesota, pointing out the interdependence between the rural areas and the urban areas. Let us take the city of Minneapolis as an example, with its banks, headquarters for mills, factories, and service institutions. It must rely for its economic health and prosperity upon the prosperity and purchasing power and the needs of the surrounding trade territory. My father was a small-town merchant, as some of my colleagues may know, and a rather successful one in the sense that he stayed in business during the hard times, and was able to stay in it during good times.

Mr. MURRAY. He was able to give the junior Senator from Minnesota a good education.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remember well the experiences of those days. My father's folks were farmers in Minnesota, having gone there in 1849. I visited the family farm, which is located a mile south of El Grippa, Minn., where my grandfather was one of the outstanding dairy farmers of the State. He was one of the first true scientific dairy farmers of Minnesota. He used to carry his special products in carts to the well-to-do families of Minnesota. I shall not name them, because it might cause some embarrassment, and I do not at all wish to use names for the purpose of embarrassment. But families owning some of the biggest mills in Minnesota, and persons with some of the most well known names in Minneapolis, used to be customers of my grandfather.

I remember he used to have some of the best dairy cattle in the State. My grandfather went to Minnesota from Connecticut in 1849. His ancestors were Yankees, tracing their forebears back to Dudley, Mass., in 1689. On my mother's side, her people were of Norwegian descent, having come to Minnesota in the late 1880's, settling first at Minnehaha Falls, and later going to an area between Webster and Watertown, S. Dak. I grew up on those farms as a boy. I used to work on farms in the summertime. I can remember the days—this is before tractors were used on farms—when we would drive the grain wagon to the country elevator and get in line in front of it. It was actually true that, if one happened to be the last in line, by the time he got to the elevator the price may have gone down 3, 4, or 5 cents. I remember those days.

I also remember the days when as a young man, I was in business with my father. Today I still share in the operation of that business. I remember how our business fell off as farm purchasing power went down.

We all agree that the days of greatly depressed farm income should not come again. We all agree that the farm economy is an essential part of American life. The only reason we are debating farm legislation is that all of us do not want to see on the farms a recurrence of conditions which happened in the past.

Whether he is in favor of price supports of from 75 to 90 percent, of from 85 to 100 percent, or of straight 90 percent, I think every single Member of this Congress wants to make sure that the conditions of which I have spoken do not happen again. In the typical parliamentary manner, what we are doing is battling the problem out in the refinery fire. We are going to have to come to a decision. We hold different views with conviction. Our backgrounds are different. Our experiences are different. Our educations are different. Naturally, our attitudes are different. I am happy about that, because in the long run I know we are going to enact better legislation because of the conflict of ideas than we would if there was a uniformity of ideas.

I may say I am happy to have the company of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] because as I started my remarks I was set upon by strong arguments on the part of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. When I looked around me and saw a few of the stalwart friends of parity for agriculture it gave me courage and strength. I see now in the Chamber some who disagree with us. So I may need the moral support of my friends and also their oratorical, rhetorical, and legislative support. I am happy to see such a splendid tactician present as the senior Senator from North Dakota, who is seasoned in the battle of liberal democracy, and also the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. Thou givest me great courage and strength, gentlemen. I ask them to stay here.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I may inform my good friend from Minnesota that I would have been present on the floor of the Senate this morning, but, unfortunately, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I had to consider 4 or 5 bills in which the Senator from Minnesota is very vitally interested.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senator from North Dakota take care of the Leif Ericson bill?

Mr. LANGER. The committee was dealing with the Bill of Rights. There are some persons who want continually to infringe on the Bill of Rights. Bills on that subject were up for consideration this morning. I discussed the matter with the Senator from Minnesota, and he told me that he would rather have me consider those matters than be present on the floor, and that the Senator from Minnesota would handle his part of the debate, and that he wanted to make sure that the Bill of Rights would be protected. I want to assure him that I did the best I could.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No one will ever justly accuse the Senator from North Dakota of shirking his responsibility. He is always present on the floor of the Senate when necessary.

Mr. President, my position on this issue has certainly been made clear to this body time after time. My position is not new. I am no Johnny-Come-Lately with my concern for an effective farm program. I have fought for equality for agriculture ever since I have been in the Senate. I have fought for fair treatment of agriculture before coming to this body, both as a private citizen and as mayor of a city serving as marketing center for a great agricultural area in the heartland of America.

I have not done so for political expediency. I have done so as a matter of principle, and a matter of conviction that the entire well-being of our Nation's economy is at stake.

I approach this issue with that same attitude and same conviction today. I realize there are honest differences of opinion as to the most effective ways to achieve equality for agriculture. That is what we are after—equality; no more; no special privilege. As the Senator from North Dakota pointed out earlier, what we are after is only equality for agriculture.

The Members of this body who share my concern for our farm economy are trying to find the most effective ways to achieve equality for agriculture. Yet I also realize, as I know others about me realize, that there are forces at work today to tear down and destroy all the progress we have made during the past two decades toward achieving the equality to which agriculture is entitled.

I appeal today to the Members of this body to put aside past differences and political reasoning, and to put foremost in their minds and hearts the welfare of America's farm population. I appeal for continuation of effective price protection through extension of existing price supports.

Mr. President, perhaps it would be helpful to us to take a brief look at the background and objective of our farm program as we consider the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont. Agriculture is still basic to America's economy. That fact must be underscored again and again, Mr. President. It is as important for us to remember that agriculture is basic to America's economy as it is for us to have the Bill of Rights itself. Without a sound, efficient, and abundant agriculture, our economy cannot long maintain itself in a prosperous condition, with opportunity for all and with a high standard of living. We have learned that in the past; we have learned it the hard way, and we must never forget it. There is a public responsibility toward agriculture that cannot be ignored.

Mr. President, nothing disturbs me more than to read occasionally in the press or to hear over the radio or in personal conversation the statement that if one is interested in the agricultural bill he is interested only in farmers. Mr.

President, I am not a farmer. I say candidly that if I have any interest at all in the farm program it is as a retailer or merchant, because my family happens to be engaged in a business enterprise that depends upon the whole trade territory. So I am not interested in agriculture from a personal point of view, at all; but I am interested in an ascertainable fact, namely, that although only a relatively small proportion of the American people are engaged in agriculture, as compared with the number engaged in industry, yet agriculture is basic to the American economy.

Mr. President, I often think of the fact that, after all, it was the farmers at Lexington who lifted their rifles for freedom; and that much of the trouble which led to the War Between the States arose as a result of the kind of agriculture carried on in the various sections of the Nation. During that war the farm boys and the farm families fought to the death in their earnest conviction that they should do all that it was within their power to do in the interest of what was right, from their point of view.

Mr. Preesident, agriculture has made a tremendous contribution to the Nation, all through its life. I believe that agriculture is one of the real keystones to our independence and our freedom. From the beginning of our history, beginning with the Northwest Ordinance in 1787, and continuing through the Homestead Act and the many other legislative policies in relation to public land, the people of America have made it clear to themselves and to the rest of the world that in America there would never be a system of a few great estates, a few "landed families," with thousands or hundreds of thousands of acres, and with the people working for them as peasants, tenants, or serfs. It was clear that there would never be any such system in America.

From the beginning of our history, the people of America have made it clear that private property and the ownership of private property are fundamental to political and economic freedom; and we have established the policy that anyone who has a desire and a will to work, and who is willing to make any sort of personal sacrifice, can become a landowner and a farmer, and can make his contribution to the development of the family-farm type of agriculture. I repeat, Mr. President, that the family-farm type of agriculture is of the greatest importance to our country. By making such opportunities available, by means of the public laws relating to homesteading, the Nation was paid many times over the value of its investment in agriculture's future.

As our Nation embarked upon its development, it was business and industry, not agriculture, that first shunned the risks of the free market. We hear a great deal about the free market, Mr. President. Yet the free market is only relatively free. Our desire is to keep the free market as free as we can, and at the same time preserve a market in which the needs of the people can be fulfilled. I think it is a matter of economic fact that business and industry were the first groups to shun the free market. They asked for aid by way of grants from the Government, including tariffs, subsidies, and the power of regulation of competition, so as to assure reasonable profits. All that is a matter of legislative history.

As a new aristocracy of industrial barons developed in our country, their influence on the Government resulted in a public policy designed more and more to serve their ends at the expense of the American workingmen. That struggle is still going on; and in recent months those who would wish to develop along that line have been doing a fairly good job. That development continued. As a result, the rich grew richer and the poor grew poorer, until finally the bubble burst, as it had to burst.

Mr. President, I do not think I need remind any of my colleagues of the great depressions our country has experienced, such as the ones in 1907, 1922, and the early 1930's. I remember that, as a boy, my father used to tell me about bankers' panics, when the bankers would restrict credit and would call in the loans they had made. The result was the ruin of hundreds of small-business men and independent farmers.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota has mentioned the depressions. Can he think of any greater aid we could have had during the depression period than the McNary-Haugen bill, which was vetoed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I have had in mind the veto of the McNary-Haugen bill. That is a symbol of the lack of imagination, faith, and trust existing on the part of some persons in the United States. I think the veto of the McNary-Haugen bill was a tragic mistake. I do not know that that bill, if allowed to become law, would have rescued us from the situation which soon developed; but certainly that measure would have firmed up the prices of agricultural commodities and would have given agriculture a chance to work out its own problems.

As a matter of fact, I believe that measure was vetoed twice.

Mr. LANGER. Yes, it was.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That measure was vetoed by both President Coolidge and President Hoover, as I recall, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Does not the Senator from Minnesota find that in the agricultural sections of the Nation, all the businessmen recognize the need to protect agriculture? In my State, I recall that in many of the villages and towns petitions have been signed by the merchants, calling upon Congress to recognize the need for protecting the farmers by enabling them to obtain fair prices for the crops they raise.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly agree with the Senator from Montana.

He will be interested to know that, just the other day, there was brought to my attention a copy of the Sauk Centre Herald, of Sauk Centre, Minn., in which there appears an editorial by the secretary of the Independent Bankers' Association of America, Mr. Ben DuBois. Mr. DuBois is a banker, and his family has been in the banking business for many years. His sons are now in the banking business in Minnesota. Mr. DuBois is a very prominent citizen, and has very keen understanding and insight into economic problems. He has testified many times before congressional committees, including, I believe, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. He is a very learned, scholarly, and able citizen, of many years of hard, practical experience as a banker in a rural community. I think the Senator from Montana and other Senators will be interested in the editorial; so I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the editorial written by Mr. DuBois, and published in the Sauk Centre Herald, of Sauk Centre, Minn., on July 29, 1954.

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

ARMYWORMS

(By Ben DuBois)

Last Wednesday I had the pleasure of attending the annual meeting of the Farmers Cooperative Elevator Co. The meeting was ably conducted, very well attended and the guest speakers careful to not be controversial. Among many matters discussed was the armyworm that to quite an extent seems to be infesting this locality. The farmers are continually met with serious problems; their courage and optimism are phenominal.

I am sure that Ezra Benson, an apostle in the Church of the Latter-day Saints, didn't use his influence with the Lord to send in armyworms to cut down production. If he did (and we say he didn't) why would he use armyworms to cut down production—why not use grasshoppers? Perhaps the armyworm came to mind because his boss used to be in the Army.

The infestation of our fields with armyworms appears serious, but to the agricultural economy of the Nation as a whole the worms in the fields are not as perturbing as the ones in the Agricultural Department. Insecticide would be of little use in the Agricultural Department as Ezra Benson has already laid his eggs in the metropolitan centers, arraying the consumer against the producer. Ezra has done agriculture an irreparable damage. Besides arraying the consumer against the producer, he is trying to divide the farmers—array the feeders against those that raise the feed.

We are operating in a political economy—the weaker segments of our economy, where their production is basic to the Nation's welfare, merit Government support. The farmers, even with the aid of their cooperatives, are not in a strong position in the market place. They cannot be organized into a cohesive mass; they haven't the strength to meet the big corporations on an equal footing.

The well-being of our farmers; the future of the family-sized farm depends upon the Government's attitude. A friendly administration can do much to give equality to agriculture; an unfriendly administration can lower the farmer's standard of living. If and when the farmers vote their economic interests they will be better recognized by the Federal Government; by the administration in power.

What applies to the farmer applies equally well to the businessmen of the agricultural communities. It is only when farmers are prosperous that the business of the agricultural communities do well. The interests of the businessmen are tied up with agricul-

tural prosperity; more so than appears to be recognized.

Why shouldn't farmers have full parity? Ninety percent is not enough if we want to be fair and when parity is reduced as is now proposed by this administration, the unfairness is magnified.

The idea of reducing parity is to curtail growing surpluses. If farmers could shift to a different crop, this might be workable, but I can't recall any basic crop that isn't in surplus. Two things make the farmers produce; one is high prices, the other is low prices. Cutting down crop acreage, if carried far enough will, of course, reduce our agricultural surpluses and definitely the income of the farmer. Our agricultural surpluses have been overemphasized. It is well to have a surplus of man's most essential. If the farmers are being subsidized, what of it? They have paid subsidies to other segments of business from the time of Alexander Hamilton. Surpluses can be reduced in a businesslike way if the Agricultural Department would spend less of its efforts in trying to reduce farmers income and more of its efforts in working out a sound and sensible scheme for disposing of our surpluses. This can be done if enough energy is expended by the Department.

What the Nation should always strive for is a balanced economy—the different segments in balance with one another. For illustration, take steel—if it were dragging in the dust it would have a bad effect on other major businesses. Agriculture is a major industry; farmers produce the essential food—they are our most important citizens as they are the most essential and the Nation cannot afford to have agriculture in a distressed position. The agricultural economy in trouble will eventually affect all other segments of our business world. If there is unemployment in the industrial centers there will be less demand for protein foods that require the most acreage and then the agricultural situation will grow progressively worse, followed by more and more of a business recession and the spiral downward will be then well pronounced.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a result of the depressions of the 1920's and 1930's, we learned that the cost of depression is far greater, in terms of both money and human misery, than the cost of maintaining a sound, prosperous Nation. I should like to have that point sink deeply into our minds. So I repeat that of course it is expensive at times to maintain the stability of an economy and its growth and progress. Sometimes that requires the help of local and State governments, which means, to be sure, expenditures of the taxpayers' money. I realize that such things are costly. Yet I say to my colleagues that the costs of recession and depression are so much greater, that the cost of trying to maintain a stabilized, progressive, expanding economy sink into insignificance, as compared with the cost of a great depression, with its accompanying economic hardship.

Mr. President, as a result of our experience in those great depressions, our country has moved forward in an earnest attempt and endeavor to reach a sounder basis for a stabilized, prosperous national economy. As a result of that effort, there has been developed a great concept, so much in keeping with the principles of American democracy that it has gained a permanent place in American life. I refer to the parity concept for agriculture. All the efforts down through the years of the great organizations of the farmers, became solidly pinpointed toward one major purpose, to make a clear declaration of public policy that prices and incomes of the farmers should be maintained on the basis of parity with industrial wages and industrial prices.

Great farm organizations have been engaged in this effort. I remember Ed. O'Neal, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, a great voice for agriculture; Louis Taber, of the Grange; the great Farmer's Union organization under the presidency of Mr. Patton, and many other great farm cooperatives. In our section of the country, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] knows, we have Mr. William Thatcher, who is head of the Grain Terminal Association.

These men have raised their voices year after year consistently for the realization of the full parity formula for agriculture, and they have battled for it relentlessly, faithfully, with determination; and, I am happy to say, it has been my pleasure to at least work alongside a few of them. My only regret is that I was not in the Congress during the days when Ed O'Neal of the American Farm Bureau Federation used to speak out so vigorously for that great organization in behalf of the farmers of the land.

This was not an easy fight. Powerful forces were arrayed against these men and their organizations, then as now.

We should recognize that there are always a few very vocal men who raise the entirely false cry of Government interference with free enterprise when their own toes are stepped upon by legislation designed to assure the benefits and blessings of free enterprise to all the rest of us. It was to this, of course, that I was directing my comments last evening as the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] was addressing the Senate.

It is the desire of every Member of Congress to encourage free enterprise so that we may have a free economic society. But I think we ought to face the fact that the farmer-producer is not in the same economic position as that occupied by the large industrial producer.

For example, a few days ago I read in the press that the automobile industry was cutting back its production. The first 6 months of the year the companies had produced a large number of automobiles, I think around 60 percent of their total production. Now they are cutting back; they are laying off workers.

The farmer cannot do that. Once he plants his crop he has planted the crop, and he has not the slightest idea whether he is going to get a full crop, half a crop, a good crop, or a bumper crop; he does not know, when he plants his grains, what the result is going to be. He has to rely upon many conditions which are totally unpredictable, a few of which I have mentioned on the floor of the Senate today.

I recall the frantic telephone calls I received a couple of weeks ago from people in western Minneseota about the infestation of armyworms. When we talk about armyworms to some folks on the banks of the Potomac, they think those are words of derogation with respect to the Army. But that is not true. Armyworms are worms that consume a crop. They move across the field with the effect of a sickle, and ruin the crop. Then there are grasshoppers. There is a new siege of them, a new plague of grasshoppers, in parts of the Midwest.

We have drought. For a period of time in Minnesota, this spring we had the most humid weather ever experienced there. The humidity in the evening was much greater than it ever had been over the years. What was the effect of it? The farmers were faced with a new kind of rust upon some of the small grains. We are developing rust-resistant seeds. But every time we develop a seed that is rust-resistant, then we find a new kind of rust, which is a blight, an attack, upon the vitality of the grain stem, the flower, or, we might say, upon the kernel of grain itself.

I have seen some of these fields. I was down in southern Minnesota the first week in July. One of my farm friends there took me around and said, "Senator HUMPHREY, notice that field. It looks like a fine field of oats. But if you will go into that field you will find that the kernel is as soft as cellophane, that here is no bulk. It is due to rust."

These are unpredictable hazards, and there is also the unpredictable element of weather. So when we talk about free enterprise in agriculture, we should discuss the factors which influence some of this free enterprise.

Nobody in the world is more free than a farmer; nobody cherishes his freedom more. No one stands his own ground more firmly and more independent in his thinking than is the American farmer. He, so far as I am concerned, represents real free enterprise. However, he competes in an economy which frequently is not so free as some of the exponents of free enterprise say it is. He competes in an economy where the prices are fixed, where they are administered. He competes in an economy where there are vast masses of capital in the hands of a few, and he has limited capital and limited credit.

Why did the Government of the United States create the Farm Credit Administration? Why did it create the Federal land banks? Why did it establish the banks for cooperatives? Why did we, during the depression, have commissioners' loans, for example, and the many other loan programs? It was because the farm people and many others were unable to obtain their financing at reasonable rates from private institutions. That was the only reason for the creation of these agencies. Had the private institutions met the needs there never would have been any such Government programs.

What has been the result of the Government programs? They have given the farmer an opportunity to compete, and, let me say, free enterprise is based upon fair competition. Free enterprise is meaningless without fair competition, and I underscore the word "fair."

The reason why we have price support programs, the reason why we have farm credit programs, the reason why we have storage programs, and crop insurance programs, is in order to afford the

farmer an opportunity to compete on fair terms. Every one knows it would not have been competition to send a 14-year old boy into the ring with Marciano or Joe Louis in his prime. That would not have been competition; it would have been murder.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Business and industry have many ways and methods of protecting themselves. For instance, they can buy out their competitors, they can consolidate, and in many other ways protect themselves in periods of danger. But farmers cannot consolidate, and they cannot buy out their neighbors. They have to rely upon some protection in periods of distress, like the one they are experiencing at the present time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Montana is absolutely correct. I think it is fair to point out that frequently the non-agricultural public gets the idea that all farmers are rich. They hear of farmers with Cadillacs. Well, why should not farmers have Cadillacs? If other people have Cadillacs, why should farmers not have Cadillacs? I have never seen more Cadillacs in my life than I have seen in Washington, D. C.

Mr. MURRAY. I have never seen Cadillacs belonging to the farmers of Montana.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have not seen too many myself. But if Cadillacs are a means of communication for the rest of the country, then they should surely be for farm people. But we get a distorted view. For example, we hear about a few farmers who may go to Miami, Fla., for the winter for a vacation, and that makes some people say, "Oh, farmers are all rich." I would like to know that farmers were well-to-do. But the truth is that most farm families are very poor. Their income, compared to that of urban dwellers, is much less.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that, despite all the conversation about this problem, the farmers, who compose 15 percent of our population, nevertheless get only 7 percent of the income?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I believe those are the latest economic figures on that subject.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not also true that despite all the talk about helping the farmer, whereas transactions on the stock market and business in general have been on the increase, in recent months the net income to the farmer has been steadily on the decrease?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is not any doubt about that.

As an addendum, let me say that, while the net income of the farmer has been on the decrease, the most recent statements of commercial letters, such as we get in each one of our senatorial offices, the bank letters and business letters we receive, indicate that corporation profits have gone up and up and up despite the fact that sales have been reduced. The spread has increased so that profits in some industries—not all, but in many of the big industries—have actually increased, despite lower sales.

What has happened to farmers? They not only have lower sales and lower prices, but they have lower profits, or no profits at all.

It can be seen what I mean by the farmer's being really in a much freer economy area than any other producer, because he does not have quite so many safeguards or protections, even though the Government has outlined a very extensive program. Those protections themselves are not even so great as the ones that affect many other areas of our economic life.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONRONEY. I was impressed with what the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota said about the very few wealthy farmers, who may be able to afford trips to Florida in some winters.

I am sure the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is an authority on small business. Is it not the fact that the ratio of the landowning farmer with a huge estate and a vast amount of income would compare to the few at the top of the business level, rather than with the general level of small business? In other words, to say, because General Motors or Du Pont is making tremendous profits, that all business is prosperous, is foolish.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is idiotic to assume that. We know that the very top of the economic pyramid is doing very well, largely through tax advantages which this Congress has given them, particularly with the repeal of the excess-profits tax. We have unburdened the giants of our industry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me interrupt the Senator to point out that in the recent tax bill the one tax advantage which the farmer got was the ability to charge off a very small amount for some of his water and conservation developments on his farm. That does not cover all such developments. I believe he is permitted to charge off as much as 25 percent in some instances. I should like to check that fact.

The tax benefits in that bill were over $1.3 billion, and out of all those benefits the only one the farmer got as a producer or as a manufacturer, so to speak, since he does make food and fiber, was that if he went into terracing and soil-conservation work, he could charge off some of those expenses as a business deduction or as an expense item. Yet we had hundreds of millions of dollars of tax benefits for the larger areas of American business.

Mr. MONRONEY. Including, I may say, the speedy amortization which was provided.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Which I believe the discussion on the floor showed would mean a $19 billion loss of revenue during the first 18 years of this new pattern.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The business community can write off in 5 years' time, machinery which would have been depreciated in 10 years, as I understand this depreciation factor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That Senator is right.

Mr. MONRONEY. We relieved the bigger taxpayers of the excess-profits tax effective not so many months ago, which is showing up now in the great earnings of tens of millions to hundreds of millions of dollars of industry profits, being reflected in the announcements every day in the newspapers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I think the Senator has given proper perspective to this discussion. I am most appreciative.

Mr. MONRONEY. One cannot say, because a few farmers are able to go to Florida in the wintertime and are able to take vacations, which we would like to have everyone able to take, that they are average farmers. They compare in numbers to the giants of our industrial system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is very much so.

I have some material here which I believe will be quite revealing. Here is an article from the New York Times of July 16th:

BIG WHEAT GROWER BACKS GOP PLAN—EISENHOWER'S FARM PROGRAM SUPPORTED BY OPERATOR OF 65,000-ACRE RANCH

Here for a brief stop-over between Boston and Billings, Mont., Thomas Donald Campbell expressed strong support yesterday for the Eisenhower administration's farm program.

Mr. Campbell was speaking as the operator of the largest privately owned wheat farm in the world—65,000 plowed acres around Hardin, Mont., not far from the Billings Airport—and as an active worker in the reactivated Citizens for Eisenhower movement in both Montana and New Mexico. He raises cattle in New Mexico.

At the Cornell Club, 107 East 48th Street, the while haired Mr. Campbell took time off between incoming phone calls about the wheat market to make clear how he felt about the administration farm bill.

I have no word of criticism of Mr. Campbell; I have heard about his wonderful accomplishments in this field; but it is true that the flexible-price-support program is of advantage to the largest producers. The 90-percent-price-support program is the keystone and the underpinning of the family-sized farm.

Without any comments at all which would be critical of Mr. Campbell—and I want my remarks so interpreted—I may say it is not good for America to have 65,000-acre farms. It is all right to have one such farm here or there, but to have that become the pattern would never be good for this country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Tom Campbell happens to be a part-time resident of the State of Montana. He leases those 65,000 acres at a very small price from the Crow Indians on the Crow Indian Reservation.

Mr. Campbell is also a part-time resident of the State of New Mexico and of other parts of the United States. Mr. Campbell veers with the wind. He was quite a good Democrat during the Roose-

velt and Truman administrations, but has changed since the wind began to turn.

One certainly cannot compare a man like Tom Campbell, who skims off the cream, with the small farmers who are operating 160-acre or 320-acre farms, from which they derive their main livelihood. Those are the people the 90 percent of parity will help. So far as Mr. Campbell is concerned, with his huge machinelike operation on a lease basis, he will prosper no matter how the current goes. I do not think he is the kind of man who should be considered in the consideration of this particular type of parity program. We should consider the little man, who needs help.

As I mentioned earlier to the Senator from Minnesota, there are more than 1.4 million farm families in this country which earn less than $1,000 a year. They cannot be compared with the Tom Campbell type of operator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. As usual, he gives us pertinent information.

What we are trying to do is to establish a legislative policy which will permit these family-sized farms and family-sized farm operations to remain an integral part of the American economy. My views on the family-type farm are so strong that I am sure I will be accused of outright prejudice, but how can we expect to have these little communities maintained otherwise?

If a person travels out through Montana, Oklahoma, Minnesota, North Dakota, or South Dakota, out in the countryside, he will see those small rural communities which are beautiful little settlements, with schools and nice homes and pleasant and lasting wholesome family environments. They will have churches of different faiths. How can we keep those communities together, Mr. President, unless surrounding them we have an economy which is interested in the communities and which pays taxes to them?

I point out that where there is consolidation of land and a mechanized operation these communities wither on the vine. They die out, because there is a totally mechanized operation. That is absentee ownership; part-time citizenship, so to speak.

I wish to make clear I am not at all sure that the farm program HUBERT HUMPHREY is in favor of is the cheapest program in terms of dollars. I imagine it is not. I would almost confess to the fact that I am sure it is not the cheapest in terms of dollars, but I say it is the best program in terms of human values.

What kind of society do we want? Do we want a society where everybody is operating a tenant farm? Do we want an economic agricultural society, where everybody is a hired man? Or do we want a society where the family owns the farm, where the family goes to church, where the members of the family are on the county board and are on the school board, where the family lends stability and dignity to the community? That costs something.

I have made a few comments on how to save money. Some people think the only goal in life is to save money. I am not one of those. If a person's only goal in life is to save money, then he should stop eating. It costs a lot of money to eat. Such a person will not live long, but he will save a great deal of money.

If a person never sees a doctor or a dentist he will save money, as long as he is living. He will not be here long, but he will save money.

What is the real truth, though? The American people are not so much interested in getting a cheap price as they are interested in getting a good product. What they want is a good product. So we spend hundreds of millions of dollars to build colleges, universities, and schools—for what purpose? To educate our children so that they may become better citizens. We build fine hospitals and sanatoriums. We build playgrounds, parks, and recreational facilities. All this costs millions. We could save the money and not do it, but we would not have as good people or as happy a society.

Surely, the price-support program and the farm program cost money. I have yet to see anything that the Congress does which does not cost money, or anything anybody else does that is worth while that does not cost money.

The truth is that it is a good investment. It is not a waste of money. I wish that every man, woman, and child in this land would travel through the countryside and see the difference between conditions today and conditions 25 years ago. Look what REA has done for our countryside. The whole country is electrified. Today the farm home is as modern as the city home. Why should it not be? Why should not the sons and daughters of farm people, as well as the sons and daughters of the city people, have the comforts, luxuries, and the pleasant experiences of life?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Reverting to what the Senator was saying about small towns, churches, and other features of rural life, it is well to remind Senators that the citizens of small towns are year-round citizens, not part-time citizens. They are parts of the community and the State. They contribute to the building up of the area in which they live. They are not there merely for the purpose of making money and then going somewhere else in the wintertime. They are there because they believe in the country and like what they are doing; and they are entitled to a degree of security.

The Senator mentioned the cost of the program. It is true that it costs some money. I am not at all happy about the farm parity program. It may not be the ultimate solution but, so far as I can find out, it is the best solution up to the present time.

If the administration would consider taking away the subsidies paid to airlines, railroads, and steamship companies, if it would consider reducing tariffs and all the other programs which cost much more money than the farm program, then I think the administration in good conscience could ask us to consider something less than 90 percent of parity.

In view of the pledges made by this administration in 1952, not in 1 or 2 places, but in 3 or 4 or 5, it has a moral obligation to live up to what it promised the American people and the American farmers then, and should recommend at least 90 percent parity, if it is honest, and eventually ask for 100 percent of parity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. He speaks with clarity and, again, with knowledge of the facts.

Mr. President, we have been discussing the kind of economic society in which we live. The junior Senator and the senior Senator from Montana have both noted that we live in the midst of protective regulations by Government. Firm prices administered by business, fixed costs established by accepted standards of fair wages and reasonable profits in other segments of our economy, Federal Reserve regulations, utility and transportation rate-fixing, tariffs to protect industry, minimum wage laws, fair trade laws to eliminate unfair pricecutting, and subsidies to shipping firms, airlines, magazines, newspapers, and periodicals, are but a few of the examples of the kind of action which Government has taken throughout the years—to do what? Not to injure the economy, not to weaken the economy, but to strengthen it.

I ask any of my colleagues what would happen to the merchant marine of the United States without a price-support program? Make no mistake about it—there would not be an American ship on the high seas were it not for Government help, and plenty of it. The Senator from South Carolina has stated that the merchant marine program has cost $289 million in recent years. For a subsidy to one ship, the steamship *United States*, we allowed something like $50 million. I am not against that. I think we need a merchant marine, and I am willing to pay the price for a merchant marine.

We need airlines. Every American airline that flies overseas is subsidized, and most of those that fly through the air on domestic transportation routes are subsidized. I am not opposed to that subsidy.

It is the duty of the Government to provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare, and to do the best it can to balance and strengthen our economy.

Recently the President announced a program to strengthen our mining industry, to firm up prices of American minerals, and stabilize mining operations. We need mines; we need minerals. I am not opposed to what is being done for that industry. All I say is that it is strange that the very people who get the greatest amount of help are the first ones who want to beat down American agriculture.

My limited experience tells me that the Republican Party and Republican administrations wittingly or unwittingly have been historically the enemies of the American farmer. Whenever they have been in power, the first ones they have gone to work on have been the farmers.

What did they do in February of last year? Did they talk about lowering bank interest rates? No. They said interest rates had to go up. When the

Federal Government underwrote those higher interest rates by announcing what it would do in refinancing the public debt, that was price support for money, and it cost the American people in 1 year more than $2 billion in increased credit costs The interest rate policy of this administration cost the Government $287 million in extra charges on the public debt.

I am happy to say that because we complained about it, the administration has retreated, and the so-called hard dollar, hard money policy, has been set aside now for a while. Interest rates are coming down.

The facts are that the banking institutions of this country—namely the large banking institutions—received a bonanza, a windfall, as the result of a simple act of Government.

What is the theory of the tax bill? The theory of the tax bill is that we must do something to help industry, manufacturing, and investment capital. The tax bill was conceived and passed with the knowledge that it would be of help to investment capital and to industry. That was its purpose, and it was clearly stated. It was made manifestly plain and obvious to everybody.

One proposal after another is made—to do what? To strengthen the stock market, or to strengthen private utilities. Take a look at the Dixon-Yates contract, which was discussed in the recent atomic energy debate. If any farmer ever got a contract like that, he would be in Paradise. Mr. Farmer, under the Dixon-Yates contract the Government was to pay all the Federal taxes, all the State taxes, and all the local taxes of a private utility, and enter into a 25-year contract for electricity. In addition, the Government was to underwrite 95 percent of the bond issue for the construction of the plant. Then the administration has the gall to say that farmers ought to get 15 percent less than parity.

That is the most unbelievable contractual relationship that the Government has ever proposed to enter into. Then the administration tells certain Members of the Congress and of the public that the farm program must be put in order, that price supports must be reduced, and that excessive costs must be eliminated.

If the Government breaks the Dixon-Yates contract, even though the Dixon-Yates Co. keeps the plant and produces electricity with the plant, the Government must give them $40 million damages right on the barrelhead.

This same administration has the unmitigated gall—I use the word advisedly—to come forth and say that we must reduce the cost of the agricultural program, when it has come forward with a tax program favorable to big business, when it has come forth with an interest program for big capital, when it has come forth with a program for private utilities the like of which has not been experienced for years. Yet it is contended that the farm program is the great burden upon the public.

I have before me a note which says that the Senate Finance Committee voted to lift temporarily, by $6 billion, the present $275 billion debt ceiling. Again we have the presentation by the administration of the need for expanding the public debt capacity of this country. The $6 billion increase in the debt ceiling is not the responsibility of agriculture any more than it is the responsibility of any other section of our economy.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am submitting an amendment which would provide for a sliding scale from 90 to 100 percent. I shall not ask the Senator to comment on it, but I wanted him to be aware of it. I thought he might wish to comment on that subject. The amendment would include dairy products, also. It provides for not less than 90 nor more than 100.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the junior Senator from Wisconsin. Earlier today I said that the principle of flexibility is not bad; it simply depends on which way the support price flexes. The flex under the Aiken amendment is from 90 percent down to 80 percent. The junior Senator from Wisconsin now brings in an amendment to provide flexibility from 90 percent to 100 percent.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin may be interested to know that the Minnesota Legislature, which is not a radical body, but is a reasonably conservative legislative body, endorsed the very principle involved in the Senator's amendment. I thought the Senator would like to know that. I shall be more than happy to provide him with a copy of the Minnesota State Legislature's resolution, which was signed by the Governor of our State, copies of which were sent to every Member of the Minnesota delegation in Congress.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall appreciate having it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am thankful that the junior Senator from Wisconsin plans to support us in this fight. I knew he would, because he comes from a great agricultural State, and he knows his farm people out there. He knows what has happened to dairying in his State. I have had an opportunity to discuss the situation with him.

It is fair to say that there have been times when the junior Senator from Wisconsin and I have been on opposite sides of questions, but it is good now to have him join with us on this issue, and we shall join in the battle for parity for agriculture.

Mr. McCARTHY. I intend to vote for high-price supports. I shall first support my own amendment; but if that is rejected, I shall support the straight 90 percent of parity. I feel very strongly that if price supports are not provided for the farm community we shall shortly be headed for a depression. I think the Benson proposal would serve to impoverish the farmer.

I am happy that this is one of the rare occasions when I am heartily in accord with the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The occasions need not be so rare, I may say.

Mr. McCARTHY. They are not too rare.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A moment ago the Senator said something to the effect that a great deal depended on the direction in which flexible supports flex, and how they work. Does not the Senator also agree that the condition of the economy at the time a flexible-support program is put into effect has much to do with the situation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, it does.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the minority views of the committee quoted from the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report in 1949, when the joint committee recommended a flexible price-support program. I am certain the Senator has read it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have read the economic report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I invite the Senator's attention to a very significant part of the recommendation, which appears on page 52 of the report, namely, that any such flexible price-support program would need to be intelligently adapted to postwar conditions, and that consideration should be given, as parts of a coordinated program, to such measures as the provision of adequate storage facilities, more adequate credit accommodations, crop insurance, and so forth.

In other words, even in those days, although I do not have the figures before me, but I feel certain that if I had them, they would bear me out in my feeling that farm conditions were much better than they are today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There was stability. There was not the pinch which farmers feel today.

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report at that time said that it might be well to adopt flexible supports, provided consideration was given to the other programs. I bring that out because, in February of this year, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report said, as it is quoted in the report—and remember, there were 8 Republicans and only 6 Democrats on the committee, representing both Houses of Congress——

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was this year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This year. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report made this statement, which appears in the majority report, at page 29:

> In spite of the fact that agricultural income has fallen, there is reason to believe that the proposals contained in the economic report—

That is the President's recommendation, and that was the flexible program——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I continue:

> There is reason to believe that the proposals contained in the economic report may actually place the farm family in a worse position in the short run. Whatever the merits of flexible supports and modern parity may or may not be as a long-run program it is questionable whether their contribution at this time will act to sustain farm income in the months immediately ahead when the

threat to our economic stability is so generally recognized. On the contrary, it seems more likely that the proposed shift to modernized parity at this particular time would be an unnecessary disrupting factor.

Is not that one of the big problems? Is not that the question of timing or timeliness, about which I asked the distinguished Senator in my first question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. For example, when the minority cites the so-called Democratic and Republican support for the flexible price support schedule, it is citing statements made at a time when the economic situation was entirely different, and the world situation and the production situation were entirely different, from what they are today.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They also disjoined it from the accompanying programs which were recommended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They did, indeed.

I was pointing out earlier to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] the fine testimony he gave in 1947 before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. But if one will read the whole program, he will see that flexible price supports are only a small part. It is necessary again to relate that program to the general economic situation, to the general world situation, and to the production problems which are involved.

I am glad the Senator has brought out this point. The important point is that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, consisting of 8 Republicans and 6 Democrats—am I correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. They were from both Houses. They recommended against such a plan.

Mr. HUMPHREY. After listening to all the testimony.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Including a great deal of testimony given by the Secretary of Agriculture himself.

I ask the able Senator if he is aware of some of the evidence which the Secretary of Agriculture gave in those hearings.

Mr. HUMPHREY. After listening to that evidence, the committee issued a report which said that the administration's farm program would——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would further depress farm income at a time when it was already depressed. Since that report was issued, in the latter part of February, the situation of the farmers has become even worse.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What does the Senator think can be done to get that information out to the public? What does the Senator think can be done to show the American people that the problem is not merely a problem of surpluses, not merely a butter problem, a cotton problem, or some other kind of problem? A committee of Congress has specifically analyzed the economic problems of our times and has reviewed the President's own reports on economic conditions. We have the benefit of the testimony of Cabinet officers, economists, and other men who are familiar with industry, agriculture, and labor. Yet that committee has recommended in its majority report against the administration's farm program. Is that not correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In its unanimous report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In its unanimous report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There may have been 1 or 2 who placed a footnote in the report, saying that they did not believe that the farm program would very badly disrupt the economy; but the report as a whole recommended against it. There were no minority views, although there were a few addenda in the form of footnotes. I remind the Senator again that the committee was comprised of 8 members of the President's party and 6 members of the Democratic Party.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A moment ago I spoke about the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture. We questioned him pretty closely. If the Senator is familiar with the testimony, he knows that the Secretary testified that the imposition of the President's program would have the effect of lowering the prices of farm commodities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He did, indeed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He gave his testimony in terms of some kind of formula points; but I remember asking him a question, which the Senator may remember from the hearings. I said, "Mr. Secretary, can you give that in terms of cents a pound or dollars a ton, so that we can understand?"

I said, "For example, there are two crops down my way about which I should like to ask you. The first is cotton. What would that amount to?"

The Secretary's reply was, "Oh, it would be only 2 cents a pound."

I said, "Mr. Secretary, you say, 'Only 2 cents a pound.' That is $10 a bale. To the average Alabama cotton farmer, $10 a bale probably means the difference between profit and loss. To the little cotton farmer, the tenant farmer, it may mean the difference between his children having winter clothes and not having them; the difference between his children having school books, and things of that kind, and not having them."

Then I asked the Secretary of Agriculture about peanuts and what he meant in the case of peanuts.

As I recall, he said, "It amounts to about 2½ cents a pound."

I said, "Mr. Secretary, that is $50 a ton. That is a reduction of 25 percent in the price of peanuts."

I believe the Senator from Minnesota will agree with me that at this time, if I properly construe the reports of the Department of Agriculture, the farmer is in the worst pinch he has been in since 1941. Is the farmer able to sustain a shock such as that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He is not. It would be a most unwise policy for this Government to pursue. We must remember that the farmer has already lost considerable income. We must remember that the prices he pays for various articles continue to go up. At the same time we have reduced his production of many crops.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I remind the Senator from Minnesota that a few weeks ago an announcement was made that the price of steel was going up $3 a ton. Will that help the farmer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The situation is exasperating. Steel goes up $3 a ton. The other day in the Senate we heard about the profits made by some of the large corporations. Some of the profits were incredible. They were larger than those made last year; and last year records were broken so far as profits were concerned. Sales are down, but profits are up. The per capita income declines and the cost of living goes up. We cannot continue to operate in that manner.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is against the recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, as the Senator from Alabama just noted. It is against the recommendations of a majority of both the House and the Senate Committees on Agriculture. It is against the campaign promises of President Eisenhower and the Republican Party. It is against the platform of the Democratic Party, and the pronouncements of Governor Stevenson and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who were candidates for President and Vice President, respectively. It is against the recommendations of both the AFL and the CIO.

I want my friends in the Senate who have large labor constituencies in their States to know that representatives of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations testified before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Joint Commission on the Economic Report in opposition to the administration's farm program, and in support of high level parity and 90 percent of parity.

I regret that there are not present more of our colleagues from States having more city people than rural people. If we are to talk about who best represents the consumers, I should say that the bulletin I received from the Chamber of Commerce is not as persuasive to me as is the bulletin I received from the AFL, the CIO, or the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. The great labor organizations of America are four-square and firmly behind the report of a majority of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. They are against the administration's farm program.

The laboring people know that if we start trimming down the income of farmers, workers in industry will be the next ones to have their incomes trimmed down. What is more clear is that when farm income drops, the incomes of workers generally drop.

That is why George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, a great patriot and an able labor leader, testified before committees of Congress in opposition to flexible price supports.

That is why Walter Reuther, who represents millions of workers in this country, and who is a great labor leader, a clean, intelligent, and forceful American, appeared before committees of Congress and testified that the CIO was not in favor of the flexible price-support program, and that the CIO did not believe the program would lower food prices. The CIO is right. It does not mean lower food prices.

I have in my possession a copy of the CIO and the A. F. of L. statements, but I shall not burden the record with them. I make note of the fact that on July 30, 1954, I received a copy of a statement which summarizes the recommendations made to the committees of Congress.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. In the past few minutes there has been reference to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. The legislation which created that committee has been regarded as one of the most important laws Congress has enacted in the past 50 years. It was as a result of the great depression that the law was enacted which established a committee to study the economic trends of the Nation in an effort to avoid another serious depression. The economists of the country have agreed that the committee is a very important one, and I am very much interested in knowing that the committee is reported as being against the flexible price-support program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Montana for his contribution. As the author of the Employment Act of 1946, he realizes the important position which the Joint Committee on the Economic Report holds in Congress.

The abundance of food, feed, and fiber has operated in behalf of the consumer, and not against his interests. Moreover, I point out that an abundance of agricultural production is needed for our growing population today. It is needed for the anticipated growth in our population; and we are witnessing such a growth every year.

I have some figures before me as to the growth of the population. Our population is increasing at the rate of 7,500 a day, which means an additional population of 2½ million a year, or an increase of 5 people every minute. By 1975, it is estimated that there will be between 220 million and 225 million people in the United States. By 1960, which is less than 5½ years from now, it is estimated that there will be 175 million people. They will need to be fed and clothed. They will have to get their food and clothing from the land we now have in this country. Fewer and fewer farmers, and fewer and fewer farm producers, are remaining on the land.

The Department of Agriculture has made a study of this problem. We find that by 1975 we shall need an increase in our hog production equal to the total hog production of Iowa and Nebraska in 1952. We shall require that many more pigs.

We shall need an increase in the number of cows—and I wish Mr. Benson were present in the gallery today, in case he has not read the report—equal to the total number of cows in Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Texas, in order to have milk and butter for the population we shall then have.

By 1975 we shall need an additional number of lambs equal to the total number produced in 1952 in Montana, Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada.

By 1975 we shall need 40 billion pounds more of milk. We shall need 16 billion more eggs. We shall need at least 2,200,000,000 more bales of cotton. We shall need 109 million more bushels of wheat.

I wish that the Department of Agriculture, instead of having its eyes in the back of its head, looking to the rear, would look a little bit to the fore, and be a little farsighted and look over the present little hill and into the valley of the future.

What about this valley of the future? What have we now? We shall destroy our dairy herds if we drive people off the land. What if we fail to take care of the agricultural economy? Who will feed our people? What of our security if we pursue a program which does not take into consideration the vast development of the resources of our country?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota a question, while he is discussing this subject and pursuing his line of argument: Is it not true that the margin between surplus and shortage is very small?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is very true. Earlier today I stated for the RECORD the amount of farm commodities owned by or under loan from the Commodity Credit Corporation. That is the amount that is in reserve or surplus or, as I call it, in inventory. It is interesting to note that we have an hand a 10-day supply of oats. Yet some have the nerve to call that a surplus. Furthermore, we have on hand only a little more than 3 months' supply of corn, and yet some have the gall to call that a surplus.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In that connection, let me ask this question of the Senator from Minnesota: If the present drought continues all over the country, is it not likely that we shall be thankful we have the 3 months' supply on hand?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed. I predict that before next Christmas, Secretary Benson will look back upon the storage facilities we have now and the grains and other foods that are stored in them, as the greatest blessing in his career. He will be eating crow. He will be saying, "Oh, why did I talk about those surpluses?"—because the same surpluses which they now use as almost a wig-wag system of signaling disaster to the American people will be the means of saving this administration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is any one of the important crops—such as cotton, corn, wheat, and the other commodities which we must have if we are to live—in excess supply to such an extent that the supply cannot be converted into a shortage as a result, perhaps, of one bad crop?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true, with the possible exception of wheat. We now have approximately 10 months or 1 year's supply of wheat in the Commodity Credit Corporation's facilities, either owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation or under loan from the Commodity Credit Corporation. That includes most of the wheat.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Minnesota remembers that, about 2 years ago, when it was proposed that the United States send wheat to India, it was necessary to search rather carefully, first, in order to determine whether we could spare enough wheat for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct, because we have a law which provides for normal reserves.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and at that time it was felt that probably the shipment of that much wheat to India would lower our reserves not only below the amount of reserve required by law, but also below the amount of reserve we ought to have. Of course, the law sets the reserve at rather a minimum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to digress long enough to make note of the fact that I have heard many persons say we should have a more aggressive foreign policy. It has even been suggested in some instances that we should cooperate with Dr. Rhee and his plan for some sort of limited invasion of the Chinese mainland. I have not joined in that proposal; but I have heard voices raised, both in this Chamber and elsewhere, saying that we should come to grips with the problem in Communist China. I ask: How do we dare even contemplate such a foreign policy or such a military policy if we are not prepared with sufficient food and fiber? I recall, that before the outbreak of the Korean war, bill after bill was introduced to cut back our production of agricultural commodities. Immediately before the outbreak of the Korean war we were deeply concerned, supposedly, with surpluses. But suddenly they simply disappeared. They disappeared because of the international situation which developed.

So, for the life of me, Mr. President, I cannot understand why we are so much concerned about having large stocks of food and fiber, so long as they are manageable. Of course, in the perishable field the situation is acute; and I recognize that we must do something about it.

By the way, Mr. President, I believe that my colleagues will be interested in recalling what President Eisenhower had to say on that subject back in 1952, at the time when he was a candidate for office:

> We must find methods of obtaining greater protection for our diversified farms, our producers of perishable foods. They yield the rich variety of meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables that support our nutritious national diet. As approved in the Republican platform—crops such as oats, barley, rye, and soybeans—should be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops.

That is what I propose in one of my amendments, Mr. President.

I read further from the statement by Candidate Eisenhower:

> The Democrat planners have made the diversified farmer the forgotten man of agriculture. They keep saying, "There is no way of protecting perishables except through the Brannan plan." We can and will find a sound way to do the job without indulging in the moral bankruptcy of the Brannan plan.

Mr. President, the moral bankruptcy of certain aspects, at least, of the Brannan plan—those calling for production payments—has now been accepted as fine and virtuous, and as having outstanding qualities of good character, for we have the production payment system in the wool plan which the administration has sponsored. I am in favor of it, but I wish they would not make speeches of that sort.

For example, I notice that the President made a firm commitment for the support of perishable commodities, in the course of answering questions for the Farm Journal, a prominent farm publication. In October 1952, Mr. Eisenhower was asked:

What do you propose to do in the way of governmental price protection for perishables and nonbasic farm commodities?

This is the answer:

The general believes that the producers of perishables and of diversified crops are entitled to their full share of the national income, just as are producers of basic crops, but the plan must be different. * * * "When you have to dye potatoes blue because you do not know how to use them profitably, that is proof that we have not examined the problem scientifically." Still another part of the answer may be in special distribution programs. "That is why I have said I would call on the best minds of the country to help with farm problems."

Candidate Eisenhower went on to say, at Fargo, N. Dak., on October 4:

It is in the record as to what the Republican Party expects to do, proposes to do * * * with all of those things that mean so much to farm life today. And that means perishable products as well as nonperishables.

So, Mr. President, I think this administration is fairly well committed to a perishable support program, as well as to supporting the prices of nonperishables.

I wish to say a few words about price and production. One of the great theories about the sliding-scale price-support program is that by cutting price it is possible to reduce production. I think it is fair to say that the emphasis upon the use of the flexible price supports is that by cutting price, one cuts production. Of course, the record should be crystal clear, as of now, that the Secretary of Agriculture will not give farmers any more freedom than they have had. In fact, he will not give them quite as much freedom as they have had. I want that record to be perfectly clear.

Last night I made some comments on that subject. Before I refer to that comment, let me point out that parity is a flexible instrument. It is a flexible measurement of fair farm-commodity prices, going up when farm costs rise, and going down when farm costs decrease. It was designed to operate in that way. So parity puts a flexible system upon a flexible system.

As has been pointed out in the course of the debate, we use the so-called sliding-scale flexible parity formula. However, the time when we get the good from it is the time when we do not need it. In other words, when there is a shortage of supply, under the sliding-scale flexible price supports, the farmers receive 90 percent of parity; but, of course, that is when they do not need it.

When there is an excess of supply is the time when the farmer will receive the 75 percent or the 80 percent or the 82½ percent of parity, and yet that is when the farmer needs higher price supports. The time when he needs price supports which, properly interpreted, mean Government purchases or Government loans on food commodities or farm commodities, is when there is an excess supply, not when there are limited supplies or a lack of a proper supply.

I used the analogy that flexible price supports are like an umbrella. When the sun is shining one can put the umbrella up; when it rains the umbrella is down. This flexible price-support program is the kind of agricultural economics that, to me, is upside down.

What was the purpose of this program of sliding-scale flexible price supports? Its purpose was twofold: To relieve the farmer of so-called regimentation and Government controls; and, secondly, to use the reduced price to bring production in line with demand, to bring supply and demand in balance.

I charge here that program does not work either way. It does not bring supply into balance with demand or production into balance with use, nor does it remove controls.

The Secretary of Agriculture, in testifying before the House Committee on Agriculture, made this statement:

It is not proposed in the administration's recommendations that price changes should bear full responsibility for shifts in production of basic crops. Authority for acreage control must be retained and must be used.

I cite for the RECORD the fact that this administration has imposed more stringent acreage controls than any administration in 20 years—I should say any administration in 15 years. We had some controls back in the period 1933 to 1939, when there was a tremendous surplus.

Now, as to flexible price supports making it possible to reduce controls and to give the farmers more freedom, let us stop talking about it, because it is not true.

I read last night from the Wall Street Journal, and I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in reading in the copy of the Wall Street Journal for July 9 an article on the front page entitled, "Farm Kibitzing. Federal advisers will offer individual farmer master plan for living. They'll cover fertilizer use, pest killing, bookkeeping, even raising children. One aim: Curb overplanting."

There is now in office an administration which says it is for freedom, and it has a plan already in being in the Department of Agriculture, in draft form, which literally tells the farmer not only how much he can plant in the field, but how many children he can have in the house. I am sure that the Wall Street Journal is not given to irresponsible statements.

I imagine that the Wall Street Journal is not a publication of the Democratic National Committee. I do not think it is socialistic, and I am quite sure that it can be considered to be relatively responsible and conservative. This article by Lester Tanzer, staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal, reads as follows:

Federal Farm Boss Benson has whipped up a new kind of Federal-aid program for farmers. The key ingredient is not taxpayers' dollars, but advice—on every subject from irrigation to raising children.

The Republican Secretary of Agriculture thinks mechanical contraptions, soil conservation, insecticides, Federal price supports, and planting restrictions have overly complicated rural living. What the modern-day farmer needs, he figures, is a "complete master plan."

I must say that is a most unusual article to come 5 days after the Fourth of July. I thought the Fourth of July was the day which commemorated our independence. It appears now that we have a master plan. What is this master plan? According to this article—

Precise details haven't been worked out. But the outlines of the scheme—billed as a "dynamic new program"—

Undoubtedly that phrase was created by one of the large public relations firms which seems to be creating more slogans than it does reasonably good programs—this article continues—

are contained in a confidential document currently circulating in upper echelons of the Agriculture Department.

Then it goes on to describe it. I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

FARM KIBITZING—FEDERAL ADVISERS WILL OFFER INDIVIDUAL FARMER MASTER PLAN FOR LIVING—THEY'LL COVER FERTILIZER USE, PEST KILLING, BOOKKEEPING, EVEN RAISING CHILDREN—ONE AIM: CURB OVERPLANTING

(By Lester Tanzer)

WASHINGTON.—Federal Farm Boss Benson has whipped up a new kind of Federal-aid program for farmers. The key ingredient is not taxpayers' dollars but advice—on every subject from irrigation to raising children.

The Republican Secretary of Agriculture thinks mechanical contraptions, soil conservation, insecticides, Federal price supports, and planting restrictions have overly complicated rural living. What the modern-day farmer needs, he figures, is a "complete master plan," worked out down to the last detail for each farmer with the help of a Government agent dispatched to his doorstep.

SPREADING THE GOSPEL

Sometime this summer Mr. Benson will pass the word for hundreds of Agriculture Department agents to set out in scattered parts of the country, spreading the gospel of "planned farming." Precise details haven't been worked out. But the outlines of the scheme—billed as a "dynamic new program"—are contained in a confidential document currently circulating in upper echelons of the Agriculture Department. Officials say the idea is this:

A Government man will call on farmers at their homes, and offer to work out a "carefully planned system of farming for the entire farm unit." The whole idea is voluntary; if farmers accept, they'll start, with the help of the Government agent, to make a complete inventory of their resources—land, money, and manpower.

They'll consider, too, all the "off-farm influences," such as national price-support programs, the economic outlook in the United States and abroad, export trends. Then they'll make up a plan, setting goals not only

for farm output but also for "family satisfactions."

REDECORATING ANSWERS

The plan will aim to include answers to questions like these: What crops to plant and in what quantity; what fertilizer to use; how to deal with farm pests; what repairs to make on farm buildings or machinery and how to raise the necessary money; how to keep books and pay taxes; how much profit a farmer should make to be able to afford to redecorate the front parlor or buy a television set or a new refrigerator.

The aim, according to the outline drawn up by Mr. Benson's aides, is a plan "through which the farm family can coordinate the use of various farm and home practices to achieve efficient production, high net income, the improvement of soil productivity, and better living conditions for the entire farm family."

If this sounds like more Federal "meddling" in rural affairs, the aim is professed to be just the opposite. Mr. Benson's real objective is to hasten the day when farmers will be able to get along without so much Federal price-support aid and without stringent planting curbs. He favors a gradual trimming of price-support levels and increasingly tighter planting controls until record farm gluts have begun to shrink. Meantime, the idea is that if farmers do their planning with a Government expert looking over their shoulder they'll be less likely to overplant crops already in abundance.

This basic aim, officials argue, requires broader planning than it implies. Thus an agent might advise a farmer to shift land from barley to tomatoes, if he wants to make enough money to buy the freezer his wife is pleading for. Raising tomatoes, the agent might add, might mean making Junior work on the farm in the summer instead of taking a job in town.

Going a bit further, some of the new agents will be women, who are expected to give tips on latest developments in child psychology. They'll also encourage participation in 4-H Club activities.

A MODEST START

The program will begin on a modest scale. To finance it for the fiscal year that started last week, Mr. Benson wrung an extra $8.3 million from Congress in appropriations for the Agriculture Extension Service, a "farmer education" program run jointly by the Federal Government and State farm agencies. Working through the extension set-up, Mr. Benson will use the extra money to hire 1,000 new county agents and about 2 dozen Washington policymakers to push the planned farming scheme.

With this task force, Mr. Benson guesses he'll reach only a fraction of the farming population. But if the plan is successful, he's prepared to ask Congress next year for more money to expand his efforts. Also, the 1,000 new agents will be busy indoctrinating the 12,500 county agents now on the Federal-State payroll so that they, too, can push "farm planning."

The new agents will be divided up among the States. It will be up to each State to decide how they'll be used. Some States may decide to blanket a couple of "pilot counties" with enough agents to reach every farmer that's interested in farm planning. Others may decide to distribute a few "farm plan" salesmen in each county to work with a handful of farmers.

PAMPHLETS, RADIO, TV

Dispensing advice to farmers is not, of course, a new chore for the Agriculture Department. The Extension Service uses pamphlets, radio, and television, and group meetings to bring to rural folk all kinds of information on farm matters, most of it gathered by Agriculture Department researchers and experts at land-grant colleges throughout the country. This service is paid for partly by the Federal Government, partly by the States, and partly by counties.

The trouble with all this, as Mr. Benson sees it, is that it's too indirect and impersonal. He argues, too, that the present setup covers only special topics, without attempting to wrap up all the problems of running a farm into one neat package. That's the aim of the new program for "complete farm and home development," as it's referred to in the policy document now making the rounds of Agriculture Department offices.

The department plans to go right on for a while "educating" farmers through mass media like radio and group discussions. But after a year or so, the idea is to shift toward ever greater emphasis on the personal approach now about to begin.

FARM FAMILY THE TARGET

The department's new program is designed primarily for family farms, those on which the family does the major share of work. Family farms make up the big majority of the 5.5 million farms in the country and turn out over 70 percent of all the agricultural goods sold. The outline of the new program notes:

"On a family farm, the farm business and the home are inseparable. Decisions made on the farm must consider both the effect on the farm operations and on the farm family. This is not true for most other types of business. It is for this reason that the farmer and his family must plan together."

Mr. Benson's aides are sure their scheme will work. It's been tried experimentally in a couple of States with success. A study made in Vermont, according to the Department, showed the income of a dozen farms with intensive Government planning aid was triple that of 12 farms that operated without master plans.

Will farmers accept Mr. Benson's offer? The Department expects a heap of resistance from individual farmers. One farm expert claims the people who have usually gone in for Federal help in a big way are those who have been most amenable to Government suggestions. It's the more conservative rural citizens the Department hopes to reach with its new project.

Mr. Benson isn't inclined to force any scheme down farmers' throats. So his minions have orders to go about their business with some degree of subtlety. The Federal planners offer this advice to the agents: "Stress in all activities the relationship of what is being presented to the other decisions and activities relating to the individual farm and home situation, and the interdependence of each decision and action on all the others."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the sliding scale, in so far as reducing acreage is concerned, unless the scale slides so low that it slides everybody out of economic existence, will not do what it is supposed to be designed to do.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Has the Senator ever seen prices slide except in one way?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I said earlier today that it is quite hard to slide uphill, and it is generally easy to slide down.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the only way to get a price up is to lift it up?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. And the only way to keep it there is to hold it there?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is right.

Mr. KERR. When we take the support from under it, then what happens?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In most instances, unless we defy the law of gravity, I would say it would fall.

Mr. KERR. It would slide.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Or slide. I also pointed out earlier in the debate that in most instances, in the vast majority of instances, the reduction of prices does not result in a reduction of acreage, and rather than just have that as a matter of conjecture, I have had the facts researched. I think it would be of interest to note that in the years when the parity ratio was as low as 60, and when it was down in the area between 58 to 65 to 70—from 1929 to 1933—the total acreage, in the face of declining prices from 1929 to 1933, increased from 363 million acres to 375 million acres.

In other words, when farm prices were collapsing, when corn was 9 cents a bushel, and when wheat was 25 cents a bushel, instead of the farmers planting less, they had to plant more.

It is simple. If a man is a wheat farmer or if he is a corn farmer, if he rases small grain, he has land, and if he does not have the mechanical equipment for dairying operations or for meat processing, or if he does not have meat or does not have a good herd of steers or beef cattle, what is he going to do? He is going to plant, and that is what the farmer did, and that is what he continues to do.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I notice in the amazing article to which the Senator referred, in the Wall Street Journal——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Was not the Senator interested in that article?

Mr. KERR. I thought that article told far more than what is in it, and what is in it tells plenty. The fact that it was published in the Wall Street Journal was quite significant.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a leading farm publication. [Laughter.]

Mr. KERR. I must say that I have great respect for the Wall Street Journal as a financial journal and economic publication.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join in that sentiment.

Mr. KERR. But that was its principal reputation, I would remind the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, before "B. B."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Before Benson.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Before Benson.

Mr. KERR. Since that time it has become the principal source of journalistic information from the Benson offices.

I do not know whether or not it is because the ordinary journalistic avenues have felt that what comes out of the office of the Secretary of Agriculture is of more interest to the financial community than of concern to the country and to agriculture, but in that article I noticed a statement about which I wanted to ask a question or two. I read:

The plan will aim to include answers to questions like these: * * * How to keep books and pay taxes.

Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that before a farmer can pay taxes he has to make some profit?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That has generally been the accepted formula.

Mr. KERR. Has the Senator figured out how the farmer is going to make a profit under the Benson program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma that that is one of the great unsolved mysteries of this administration. It is top secret, by the way.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator think that the tax problem of the farmer is going to be pretty well solved when the Benson program is put into effect, to the complete disappointment of the farmer and the Government, both of whom would like to see him have some income upon which to pay taxes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma that on a recent trip into southern Minnesota I was in Cottonwood County, where I had been attending a soil conservation meeting, and I was discussing taxation with one of my farm constituents. He said, "Senator, I see that you folks up there in Congress have been reducing taxes for the big boys," and he said, "I want to tell you something. You have reduced mine, too. You have reduced mine in Washington by having my income so low that I do not have to pay any taxes anymore." It is sort of a hard way to get at it, but that man had a good deal of practical wisdom.

Mr. KERR. Has the Senator from Minnesota read the entire article?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have read it. In fact, I read most of it into the RECORD last night.

Mr. KERR. Has the Senator ever seen anything that approaches it in America? It would completely plan and control the lives and operations of the farmers and their families.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have not. I may say to my friend from Oklahoma that if that article had been printed with the name "Brannan" substituted for "Benson" there would have been a howl put up by Senators on the other side of the aisle that would have made Mount Vesuvius sound like a small teakettle. They would have roared. When the Brannan plan came out, or even before it was issued, when people read the name Brannan on the ticker there was such a shouting and such a hullabaloo in Washington that it frightened people 2,000 miles away. This plan is the most unbelieveable story that could have come from an administration which is supposedly dedicated to free enterprise.

Mr. KERR. Has the Senator from Minnesota put into the RECORD the statements by Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, as a candidate, at Kasson, Minn., and at Point Pleasant, W. Va., with respect to the elimination and prevention of plans coming out of Washington?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have made general reference to them, but I would be delighted to have the Senator from Oklahoma put them in the RECORD. I think it is wonderful to listen to those speeches. A replaying of them makes my heart feel good. In view of what the administration is about to do to the farmer, I think we should hear what the administration's candidate said would be done for the farmer.

Mr. KERR. I should like to read the statement made by Gen. Dwight Eisenhower on September 6, 1952. I ask the Senator whether that statement conforms or harmonizes with the proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture. Candidate Eisenhower said on that occasion:

> Do you have a voice that carries weight with the Washington agricultural autocrats? Or should I call them agricats? Do they listen to you? Do they welcome your farm organization leaders in their councils? Our goal will be sound, farm-run programs that safeguard agriculture—but do not regiment you, do not put the Federal Government in charge of your farms.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That statement is, of course, a wonderful doctrine. It reads well and it sounds well. Would that it were applied as a principle of government. However, it is in direct contradiction of the article in the Wall Street Journal.

Let us look at what is happening to our county committees. I listened to the speeches of the two Senators from Missouri with respect to what was going on in Missouri. There is outright political control of the great PMA committees. We have seen, for example, a recent bulletin published in Washington, in which it was stated that the only reason the committeemen in Minnesota were not being fired is that it might reelect HUMPHREY. Of course, to some people that would be the curse of all curses.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator like to know what General Eisenhower said in another speech?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am always interested in what General Eisenhower had to say, as compared with what President Eisenhower has been doing.

Mr. KERR. Or Secretary Benson.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; because Secretary Benson speaks for the administration.

Mr. KERR. General Eisenhower stated:

> You are being threatened by the fact that we have not got as many Washington bureaucrats who want to move in on you and show you how to run your business, particularly your farms.
>
> They want to tell you what to raise, how much of it, and when to plant it and what to get for it and how much to pay for everything you use on that farm. Certainly we believe in proper price supports—proper protection of the farmer against disaster—but we certainly want him to run his farm as he thinks it should be run and not the way some long-haired bureaucrat behind a desk in Washington thinks it should be done.

Does that sound like the basis for the superplan which the publication to which the Senator has referred publishes as having been launched by Secretary Benson?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It does not. It does not sound like the basis for the extraordinary control that is proposed to be placed on the use of diverted acres. Wait until the farmers find out what Secretary Benson has to say about diverted acres. The Secretary of Agriculture will literally tell them what they can plant, how much they can plant, and how much they can take out of the ground.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from Minnesota refer to the article he put in the RECORD and listen to this language?

> The plan will aim to include answers to questions like these: What crops to plant and in what quantity.

On the other hand, Candidate Eisenhower said:

> Bureaucrats who want to move in on you and show you how to run your business, particularly your farms. They want to tell you what to raise, how much of it, and when to plant it—

This is Secretary Benson talking now—

> what fertilizer to use; how to deal with farm pests.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What was that about dealing with farm pests?

Mr. KERR. How to deal with farm pests.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Well——

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from Minnesota believe that such knowledge would be comprehensive enough to enable farmers to deal with the superpest of the farmer, the present Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether that was included in the general confines of the statement. I do not wish to be personally unkind to the Secretary of Agriculture. I simply disagree with him on philosophy. I have met the Secretary of Agriculture and I have found him to be a very pleasant and genial and fine man. I mean that honestly. I like him as an individual. I simply cannot understand his individual thinking.

Mr. KERR. I invite the Senator's specific attention to one statement in the Wall Street Journal. One of the specifications to be included in the plan is the following, and I should like to ask the Senator if he does not think it would have some merit:

> What repairs to make on farm buildings or machinery and how to raise the necessary money.

Does not the Senator believe that that would be a wholesome situation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not only wholesome but absolutely imperative, if the New Look in agriculture goes into effect.

Mr. KERR. The last specification in that particular paragraph is:

> How much profit a farmer should make to be able to afford to redecorate the front parlor or buy a television set or a new refrigerator.

Does the Senator think that is at all consistent with the promises of the President of the United States that he would relieve the situation of "so many Washington bureaucrats, who want to move in on you and show you how to run your business, particularly your farms. They want to tell you what to raise, how much of it, and when to plant it, and what to get for it, and how much to pay for everything you use on that farm."

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma knows that I feel as he does, that the proposed master plan is in direct opposition and in direct contradiction to the philosophy expressed by the Republican candidate for President in 1952. I am sometimes of the opinion

that that speech, which was a denunciation of so-called agricats, has undoubtedly been accepted as a positive program, rather than one of strength or limitation.

Mr. KERR. The Senator knows that the last quotation I gave from the candidate's speech was from the speech he made at Point Pleasant, W. Va., on September 24, 1952. While it was not an exact repetition of the one he had made at Kasson, Minn., on September 6, 1952, it was consistent with it, and it went even further in denouncing plans made in Washington, and proclaimed a philosophy of freedom of the farmer from such plans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I invite attention to another pertinent matter with regard to the very instructive analysis made by the Wall Street Journal in its article to which the Senator has referred. It is very interesting to me that some of the so-called new information we get on agriculture these days comes from the splendid publication known as the Wall Street Journal. Formerly we used to get information in the Department of Agriculture and in such splendid publication as Wallace's Farmer, or in other leading farm publications. Such agencies would have an opportunity to know first about agricultural matters.

There was a time when the Department of Agriculture really had farmers in key positions. Today there are undoubtedly men in the Department who have had great experience in agriculture, but there is a shortage of men like Mr. McCormack, who was once Under Secretary of Agriculture. He owns his own farm, operates his own tractor, and does his own farming. There are others like him, without naming anyone in particular. Many of them were real farm people.

The one particular point on which I wish to conclude is the kind of philosophy which seems to motivate and to be behind the present farm program.

I have mentioned this on other occasions, but I do not recall that I have mentioned it to my colleagues in the Senate. It is to be expected, if a farm program is enacted into law, that those who administer it will administer it in full faith and will give it full support.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator under the impression that the Department of Agriculture was created to be, and was thought by those who created and supported it to be, an instrumentality of service to the farmers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was under that impression after reading the preamble to the public law which established the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that any relationship between that basic principle and the present operation of the bureaus generally, insofar as the Secretary is concerned, is rather coincidental or accidental?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has put his finger upon what is an increasingly obvious development. I think the Senator is indeed right.

I feel that when we pass a law which includes 90 percent of parity price supports, for example, such as the present law provides, the people administering the program should be in sympathy with it. There are many good Republicans in Congress who are in sympathy with the program. Many Republicans believe in 90 percent of parity. The distinguished Representative from Kansas, Mr. HOPE, has taken a stand on this. My colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], has taken a very forthright stand on it. I saw on the Senate floor only a moment ago one of our Representatives from Minnesota, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, whose own political party has gone after him with hook and tong because he took a stand on 90 percent of parity. I only ask that we have men who are sympathetic with the program to administer the program.

Who is the Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Service at the present time? Who is the gentleman who succeeded Mr. Howard H. Gordon? Mr. Gordon is the former head of the Commodity Stabilization Service. The man who succeeded him, appointed on February 1, is a gentleman by the name of McConnell. Mr. McConnell has not been appointed to the Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is an appointment subject to Senate confirmation. We have not had the opportunity to pass upon his nomination or his choice by the President. Yet he attends most of the board meetings and advises it, because most of its business is administered by the Commodity Stabilization Service which he heads.

This is not the first instance in which Congress has been by-passed by having appointees not subject to confirmation assigned duties and functions normally handled by Presidential appointments upon which we can hold hearings and take action. It has happened before in the Treasury Department. It has happened now in the Department of Agriculture.

Frankly, I believe it was done because of the knowledge that very serious questions would be raised about Mr. McConnell's qualifications to administer programs with which he was not in sympathy.

I am not running down Mr. McConnell. He is undoubtedly a very able, intelligent man; he is undoubtedly a very effective personality. He undoubtedly has a good education, and is a man of good character. I make no personal remarks about him, except to say that McConnell is a mortal enemy, an avowed, self-described enemy, of the price-support program—and he is administering it. It is like putting an arsonist in charge of the fire department. It is plainly ridiculous. It is absolutely beyond the pale of good reason.

What did Mr. McConnell say, speaking on November 30, 1953, at Syracuse, N. Y.? He spoke on the subject The Long-run Agricultural Policy.

I call this to the attention of my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON]. Mark what was said by this man who administers the cotton and wheat price-support programs. Listen. He said farm price supports are a part of "a very carefully planned and carried out conspiracy to make out of this country a socialistic Nation."

Really! Mr. McConnell can make all this program socialistic if he wants to, but we do not hire people to do it. We do not hire people to stand up on the housetops and condemn the very program they are administering. Generally, people are fired for doing things like that, rather than being hired.

I quote further from Mr. McConnell. Again, I say that I am sure that Mr. McConnell is a good man. I simply do not agree with him, that is all. More than that, he does not agree with the law that was passed by the Congress. He speaks of the law as a part of a conspiracy to make America a socialistic nation. He should not be in public office on the basis of an appointment to administer this program, unless it is desired to wreck the program. If that be the case let wreckers be hired, people who really want to wreck it. If we want to weaken the program, let us hire people who really want to weaken it—but let us do it openly, and know what is happening.

This administration has just started its program of weakening American agriculture. This is but the beginning. Listen to what Mr. McConnell has to say about a great commodity known as wheat:

> Wheat is one of the best examples of modern socialism we have in this country.

I do not know how he ever got that idea, but there it is. It is on the record. I have the full copy of the speech, and I hope Mr. McConnell is in the gallery today. I say he ought to resign. A man who calls the price-support program a part of a national conspiracy to socialize this country has no right to administer these programs. Yet he is the head of the Commodity Stabilization Service, which has control over the commodity credit operations.

Listen to what else Mr. McConnell says:

> The Government controls the amount of acreage we can plant. It controls pretty largely, through its support programs, the price and marketing. The production of wheat in this country is shot through and through with Government control. The laws on the books provide for acreage controls, for marketing quotas, for penalties. Good or bad, it's a perfect example of modern socialism.

That is the end of the quotation from Mr. McConnell's speech at Syracuse, N. Y. I guess he went up to Cornell to get that. I like Cornell University. I have attended a few universities myself. That is a great school. It has a fine school of public administration. The philsophy of agriculture that comes from that university is permeating the Government. It is the philosophy of cheap fed, cheap grains for cheap food. They are not going to cheapen American agriculture with my help. They are going to get plenty of resistance.

Mr. McConnell says that the price-support program, good or bad, using wheat as an example, is a perfect example of modern socialism. My colleagues, if that man's nomination had been sent

to the Senate for confirmation, he would not have received very friendly treatment, particularly when he talks this way about a price-support program which he is supposed to administer.

If Mr. McConnell wants to go on the Federal Reserve Board, if he wants to become Comptroller of the Currency or vice president of the last or first national bank, that is fine. Maybe that philosophy fits into some of those positions. But when one becomes the head of a great organization to administer a price-support program which the law of this land specifies, which the Congress, the representatives of the people, has said is the law of the land, which the President of the United States in his speeches as a candidate said he would support, I say it is grossly wrong to have men running the program who do not believe in it and who think it is part of an organized conspiracy.

I cannot believe that this is the truth, and yet the truth is here. The fact of the appointment is known. The knowledge of the feelings and attitudes of these men is perfectly obvious.

Secretary Benson has testified that even under his recommendations we must keep and use production controls, such as marketing quotas. Mr. McConnell is the man he has chosen to administer marketing quotas, and Mr. McConnell thinks marketing quotas and acreage controls are socialism. So by any test of ordinary simple logic Mr. McConnell is against the program.

Surely we would not put in charge of the police department the leader of those who have been robbing banks; we would not put in charge of the public health department a carrier of diphtheria; and unless it is desired to wreck the program, neither should there be put in charge of the price-support program—a program which involves acreage controls, marketing quotas where they are necessary, and price supports—a man who says he is opposed to them, that he thinks they are a part of a national conspiracy to socialize the country, and he is against them.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LENNON. I assume from what the Senator has said he believes it to be the duty of the administration to get rid of officials and employees who are seeking avowedly to destroy the policy of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do.

Mr. LENNON. I wish to let the Senator know I share those views.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator very much. If we do not want to get rid of them, then we should make it crystal clear we want to destroy the policy and that we are going to get away from it. But the administration does not openly admit it wants to do that.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LENNON. Does the Senator believe that anyone who may have a policy or theory inconsistent with the action taken by the representatives of the people of the Nation is a person who should remove himself promptly from public office and go into a private field to press his views with respect to the matter?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the administrator of a program which is designed and specified by public law, by the will of the Congress, is not in favor of that program, if he feels it is a danger to the country and a part of a conspiracy to socialize the Nation, he has a moral responsibility, first of all, to speak out honestly against the program, to lead the fight against the program; and, second, to resign.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LENNON. I assume from what the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has said he does not believe Mr. McConnell can actually carry out his stewardship to the American people, in view of the feelings he has expressed in a public statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my opinion. I want to make it clear again, I do not know Mr. McConnell as an individual. I assume and I know he must be a man of good character, because otherwise he would not have been appointed by the Secretary. I am sure he is a man of keen intellect, cultured, well-mannered, and a decent, wholesome person with good attributes. But he does not believe in the program and he has said so.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. LENNON. Does the Senator believe that if the views of Mr. McConnell he has just quoted had been known to the Congress, and especially this side of the Congress, this Senate would have expressed itself in very vehement terms in opposition to the appointment of the man who is about to wreck the farm program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think Members of Congress would have been quite disturbed. I do, indeed. I doubt whether Mr. McConnell's nomination would have been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder how far the Senator would carry that suggestion. In 1949 Secretary Brannan sent a program to the Congress of the United States. I took some responsibility for a bill which was quite contrary to the Brannan plan. Congress passed my bill. Would the Senator have recommended that Mr. Brannan promptly resign?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; because, although Mr. Brannan did not assent to the act that was passed, he accepted it. Even though Mr. Brannan had other views which he thought were better than the act which was passed, he did not accuse Congress of a conspiracy to socialize the Nation.

I know of no time when Secretary Anderson or Secretary Brannan or Secretary anybody-I-can-remember said he thought price supports were a part of a scheme—a conspiracy, I use Mr. McConnell's word "conspiracy"—to socialize the Nation.

How a man could be in office and say that I cannot understand.

For example, let us consider Secretary Benson. Let us assume—as I think we will—that we adopt the 90 percent of parity program of price supports. Secretary Benson will say he is against that. He feels it is unwise. But if that is the will of the Congress, he will administer it. I am not going to be opposed to that, because he believes in some kind of price supports. Secretary Benson believes in price supports of 75 to 90 percent of parity.

But the gentleman I am referring to does not believe in acreage controls, or in marketing quotas, and he says they are a part of a "conspiracy."

I do not want to be personal with the gentleman. I merely want to say from an administrative point of view I think this is an unwise position to hold.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield again?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was anxious to clear up that point, because sometimes a man has to administer a program he may personally dislike.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. I recall when a Secretary of Agriculture had to administer a potato program which he thought was terrible. He sent letter after letter to the Congress of the United States trying to get Congress to change the law. They would not change it. Nonetheless, the Secretary of Agriculture had to go ahead and administer that program to the best of his ability.

To that point, I think a man has that privilege.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is quite a difference between appointing a man who has already expressed his opposing position, and foisting upon a man in that office a policy in which he does not concur. I shall give a classic example. I use again an example without any personal reflections at all. I refer to the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. I got along very well with, and hold in high regard, Dean Manion, the man who was head of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. But I say, in all candor, that the President knew that Dr. Manion was opposed to many of his policies. He knew that before he appointed him. It became perfectly obvious that either Mr. Manion had to resign, or the President had to ask him to resign.

In politics we play for keeps, in a sense. We do not appoint people to positions merely because we think they are good fellows. Men are appointed to positions because it is believed they are in sympathy with the objectives of the administration or the program.

Either Mr. McConnell is symbolic of what the administration has in mind, or his was an appointment which should never have been made, in terms of the program outlined under the policy of Congress.

It was bad enough to have its administrative officer chosen from an area concerned more primarily with low feed prices and low fiber prices, instead of fair prices to producers. But it is even worse to find that this man is fundamentally opposed to these farm programs in

their entirety, and thinks we should have no supports at all.

Let me give more of a picture of the man now administering our price-support program. Referring to the conspiracy which Mr. McConnell charged in his address, he said:

> Our so-called food program has been wrapped up in cloaks of patriotism, fighting communism, food for defense, charity, antidepression nostrums. They would have us believe that it is our duty to feed a hungry world.

How enlightening that is. Now perhaps we are seeing why the administration has done so little to put our abundance of food to good use. Let that sink in. Here is a man who is administering a program, who ridicules the use of food to combat communism. He says, for example:

> Our so-called food program has been wrapped in the cloaks of patriotism.

Mr. President, you bet it has been. What is more patriotic than the production of food and fiber, which saves lives? Such production does not take lives. Merchants of death are not producers of food and fiber. Guns and bombs destroy life; food saves it.

I am shocked beyond words to think that there should be in a key position today a man whose duty it is to administer the price-support program, but who, nevertheless, thinks it is socialism, who thinks it is a part of a conspiracy to socialize the economy, who is opposed to price supports, and who says:

> Our so-called food program has been wrapped up in the cloaks of patriotism, fighting communism, food for defense, charity, antidepression nostrums. They would have us believe that it is our duty to feed a hungry world.

Mr. President, I do not know whether it is our duty to feed a hungry world, but when the multitude was hungry, and the Man of Galilee, the Nazarene, saw them, he fed them. Scripture tells us that they had loaves and fishes.

Have we a moral responsibility? I am not ashamed to stand on the floor of the Senate and say that if we have food in abundance, food that we cannot use, we ought to help feed a hungry world. There never will be peace in the world so long as people are in anguish, pain, and hunger.

Treaties can be signed until the Library of Congress is filled with them. But so long as there is misery, poverty, sickness, frustration, and hopelessness in the world, and something is not done to alleviate them, there will be war. A little old war, a two-bit war, a fringe war, a small war, costs more than all the agricultural programs put together.

What this country needs today is people with faith and vision, people who will work and will do what they think they should do.

Mr. McConnell is very sweeping in his charges. He says that the "socialistic" conspirators backing our farm program are aided by "professional people."

I am quoting him, now. He says they are aided by "professional people," who "are being turned out by theological seminaries, on our college campuses, writing textbooks used in our primary schools, labor leaders, in the ranks of cooperative leaders."

Let me ask: What is wrong with having idealistic people? If I am to be turned out of a school, what is wrong with being turned out of a theological school? I see nothing wrong in that.

How can it be expected that a program will work if the program is in charge of people who say it is no good, that it is a conspiracy, that it ought not to work? How can there be a food program that will work for the good of all of us if there is a man at the head of it who laughs at the doctrine of the need of food as a part of a worldwide program?

I have tried to say that the price-support program which the administration was pledged to support has not only been undermined by a legislative proposal now before the Senate, in the nature of a substitute or an amendment, but it has been undermined by the actual administration of it. No law is any good if it is not well administered.

There is no use in having the best law on the books, if it is not administered with determination. The best laws man ever devised may be enacted, but if the police department is not honest, corruption and gangsterism will be found to exist. There may be price-support laws on the books, but they will not work unless there is the determination, the will, and the imagination to enable them to work.

I am so fed up with hearing about the terrible surpluses that it has almost become a phobia with me. Despite all the cry about surplus the administration refuses to help use our abundance for the American people. The administration, despite the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has had a food-stamp plan in the legislative hopper for more than 2 years, has not had a letter of recommendation sent from the Bureau of the Budget to the Secretary of Agriculture in behalf of that plan. The junior Senator from Minnesota spent time and money to have research done on the quality and nutritional values of our dairy products and the possibility of implementing the diets of needy people with such products. That bill has been in the Congress for months. All one gets out of the administration is, "No. No." The administration wants to talk about mountains of butter. I serve notice on the administration that it is not going to "potato-ize" the dairy industry. It will not be allowed to brand the dairy industry of America with any kind of hokum or scandal.

Mr. Benson and his associates will find out that if that is tried they will have more trouble on their hands than they ever dreamed possible. If the officials exhibited a little more imagination, a little will, and a little determination, many of our problems would be licked.

The junior Senator from Minnesota had to call this administration's attention on the floor of the Senate, to the fact that there was starvation in the Philippine Islands. Two hundred thousand farm people lost their crops. Rodents and vermin destroyed the crops of 200,000 of our allies, our friends. Sooner or later we got a little food over there—mostly later. We have been too timid in this project of the proper utilization of our food.

Now about prices and production adjustment.

As I said a while ago, my belief is, and the records I have studied so indicate, that reduced prices do not bring about acreage reduction or production control. Price is but one of many factors. A reduced price can actually stimulate production. A reduced price can actually increase acreage. I have before me a table on acreage trends during the depression, when low prices were in effect.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire table, along with pertinent comment as a result of a study by the School of Agriculture of Purdue University, Bulletin 555, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

ACREAGE TRENDS DURING LOW PRICES OF DEPRESSION

ITEM I

Total planted acreage:

1929	363,000,000
1930	370,000,000
1931	371,000,000
1932	375,000,000
1933	373,000,000

Total acreage in the face of declining prices increased from 363 million to 375 million between 1929 and 1932.

ITEM II

Between 1929 and 1932 most crops show an increase in acreage planted.

Corn, from 99 million to 113 million.

Spring wheat, practically unchanged at 23 million.

Oats, from 41 million to 46 million.

Barley, practically unchanged at 14,700,000 to 14,600,000.

Flaxseed, 3,400,000 to 4,500,000.

Rice, 860,000 to 966,000.

Sorghums, 8,800,000 to 12,100,000.

Potatoes, 3,100,000 to 3,600,000.

Sweetpotatoes, 647,000 to 1,059,000.

Sugar beets, 772,000 to 812,000.

Dry edible beans, 1,900,000 to 2,300,000.

Dry field peas, 250,000 to 312,000.

Soybeans, 2,400,000 to 3,700,000.

Cow peas, 1,200,000 to 3 million.

Peanuts, 1,600,000 to 2 million.

A total of 17 crops, 267 million to 288 million.

Winter wheat, 45 million to 46 million.

Cotton, 44 million down to 36 million.

Eleven vegetable crops, 1,181,000 down to 779,000.

A total for all 52 crops, increase from 363 million to 375 million.

ITEM III

In the case of winter wheat where the acreage remained practically unchanged between 1929 and 1932, there were some States that increased acreage and some that decreased and some that remained unchanged.

Of the 32 States that grow winter wheat, 14 increased acreage, 12 decreased, and 6 remained practically unchanged.

ITEM IV

In the case of spring wheat of 11 States growing spring wheat in 1929 and 1932, 5 States increased, 5 decreased, and 1 unchanged. The total of 11 States remaining practically unchanged.

ITEM V

In the case of dry field peas, 6 States total acreage 250,000 in 1929, 257,000 in 1932—3 States increased and 3 States decreased.

ITEM VI

In the case of barley, 13 States—the total acreage practically unchanged between 1929 and 1932: 8 States increased, 4 States decreased, and 1 unchanged.

SOME CONTRASTING VIEWS

If farmers increase production when prices fall relatively, then they act contrary to their own interests and contrary to the needs of consumers. Such a situation would be intolerable and would call for a full-fledged system of government controls.

If farmers decrease production when prices fall relatively, then they make adjustments which are in the interests of all concerned, and can safely be entrusted with a large degree of freedom in planning their production. (Ezra Benson, March 10, 1954.)

SUMMARY OF CROP RESPONSES FROM THE SHORT TIME RESPONSE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION TO PRICE AND OTHER FACTORS

(Bulletin 555, Purdue University, October 1950)

In the analysis of the different crops there was some evidence that farmers as a group do, or intend to, respond to changing relative crop prices from year to year by changing the acreage planted. However, the amount of variation in either intended acreage or harvested acreage which could be explained by price changes was in many instances quite small. This was in contrast to the findings for livestock. In some of the truck and special crops more than one-half of the variation in acreage could be explained. However, only about one-fourth of the variation in wheat acreage or intended corn acreage could be explained. For some crops, price explained none of the variation in acreage. In showing slight acreage response to year-to-year price changes, farmers are behaving intelligently and in their own interests. A high price for a crop in a given year is little indication that the price will be high the following year. Consequently a close response of acreage to price from year to year for crops would mean unwise resource allocation and lower incomes for farmers. Among the various farm products the price in a given year has been erratic in its relationships to the price the preceding year. A high price in a given year might be followed by another high price, by a low price, or by an average price. The relationship was not generally significant.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I make note of the study that was made by Purdue University, which states in part:

In showing slight acreage response to year-to-year price changes, farmers are behaving intelligently and in their own interests. A high price for a crop in a given year is little indication that the price will be high the following year. Consequently a close response of acreage to price from year to year for crops would mean unwise resource allocation and lower incomes for farmers.

That statement by Don Paarlberg—refuting the Secretary he now serves as an assistant—along with the statistical totals year to year, will be of great help to those who are trying to make a careful analysis as to whether flexible price supports will really reduce our supplies.

Mr. President, I wish to mention a word about public opinion on the question, because time after time statements have been made about city opposition to farm programs. As a Senator coming from a Midwestern State, I wish to point out that there are more people living in cities than on farms in my State. The majority of the people in Minnesota live in cities rather than on farms, despite the fact that Minnesota is supposed to be such a large farm State. Farmers have radios and television sets in Minnesota. There is no farm and city attitude. We are members of the same family. I notice a determined effort is being made by the administration to sever, and cut down the middle, consumer from producer, farmer from city worker. It is a determined effort to divide and conquer. I have some interesting information that will help us understand a little how the city man feels about the question.

Mr. Silvester J. Meyers, president of the Chicago Board of Trade, recently appeared in Washington and mentioned the fact that farm prices were getting so high that farmers might price their products right out of the market place. Let us see what a proper response to that statement would be. I wonder why Mr. Meyers did not go over to the Secretary of Commerce and have Mr. Weeks announce that some other prices are getting pretty high? No; just farm prices. Mr. Meyers preached the same line that has been preached by the Secretary of Agriculture. This is what he said:

Ominous signs in all sections of the country that city taxpayers are in no mood to continue to tolerate high price supports on farm products.

That is the president of the Chicago Board of Trade speaking. I welcome his testimony. Every man has a right to be heard. I accept his testimony with the proper objectivity. I am quite confident that the Chicago Board of Trade has never shown too much interest in the general well-being of the individual farm producer.

Mr. Meyers said further:

It is not inconceivable that city people will force the withdrawal of all aid for agriculture unless intelligent attempts are made to appreciably reduce this tax burden.

Listen, Mr. Meyers, what tax burden? What tax burden is put on this country by the farmers that other persons do not put on the country? Farmers pay taxes, and farmers have fewer ways of getting out of paying taxes. Farmers do not receive 23, 25, and 26 percent depletion allowances on the fertility of their soil. Farmers do not get "split-offs" and "spin-offs" and "corporate this" and "corporate that"; they pay taxes, and their income tax rates are high.

What Mr. Meyers should be concerned about is making sure that farmers earn enough money so they may pay taxes, and so the Chicago Board of Trade will be a whole lot better off.

Some time when I am in Chicago I am going to see Mr. Meyers. I am sure he is a very fine man, but some of these men who get into high positions forget whence they came.

The whole Chicago Board of Trade is not worth any more than the smallest farmer in America. It is only as strong as the farmers of America. These gigantic industrial and business organizations came crawling to Washington in 1933. They were the first to get at the trough. They were the first to get the help of RFC. They were the first to be bailed out. Now they are mighty, and they come to Washington and say the farmer has to reduce his prices or they will get mad and put the "clamps" on him and the farmer will get more.

We will see about that. I am glad the American people have not been listening to the board of trade too often. That is why we have a board of trade. We would not have a board of trade very long if people listened to its advice.

A research firm by the name of Alfred Politz Research, has been doing some excellent work on public opinion surveys. Politicians, as well as commercial enterprises, use those studies. Alfred Politz is one of the leading research men in the country in the field of public opinion studies.

His nationwide study asked the question among city people: "Do you think that the Government favors or helps any of the following groups more than it favors others: labor, industry, farmers?"

Sixty-one and eight-tenths percent said they thought the Government helped all groups of our economy the same. Only 17.2 percent thought farmers were helped more than other segments.

But in further support of my contention that Secretary Benson and men like Mr. Meyers are building a mountain out of a molehill, on the fallacy of consumer opposition to price supports, let me report further on the Politz Research study. It was found, in the course of that study, that only 52.4 percent of the people had even heard of price supports. The remaining 47.6 percent had not even heard of price supports at all.

Mr. President, how can there be such a consumer uprising about something that half of the consumers have never even heard about?

Among those who had heard about price supports, only 57.5 percent could give a correct definition of what price supports were. Another 18.7 percent thought they knew what price supports were, but they were mistaken. Twenty-three and eight-tenths percent simply could not define price supports at all.

Mr. President, if the Department of Agriculture would quit trying to set the workers against the farmers, and would quit trying to set the housewives against the producers of agricultural commodities, there would not be any so-called uprising. Of course, it is easy to start trouble; it is comparatively easy to start an uprising. What we have in the Department are troublemakers.

Now let us look at parity prices, Mr. President. Some people tell us that the consumers might not object to price supports, but they do not think farmers should get parity prices. In that connection, Mr. President, what do the Politz studies show? They show that 59 percent of the people had never heard of parity prices. Only 41 percent of the people had heard of them.

Of the minority who had heard of parity prices, 61.7 percent were able to give a correct definition of parity prices. Twelve and five-tenths percent gave a wrong definition. Twenty-five and eight-tenths percent did not know what parity prices are and admitted it.

Among those who were interviewed, only 25.5 percent thought it was not a

good idea for the Government to set the bottom price for farm products. Fifty and nine-tenths percent thought it was a good idea. The remaining 23.6 percent had no opinion.

So, Mr. President, twice as many persons in that consumer study thought it was a good idea for the Government to set bottom prices for farm commodities, as compared with the number of those who thought it was a bad idea. Incidentally, let me point out that the study was made among city people, among consumers living in cities. Furthermore, just for the record, let me point out that the survey also showed that more consumers thought it was a good idea for the Government to buy the surplus; and a smaller number of consumers thought it was a bad idea.

Mr. President, the American people are pretty smart—smarter than some people in the United States who are trying to educate them.

Among the persons interviewed in the course of the survey who did think it was a bad idea for the Government to set bottom prices for agricultural products, only 4.2 percent thought it resulted in keeping too high the prices that consumers have to pay for agricultural commodities.

I believe that this study refutes many of the contentions of the foes of an effective farm program, and I believe it should bolster the backbone of some of the city Members of Congress who otherwise might be stampeded into voting against our farm programs.

Mr. President, I shall not speak further regarding the agricultural program. I have already taken more time than I should have.

I appreciate very much the colloquy we have had today; there has been great participation in the debate.

I wish to say that the argument that the consumer is injured by high price supports cannot be verified or supported.

On previous days I have submitted, for printing in the RECORD, statistical records showing the purchasing power of the worker's dollar today, as compared with its purchasing power in the 1930's, 1940's, and also in 1929. Today the American worker can buy more food with his dollar than can any other worker in the world. I want the RECORD to show clearly that nowhere else in the world is so small a proportion of the per capita income of the workers spent for food and fiber. In all the world, the American consumer spends the least of his per-capita income for food and fiber. The American consumer is the best fed, best clothed consumer in the world. He has the best diet, and the best variety of food and fiber from which to choose. The average citizen of the United States spends less of his income for food and fiber than does any other person in the world.

So, Mr. President, what are we complaining about? When we consider the cost of food to American consumers, I remind my colleagues—and I have tables to support this assertion—that when the cost of food in the United States has risen, it has not risen as much as have rents or the cost of many other items which go to make up the average family budget. The tables and statistics in support of that assertion are available, Mr. President. Of course, later in the debate I shall very likely get into an argument with one or another of my colleagues, and in that connection I shall very likely refer to those tables.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to state that if we desire to have soil conservation practiced by American farmers, there must be adequate farm income. In that connection, I wish to state that I now hold in my hand a letter from the Acting Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, Mr. Gladwin E. Young. His letter is dated June 15, 1954. Listen to this part of his letter, Mr. President:

> Our records indicate that during the current economic squeeze which farmers are experiencing, there has been a falling off of requests for Service assistance on the more costly practices such as terracing. In other words, it appears that when farm income is down, farmers go a little slower in investing capital for conservation practices which require a period of time to make a profit.

Mr. President, that is what the expert says.

Now let me read what the Minneapolis Star had to say. Of course the Minneapolis Star is in favor of the Eisenhower program. Name almost anything, and if it has the Eisenhower label, the Minneapolis Star is in favor of it.

The headline of the editorial is, "Unwise Land Use."

I read from the editorial:

> Some time ago this editorial page got into an exchange of opinions regarding the "costs" of Federal high-price-support programs for agricultural products. We noted you can't merely add up administration costs and benefit payments.

This editorial was written when the Minneapolis Star was taking after me, let me say to my colleagues. That is its regular procedure.

The editorial proceeds to refer to a picture, published on the same page, showing parched land near Texas and New Mexico border—final cost to Nation cannot be estimated.

Listen to what the editorial has to say on that score, Mr. President:

> This picture conveys dramatically what happens when land which probably should never have been broken by the plow in the first place—or, having been broken, should have been handled with the greatest possible diligence with regards to soil-conservation practices—is subjected to intensive cultivation year after year. The shocking part of it, of course, is that such costly farming was actually encouraged under past high-support-price programs.

In other words, the high price supports encourage wasting the land; that is what the editorial is saying. If we correctly interpret the editorial, it is saying that higher price supports are in opposition to sound soil conservation.

But what does the Acting Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture say? The Acting Administrator, Mr. Gladwin E. Young, says in his letter of June 15, 1954:

> Our records indicate that during the current economic squeeze which farmers are experiencing, there has been a falling off of requests for Service assistance on the more costly practices such as terracing.

Mr. President, we know that terracing is a very important form of soil conservation.

I read further from the letter of the Acting Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service:

> In other words, it appears that when farm income is down, farmers go a little slower in investing capital for conservation practices which require a period of time to make a profit.

Mr. President, let me comment on the phrase "when farm income is down." What causes it to go down? That is brought about in two ways: a falling off of production or a falling off of price. Well, it is perfectly obvious, according to the complaints about the surpluses, that production is good. So the price is what has been falling off; the price is what is down.

Mr. President, if we wish to have soil conservation practices engaged in, we must have an adequate farm income; and if we wish to have an adequate farm income, we must have adequate production and good prices.

I must say that I am rather shocked to see the propaganda campaign on the part of the Department of Agriculture, with the production of various maps and charts, such as the ones I have seen, and about which I spoke on yesterday. I leave it to any fairminded person to judge the implication of charts such as chart No. 6, which was placed on our desks yesterday. The heading of the chart is "Cash Receipts From Nonsupported Commodities and Dairy Products."

The obvious connotation is, of course, that all of them are nonsupported. However, following the word "products," there is an asterisk; and at the bottom of the page there appears in small type, following a corresponding asterisk—and of course, here we see the really objective treatment—with full prejudice:

> Most of the purchases of dairy products for price support are concentrated in five States—Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, Missouri, and Iowa—with Nebraska and New York ranking next.

Mr. President, that statement was just about as necessary as an explanation that there is dandruff on the head of the Acting Secretary. Mr. President, why was it felt necessary to single out that group? Why did they not say that most of the tomatoes or most of the grapefruit are produced in Florida or in Arizona?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The answer is that tomatoes and grapefruit were not being purchased by the United States Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Well, tomatoes and grapefruit are not being purchased by the Government because they are selling at prices which are being fixed by

marketing agreements; and if the Senator from Florida wishes to have us discuss how those agreements work, in fixing the prices and in limiting the amounts available, we shall proceed to discuss that subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Unfortunately, Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota does not have the correct information. There are no marketing agreements on tomatoes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is a marketing agreement on grapefruit, and we have little embargoes on tomatoes.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no marketing agreement on tomatoes, and the marketing agreement on grapefruit, unfortunately, has not been able to make raising grapefruit a profitable venture for the past 2 years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am now getting the information that grapefruit is not a profitable venture, which proves that the program is not working.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question about these charts. They apparently aim to prove that the price-supported commodities form only a small percentage of the total agricultural output.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; that is what the charts show.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What they apparently show. But chart 1, for instance, shows cash receipts from basic commodities, the six basics on which price supports are fixed legislatively, but it does not include the commodities whose prices are fixed by administrative fiat, notably dairy products.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is there anywhere in this series of charts a combination of the percentage of the product of the six basics in the various States, plus the dairy products, and the other products on which prices are fixed by administrative fiat?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is not. There is no such chart. There is no chart which shows, for example, even the six basic crops and dairy products, on which there are mandatory price supports. There is none.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Everything else is shown, but that is not shown.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. That is a part of the game of divide and conquer.

As I pointed out the other day, when departmental officials are in North Carolina and in South Carolina, they tell how well the cotton price-support program works.

Then they tell the folks, of course, the real problem involves dairy products, and where do they buy all the dairy products for Government storage? They buy them in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and other States.

Then they come up my way and talk about how wonderful the corn-support program works. What is the real problem? It is that we have to have peanuts under price supports, they say, and other statements like that. We hear those comments.

It is not possible to work both sides of the street on this farm price-support program. My protest is not over whether the figure is 75 to 90. There is room for honest difference of opinion. I respect the judgment of men who believe that from 75 to 90 percent is the proper spread for price supports. But I do not like to have a program which has done so much good look as if all at once it was the greatest mistake our Government ever made; taking the fact that we have a momentary and temporary surplus, and making it appear as though it will always be there, and exaggerating that surplus.

I wish that the newspapers of this country would carry every day, as they seem to be carrying articles with respect to agricultural surpluses, information as to the stockpile of metals we have.

I wish that they would list every day the inventory that we have in our great economy, and, by the way, any man who knows about inventory knows that the storage charges for inventory in private enterprises are charged up to the commodities. The taxpayer pays for that. It does not take too big a businessman to know the difference in how you handle an inventory. Of course, an inventory is considered both an asset, and the costs of it are considered to be an expense, which you pass on to the consumer.

Mr. President, I will conclude by reading a letter, a copy of which I received, which was sent to the President. It is addressed to President Dwight Eisenhower, White House, Washington, D. C. This is a letter from an ordinary American citizen. It says:

> There is still time for us to see sound Christian principles placed ahead of misguided economic theories relative to the farm program. The only approach based on sound moral foundations is the idea which assures bountiful production—with the farmer receiving fair prices for his products.
>
> This cannot be done on the free market. Even if production were equal to demand, the record shows that the free market would force upon us the unethical proposition whereby the farmer would have to accept prices far below that to which he is entitled. There is every indication that if the farmer were to get a fair price in the marketplace, he would have to embark on a program of planned, deliberate scarcity.
>
> Surely we can't ask our people to be finagled into such an unhuman, uncivilized situation. Whether he be consumer or producer, the American has a right to expect that the leaders of our Nation will not sell him short. Both will be sold short if we tell the farmer he should have a fair price, and then lead him to the inevitable theme of "planned scarcity" of food and fiber—to get a price. All average citizens will lose, but it will be the only alternative if the "price-flexer" wins. Let's not allow atheism to take over our farm program.
>
> Respectfully yours,
>
> C. W. HESS.

I do not think atheism has taken it over. I think the man went too far in that last sentence, but I want to say that he surely understands what is going on. He understands that the only way the sliding scale works is on the principle of scarcity. When the supply of a commodity is less than the demand, then it is taken for a ride in the market.

Production in abundance is the fair way to take care of the consumer and the producer. Scarcity is an unethical way. Scarcity is the grabber's way. Scarcity is the profiteer's way, the speculator's way. I say it is un-American.

This country has been based upon the proposition of abundance for all—not scarcity. Scarcity is the one way to make the marketplace a gambler's paradise.

An economic philosophy based upon scarcity is an economic philosophy that is based upon trouble, because scarcity leads just to that, and abundance leads to plenty.

I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9077) to amend section 405 of the District of Columbia Law Enforcement Act of 1953, to make available to the judges of such District the psychiatric and psychological services provided for in such section.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8152) to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. AYRES, Mr. TEAGUE, and Mr. DORN of North Carolina were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9936) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. CANNON, and; on chapters 1, 2, 4, 11, 12, and 13, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. ANDERSEN and Mr. GARY; on chapter 3, Mr. CLEVENGER, Mr. BOW, and Mr. ROONEY; on chapter 5, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. BUDGE, and Mr. FERNANDEZ, on chapter 6, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. WHITTEN; on chapter 7, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. FENTON, and Mr. NORRELL; on chapter 8, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. JONAS of North Carolina, and Mr. THOMAS; on chapters 9 and 10, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. CEDERBERG, and Mr. RABAUT, were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton;

H. R. 717. An act for the relief of Henriette Matter;

H. R. 785. An act for the relief of Apostolos Vasili Percas;

H. R. 822. An act for the relef of Sister Giuseppina Giaccone;

H. R. 826. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski;

H. R. 832. An act for the relief of Katharine Balsamo;

H. R. 839. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Gertrude (Mary Gertrude Kelly);

H. R. 877. An act for the relief of Nasser Esphahanian;

H. R. 1156. An act for the relief of William H. Barney;

H. R. 1157. An act for the relief of Herbert Roscoe Martin;

H. R. 1622. An act for the relief of Agustin Mondreal;

H. R. 1627. An act for the relief of Johann Groben;

H. R. 1701. An act for the relief of Ewing Choat;

H. R. 1785. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman E. Mosley, as natural parents of Herman E. Mosley, Jr.;

H. R. 2015. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Lloyd H. Turner, of Wards Grove, Alaska;

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Dr. Vahram Uluhogian;

H. R. 2393. An act for the relief of Brother Eugene Cumerlate;

H. R. 2415. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas;

H. R. 2480. An act for the relief of Charlotte Margarita Schmidt;

H. R. 2483. An act for the relief of Giacomo Bartolo Vanadia;

H. R. 2647. An act for the relief of Angelita Haberer;

H. R. 2674. An act for the relief of Dr. Paul Keuk Chang;

H. R. 2794. An act for the relief of Mrs. Claire Godrean Daigle;

H. R. 2799. An act for the relief of Gertrud Babette Kraeutter;

H. R. 2901. An act for the relief of Tokuko Kobayashi and her minor son;

H. R. 3013. An act for the relief of Spyridon Saintoufis and Mrs. Efrossini Saintoufis;

H. R. 3014. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfred L. Smith;

H. R. 3024. An act for the relief of Sergio Emeric;

H. R. 3144. An act for the relief of Elias Y. Richa;

H. R. 3237. An act for the relief of Paul Nelson;

H. R. 3330. An act for the relief of Milos Hamza and Mrs. Jirina Hamza;

H. R. 3388. An act for the relief of Louie Ella Attaway;

H. R. 3447. An act for the relief of Maria Paccione Pica;

H. R. 3507. An act for the relief of Major Elias M. Tsougranis;

H. R. 3665. An act for the relief of Marko Ribic;

H. R. 4015. An act for the relief of Josef, Paula, and Kurt Friedberg;

H. R. 4054. An act for the relief of Jorge Sole Massana and Montserrat Thomasa-Sanchez Massana;

H. R. 4427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helena Piasecka;

H. R. 4522. An act for the relief of Petrus Van Keer;

H. R. 4908. An act for the relief of Pietro Petralia;

H. R. 4969. An act for the relief of Basilios Xarhoulacos;

H. R. 4975. An act to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses;

H. R. 5194. An act for the relief of Pauline Katzmann;

H. R. 5344. An act for the relief of Bob Kan and Fourere Kan;

H. R. 5749. An act for the relief of Maria Teresa Lubiato;

H. R. 5762. An act for the relief of Suren Pelenghian;

H. R. 5870. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Roderick D. Strawn;

H. R. 5978. An act for the relief of Chung Fook Yee Chung;

H. R. 6266. An act for the relief of Frank Robert Gage;

H. R. 6531. An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett;

H. R. 6858. An act for the relief of Mrs. Efthemia Soteralis;

H. R. 7033. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna J. Weigle;

H. R. 7051. An act for the relief of Mary George Solomon;

H. R. 7073. An act for the relief of Vito Magistrale;

H. R. 7080. An act for the relief of Bartolomeo Montalto;

H. R. 7151. An act for the relief of Mazal Kolman;

H. R. 7228. An act for the relief of Christine Susan Caiado;

H. R. 7229. An act to provide for the conveyance to T. M. Pratt and Annita C. Pratt of certain real property in Stevens County, Wash.;

H. R. 7262. An act for the relief of Rosa Maria Phillips, nee Vollmer;

H. R. 7343. An act for the relief of Hildegart Liselotte Budesheim and her minor child;

H. R. 7463. An act for the relief of Theodora Sammartino;

H. R. 7497. An act for the relief of Roy M. Butcher;

H. R. 7498. An act for the relief of David Manuel Porter;

H. R. 7499. An act for the relief of Charles Chan;

H. R. 7572. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul);

H. R. 7579. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone;

H. R. 7581. An act for the relief of Gaetano Conti;

H. R. 7594. An act for the relief of Yin Mow Moy;

H. R. 7750. An act for the relief of Kermit R. Lay, Sr.;

H. R. 7828. An act for the relief of Mariana George Loizos Kellis;

H. R. 7829. An act for the relief of Shimasoi Michiko;

H. R. 7834. An act for the relief of Erika Schneider Buonasera;

H. R. 7885. An act for the relief of Sohan Singh Rai and Jogindar Kaur Rai;

H. R. 7938. An act for the relief of Miss Martha Heuschele;

H. R. 7987. An act for the relief of Roger Feghali;

H. R. 8065. An act for the relief of Carlos Francisco, Manriqueta Mina, and Roberto Mina Ver;

H. R. 8066. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Eckerl Strickland;

H. R. 8183. An act for the relief of Elfriede Ida Geissler;

H. R. 8375. An act for the relief of Ilse Radler Hughes;

H. R. 8413. An act for the relief of Sigrid Brinkhoff;

H. R. 8424. An act for the relief of Mrs. Else Johnson;

H. R. 8606. An act for the relief of Neil C. Hemmer and Mildred Hemmer;

H. R. 8694. An act for the relief of Suzanne L'Heureux;

H. R. 8810. An act for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska;

H. R. 8812. An act for the relief of Robert Francis Symons;

H. R. 8936. An act for the relief of Dana Evanovich;

H. R. 9103. An act for the relief of Rose Mary Keser;

H. R. 9336. An act for the relief of Marianne Geymeier;

H. R. 9496. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Hoeft;

H. R. 9671. An act for the relief of Dr. Liang Nun Wang and his wife and child, Fa-chi Ling Wang and Eileen Wang;

H. R. 9910. An act to amend section 413 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946;

H. R. 9953. An act for the relief of Mr. Fu-Ho Chan, Mrs. Fu-Ho Chan, and their child, Richard Chan; and

H. R. 9996. An act for the relief of Susan Ellen Heiney.

ADDITIONAL HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following additional bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton;

H. R. 717. An act for the relief of Henriette Matter;

H. R. 785. An act for the relief of Apostolos Vasili Percas;

H. R. 822. An act for the relief of Sister Giuseppina Giaccone;

H. R. 826. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski;

H. R. 832. An act for the relief of Katharine Balsamo;

H. R. 839. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Gertrude (Mary Gertrude Kelly);

H. R. 877. An act for the relief of Nasser Esphahanian;

H. R. 1156. An act for the relief of William H. Barney;

H. R. 1157. An act for the relief of Herbert Roscoe Martin;

H. R. 1622. An act for the relief of Agustin Mondreal;

H. R. 1627. An act for the relief of Johann Groben;

H. R. 1701. An act for the relief of Ewing Choat;

H. R. 1785. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman E. Mosley, as natural parents of Herman E. Mosley, Jr.;

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Dr. Vahram Uluhogian;

H. R. 2393. An act for the relief of Brother Eugene Cumerlate;

H. R. 2415. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas;

H. R. 2480. An act for the relief of Charlotte Margarita Schmidt;

H. R. 2483. An act for the relief of Giacomo Bartolo Vanadia;

H. R. 2647. An act for the relief of Angelita Haberer;

H. R. 2674. An act for the relief of Dr. Paul Keuk Chang;

H. R. 2794. An act for the relief of Mrs. Claire Godrean Daigle;

H. R. 2799. An act for the relief of Gertrud Babette Kraeutter;

H. R. 2901. An act for the relief of Tokuko Kobayashi, and her minor son;

H. R. 3013. An act for the relief of Spydiron Saintoufis and Mrs. Efrossini Saintoufis;

H. R. 3014. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfred L. Smith;

H. R. 3024. An act for the relief of Sergio Emeric;

H. R. 3144. An act for the relief of Elias Y. Richa;

H. R. 3237. An act for the relief of Paul Nelson;

H. R. 3330. An act for the relief of Milos Hamza and Mrs. Jirina Hamza;

H. R. 3388. An act for the relief of Louie Ella Attaway;

H. R. 3447. An act for the relief of Maria Paccione Pica;

H. R. 3507. An act for the relief of Maj. Elias M. Tsougranis;

H. R. 3665. An act for the relief of Marko Ribic;

H. R. 4015. An act for the relief of Josef, Paula, and Kurt Friedberg;

H. R. 4054. An act for the relief of Jorge Sole Massana and Montserrat Thomasa-Sanchez Massana;

H. R. 4427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helena Piasecka;

H. R. 4522. An act for the relief of Petrus Van Keer;

H. R. 4908. An act for the relief of Pietro Petralia;

H. R. 4969. An act for the relief of Basilios Xarhoulacos;

H. R. 4975. An act to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses;

H. R. 5194. An act for the relief of Pauline Katzmann;

H. R. 5344. An act for the relief of Bob Kan and Fourere Kan;

H. R. 5749. An act for the relief of Maria Teresa Lubiato;

H. R. 5762. An act for the relief of Suren Pelenghian;

H. R. 5870. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the eastern district of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Roderick D. Strawn;

H. R. 5978. An act for the relief of Chung Fook Yee Chung;

H. R. 6266. An act for the relief of Frank Robert Gage;

H. R. 6521. An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett;

H. R. 6858. An act for the relief of Mrs. Efthemia Soteralis;

H. R. 7033. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna J. Weigle;

H. R. 7073. An act for the relief of Vito Magistrale;

H. R. 7080. An act for the relief of Bartolomeo Montalto;

H. R. 7151. An act for the relief of Mazal Kolman;

H. R. 7228. An act for the relief of Christine Susan Caiado;

H. R. 7262. An act for the relief of Rosa Maria Phillips, nee Vollmer;

H. R. 7343. An act for the relief of Hildegart Liselotte Budesheim and her minor child;

H. R. 7463. An act for the relief of Theodora Sammartino;

H. R. 7497. An act for the relief of Roy M. Butcher;

H. R. 7498. An act for the relief of David Manuel Porter;

H. R. 7499. An act for the relief of Charles Chan;

H. R. 7572. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul);

H. R. 7579. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone;

H. R. 7581. An act for the relief of Gaetano Conti;

H. R. 7594. An act for the relief of Yin Mow Moy;

H. R. 7750. An act for the relief of Kermit R. Lay, Sr.;

H. R. 7828. An act for the relief of Mariana George Loizos Kellis;

H. R. 7829. An act for the relief of Shimasoi Michiko;

H. R. 7834. An act for the relief of Erika Schneider Buonasera;

H. R. 7885. An act for the relief of Sohan Singh Rai and Jogindar Kaur Rai;

H. R. 7938. An act for the relief of Miss Martha Heuschele;

H. R. 7987. An act for the relief of Roger Feghali;

H. R. 8065. An act for the relief of Carlos Francisco, Manriqueta Mina, and Roberto Mina Ver;

H. R. 8066. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Eckerl Strickland;

H. R. 8183. An act for the relief of Elfriede Ida Geissler;

H. R. 8375. An act for the relief of Ilse Radler Hughes;

H. R. 8413. An act for the relief of Sigrid Brinkhoff;

H. R. 8424. An act for the relief of Mrs. Else Johnson;

H. R. 8606. An act for the relief of Neil C. Hemmer and Mildred Hemmer;

H. R. 8810. An act for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska;

H. R. 8812. An act for the relief of Robert Francis Symons;

H. R. 8936. An act for the relief of Dana Evanovich;

H. R. 9103. An act for the relief of Rose Mary Keser;

H. R. 9336. An act for the relief of Marianne Geymeier;

H. R. 9496. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Hoeft;

H. R. 9671. An act for the relief of Dr. Liang Nun Wang and his wife and child, Fa-chi Ling Wang and Eileen Wang;

H. R. 9953. An act for the relief of Mr. Fu-Ho Chan, Mrs. Fu-Ho Chan, and their child, Richard Chan; and

H. R. 9996. An act for the relief of Susan Ellen Heiney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2015. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Lloyd H. Turner, of Wards Cove, Alaska; and

H. R. 7229. An act to provide for the conveyance to T. M. Pratt and Annita C. Pratt of certain real property in Stevens County, Wash.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7051. An act for the relief of Mary George Solomon; and

H. R. 8694. An act for the relief of Suzanne L'Heureux; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 9910. An act to amend section 413 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER PROPERTY OF KLAMATH TRIBE OF INDIANS, OREGON

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2745) to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Klamath Tribe of Indians located in the State of Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes, which were, on page 3, line 20, strike out "7" and insert "6"; on page 3, strike out all after line 22 over to and including line 25 on page 4 and insert:

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to select and retain by contract, at the earliest practicable time after the enactment of this act and after consultation with the tribe at a general meeting called for that purpose, the services of qualified management specialists who shall—

(1) cause an appraisal to be made, within not more than 12 months after their employment, or as soon thereafter as practicable, of all tribal property showing its fair market value by practicable logging or other appropriate economic units;

(2) give each adult member of the tribe, immediately after the appraisal of the tribal property, an opportunity to elect for himself, and, in the case of a head of a family, for the members of the family who are minors, to withdraw from the tribe and have his interest in tribal property converted into money and paid to him, or to remain in the tribe and participate in the tribal management plan to be prepared pursuant to paragraph (5) of this subsection;

(3) determine and select the portion of the tribal property which if sold at the appraised value would provide sufficient funds to pay the members who elect to have their interests converted into money, arrange for the sale of such property, and distribute the proceeds of sale among the members entitled thereto: *Provided*, That whenever funds have accumulated in the amount of $200,000 or more, such funds shall be distributed pro rata to the members who elected to take distribution of their individual shares, and thereafter similar pro rata distribution shall be made whenever funds have accumulated in the amount of $200,000 or more until all of the property set aside for sale shall have been sold and the proceeds distributed: *Provided further*, That any such member shall have the right to purchase any part of such property for not less than the highest offer received by competitive bid, and to apply toward the purchase price all or any part of the sum due him from the conversion of his interest in tribal property: *Provided further*, That when determining and selecting the portion of the tribal property to be sold, due consideration shall be given to the use of such property for grazing purposes by the members of both groups of the tribe;

(4) cause such studies and reports to be made as may be deemed necessary or desirable by the tribe or by the Secretary in connection with the termination of Federal supervision as provided for in this act; and

(5) cause a plan to be prepared in form and content satisfactory to the tribe and to the Secretary for the management of tribal property through a trustee, corporation, or other legal entity.

(b) Such amounts of Klamath tribal funds as may be required for the purposes of this section shall be available for expenditure by the Secretary: *Provided*, That the expenses incident to the sale of property and the distribution of proceeds of sale pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection shall be charged exclusively to the interests of the members who withdraw from the tribe, and the expenses incurred under paragraphs (4) and (5) of this subsection shall be charged exclusively to the interests of the members who remain in the tribe, and all other expenses under this section shall be charged to the interests of both groups of members.

On page 4, after line 25, insert:

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to execute any conveyancing instrument that is necessary or appropriate to convey title to tribal property to be sold in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 5 of this act, and to transfer title to all other tribal property to a trustee, corporation, or other legal entity in accordance with the plan prepared pursuant to paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of section 5 of this act.

(b) It is the intention of the Congress that all of the actions required by sections 5 and 6 of this act shall be completed at the earliest practicable time and in no event later than 4 years from the date of this act.

(c) Members of the tribe who receive the money value of their interests in tribal property shall thereupon cease to be members of the tribe: *Provided*, That nothing shall prevent them from sharing in the proceeds of tribal claims against the United States.

On page 5, line 1, strike out "6" and insert "7"; on page 5, strike out all after line 11 over to and including line 11 on page 7; on page 8, line 4, after "of", insert "this"; on page 10, strike out all after

line 19 over to and including line 3 on page 11 and insert:

SEC. 12. Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 872, 873), and section 2 (a) of the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1253), are repealed effective on the date of the transfer of title to tribal property to a trustee, corporation, or other legal entity pursuant to section 6 of this act. All loans made from the reimbursable loan fund established by section 2 of the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 872), and all other loans made from Klamath tribal funds, including loans of livestock made by the tribe repayable in kind, shall be transferred to the tribe for collection in accordance with the terms thereof.

On page 12, line 21, strike out "ten" and insert "fifteen"; on page 15, line 3, strike out "tribe," and insert "tribe"; and on page 15, strike out lines 6 and 7 and insert:

SEC. 21. Nothing contained in this act shall deprive the tribe or its constituent parts of any right, privilege, or benefit granted by the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049).

Mr. CORDON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER PROPERTY OF CERTAIN TRIBES AND BANDS OF INDIANS IN WESTERN OREGON

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2746) to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes and bands of Indians located in western Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes, which was, on page 10, line 15, strike out all after "(b)" down to and including "citizens" in line 18 and insert "Nothing in this act shall affect the status of the members of a tribe as citizens of the United States."

Mr. CORDON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3052) to encourage a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture, and for other purposes.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I will yield providing I do not lose the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point, the minority views to the report of the Committee on Agriculture with respect to the Agricultural Act of 1954.

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

MINORITY VIEWS

The Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported S. 3052 with three major provisions which we consider highly objectionable.

The provisions are—

1. Mandatory 90 percent rigid supports for 5 major commodities—corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and peanuts. (Tobacco is not an issue in this bill.)

2. A provision forcing the Secretary to increase supports for dairy products from 75 percent to 85 percent of parity.

3. A provision forcing the Secretary to increase the support prices for oats, barley, and grain sorghum to levels as high as 113 percent of parity.

These provisions are neither in the interest of the farmers nor the public generally and should be defeated by the Senate.

PART 1. PRICE SUPPORTS FOR BASIC COMMODITIES

The program of farm price supports was instituted in the late twenties and early thirties to assist farmers to market their commodities over a 12-month period in an orderly manner. A necessary part of this program was the providing of governmental machinery to farmers to assist in adjusting production to effective market demand, thereby increasing the opportunity for farmers to get a fair price in the market place. In recent years, this idea has been twisted into the right of some farmers to a profitable fixed price for their commodities regardless of either how much the market will absorb or how great the price-breaking surpluses may become. The 90 percent price support that was a Government incentive to produce for war has been distorted into a peacetime program of temporarily guaranteeing profits for a minority of the farmers.

As unmanageable surpluses pile up and the right to produce is restricted, the demand for the continuance of these high rigid supports shifts from one of guaranteeing a profit to one of providing relief.

We are strongly of the opinion that the American farmer should neither be guaranteed a profit-yielding price nor forced to trade his independence for Government relief.

We favor farmers getting the highest possible net income that they can earn. Farmers can never expect to obtain through a Government relief program as high or as satisfactory an income as they can by producing and selling what consumers want. We think that Government programs should assist farmers in their goal of obtaining the highest possible net farm income and not interfere with either their freedom or opportunity to do so.

Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949

Widespread misunderstanding exists with regard to the economic and political facts surrounding the passage of the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949 which were designed to carry out in the postwar period the idea of assisting farmers to market their commodities in an orderly manner throughout the marketing year.

The Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949, which constitute the basic price support and adjustment program authority, were designed to provide farmers governmental assistance in adjusting production to effective demand.

It should be borne in mind that this legislation was evolved during a period after World War II that resembled in many ways the current period. Then, as now, we had moved out of a shooting war situation into a postwar type of economic setting. Then, as now, we had our agricultural plant overexpanded and were confronted with reduced foreign demand. The year 1947 was one of extensive farm program studies, just as 1953 was.

On April 21, 1947, Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, said:

"We need to develop a long-range system of commodity price floors to protect producers against excessive or abnormal declines during the market season and to generally cushion declines in farm prices and incomes in the event of business recessions. We should make sure, however, that we do not establish a rigid system of price relationships * * *. Prices are and should be an effective means of encouraging changes in production as the conditions of production and demand change."

In 1947 in response to questioning by members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Carl C. Farrington, speaking as chairman of the Department's Committee on Price Policy and Production Adjustment, said:

"We have given much thought to the percentage of modernized parity which might be used as a minimum price floor. Our studies indicate that 50 percent of parity, for example, might not be high enough to act as an effective stop-loss mechanism, and 90 percent might force us into a completely managed agricultural economy."

President Truman sent a message to the Congress on May 14, 1948. In it he asked for flexible price supports in these words:

"Many shifts in production will have to be made and flexible price supports will help us make them in an orderly manner. This will require authority to make prompt adjustments in support levels in line with current and prospective supply-and-demand conditions. It will also require flexibility in the choice of methods or programs that are designed to be most effective for individual commodities, that avoid waste, and that help bring about needed adjustments in production, distribution, and consumption."

Both the Republican and Democratic Party platforms in 1948 were straightforward in their endorsement of the basic principles of the Agricultural Act of 1948, including flexible price supports.

Both candidates for President campaigned in support of flexible price supports. In a speech which Candidate Truman delivered at Springfield, Ill., on October 12, just prior to the November 2, 1948, election, he said:

"Here are the main outlines of the agricultural program we must have.

"1. We must have on a permanent basis a system of flexible price supports for agricultural commodities. Price supports and related measures help us keep our farm production adjusted to shifting market requirements."

The President's Council of Economic Advisers on January 7, 1949, submitted an economic review under the heading, "Farm price supports," in which they used these words:

"Intercommodity price relationships must be kept consistent with basic trends in demand and supply conditions. To the maximum extent possible, parity-price relationships and support-price programs should encourage shifts to those commodities that are most wanted. Rigid systems of support, in violation of this principle, can only lead to rigid systems for restricting output that violate our tenets of economic freedom, that work against our objectives of maximum production, and that in the end take away from farmers' incomes through decreased volume as much as, or more than, they add through increased prices.

"The Agricultural Act of 1948 represents an important step forward in recognizing the difficulties associated with overrigid supports."

In his budget message to the 81st Congress in January 1949 President Truman restated the fundamental principles upon which the Agricultural Act of 1948 was based.

"As I said a year ago, price supports should be regarded 'chiefly as devices to safeguard farmers against forced selling under unfavorable conditions and economic depression.' Their purpose is to bring an element of stability into agriculture. At the same time they should not place excessive burdens on the Treasury and taxpayers or inhibit shifts in production needed to meet peacetime demands and to promote adequate conservation of our soil resources."

The majority report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, headed by Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, and Congressman HART, Democrat, of New Jersey, had this to say on May 1, 1949:

"In order to fit a prosperous and equitably treated agriculture consistently into an economy seeking to operate continuously at maximum levels, agricultural price supports must be kept as floor prices; not as a means of price fixing, nor to guarantee a profit, but to provide a barrier against the sort of devastating price declines which in the past have made agricultural depression the forerunner of business and industrial depression * * *.

"The need to put into operation a flexible, well-integrated, and varied farm program is urgent. In addition to flexible price supports intelligently adapted to postwar conditions, consideration should be given as parts of a coordinated program to such measures as the provision of adequate storage facilities, more adequate credit accommodations, crop insurance, and so forth."

The minority report contained the following pertinent paragraph:

"We still consider that a support-price program for farm prices is highly desirable to prevent the development of a depression through a complete collapse in agricultural products. We do not feel that it is our function at this time to discuss the various plans for such price support, but we recommend that a full trial be given to the Aiken-Hope Act and its plan of sliding-scale support recommended by the leading agricultural associations. The administration of this plan should be directed not as if it were a relief measure or a guaranteed equality of income for individuals, but as a major weapon against distortion between urban and rural incomes which could bring collapse to the entire Nation."

Rigid mandatory supports at 90 percent of parity without regard to supply seriously injure (1) the vast majority of farmers, (2) consumers, (3) our competitive free-choice economic system, (4) the Government and the general interests of the people of the United States.

1. Rigid supports injure farmers

Rigid supports injure farmers by increasing their costs, decreasing their markets, decreasing their freedom of choice, assisting their competitors, lowering their net income, and obstructing needed adjustments.

1. Increase Costs

The greatest single source of farm income is the sale of livestock and livestock products. One of the most important factors in the costs of producing livestock is feed. Rigid price supports have diverted feed from livestock into Government warehouses. Only 23 percent of the United States farm income comes from the basic commodities which, with the exception of tobacco (which accounts for 3.3 percent of total farm income), are the main subject of the present controversy. Three-fourths of our farm income is from the nonbasic commodities. Approximately 60 percent of our agricultural income is from nonsupported commodities. The argument is often made that high price supports on the six basics help to stabilize economic conditions for the others. This argues that the tail wags the dog.

Diverted acres: In many respects mandatory supports at 90 percent of parity work to the disadvantage of nonsupported products. Acres diverted from the basic commodities tend to increase the supply problems of the nonbasic commodities. During 1954, efforts to provide rigid price supports for wheat, corn, and cotton have resulted in the following acreage increases over 1953 of other commodities:

	Percent
Barley	+51.3
Sorghum	+39.5
Sugar beets	+21
Flaxseed	+26.2
Soybeans	+20.6

Thus supply problems, instead of being solved, are being shifted from one group of crops to another and all through the coming years we will be listening to the trouble of farmers who plant these other crops. To avoid this inequity, cross compliance and compliance with a total acreage allotment has been required for 1955. This will serve to give a degree of protection to nonbasic crops, but forage crops, which can be grown on the diverted acres, will in time adversely affect dairymen and beef producers. Oftentimes producers of a basic crop maintain that they are willing to restrict production in order to obtain price support at 90 percent of parity. What they mean, in many cases, is that they are willing to divert acres out of the basic crop and into other uses in order to obtain price support on the basic crop. This does not really face up to the problem.

With an acreage-control program, there probably is no way fully to control the shifting of supply problems from one crop to another. That being the case, price support should be kept at moderate levels so as to minimize the problem.

Costs are increased to livestock producers by rigid price supports in other ways. Supporting favored crops at high levels prevents needed adjustments which the farmers, consumers, and the trade would normally make by themselves. Supporting corn at a high level raises the cost of cattle feeding. The price paid by a Corn Belt farmer for feeder cattle is limited by his expectation of profit, after taking account of costs. Last fall, 90 percent of parity for corn contributed to low prices for the feeder cattle from western ranges. Similarly, a farmer in the Corn Belt could easily decide whether to feed his corn to cattle or sell it through 90 percent supports to the Commodity Credit Corporation. We once fed a substantial part of our wheat, but 90 percent of parity for wheat means that wheat is priced too high to permit a large volume of feeding. This causes particular difficulty in the Northwest and the Northeast, which in the past have made heavy use of this crop for feed.

2. Decrease Farmers' Markets

Rigid supports decrease farmers' markets by lowering consumption. This is just exactly the opposite of what farmers need at this time. The most satisfactory solution to the current farm problem is to expand domestic and foreign markets until they balance agricultural production. It is commonly said that price has little to do with the consumption of agricultural products. Though we might decrease the price of wheat or cotton, it is said, no more bread or shirts would be purchased than before. There is enough truth to this statement to make it convincing, and enough untruth to make it dangerous. In the case of many agricultural products, such as livestock and dairy products, fruits, and vegetables—by far the most important source of farm income—the statement that price has little to do with guiding production and consumption is completely untrue. It is true, however, that a lower price for wheat would not increase the domestic consumption of bread. But it would permit us to meet export competition and to move more wheat in the form of livestock feed. A lower price for cotton would permit us better to meet the competition of synthetic fibers. It would permit us to regain a part of the world cotton trade which has been lost to foreign countries with respect to whom we have held a price umbrella. The housewife chooses food on the basis of price. The foreign buyer of American export products is price-conscious. The textile trade selects its fibers partly on the basis of price. No more effective weapon can be used to drive customers away from our products than to price these products at levels which are out of line with other products or alternative sources of supply.

3. Assist Farmers' Competitors

The efficient wheat-producing farmers that were in business in 1940 have watched with growing concern the shifting of the right to produce wheat from themselves to other farmers here in the United States as well as in foreign countries. The western Kansas wheat farmer along with the wheat farmers in Texas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, and the other great wheat-growing States have seen thousands of acres of additional land in the old Dust Bowl area of southwest Kansas, northwest Texas, northwest Oklahoma, and southeast Colorado returned to wheat in violation of the principles of effective soil conservation. They have also seen the less efficient wheat-farming areas of the country that are better adapted to other types of farming, shift to the production of wheat. For example, they have seen Michigan expand wheat and go out of the production of dry, edible beans because the production of wheat for the Government was a more profitable venture. Now that we have such a tremendous surplus supply of wheat (900 million bushels—over 6 times the normal amount prescribed by law) which is destroying market prices and threatening to overwhelm the farm program in a manner similar to the way it destroyed the old Federal Farm Board, serious cuts in production are being called for. The new areas are claiming their right to produce wheat and the efficient producers in the old areas are being cut drastically. For the most part, the efficient wheat-producing areas can produce wheat better than anything else, yet the support program has built up such surpluses that they are being deprived of their right to produce while other areas which could more efficiently produce alternative crops are staying in the production of wheat due to the high Government incentive prices. The efficient western Kansas wheat farmer along with the efficient wheat-producing farmers in other States also see that the price-support program has encouraged the Canadian, Argentinian, Australian, Turkish, and other wheat farmers of the world to plunge into the production of wheat in competition with him knowing that the wheat of the United States farmers will be the last to find its way into the world markets. The cotton producer who is looking at the facts is also aware of both domestic and foreign competition which is being aided by the rigid 90 percent price supports. Since 1930, synthetic consumption in the world has increased from the equivalent of 1 million bales of cotton to 10 million bales. Before 1933, America produced more cotton than all the rest of the world. This situation is no longer true today.

4. Supports Disturb Foreign Trade

Ninety percent of parity price support for our great export crops gives a price which

is irresponsive to changes in supply at home or demand abroad. If this continues, we can never hope to become more than the residual supplier. Under these conditions subsidies may be needed to bridge the price gap between the domestic and export market. To maintain an acceptable share of export market for wheat we have had to pay, thus far during this marketing year, an export subsidy of 43 cents a bushel.

Pricing domestic products at 90 percent of parity draws imports to our shores as a magnet draws metal. These products are attracted out of their normal trade patterns, away from the legitimate recipients and to our already overburdened markets.

In order to keep costs of these programs within reasonable bounds, embargoes, quotas, and import fees are needed. These unavoidable obstructions offend those nations whom we urgently need as friends.

If 90 percent of parity price support is voted, the Congress by that act establishes a restrictive foreign-trade policy for agricultural products.

5. Ninety Percent Guaranties Result in Strict Control and Decrease Farmers' Freedom of Choice

With high price supports, production is encouraged and consumption retarded. Consequently, surpluses accumulate. These surpluses are costly to store and difficult to move. For most commodities, spoilage is a threat. Thus surpluses tend to overhang and depress the market. Consequently, to avoid the evils of continuing surpluses it becomes necessary to place sharp restrictions on production. The restrictions reduce not only farm output but also sharply restrict activity in related agricultural industry.

This essential truth has not been made sufficiently clear to American farmers and nonfarmers. In the past, every time the problem of excess stocks began to loom large, something intervened. The workability, over a period of years, of a system which retires from production large numbers of acres of our basic crops has not been fully tested. The droughts of 1934 and 1936 reduced our supplies and called for feed production from the diverted acres. Then, when the problem again began to pinch, World War II broke out and called for the use of all our acres. In 1950, when we again faced the problem of what to do with acres retired from wheat, corn, and cotton, the Korean war intervened and we put all our acres back into production.

6. Continuing Rigid Supports at Temporarily Profitable Levels Requires Controls That Must Actually Cut Production Unless the Entire Program Is To Collapse, As it Is Presently in Danger of Doing for Some of the Basic Crops Such as Wheat

If the adjustment principle were to be strictly followed on wheat, farmers would not have a right to plant more than approximately 6 million acres for harvest next year, when just 2 years ago they planted 78 million acres—over 10 times as much acreage. Of course, such an abrupt adjustment is impractical—yet it shows the desperate situation in which wheat farmers find themselves.

Marketing quotas have not been invoked by any Secretary of Agriculture on corn, mainly due to the conviction by people experienced with controls, that corn marketing quotas cannot be made to work. Yet rigid price supports are providing a powerful force to increase production of feed grains and other crops that can be used for feed. If we do not begin to let prices allocate resources to direct the production and consumption of agricultural commodities, we inevitably are faced with the stark necessity of extending controls to more and more crops. If farmers substitute feed grain, such as grain sorghums and barley, for wheat acreage, the feed surplus will continue to mount to unbearable levels. As more and more intensive production of forage crops is encouraged, control will become necessary on livestock. Mr. Farrington's prophecy of a completely managed agricultural economy by the Government is fast becoming a reality.

7. Rigid Price Supports Injure Farmers by Assisting Their Competitors

We have seen how holding up the price of wheat has increased competition for the efficient wheat farmers by the less efficient wheat areas of the United States. Similarly we are holding an umbrella over the rest of the world for wheat and other rigidly supported crops. Our rigid-price-support announcements serve as notice to the world that we are not only going to support our prices, but world prices as well. The farmer of Mexico, Brazil, Canada, and the rest of the world can borrow money, which they have done, to go into the production of cotton, wheat, and other rigidly supported commodities on the strength of such programs here in the United States.

8. Cost Plus Guaranties Discredit the Farm Program

The price-support principle is an accepted part of farm programs, for the greater part willingly endorsed by farmers and nonfarmers alike. Certain unique characteristics of argiculture make price supports appropriate. The wide fluctuations of market prices and the hardships to which they subject farm people, the difficulty which farmers experience in pooling their bargaining power in order to match that of labor and capital, the essential nature of food, and the vulnerability of farm people to physical and economic disaster—all these things argue for an effective price-support program.

But price supports, long continued, at high levels, serve to build up heavy stocks, become costly, and result in misallocation of resources. Thus they antagonize those who would willingly support a more moderate program.

9. The Farmer's Concern Is Net Income, Not Price Alone

With price supports at 90 percent of parity and controls strictly applied, the volume of agricultural production must be sharply curtailed. Net income, not price alone, is the concern of agriculture. Net income is affected by volume and by costs as well as price. Restricting output often raises the cost per unit of production, and of course reduces the number of units sold. Thus, while price may be enhanced by the strict controls necessary to obtain 90 percent of parity, it does not necessarily follow that net farm income increases.

The inappropriateness of parity prices as a sole objective of farm price-support programs is evidenced by the fact that while during the past 40 years farm prices have fallen 8 percent relative to nonfarm prices; per capita net farm income has increased 11 percent relative to per capita incomes of nonfarmers. Thus, since 1910–14 farmers have improved their net income position relative to nonfarmers. They did this by turning out greater volume, and by increasing their efficiency, and in spite of a relative decline in prices.

10. Unwarranted Surpluses Incurred Today Cause Us To Borrow From Tomorrow's Market

About 10 percent of the 1953 farm production wound up in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This increased farm incomes for the 1953 crop.

But there will be another year when these stocks must be released, unless we let them spoil, which is unthinkable, or give them away, which in this strange world is not only expensive but difficult.

When these commodities are released they will add to the market supply as much as they withdrew from it this past year. Farmers' current incomes in the year of disposal will be curtailed about as much as they were helped in the year of acquisition.

Thus storing excessive quantities of agricultural products serves to increase farm incomes while the accumulation occurs. But the cycle should be completed before fair judgment can be rendered.

11. High and Rigid Supports Do Not Permit Needed Adjustments

It is sometimes argued that since the legislation recommended by the President would permit price supports at 90 percent of parity for basic commodities, the supports might as well be fixed at 90 percent by law.

There is, however, a great difference.

The flexible program serves to keep in the foreground the fact that supplies must be held in line with demand in order for price supports to be at or near 90 percent of parity.

There are numerous unforeseen events which might occur.

The minimum acreage provisions for certain crops might be raised by law.

Acreage allotments and marketing quotas might not be invoked.

Yields might be extremely high.

Export markets might suddenly be diminished.

Domestic outlets might be curtailed.

If supplies pile up as a consequence of such circumstances, it is important that there be an opportunity for lowering the support price to encourage consumption, to reduce the incentive for high production, and to encourage desired shifts in the pattern of production.

Mandatory price support at 90 percent of parity does not permit these needed adjustments.

II. Rigid supports injure consumers

(1) By holding commodities off the market permanently and making them artificially scarce, as contrasted to helping farmers market their products, rigid supports increase the cost of food to consumers. The most striking example is butter. When price supports were lowered by the Secretary of Agriculture from 90 to 75 percent of parity, a corresponding decrease occurred in the market place. As a result consumption of dairy products increased about 7 percent.

(2) While the detailed facts may be hidden from view, many of the farmers' customers know that something is wrong and they do not like it. The general public became resentful about the potato and egg programs which resulted in the Government removing price supports on these commodities. The general situation with respect to wheat and other commodities is causing similar resentment. Unconsciously the general public understands that if land, labor, and equipment is being used to produce commodities which are not being sold, that someone is paying for this waste. They suspect that somehow they are being unfairly treated. There isn't any question but what consumers ultimately have to pay for using resources to produce what consumers do not want.

III. Ninety percent of parity guaranty stimulates production and wastes resources

1. Production Stimulated

The fact that an incentive price will increase production has long been recognized by the Congress, which repeatedly has used this device to stimulate production, in time of need. The Senate recently recognized this principle in passing the wool bill.

The fact that a less attractive price will help bring overexpanded production back into line has likewise been recognized by the Congress.

At this time, when less production is needed, the continuation of 90 percent of

parity rigid price support, an incentive price, is wholly inappropriate. Experience, the expressed judgment of the Congress, and economic fact all argue against it.

2. Ninety Percent Rigid Supports Discourage Sound Soil-Conserving Practices

High price supports have kept parts of the Dust Bowl in wheat instead of grass. High price supports have kept cotton on eroding hillsides in parts of the Southeast, when this land should be shifting to livestock production.

High price supports for corn have resulted in cash grain production on midwestern farms which otherwise would have been in the livestock business.

Grass- and forage-consuming livestock are major contributors to a program of wise soil conservation. This kind of farming is discouraged by 90 percent of parity price support on grain and row crops.

3. Consumers Incensed by Increased Taxes

The public generally, as well as the farmers, are aware of the fact that the public debt is straining at the $275 billion limitation and that rigid price supports have helped contribute to this burden. The reality of taxation and the burden of the public debt cannot be explained away to the taxpayer by failing to look at all of the costs. While it is true that the Commodity Credit Corporation has only suffered losses of a little over $1 billion on the program that it calls price support, it is only fair to point out that billions of dollars have been spent for surplus removal programs, acreage allotment and marketing quota programs, none of which would have been carried out except for the problems created by price supports. The Department of Agriculture has submitted facts which make it abundantly clear that rather than the true cost of price support being a billion dollars, that it is many, many times this figure. However, this is not the most important issue—the real question is—Have rigid supports worked? Obviously they have not worked and we are not getting full value for the money spent.

IV. Rigid price supports injure our competitive, free choice, economic system by—

(1) Undermining the functioning of price,
(2) Penalizing the efficient,
(3) Rewarding the inefficient, and
(4) By making farmers dependent upon the Government.

1. Excessive Prices Pile Up Surpluses Which Depress Price

Six and a half billion dollars worth of American farm products have been piled up in the effort to make price support effective; 5 billions of this consists of the basic commodities, supported at 90 percent of parity. Storage charges alone are $700,000 a day. Movement of these surpluses without pulling down the price structure is extremely difficult, and the law requires that the price structure be maintained.

Thus 90 percent of parity is an effective means of procurement, but disposal is a difficult matter.

Ever-mounting surpluses hang over and depress the market despite the most strenuous efforts to support it. Though supports are at 90 percent of parity, wheat is now selling at 77 percent of parity and corn at 82. There comes a time when surpluses are so great that price supports, however administered, cannot be fully effective. Marketing the wheat harvest of 1954 is likely to show this most convincingly.

2. Pricing Commodities Out of the Market Puts Government Into the Business of Merchandising Farm Products

At a very low percentage of parity, price supports would be without meaning.

At a moderate level, Government would be providing price support only occasionally, in time of a burdensome supply or a weakened demand.

At a high level, and maintained over a period of time, the Government not merely supports the market; the Government becomes the market. Government acquired 47 percent of the 1953 wheat crop, for example.

The higher the level of price support, the more likely it becomes that Government will supplant the private trade as a market for farm commodities.

3. High Rigid Price Supports Incur Consumer Resentment

Through various forms of accounting, the costs of farm programs can be variously estimated. The Department of Agriculture, after a careful study, estimates the cost of farm programs primarily for the support of farm prices and farm incomes for the past 21 years at about $9.5 billion (before crediting processing taxes of approximately $2 billion). Other estimates run higher or lower, depending on which items are included.

That price support is costly is evidenced by the fact that twice during 1954 the Congress has been asked to increase the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, first from $6.75 billion to $8.5 billion and now up to $10 billion. Of present CCC inventories and loans, about 80 percent consist of the basic commodities supported at 90 percent of parity.

4. Parity Is Not Equality

The longer uneconomic price-support programs are continued the more injurious they become to sound government. Excuses have been freely offered that other segments of our economy are being subsidized so therefore it is right to carry out any kind of a subsidy under the farm program. The argument that parity is fair and therefore farmers are receiving less than a fair price when commodities are supported at 90 percent of parity will not bear close examination. Parity as presently calculated is a price which gives the same quantity of a commodity the same purchasing power as it had in some past period, usually 1910–14. This does not take into account the tremendous advances that have occurred with respect to the lowering of the cost of production of some commodities and the resulting increase in the quantity that can be produced with the same resources while the cost of production and the quantity produced of other commodities has remained relatively constant. In the case of wheat, the cost of production, due to mechanization, better yielding varieties, etc., is approximately one-third of the support price in the efficient producing areas of the United States. Hybrid seed corn and nitrogenous fertilizer, along with mechanization, likewise have brought about dramatic improvements in the quantity of production in the case of corn. Since for the same or lower cost of production a much greater quantity can be produced now than in the base period, "old" parity is too high on some of these commodities in relation to other commodities. To those who insist that producers must have 90 percent of parity supports in order to obtain a fair price, we call attention to the fact that today the average price of grapefruit is about 22 percent of parity. Yet we do not have the grapefruit producers insisting that they need a price-support program. Oranges have consistently averaged in the neighborhood from 40 to 60 percent of parity, yet the orange industry does not believe the answer is price support.

V. Impairs our relations with foreign countries

1. Import Restrictions

As price is supported at levels that result in profitable prices to domestic farmers, they attract sizable imports into this country. To help protect the Government from being flooded with imports to add to the excessive production in the United States, barriers to imports must be built higher and higher. The result is bitterness and misunderstanding among people of other lands, who hear us talk of "trade, not aid," and whom we greatly need as allies in the struggle against the Socialist dictatorship of Russia.

2. Fear of Surpluses

Today one of the greatest deterrents to a healthy world economic activity is the huge surpluses of CCC commodities overhanging the market. Our allies fear that we may dump these commodities on world markets and destroy them.

VI. Makes farmers dependent on Government

The world is witness to the struggle of governments to become the master of the individual rather than his servant. The higher that subsidies are set for agricultural commodities, the more government becomes the market and the more dependent farmers become upon government. This is the basis for the farmers' undoing. Today the Government is still the servant of the people. Self-government will be completely destroyed, and farmers ruined with it, whenever the Government becomes the master—whether paternal or otherwise—of the people.

PART 2. DAIRY

S. 3052 as reported to the Senate would require: (1) The Secretary of Agriculture to increase the level of price support on dairy production from 75 to 85 percent of parity, (2) deny him authority to bring parity for manufactured dairy products into line with a sound determination of parity for butter, evaporated milk, cheese, etc. If the Secretary is forced by Congress to raise the price of dairy supports, it will help to destroy the market that is being regained for fluid milk, butter, and cheese. The probable effects of raising price supports on dairy production would be:

1. The progress made since April 1 of increasing butter consumption 7 percent will be swept away.

2. The incentive to maintain a higher level of dairy production would be increased and the incentive to build markets would be decreased.

3. Consumption of butter in the market would decrease about 50 million pounds at 80 percent. Margarine consumption would increase by approximately a like amount. With support at 85 percent of parity, these changes would approximately be double.

4. The Government acquisition of butter would increase by about 100 million to 150 million pounds at 80 percent of parity. If support were at 85 percent of parity Government acquisition would go up correspondingly.

5. Windfall profits would accrue to the butter trade on inventories in stock. Not only would millions of unearned dollars be made by the butter trade but it would short the market during a considerable period prior to September 1 when new price-support levels would go into effect.

6. Consumers would resent a return to higher prices.

The adjustment to 75 percent of parity has been made. It has been accepted by farmers, by the trade, and by consumers. The farmers and the trade have instituted a sales-promotion program geared to 75 percent of parity. A boost to 80 or 85 percent of parity would turn us away from sound solutions to the dairy problem. To boost the price support now would be unwise.

PART 3. SMALL GRAINS

Last week a bare majority of the committee once rejected and then voted to report out a bill which included a directive to the Secretary of Agriculture, forcing him to support the prices of oats, rye, barley, and other

grain sorghums at "not less than the level the Secretary shall determine is the feed-value equivalent to the support level for corn." This will force the Secretary for 1955 and 1956 to raise the support levels as follows:

	Present 1954 support		Mandatory price support proposed	
	Dollars per bushel	Percentage of parity	Dollars per bushel	Percentage of parity
Oats	0.75	85	0.81	92
Barley	1.15	85	1.31	96
Grain sorghums	1.28	85	1.62	113

The Secretary would in effect be directed to reduce the price support on rye from $1.43 a bushel, which is 85 percent of parity, to $1.38 per bushel, which is 80 percent of parity. Price support would be mandatory. Currently, support is discretionary. The support level would be determined solely on the basis of its feed value to corn. Under present law feeding value is only 1 of 8 factors considered. The eight criteria are set forth in the 1949 act as follows: "(1) The supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which other commodities are being supported and in the case of feed grains, the feed values of such grains in relation to corn, (3) the availability of funds, (4) the perishability of the commodity, (5) the importance of the commodity to agriculture and the national economy, (6) the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price-support operation, (7) the need for offsetting temporary losses of export markets, and (8) the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand."

This provision raises the question: Does this require feed grain outside the commercial corn area to be supported at a different level than required inside the commercial corn area?

At present the following percentages of the crops are produced inside the commercial corn area: Oats, 60 percent; rye, 45 percent; barley, 20 percent; grain sorghums, 20 percent. This would in effect set the support price for over one-half of the production of rye at $1.03 per bushel, which is 40 cents per bushel less than the present support price as set by Secretary Benson under discretionary authority.

The foregoing and the facts concerning price relationships between these grains shows how utterly ridiculous it is for the Congress to arbitrarily interfere with the functioning of price by setting a rigid pattern of supports regardless of the economic facts of life.

As supply and demand fluctuate, the result is reflected in price. Since supply and demand are constantly changing, prices continuously change to reflect the relationship. Therefore, it is not surprising that strong variations from year to year in relative prices help guide consumption and production. The facts are reflected in the following table:

Commodity	Farm price relationships [1]						Feed value relationships
	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	May 15, 1954	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Corn	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Oats	93	91	87	91	89	91	88
Barley	100	91	89	107	93	86	94
Rye	97	86	92	114	88	69	85
Grain sorghums	91	69	80	105	89	94	100

[1] As percent of corn price.

Oats, barley, rye, and grain sorghums are used in varying quantities for purposes other than feed. For example, at times nearly two-thirds of the rye and over one-half of the barley goes into nonfeed uses.

Finally, these grains represent only a very small part of farmers' total cash income. In 1953 farmers obtained the following percentage of cash farm income from these feed grains: Oats, 0.75 percent; barley, 0.55 percent; grain sorghums, 0.30 percent; rye, 0.06 percent. The total for all of these amounted to less than 2 percent; namely, 1.66 percent of farmers' total cash income.

Mandatory price supports usually carry with them mandatory controls. In view of the patent unsoundness of the proposal, it is not surprising to see that it is put forward without any proposal for controls to keep supplies in line with demand.

Informed opinion favors flexible supports

The great majority of informed opinion favors flexible price supports. All of the Secretaries of Agriculture for the past two decades have recommended flexible supports.

The major farm organizations representing most of the farmers have rejected rigid supports as unsound.

Economists are practically unanimous that the long-run interests of farmers are harmed by rigid supports.

The thorough studies by Department of Agriculture experts in 1946, 1947, and 1948, and again in 1953 and 1954, came to the firm conclusion that rigid wartime supports designed to stimulate production for war needs were incompatible with a free, peacetime economy.

The facts are well known to the farmers, the consumers, the taxpayers, and the Congress.

As the surplus situation proves, rigid price support amounts to price fixing at the support level, misdirects the use of agricultural resources by maintaining an excess output, prohibits the proper flow of commodities into consumption, attracts additional imports of the goods in surplus, and prices American products out of the world market.

The House of Representatives just a few days ago rejected rigid supports by a decisive vote of 228 to 170. The Senate likewise should decisively discard rigid supports for five basic commodities, reject the proposed market-destroying increase in dairy supports, as well as reject the completely unrealistic rigid supports proposed for small grains.

Those subscribing to the attached minority views are as follows:

GEORGE D. AIKEN.
HERMAN WELKER.
ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL.
JOHN J. WILLIAMS.
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER.
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.
CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, so much was said during the course of the House debate on the House version of the bill now before us, particularly where the State of New York is concerned, that I rise to set the record straight. It was asserted in that debate that a continuation of the 90-percent-of-parity fixed price support for the so-called basic farm commodities is essential to the continuance of the economic health of the country's urban economy.

In this connection let us consider, for example, the New York farmer's position. To the New York farmer feed grains, of which corn is the bellwether, are an important expense item. Of the total New York farm income, 51.4 percent stems from dairying and 13.6 percent from poultry and eggs—a total of 65 percent. These figures are taken from the Department of Agriculture's summaries of 1952, inasmuch as the 1953 figures, which presumably correspond, are not yet available. New York does not produce enough feed grains for its cows and chickens; in fact, imports into the State from Midwest producing areas constitute about two-thirds of the State's feed-grain requirements. To this degree New York agriculture is a processing industry, turning Midwest feed into milk, poultry, and eggs for New York consumers. Feed is 57 percent of the cost of producing eggs and 51 percent of the cost of producing milk on New York farms. Thus higher prices for feed grains mean higher costs for two-thirds of New York's agriculture. These higher costs are a detriment to production and hence are adverse to the interests of both producers and consumers.

Now where does the New York housewife fit into the picture? Between 60 and 65 percent of the money she spends for food goes for meat, poultry, eggs, and dairy products—all animal product foods. Grains are raw materials behind these foods. But who wants to switch to a diet of cornmeal mush and cracked wheat palatable as these foods are in moderate amounts? And yet, this is the direction toward which American agriculture is being forced by inordinately high price supports for grains.

The present high level of price supports was put into effect during the war to stimulate all-out production to meet wartime needs. It is still providing this stimulation at a time when we neither desire nor can use the relative quantities of these products which we needed badly during the war.

I understand that the national average cost of producing a bushel of corn is around $1.20 against a support price of $1.60. It is small wonder that the support price is attractive to producers. Indeed, the support price has looked so good to some producers that quite logically they have asked themselves why they should undertake the additional work and risk of converting corn into livestock products. It is just too easy to turn the grain over to the Government and thus to block it off from its very necessary function of conversion to animal-product foods.

The wheat situation is much the same. The support price is $2.20 a bushel against a national average cost of pro-

duction of $1.60 to $1.70 per bushel. Why would we not have wheat stored in every rusty bottom from the James River to Puget Sound and in every doghouse in between?

And so it has been with dairy products. As of June 1, 1954, and covering the period from November 1952, the Government had purchased 589 million pounds of butter, 564 million pounds of cheese, and 1,002,000,000 pounds of dry skim milk—accounting for almost one-tenth of the total milk produced in the country during those 19 months. Even after disposals, most of which were donations or nominal sales, the Government still held in storage 394,400,000 pounds of butter and 397 million pounds of cheese, representing 67 percent and 70 percent, respectively, of purchases. This net investment amounted to over $780 million and did not even cover storage and administrative costs. This operation, in turn, represents an investment of taxpayers' money used to remove from the market nutritionally valuable foods. At the same time, it has raised the price of these foods to a level which is prohibitive for many consumers.

No wonder this unhappy condition has irked the New York houseswife and housewives generally. No wonder housewives have been revolting against the price of diary products. No wonder the market for these products has been constantly diminishing and the demand for substitutes has been simultaneously increasing. No wonder the dairy industry now finds itself on the brink of disaster.

Although excessively high price supports threaten the future of all agriculture in this country, they are particularly dangerous to agricultural products where substitutes are available. Dairy products are especially vulnerable to the devastating consequences of this kind of competition.

The evil day of reckoning, where farm price supports are concerned, has long since arrived. Trying to avoid that day by further artificial and unsound means can only make the evil thereof more devastating.

The time is already overdue when we must face squarely our agricultural problems. The adminstration honestly and realistically is endeavoring to meet these problems head-on through the farm legislation which the President has recommended. Any other course of action now defies reality and only further aggravates the desperate American agricultural dilemma.

Mr. President, for those reasons I am utterly opposed to the bill now before the Senate in its present form, and for those same reasons I am strongly in favor of the amendment which has been proposed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and other Senators.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for giving me an opportunity to present a short statement on the pending bill. It is characteristic of the courtesy and thoughtfulness of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, I strongly favor adoption of flexible price supports instead of continuing the fixed 90-percent level which, under existing law, is mandatory for certain farm commodities.

There is no justification, in my opinion, for adhering to a program of price support originally adopted to stimulate all-out production for war. It is not equitable to the great masses of the taxpayers who must foot the costs.

In the light of existing burdensome surpluses, it makes no sense from the economic standpoint. It is unfair to large numbers of farmers whose products are not subject to any level of price support.

It is even less fair to farmers whose products are subject to flexible price supports but who, to carry on their operations, must purchase other farm products supported at the 90-percent level.

The original farm price-support program never envisioned a level of support as high as the current 90 percent of parity. The initial range was from 52 to 75 percent of parity. Price supports was viewed as an aid or inducement, not as a crutch.

The 90-percent level did not come into effect until 1944 when the country was being called upon to meet wholly abnormal and temporary food demands. We had the job of feeding not only our civilian population and our Armed Forces throughout the world, but the peoples and armies of many other nations.

There is no comparison between the conditions existing today and those in 1944, so far as food needs are concerned. True, we have no real peace. But beyond certain stockpile accumulations which it is wise to have for foods, as well as for strategic materials, there is no all-out production requirement such as we had during World War II.

We have long since stepped down wartime production levels of tanks, guns, and ships. It is high time we also stepped down wartime production levels of foods.

The only sound economic situation for the farmer, or anyone else engaged in production, is one wherein output is keyed to the market. When that balance is realized, the quantity of supply becomes adjusted to meet the quantity which can be absorbed by demand. But even more important, the character of the output can and does change to conform to variations in market preferences.

Consider how our dietary habits have affected the consumption of various types of foods in recent years. In the overall we are, of course, eating more food today than ever before.

But the increase has centered in foods other than cereal products. Consumption of bread and cereals has materially dropped.

Before World War I our people ate about 200 pounds of wheat and cereal products per capita per annum. Current consumption is only about two-thirds as much or around 130 pounds per capita per annum.

Is this change in consumer preference being reflected in production of cereal grains? Current high output plus constantly increasing surpluses does not so indicate.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the worst possible case is being made against the wheat producers of the Nation. I know the Senator from Michigan does not intend it that way. Two years ago, in 1952, the then Secretary of Agriculture asked the wheat farmers to increase their production 18 percent over the previous year. This is the first year, 1954, that the Department of Agriculture has asked the wheat farmers to reduce their production, and farmers are complying. The Department asked for a 21 percent reduction in acreage and, according to the latest crop estimate, there will be at least a 15 percent actual reduction in production, if not more.

With the widespread drought and the rust in the spring wheat area, we shall probably get at least a 20 percent reduction in wheat production.

Let me point out again that this is the first year the Department of Agriculture ever asked the wheat producers to reduce their production.

Mr. POTTER. I agree with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that the farmers have agreed to a reduction of wheat acreage. That was a voluntary action on the part of the wheat farmers. The argument I make is that there has been a change in the dietary habits of the people of this country. If the cereal grain producers could find new markets, new outlets to increase the demand, then it would be fine to encourage the production of more cereal grains. I intend to cover this a little later in my remarks.

I am very thankful that there has been great technological progress in agriculture. Not only because of improved mechanization, but through the utilization of more and better fertilizers, we have been able to produce more per acre than we envisioned a few years ago. That is well. The point I am making is that the technological advances we have made have not been reflected in the cost to the consumer.

Mr. YOUNG. With the added cost of the production of wheat, with costs of operation at an all-time high, consumers are getting wheat for exactly the same price they paid 5 years ago—90 percent of parity. In spite of that, the price of bread has risen 4 or 5 cents a loaf during that period. In 1947, wheat was selling for over $3 a bushel. I should like to point out again that there are two crops that are very necessary in war, namely, cotton and wheat. Our Government did everything possible to get increased production of cotton and wheat; and now that we have built up the production, we ask them to reduce it more than 33 percent. At the same time we ask them to take a one-third cut in production, we want to knock one-third off the price, which would bankrupt every wheat producer in this Nation who was patriotic enough to increase his production at the Government's request.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from North Dakota puts his finger on the source of our present trouble when he stated that the last administration failed to utilize the machinery of the law which the Congress had provided and, instead of discouraging overproduction of wheat at a time when it should have done so, actually took the opposite course and encouraged the production of enormous quantities which the officials must have known at that time could not be used and would serve only to embarrass the growers, the Government, and everyone else later. Had the reduction in wheat and cotton acreage taken effect in 1952 and 1953, undoubtedly we would not be in the temporary embarrassment we are in today.

It may be recalled that in the last week in December 1952, as a parting gift to the incoming administration, Secretary Brannan requested the corngrowers to increase their acreage 2½ million acres for 1953. That was not a very welcome gift to leave the incoming administration. Nevertheless it was done. If the wheatgrowers or other growers of basics are undergoing temporary difficulties today, they should not blame it on the administration, which is trying to get them out of the trouble. They should, rather, blame it on those who got them into their troubles.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. POTTER. Whether it is in cereals or any other farm product, whether it is in the production of automobiles or steel, whenever we produce more than the market can consume, plus what is needed for stockpiling or inventory purposes, we are in trouble.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator please tell me what is responsible for the wheat surplus? Is it 90 percent support prices, or is it the drive the United States Government put on for increased production of wheat?

Mr. POTTER. The 90 percent support was adopted as an inducement to the farmers to grow more wheat.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not think that at all, Mr. President.

Mr. POTTER. It was a wartime measure.

Mr. EASTLAND. It was put on back in the forties as a wartime measure, but the Senator is bound to admit that the present surplus was created because the Government of the United States asked the farmers for increased production because of the Korean emergency and the cold war. It was that request, rather than the 90 percent support price system, that built up this surplus; was it not?

Mr. POTTER. I disagree with the Senator. The rigid price support program was initiated during the war as an inducement for more production of the basic crops.

Mr. EASTLAND. Since the war we have not had the particular surplus of which the Senator is complaining.

Mr. POTTER. That is right.

Mr. EASTLAND. What built up this surplus? Was it the 90-percent system, or was it the policy of the Government?

Mr. POTTER. Until recent months, we have been in a state of war of one kind or another. We have been supporting our own military needs, our civilian needs, plus military and civilian needs of many other countries throughout the world. We are in a little different condition today. We do not have the great military demand that we had even in the Korean crisis.

Mr. EASTLAND. If wheat support prices are reduced, how much will that increase the consumption of wheat?

Mr. POTTER. I think it will increase the consumption very little.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Why reduce the farmer's income? If the price of bread is to remain the same, if the consumer's food bill is going to remain the same, why decrease the farmer's income? We are doing nothing, then, but helping the processors.

Mr. POTTER. If I correctly understand the Senator's argument, he is stating that if there is to be no greater consumption of cereals——

Mr. EASTLAND. And if the prices to the consumers remain the same——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. What was the Senator's conclusion in that respect?

Mr. EASTLAND. I say if the price to the consumer remains the same and consumption is not to be increased by reducing support prices, why reduce them? What do we gain? It is nothing but a windfall to the processors.

Mr. POTTER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator——

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator please answer my question?

Mr. POTTER. I hope the distinguished Senator from Vermont will answer it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. POTTER. I have the floor, and I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is safe to say that very little more bread would be consumed if the price of wheat were lowered 20 or 25 cents a bushel, because of the changing dietary habits of our country. But I think it can be truthfully said that the high supports have priced American wheat out of the world market. That is why the United States has been losing its sales of wheat.

Although wheat is supported at $2.24 a bushel today, the world market price as of yesterday was $1.72. In order to try to get rid of some of our wheat in competition with other countries, the price of wheat is being subsidized by the Government.

Mr. EASTLAND. What is wrong with that system? Our wheat is competitive. We have not lost markets because of the 90 percent support price.

Mr. AIKEN. World trade in wheat is greater than it has been during recent years, but the American part of that trade has dropped drastically, and even a subsidy of 67 cents a bushel has not been sufficient to maintain the share of the world trade which we previously enjoyed.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. While the United States maintains an export price on wheat at the same level as Canada, the United States has lost far more in the way of exports than has Canada. Argentine exports have picked up five or six hundred percent. The United States could do much more exporting of wheat if we had the will to do so.

For 9 consecutive years the Government of the United States limited the amount of wheat that United States farmers or others could export. In order to export wheat, the farmers of the United States and others had to procure licenses from the Department of Commerce.

For many years the farmers of the United States were urged to increase their production, and they did so. Now, because there is a little surplus, the Government seeks to penalize the farmer by requiring him to cut his acreage one-third and the price by one-third.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Why is it not a sound system to retain the 90-percent support price? Why destroy the whole structure? An export subsidy was provided when our products were competitive.

Today American cotton is the cheapest cotton in the world. When the cotton support price is reduced, the price of that commodity is reduced in this country, and it will not cause another bale of it to be exported. There will not be another bale consumed in this country, because there is little relationship between the price of manufactured textiles and the price of raw cotton. All that is being done is to create a great windfall for the textile manufacturer.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator would say almost the same thing as I am about to say. The two-price system is the only system of price supports I know of which would make United States wheat competitive in the world market.

Mr. POTTER. I have a great deal of regard for the two-price support system.

Mr. YOUNG. It has much merit.

Mr. POTTER. I should like to see someone work out a program of that kind.

Mr. EASTLAND. Why have an export subsidy plan with one price?

Mr. AIKEN. I hope that before the debate is finished, the Senate may act on a two-price system, not only for wheat, but also for cotton, our other great export crop.

What I desired to point out was that the price to the wheatgrowers has been steadily dropping over the past 4 or 5 years, until at present the grower of wheat in the United States is able to get only about 77 percent of parity, instead of 90 percent, which theoretically he is entitled to receive.

Within a few miles of Washington, D. C., wheat has been selling liberally at from $1.60 to $1.70 a bushel this year, instead of at the support price of $2.22 or $2.23.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, resuming my remarks, in an important degree grain growers are producing for a market that has vanished. But that fact is being obscured by the operation of the fixed high support price system. So long as grain producers have an outlet in Government purchasing on the existing scale no incentive or urge to adjust output to the wants and needs of the people can develop.

Surely, such a program is not in the best interests of the farmer or of anyone else.

The rate at which grain surpluses build up has been intensified by technological improvements introduced in this branch of farming. These include the use of better and more efficient farm machinery, and measures to increase fertility, including crop rotation, fertilization, soil and water conservation.

As a result we are producing more bushels per acre than ever before. But unlike more efficient industrial production, the consumer derives no benefit from the savings realized from improved technology. Under existing law, increases in crops of cereal grains simply bring corresponding increases in Government holdings of these commodities.

The current prospect is that by the end of 1954 nearly $6 billion of public funds will have been invested in the price-support program.

At this point in my remarks I desire to have entered in the RECORD two tables showing the net result of the program as of May 31, 1954. These figures were furnished me by the Commodity Credit Corporation, which operates this program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the tables printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 1.—*Farm commodities under support program as of May 31, 1954, purchased or acquired under loan default*

[In thousands]

Commodity	Amount	Value
Wheat ..... bushels	672,[illegible]78	$1,715,282
Corn ..... do	410,154	670,290
Butter ..... pounds	385,364	257,701
Cottonseed oil ..... do	951,784	169,893
Cheese ..... do	392,276	157,912
Dried milk ..... do	644,460	106,250
Wool ..... do	122,618	85,785
Linseed oil ..... do	43,094	9,168
Field seeds ..... do	116,406	42,263
Cotton linters ..... do	631,822	60,182
Cotton ..... bales	132	20,361
Peanuts ..... pounds	13[illegible],854	15,644
Tobacco ..... do	4,184	1,190
Other	.....	149,136
Total	.....	3,461,057

TABLE 2.—*Farm commodities under support program as of May 31, 1954, held as collateral under loan*

[In thousands]

Commodity	Amount	Value
Cotton ..... bales	7,163	$1,192,601
Wheat ..... bushels	205,642	452,725
Corn ..... do	393,463	621,083
Tobacco ..... pounds	606,208	264,035
Other	.....	117,800
Total	.....	2,530,444

Total Government funds involved, $5,991,501,000.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the first table shows that the Government has acquired ownership, as a result of purchase or loan default, of $3.4 billion worth of farm commodities.

The second table shows over $2.5 billion worth of loans now outstanding on commodities whose support is mandatory under the law. Of the $6 billion currently committed, about $4.8 billion, or 80 percent, is represented by 3 basic crops—wheat, corn, and cotton supported at 90 percent of parity.

On June 30, 1953, total commitments on all commodities in both purchasing and loan programs were around $3¼ billion, about half the present volume.

Carrying charges on stored commodities are adding appreciably to the cost burden of price support. I am advised that the present daily rate is about $700,000. Only last December it was $465,000 a day.

Unless there is a major change in the picture, it appears that before the end of 1954, the Government may be paying out as much as $1 million a day to meet storage and warehouse charges—$1 million a day, or $365 million a year. For this amount of money we could build in each one of our 48 States more than 7 hospitals, costing $1 million apiece. We could add at least one more schoolroom, costing about $12,000, in every community of 2,500 people or more in the country. In my State of Michigan, there are 153 such communities.

One would be almost tempted to laugh at the Alice in Wonderland economics of such a program, except for realization of the financial burden which it means for the great majority of all our people, and which benefits only a minority of our farmers.

According to Census Bureau figures, there are approximately 3,700,000 commercial farmers in the country, of which about 1,350,000 or 37 percent grow the basic or 90 percent supported crops.

Nonfarmers, of course, pay in two ways—higher taxes and higher living costs.

Then there are the farmers who produce other than so-called basic or 90 percent supported crops. Farmers who raise hogs must buy 90-percent supported corn, in order to produce pork and bacon, which have no support.

The same is true of farmers who raise poultry, a source of unsupported eggs and meat. Dairy farmers require 90 percent supported feed in the production of 75 percent supported milk and butterfat.

In my own State of Michigan, of total income received by those engaged in farming, more than half—or 55 percent—is derived from sale of commodities that have no price support. Over a third, or 35 percent, comes from commodities that are under the flexible-price-support program. Only 10 percent of Michigan farm-income is produced from the sale of 90 percent supported commodities.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, on a nationwide basis, a very similar relationship prevails. Only 4 of the 48 States derive half or more of their farm income from crops under 90 percent price support. Thirty-one States, or over 60 percent of all States, derive less than a quarter of their farm income from the 90 percent supported commodities.

Taking the 8 most populous States, which together account for 40 percent of all our people, only 1—Texas—derives more than 25 percent of its farm income from commodities under 90 percent support.

Six of the other seven States get less than 15 percent of farm income from the 90 percent supported crops; and the remaining State, Illinois, gets only 21 percent of farm income from this source.

For the country as a whole, Mr. President, 56 percent of farm income is derived from commodities which are not in any price support program; 21 percent from commodities in the flexible-price-support group; and only 23 percent from the high rigid support level group.

Clearly, this fixed 90 percent of the parity price support program is one which benefits the receivers of only a comparatively small proportion of total farm income; and in the long run, it will be of doubtful benefit even to them.

Mr. President, over the past year we have heard a great deal of talk about economic conditions. Words like "depression," "recession," and "readjustment" have been used repeatedly. I am no prophet. I have no crystal ball. I have no idea what sort of conditions we shall have next year, or the year after, or the year after that. But I believe in being prudent. I believe in planning against the possibility of the rainy day, while the sun is still shining. There is too long a record in history of business depressions for me to conclude that they are a thing of the past.

They have occurred under both political parties. We even had one under the New Deal. We have never heard much about it, it is true; but the contraction of 1937–38 was pronounced and painful. Had it not been for the start of World War II in 1939, that depression could have been just as prolonged as the one of 1929–32. So I am not ready to say that business depressions have yet been outlawed.

In fact, I think this administration has been well advised to have taken steps to develop a program of public works to be put into operation if the situation should so demand.

But, Mr. President, what about farm planning? What sort of shape are we in, so as to be able to act, should the farmers face economic difficulties? I say we are in bad shape. The economic system, like the human system, will absorb just about so much stimulation, and no more. After a certain point has been reached, further injections produce no results.

We have stimulated production and prices to a degree where any further stimulation, such as we might like to apply if the economy should contract, would have little, if any, effect.

Our warehouse, elevator, and even shipping and storage facilities are bursting at the seams. This year's crops are likely to add further strain to our ability to store this growing accumulation.

We have allowed ourselves to be caught in a vise which threatens soon to deprive us of any freedom of action whatever. If

we want to be in position to step in and help the farmer, should he fall on bad times, we had better start putting our house in order.

We had better set about getting some control over this situation, instead of letting it continue to control us.

Certainly there can be no one within the sound of my voice who believes that the people of this country would stand for another program of food destruction, like that of pigs and potatoes. Were anything like that to be tried again, I have no hesitation in predicting that it would be the farm program that would end all farm programs.

Nor, in my opinion, would our people be willing to bear the still heavier taxes that would be required to finance any new, large-scale, foreign-giveaway programs, involving food or anything else.

Either type of proposal to get rid of unstorable food surpluses would be certain to cause trouble.

Resentment and bitter feeling between urban and rural dwellers would be inevitable. Only one element could benefit from such a situation—the same group that always is alert to stir up dissension and hatred, to set class against class—the Communists.

We cannot let our ship of state drift into such a perilous sea. Let us adopt the reasonable way, the way of gradual adjustment toward a condition where supply can come into balance with demand; where all of our farmers, not just some of them, produce for the food needs of their fellow countrymen, rather than with the objective of jamming the products of their farms into Government-supported warehouses.

Let us take the broad view, the view that takes into account tomorrow and the day after.

Let us think of the national interest. In the long run, no sectional benefit can possibly flow from a program that conflicts with the national good.

Let us replace the present rigid, high, support levels for the basic and certain other commodities, with flexible levels, as are provided for other farm products under price support.

This is the only sound economic remedy. It is fiscally wise. It is equitable to all types of farmers, and is in the interest of nonfarmers. It is morally right.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have been visiting these last few weeks among the farm people of my State. I have talked with thousands of them. I know their plight. There is a real agricultural recession. The dairymen of my State have lost enormously since last April 1, not just in their current receipts, but in the value of their farms and their dairy herds. I have met fine young farm men and women—some of them veterans—who tell me that their equities have been wiped out by the drastic dairy price support reduction ordered by Secretary Benson last April 1.

These young people had started farming in the last few years with a few hundred dollars and a heavy debt. They accumulated a little. And then came the 15 percent cut in their dairy price supports. Milk checks fell. The value of dairy cows fell. The value of their lands fell. In some cases their equity is all gone and they already face failure and foreclosure unless this Congress does something to relieve their situation in the next few days that we are in session.

Established farmers are somewhat better off, but they, too, have had their hopes for security or retirement fade.

The farm people I have met, and I have talked with several thousand of them—have, without a half dozen exceptions, expressed great alarm over their situation. Their income is down. And they feel let down, to put it very mildly. Regardless of what may have been concealed in the fine print, they believed that both candidates for the Presidency in 1952 had assured them of 90 percent farm price supports in the law. And one candidate had spoken of 100 percent of parity prices in the market place.

The farm people anticipated efforts to build up their income—at least an effort—to prevent further decline. But farm prices have gone on down and down, 10 percent, 11 percent, 12 percent, and now 13 percent since the 1952 campaign period. And all the farmers hear is that Secretary of Agriculture Benson thinks that farm prices are still too high—that they ought to be flexed down some more for the benefit of the consumers, who will then eat the farmer out of all his difficulties.

That would be fine, if it worked, but it has not worked and the farm people wonder just how far their prices have to fall before the consumers' food prices come down just a little. Food prices have dropped less than 1 percent since 1952 although farm prices are down 13 percent.

The processors are not passing the farmers losses on to the consumers. Even if they did, with several millions now unemployed, it is doubtful that consumption of food and fiber would increase in accordance with the glowing pictures that have been painted by the Secretary of Agriculture and his staff.

I have never contended, Mr. President, that 90 percent of parity price supports is the certain and final answer to all our farm problems. They have worked well on the basics. No one disputes that they are a great success on tobacco. Uncle Sam has made money—nearly $250 million—on cotton, cottonseed, and cotton products, while supporting cotton at 90 percent of parity. It has cost about $100 million each to support wheat and corn for 20 years and $1½ million to support rice during that same period.

These are infinitely tiny sums compared to the great good that the price support programs have done both for the farmers, and for consumers in emergencies that I shall soon discuss.

The farmers have never failed to approve acreage allotments and marketing quotas when that has become necessary. The wheat farmers have just approved very drastic quotas for next year, although they did not know when they voted whether they will get 75 percent, 80 percent, 82½ percent, or 90 percent of parity price supports on their crops. The farmers have always kept their end of the price-support bargain.

It is simply inconceivable to me that it is proposed in these critical times, with several million unemployed and our economy considerably below a prosperous level, that men should be crusading to pull the rug out from under agriculture.

High price supports are needed today as never before since the great depression when they were first instituted.

Farmers are having to make a terrific postwar adjustment in their acreage. Acreage is down 21 percent this year as compared with last, even though the Congress adjusted the allotment upward a little at the first of the year. Last year cotton yields ran 20 percent above the previous 10-year average. If yields are normal this year, even with 90 percent supports our farmers stand to get 35 percent to 40 percent less income from their cotton this year than the year before.

Next year these cotton farmers must look ahead to another cut of 10 percent or 12 percent in their acreage which means another income drop.

This, of all times, is when the farmer should be assured that his prices will not also fall in upon him and make his ruin complete.

I am aware that with a set-aside of 3 or 4 million bales of cotton, the level of price supports next year under the flexible scale is expected to stay at 90 percent or very close to it. But what will happen to the markets when the assurance of 90 percent for several years has been removed? Will the mills here and abroad not hold back on cotton purchases for future lower prices? I recently heard Secretary of Agriculture Benson's strategy to bring on low farm prices as the strategy of knocking over a line of dominoes. First withdraw the assurance of continued high supports and the market falls. The Government then gets a great deal of cotton through the loan. This then becomes the excuse for lowering price supports even more so the Government will not accumulate surpluses. It is an endless chain.

The reduction in dairy price supports has not stopped accumulation of Government stocks. There is the same excuse today for reducing dairy price supports further that there was when the Secretary heartlessly and unwisely dropped them from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent of parity last April 1.

I am completely unable to see why anyone is panic stricken by our great good fortune in having some reserve stock of wheat, feed grains, dairy products, and cotton in our national storehouse.

Such stocks have stood this Nation in good stead on more than one occasion. There were drought years in the thirties and two war periods when we thanked the Almighty that we had a few bins full of food, and warehouses full of cotton, to meet our emergencies.

Today we have the threat of widespread drought. No one can predict if this will prove a year of mild drought or not of catastrophe, or if this is another drought decade like the thirties. But 1954 crops have already been seriously damaged in many places, and drought conditions are more widespread today than in the thirties. We could be in for very serious trouble. We are lucky to have feed reserves.

I am told that if feed grain yields fall as much as 3 bushels per acre in 1 year our surplus feed stocks will disappear, that the whole excess over normal carryover will be gone. Our margin of surplus is really rather small.

No one knows, except possibly the men in the Kremlin, if there is to be another Korea, or even an all-out war. I hope and pray that there will be no defense emergency. But I am positive that our great stocks of food, as well as our $135 billion stock of military equipment, material, and atomic weapons, act as a deterrent to any aggressor. The old saying that "food will win the war and write the peace" has not been completely outmoded by the A-bomb and the H-bomb. People still eat. And the nation with abundant food supplies still has a great advantage over those without.

In this respect, our cotton carryover looks small indeed. We have 7 million bales of cotton in reserve now. We had 13 million bales at the outset of World War II. We had to apply strict controls to make the 13 million bales—plus all the production we could get from farmers—meet the needs of ourselves and our allies during World War II.

I am not going to dwell at length on the falsity of the argument for flexible supports. Other Senators have done that. The reports of both the House and the Senate Agriculture Committees demolish all the arguments that have been arrayed for the sliding scale.

Lower farm prices have not increased consumption; they have not even reached the consumer. They do not discourage production. Milk production has gone right on up since Secretary Benson ruined thousands of dairy farmers with his drastic cut in their supports. The sliding scale will not reduce the cost of supports to the Government. The devaluation of Government stocks alone resulting from adoption of low supports would cost more than continuing supports at 90 percent of parity. The Government has 7 million bales of cotton, 878 million bushels of wheat, and 803 million bushels of corn either owned or under nonrecourse loan. These reserves and others would be devalued to whatever extent support levels are permitted to fall. The loss would run over the total cost of supports for the last 20 years.

Mr. President, during the present session of the Congress and during the last session, I have joined with my fellow Senators in proposing constructive approaches to the farm problem.

We have no real surplus of food. Beyond our reserve needs, there are hungry people in the world and in these United States, who need all the food we have. Our problem is to get the food to them.

I joined with the Senator from Montana in his international food reserve proposal made a year ago. It has been ignored by the leadership in this administration and this Congress.

Early this year I joined with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] as cosponsor of a bill providing that recipients of old-age assistance should get food certificates equal to 10 percent of the amount provided for them. These older citizens need more than they are getting. It was a splendid and very worthy bill. But it has been given no consideration.

The House of Representatives Agriculture Committee has just gotten out a report which tells us that farm prices have fallen 20 points since 1951, but that food prices which the consumer pays are within a fraction of a point of their all-time peak. In June of this year farm prices fell 4 percent but food advanced one-half of 1 percent. This is the report of Representative COOLEY in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 27.

Some of us have strongly urged an investigation of why price spreads between farmer and consumer are increasing. Many of us joined with the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] last year in requesting such an investigation. But we can get neither a congressional committee investigation nor an appropriation to permit the Federal Trade Commission to study this outrageous situation. The majority has even put a rider on appropriations acts to forbid the expenditure of Federal Trade Commission funds to study price spreads.

The one constructive measure that we have adopted is the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

We have two clear alternatives in agriculture.

We must either shrink our farm production until population increases enough to consume all the farmers can produce, or we must find ways to move our production to the hungry, undernourished people in our own country and other free-world nations.

Unhappily, we have done much less than we should to expand markets and move out our foods and fibers. As a consequence, we are having to shrink production. This in itself is a staggering blow to farmers—wheat, corn, cotton, and the rest, to our whole economy.

It would be pointless, useless, economic insanity to worsen the condition of farmers still more by reducing their price supports.

Mr. President, I believe if we will work toward a real effective extension of the Hull reciprocal trade agreement program, in line with the report of the Randall Commission, whereby we could sell our cotton and tobacco and food products to nations with people who need them, and take back rubber, uranium, manganese, and things those nations have, we would then make real progress toward some permanent solution to this problem of farm surpluses.

By reducing the price supports to below 90 percent we are certainly not working toward a solution, and I expect to vote against such action.

I thank the Senator from Michigan very much for his generosity.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was happy to join with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and several other Senators in sponsoring the amendment which is now the pending business.

All of us recognize that the problem of price supports for general agricultural programs has been with us for a long time, and probably will remain with us for many years to come.

We all recall that the Federal Farm Board, starting back in 1929 and 1930, tried its hand at stabilizing farm prices.

It decided to go into the market place and try to deal there with the problem of the existence of agricultural surpluses, but it got out of the market place pretty quickly, after it dropped $128 million on cotton and $184 million on grain.

The farmers of this country, as well as those who were trying to administer the program, realized that they could not depend upon that type of stabilization. They could not walk into the market places and succeed, by their manipulations of grain prices in the market place, in achieving any degree of stability whatever for the farmers of this country.

Reference was made earlier today to the two attempts to pass the McNary-Haugen Act. I think if that act had become law when originally proposed, or even the second time it went to the Congress, great good would have resulted to the agricultural community, and great good to all the people of the United States.

But the bill was not successful, and subsequent attempts were made by various types of agricultural devices to bring about stability for American agriculture.

The early agricultural acts were found to be, perhaps, unconstitutional; at least, the efforts that were then made did not conform to the constitutional pattern.

It was not until the Agricultural Act of 1938 became law that this country seemed to be on its way to some measure of agricultural legislation which might offer the farmer the protection he so properly deserved.

There has been a great deal of discussion of flexible price supports through the years, as though they were some new device. Let it be remembered that in the Agricultural Act of 1938, flexible price supports ranging from 52 to 75 percent were prescribed, and a great deal of the supporting of agricultural prices took place at the lower part of that scale.

My experience with agricultural price supports begins somewhere in that period, because while I was a Member of the 77th Congress, in 1941, there was a feeling that the American farmer needed to have something similar to the assurance that was being given to industry.

Mr. President, I have never made excuses for agricultural price-support programs. Industry was given much assurance all during the period when we were asking for increased production. It was not unusual for the farmer to get similar assurances from the Government of this country.

So in 1942 the Steagall legislation was passed.

In the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate I once referred to the fact that while we have referred to the legislation which gives 90 percent supports to commodities at times when increased production was desired as Steagall legislation, the term "Steagall legislation" is, perhaps, a misnomer.

The first recommendation for such legislation came from the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and at that time the legislation which he proposed was not accepted.

It remained for the very excellent chairman of that committee, Mr. Steagall, to work it into legislation himself. Because he was the successful author of the bill which finally passed the House of Representatives, and then passed the Senate and became law, we have referred to that principle of stimulation of crops by guaranteeing a high level of price supports as the Steagall legislation, although, as I say, credit should be given to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. That legislation provided that the incentive support prices at 90 percent should be in effect during the period we were at war, recognizing that it would stimulate the production of agricultural commodities.

Bearing in mind what had happened to the farmer in the period immediately after World War I, a provision was inserted in the legislation that prices should continue at that high level not only during the period in which we were actually at war but for 2 years after the termination of the war, that is, 2 years after the actual termination of the war and upon an effective armistice being entered into and a proclamation to the effect that we were no longer at war.

That provision carried the high level of supports through the year 1948. Even though there had been a termination of hostilities in 1945, it was not until December 31, 1946, that Congress by legislation held that the war activities had ceased; and the Steagall legislation would therefore terminate in 2 years.

Congress recognized that that high level of price supports was intended to stimulate production during war and that it was intended, as part of the program of this country, every effort should be made to obtain the highest possible degree of production from the American farmer.

Having produced agricultural commodities in great surpluses and in tremendous quantities for the use of this country during the war, the farmer had a right to be protected against a sudden dropping off of agricultural prices.

Halfway through that period I became more intimately connected with these programs by becoming associated with the Department of Agriculture. I had to ask myself, as I went into the Department of Agriculture, what creed I was to follow, or what goal I would set for myself.

I have said several times that what probably influenced me more than anything else was the realization of what had happened to the farmers, who after World War I had taken a terrific whipping solely because of their desire to produce abundantly for a country which needed tremendous food supplies during the war.

I recalled the example of a farmer with whom I had been well acquainted. He was a fine farmer, of very high standards, in my native State of South Dakota. That man had gone to State fair after State fair, and had taken prizes year after year. He was, I believe, the most successful farmer I had known.

My father had been in the farm machinery business. That man had credit with my father that was as wide open as any man could have. He could buy anything he wanted, at any time, without being asked how he intended to pay for it.

Some years later, in 1922, I went back into my home community in South Dakota. I encountered that man on the street. He was broken in spirit, and broken in body. He did not resemble the individual I had known. He stopped me and asked me if he could get a position managing a farm which was in our possession. For a while I did not recognize him. It was only after he gave me some identification that I realized that there was a man who only 4 or 5 years before had been regarded as the best farmer in our community. He was broken because loyally and patriotically he had tried to make the best possible contribution he could make to his country. When the markets faded away, he was financially destroyed.

I resolved, as I went into the Department of Agriculture, that, if I could prevent it, no farmer would be put through the wringer in the comparable years immediately following World War II.

Therefore, in 1945, there was appointed in the Department of Agriculture a special committee to consider what the agricultural policy of this country ought to be at the close of the war. That committee consisted of a specialist from each branch of the Department. Any field of activity that seemed to bear in any way on agricultural problems was drawn upon. We brought into that committee men who were familiar with soil conservation work, men who had been handling agricultural programs and men who had been developing the agricultural action programs.

We tried to calculate how many acres could be profitably grown, how many acres could be cultivated without destroying soil conservation practices, and how agricultural production could be obtained at prices satisfactory to the American farmer.

That committee met with great regularity. It not only met with experts within the Department of Agriculture and in the field, but with the great farm organizations—all four of them—that were operating at that time. Every effort was made to get the finest possible cross section of agricultural thought.

When the report of that committee was ready, it was worked over very carefully inside the Department of Agriculture. It was discussed time after time, and every effort was made to make sure that we had a program that we could stand behind when it was presented to the American people.

That program in part was reported to Congress in the summer of 1946.

Then the House Agriculture Committee held hearings on the program across the country, in which it attempted to find out what the sentiment of the people of the United States was, and what the farmers themselves thought of that kind of program.

The committee reported back in the fall of 1946. In 1947 the program was again presented to the Congress. As I looked through the report of the minority members on the pending bill, I found included in the report a quotation from a statement I first made on April 21, 1947. At that time I stated:

> We need to develop a long-range system of commodity price floors to protect producers against excessive or abnormal declines during the market season and to generally cushion declines in farm prices and incomes in the event of business recessions. We should make sure, however, that we do not establish a rigid system of price relationships * * *. Prices are and should be an effective means of encouraging changes in production as the conditions of production and demand change.

Madam President, that decision was not quickly arrived at. It represented years of study by people in the Depart- of Agriculture. All during World War II—yes, even prior to World War II—there was a committee in the Department of Agriculture which studied this question.

Actually, in the early months of 1940, when it became apparent that Europe was about to become involved in a great world war, the Department of Agriculture sent specialists to Europe in an effort to find out what kind of impact war would have upon the food habits of a country.

The committee returned and reported that as a nation went to war it began to demand different types of food, and a change in its diet. Whereas theretofore the average person in a small family might be satisfied with flour, potatoes, and a rather limited diet, as soon as a country went to war and operations in factories started with extra physical exertions being called for, people upgraded their diets. Whereas formerly they were satisfied with one bottle of milk, they now demanded that a second bottle of milk be left at their homes. Then they added meat to their diet, and finally reached for what previously had been regarded as perhaps luxury foods, and then gradually added other foods to their diets, in order to contribute the finest possible work for their nation.

When that report was received, the Department of Agriculture immediately called upon the farmers of this country to start producing things that would be needed in the extra and upgraded diet. That was part of the reason why the first Steagall legislation moved toward the development of new types of food, instead of merely stimulating the production of flour and potatoes.

Therefore, I say that all the way through this period, as we presented this program to Congress, we made every effort to make sure that the program would give to the American people the type of diet that was necessary, and at the same time protect the American farmer against economic disaster.

Madam President, this, then, was a well-tested program which the Department of Agriculture had worked upon and which finally became the basic agricultural law of the country. In the spring of 1948, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] introduced in the Senate a bill which would have carried into effect the studies which the Department of Agriculture had made and the recommendations which the then President of the Nation made to the Congress.

I stress that because I think it is of extreme value to remember that the recommendation was made to the Congress by a President who was a Democrat, and introduced into the Senate by a distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who is a Republican. That legislation had support from both sides of the aisle, and was passed by the Senate.

The House of Representatives took a different view. The House felt that in that election year it might be desirable to extend 90 percent supports for 1 year. Therefore, the House passed a simple continuing resolution introduced by the Representative from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. The two Houses were deadlocked for a long time. Finally, as so frequently happens, it was essential that some sort of compromise be reached, and there was a compromise which provided that the Hope bill should be applicable through the year 1949, but that thereafter the Aiken bill should become effective as the law of the land.

It should not be forgotten that in the election in 1948, there was a great deal of discussion about farm policies and the farm program. Many people remember that the farm program was very hotly debated through the election campaign and thereafter.

When Congress met again in 1949, there was presented to Congress a legislative proposal which became somewhat controversial. There were hearings on the proposal and, as a result of those hearings, it seemed desirable to the members of the Senate committee that a different type of legislation be presented than the somewhat controversial type of legislation which had been proposed.

Therefore, with the full cooperation of all members of the Agriculture Committee and with the possible dissenting vote of only one member of that committee, a new piece of legislation was introduced by the junior Senator from New Mexico, which changed to some degree the scale of price supports, and altered certain other provision of the law, but was intended to carry out the essential idea of flexible price supports.

Madam President, frequently there is a reference to a sliding scale of price supports. In all the testimony submitted by the Department of Agriculture when I was connected with it—and I think perhaps in the testimony at subsequent dates—there was never a suggestion that price supports should drop according to a fixed and established table. The original testimony presented in 1947 was that there should be a lower level of about 75 percent and an upper level of 90 percent, and that the Secretary of Agriculture should have discretion as to the level which he should use between those two figures. That is still my view of the way the law should be administered, and there is nothing in the Agricultural Act of 1948 or the Agricultural Act of 1949 which forbids the Secretary of Agriculture to set the level of agricultural price supports at 90 percent, no matter what the supply situation may be.

Madam President, I say that because I have not been enthusiastic about the set-aside provisions provided in this law. It is a personal feeling, perhaps, but nonetheless the junior Senator from New Mexico believes that the Secretary of Agriculture should have the responsibility for disposing of these surpluses. It does no good to say to him that 3 or 4 million bales of cotton do not exist, that 400 million or 500 million bushels of wheat do not exist, that they can be set aside in a special reserve and insulated from the market. I think the very fact that he knows what the total inventories are, and that the carryover of wheat will be nearly a billion bushels, challenges him all the more to make disposition of the surplus. Providing for some special set aside does no good.

Nevertheless, even if the Secretary of Agriculture had a carryover of a billion bushels of wheat, if he desired to do so and thought the interests of the country required it, he could establish the price level at 90 percent.

I know there is a steady contention that the high level of price supports has been extremely useful to the farmers of the country. I think it is significant that from 1940 to 1949 the average has been something like 111 percent of parity. Therefore, there were other conditions that worked besides 90 percent support.

I noticed a few moments ago that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], in expressing his opposition to the amendment which is now pending before us, and his general support of 90 percent levels for agricultural commodities, referred to a speech by Representative COOLEY, of North Carolina. He said that the Representative had pointed out the decline of agricultural prices. That is carried in the RECORD at page 12268. It quotes Mr. COOLEY as saying:

> Since 1951, farm prices have declined 20 percent in relation to farm prices in 1947–49, but food prices have gone down only about 1 percent.

I agree with both those statements. I think it is too bad that when farm prices decline, food prices do not correspondingly decline, but there are other elements that enter into those prices. The significant thing is that since 1951, with 90 percent supports in operation all the time, farm prices have declined 20 percent in relation to farm prices from 1947 to 1949.

Therefore, I think that it is not exactly correct to assume that 90 percent supports will be of great assistance to the farmers of the country. I think farm income goes down because of the accumulation of large quantities of goods. The fact that this one year we have increased our carryover of cotton some 4 million bales is somewhat significant in relation to cotton prices, and it ought to be apparent that to continue to pile up tremendous quantities of this nature will not be good for the American farmer.

We have heard a great many things about how profits have come from certain operations within this program. Today we heard the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] say that Uncle Sam has made money out of this program, and that the Government has made $250 million out of cotton alone. I believe the junior Senator from New Mexico could testify as to how that $250 million was made. The Government of the United States had on hand 7 million bales of cotton. It kept that 7 million bales of cotton on hand all during the period of World War II, to a very large degree. That cotton had been acquired when the earlier support program was in effect and when price levels were low. Some of it cost the Government 7 cents, 8 cents, and 9 cents. When the 7 million bales could be safely sold, at the end of World War II, the question arose as to the price at which it would be sold. There were people in the Department of Agriculture who recommended that it be put on the list and be made available to all the people wanting cotton at its cost. That could have been done easily. There would have been no great outcry, because it represented the ragtag end of many years of operation. It would have been very simple to have said, "Yes, we will put it on the list, and we will let somebody take it out at 8 or 9 cents."

Also, it was apparent that there was great need for cotton in certain countries we were then occupying. It seemed only reasonable to ship that cotton to those countries at prices representing something near the then world price for cotton.

The price of cotton was extremely high. Therefore the cotton was shipped by the Department of Agriculture to the armed services of the United States in Japan, Austria, China, and Germany—all over the world—at the then prevailing world price for cotton, and not at the bargain prices under which the tremendous supply had been obtained. It resulted in a profit of $250 million or $268 million. But I have wondered many times since then what would have happened if that profit had not been made. The cotton could just as easily have been handled in another fashion, and the saving could have been credited to the armed services, instead of being shown as a profit to the Department of Agriculture. If that had happened, there would not have been a very great claim that these programs had been profitable.

I believe that we would do well to try out the legislation which was designed years ago to be effective in exactly this type of situation. As I have said, the Department of Agriculture spent a great deal of time in the study of this program. Representatives of the farm organizations were called in. This was not something which was kept secret from them. Indeed, they desired to do it. Senators can read page after page of

testimony by the heads of farm organizations, in which they said they were enthusiastic about modernized parity, which has not yet become fully effective; they were enthusiastic about the flexible system of price supports at a level of from 75 to 90 percent.

That being true, I wonder why the system is not tried sometime. Surely there has been enough trouble with the present system to show that it cannot continue forever. I, for one, believe it is time to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, and joined in by several other members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, so as to ascertain if this is the best way to operate an agricultural program. Flexible price supports have been on the statute books since 1948. Such a program was supposed to have become effective in 1949. It was put off so that it might become effective in 1950; 1950 was an election year, so it was put off until 1952; 1952 was an election year, so it was put off until 1954; 1954 is an election year, and there are some who want to put it off to some other year.

But I think it is time to test it, to see if it is the right position to take. I think the people of the country will find that it is a good, workable law. I think the farmers of the Nation will find that it will bring them benefit in the long run. I therefore favor the pending amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1183) for the relief of John L. de Montigny, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 268) relating to the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 8300) to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2763) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to modify the duty on the importation of wood dowels, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

REVISION OF INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS—CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF BILL

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 268, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 8300) to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States, is authorized and directed—

(1) In section 116 (a), to strike out "to the extent" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "From domestic corporations, to the extent."

(2) In the last sentence of section 404 (d), to strike out "applies is" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "applies, is."

(3) In section 556 (b) (6), to strike out "403" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "404."

(4) In the table of sections immediately preceding section 641, to insert after "subparts" the following: "A."

(5) At the end of section 691 (b) (2), to strike out "received.—" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "received."

(6) In section 804 (a) (3), to strike out subparagraph (B) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) the reserve earnings rate, bears to a denominator comprised of the aggregate of the excess of taxable incomes (computed without any deduction for tax-free interest, partially tax-exempt interest, or dividends received) over the adjustment for certain reserves provided in section 806."

(7) In section 853 (e) (2), to strike out "sections" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "section."

(8) In section 1033 (b), to strike out "of residence," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "of the residence."

(9) In section 2513 (b) (2) (A) and in section 2513 (c) (1), to strike out "March" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "April."

(10) To add at the end of the table of sections immediately preceding section 4341 the following: "Sec. 4345. Cross references."

(11) To strike out section 4551 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4551. Imposition of tax.

"In addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law, there is hereby imposed upon the following articles imported into the United States, unless treaty provisions of the United States otherwise provide, a tax at the rates specified. For the purposes of such tax, the term 'United States' includes Puerto Rico.

"(1) In general: Lumber, rough or planed or dressed on one or more sides, except flooring made of maple (other than Japanese maple), birch, or beech, $3 per 1,000 feet, board measure.

"(2) Wood dowels:

"(A) Dowels made of fir, spruce, pine, hemlock, larch, or cedar (except cedar commercially known as Spanish cedar), 75 cents per 1,000 feet, board measure.

"(B) Dowels made of Japanese maple, Japanese white oak, teak, box, ebony, lancewood, or lignum vitae, $3 per 1,000 feet, board measure.

"(C) Dowels made of wood and for which no rate of tax is specified under subparagraph (A) or (B), $1.50 per 1,000 feet, board measure."

(12) In section 4601 (2), to strike out "duty." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "duty; and."

(13) In section 4601, to strike out paragraphs (3) and (4).

(14) In section 4601 (5), to strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(3)."

(15) In section 4602, to add at the end thereof the following:

"Each reference to any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 in any agreement entered into, or in any proclamation of the President made, under the authority of such section shall be deemed also to refer to the corresponding provision of this title."

(16) In section 4773, to strike out "4732 (c)" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "4732 (b)."

(17) In section 4883 (c), to strike out "4884 (a) (4)," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "4884 (a) (3)."

(18) In section 5044, to strike out "of his delegate" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or his delegate."

(19) In section 7601 (b), to strike out "7211" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "7212."

(20) In the table of subparts preceding section 351, to strike out "Special rules" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Special rule."

(21) In section 2031 (a), to strike out "by determined" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "be determined."

(22) In section 2038 (a) (2), to strike out "of where" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or where."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution. It is merely for the purpose of making certain corrections in the enrollment of House bill 8300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 268) was considered and agreed to.

AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3052) to encourage a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture, and for other purposes.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, I am aware of the fact that I have asked for and obtained the floor to discuss a subject about which many Senators know more than I do. I realize that they have spoken from conviction and from opinions based on many things. Certainly their opinions have been based upon knowledge which they have gained from experience. I think, Madam President, they have also spoken from the viewpoints of the positions of their own States. I neither condemn nor criticize that. I am astounded, however, at their apparent intolerance of the viewpoints of Senators from other States, the interests of whose people differ from those of the people of their own States.

The farm people of the United States are not uniquely different from any other group in America. They have about the same attitudes toward their country, toward their families, and toward their economic positions, as do other groups. There is one thing I have noticed about them, though. They have an attitude which I think they are entitled to have, and which I can understand. They are against any combine which they are not in on. They have the feeling that the Government should be of, by, and for the people, including themselves; that they are just as much entitled to have their viewpoints and their interests safeguarded by the Government, as is any other group in the Nation.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has a very distinguished Senator as its chairman. I regard him as a sincere, honorable, patriotic Senator. But I think it is a frightful tragedy that he is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because I do not believe that the farmers of the 48

States should have to be victimized by the viewpoint of one who limits his political philosophy to what he regards as the interests of the people of only one State.

There have been some votes in this country on the question of the reduction of acreage allotments. There was a vote with reference to wheat. My information is that there was one farmer from the State represented by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who voted in that election. There was an election on the question of the reduction of cotton acreage. My opinion is that not a single farmer from his State voted in that election. My information is that his State produces no peanuts, no rice, and no commercial tobacco, and certainly very little, if any, commercial corn.

Therefore, Madam President, it is not hard to understand how his attitude with reference to these great basic commodities would be different from that of the majority of the citizens of all the States in our country.

Yesterday I found on my desk what purported to be a compilation of information. I think it is wonderful information. The only thing about it is that it is 2 or 3 years old.

I am reminded of the story written by O. Henry about a couple of mining prospectors who had holed up in a cabin in Idaho, prospecting some claims. One day they had a visitor. Visitors were scarce, but welcome. This visitor brought with him a newspaper, and left it. Those two prospectors were greatly interested in having this communication from the outside world.

This particular newspaper, as do many newspapers, had in it a feature designated "Weather Forecast." Being interested in the weather and what it was likely to be, they read the weather forecast with great interest. They were advised that the immediate future was to be characterized by a situation described as "fair and warmer, with southerly and westerly breezes."

Acting on that information, they went several miles away from their cabin that night, and to their amazement a blizzard descended upon them. It took them 24 hours, in which they nearly died, to get back to their cabin.

Then they looked again at the newspaper which had been left by the stranger who had visited them. Sure enough, they found they had read the weather forecast accurately. But the fact which they had failed to take into account was that the newspaper was 90 days old.

If the Senate were to act upon the information left here by the senior Senator from Vermont, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, we would find ourselves in about the same situation which those two prospectors ran into. In the first place, this tabulation of outdated information, nearly as old and cold as the Secretary of Agriculture himself, has but one purpose in mind, namely, to divide the membership of the Senate.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the chairman of the committee are acting on the principle of divide and conquer. I find on one page the heading "Cash Receipts From Nonsupported Commodities," with a little asterisk, and below a footnote which reads: "Includes meat animals, poultry and eggs, fruits, nuts, and miscellaneous crops."

Madam President, nobody knows any better than the chairman of the committee how much money has been spent on the commodities referred to as nonsupported commodities. Last year the Secretary of Agriculture spent $100 million in what he said was a program to support the price of beef. Yet the chart I have referred to includes meat animals among the nonsupported commodities.

I can understand that, because the Secretary of Agriculture spent his money buying processed meat, hamburger, and canned gravy. It did not do the price of beef any good, but $100 million was spent, purportedly to support the price of meat animals.

Another purportedly nonsupported commodity is potatoes. The fact about that commodity is that, while I do not know how much money the Government has spent on Irish potatoes, the net loss has been $478 million. Yet, according to the map and the tabulation, I see it is included as a nonsupported commodity. Yet the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry made the statement on the floor of the Senate yesterday that even now a program of support for potatoes has resulted in the price of potatoes being very greatly increased for the benefit of the producers.

Poultry and eggs are also referred to in the tabulation as nonsupported commodities. Yet the fact is that, while I do not know how much money the Government has spent on those commodities, there has been a net loss of $200 million as a result of supporting egg prices.

Yesterday I asked the distinguished chairman of the committee if he thought this information was honest. He replied that he certainly did. I do not think it is honest. I know it is not current. I know that any chart which purports to show the cash farm receipts in 1952 from meat animals, poultry and eggs, fruits, nuts, and miscellaneous crops as applied to 1954 is inaccurate.

I tried to get the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to tell the Senate how much difference there was between the prices of poultry and eggs this year and the prices of 1952. The chairman spoke many words, Madam President, but he did not answer the question. I know that certain meat animals are selling today at less than half the prices they sold for in 1952. I know that poultry and eggs together are selling at far lower prices, and in my opinion the prices received for those commoditiese are not in excess of half of the prices received in 1952.

Therefore, Madam President, it seems to me to be a tragedy to make the effort which is certainly evidenced by this exhibit, not only to divide and conquer Members of the Senate representing various phases of agriculture, but also to mislead them as to what the facts in 1952 were.

We have heard much about surpluses. I have heard so much about them that I have almost become convinced that having a surplus of food is a curse. I hope the all-wise, merciful, omnipotent God whose we are and whom we serve never learns or never takes official cognizance of the fact that there are those in this blessed country of ours who regard an abundance of food as a curse. It might be, Madam President, that action would be taken to relieve us of that burden.

I know of no more well-established fact than that our country is able to produce an abundance of food, and to spare, for the citizens of our country, and to fortify our country in her position as the leader of the free peoples of the world. There are some surpluses of food. Three-fourths of the world is bedeviled by shortages. If we consider the situation impartially and wisely, I am of the opinion that we shall learn that mankind has always been confronted with the problem of either a scarcity or an abundance of food, and that, as between the two, the problem of abundance can be dealt with much more satisfactorily than the problem of a scarcity.

It has been noted on the floor of the Senate that most of the surpluses, and certainly all of the surpluses of basic commodities, have arisen in part, if not altogether, by reason of the necessities of our Government in time of great danger to our national security. Madam President, our country produced many things in the hours of her great national danger. When the danger receded, or seemed to recede, we had left on hand much of what we had produced. Was it regarded as a curse, Madam President? Were the producers of the planes, tanks, ships, and guns that were left on our hands after the danger had receded penalized because they had responded to the call of their Government to produce what we needed?

I remember one transaction early this year, or late last year, when the Defense Department made the announcement that it had sold $1 billion worth of war material, which was no longer regarded as needed, for approximately 10 cents on the dollar. Were the manufacturers of those products penalized? Were those products advertised before the world and before every citizen as a burdensome surplus, and therefore, as a reason why we should now reduce our requirements in modernized military equipment and materiel?

Not at all.

Madam President, why should a surplus, if it exists, of food produced, when required for our national security, now be held as a cudgel over the heads of those who produced it, and be used by the Government as an instrumentality to wreak economic havoc upon those who had so gallantly and patriotically produced it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at this point?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the same producers who, at the request of our Government, stimulated their production in World War I, World War II, and in the Korean war, have in recent months been more than willing, as shown by their votes, to accept acreage controls and other controls which may be necessary to bring their production into more proper balance?

Mr. KERR. They have.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, they are not asking for a "free ride" on the Government. All they desire is a fair price for what they produce, and they are willing to accept whatever controls are necessary in order to bring their production within reasonable limits of national need; is not that correct?

Mr. KERR. They are.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that point needs to be clarified, so that it does not appear that those who seek 90 percent of parity are doing so only in order to have an unlimited right to sell to the Government or to dump on the Government their surpluses.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is entirely correct.

As I have been thinking about this matter, Madam President, I have heard Senators on this floor tell the Senate what is good for the farmer. One of the most amazing things I find, Madam President, is what appears to be an absence of realization on the part of Senators that the farmers are able to think for themselves and to urge upon our Government programs which would be for their welfare.

As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has called to our attention, the farmers have voted on these control programs, and have voted in favor of them by a majority of anywhere from seventy-some percent up to ninety-some percent, which evidences, Madam President, not only that they know what they want but actually what they do want.

Madam President, in recent weeks I have been in the posture of finding out from the farmers themselves what they want. I say to the Members of this Senate that whenever we act on the theory that the farm people of America will be satisfied with anything less than an extension of the 90 percent of parity price supports on the basic commodities we are acting on an erroneous assumption.

That matter happened to be one of the issues in the campaign from which I just recently emerged, Madam President, and the farmers proved by a vote of anywhere from 3 to 1 to 20 to 1 how they felt about it.

Madam President, I wish to say to my distinguished colleagues on this side of the aisle, I hope they will be the beneficiaries of the knowledge of how the farm people stand. I am positive in my own mind those on the other side of the aisle are going to have to learn the hard way what the farmers themselves think about this simple and very vital question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma may recall that earlier today, while the junior Senator from Minnesota was discussing some of the inventory figures, or the so-called reserve and surplus figures on crops, noting the amounts and quantities held, I read the item pertaining to the stocks of butter. During that reading I misquoted myself. I desire merely to have the privilege of correcting the RECORD, since I should like to change the transcript.

I said there was an 18 months' supply of butter, when I meant there was an 18 weeks' supply. I did not do anything to help myself by that misstatement. I desire to have the RECORD perfectly clear that what we have is appropriately a 4 to 4½ months' supply of butter in reserve rather than an 18 months' supply. I desire the RECORD to be clear now, because it is my intention to so amend the RECORD during the period of my speech and the colloquy in which I was engaged with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and others on that particular item.

Mr. KERR. I am interested in those remarks of the Senator from Minnesota.

Madam President, much has been said about subsidies. I do not regard an adequate price support program as a subsidy. To me it is an insurance policy for the economy of our country; not only for the producer, but for the consumer.

Madam President, I hold in my hand one of the most interesting Government documents I have ever seen.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, will the Senator yield before he concludes his discussion of this matter?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was intrigued by the Senator's argument about the fact that we had many other surpluses, in addition to agricultural surpluses, growing out of the war-aid eras and the necessity for national defense. Of course, we are still producing some of the other things which were in surplus at the end of World War II in large quantities.

Has the Senator heard of any demand that the producers of trucks and other motor vehicles, which are being ordered in quantities which cost hundreds of millions of dollars, at this time should produce those articles for 75 percent of what is recognized as a fair price? Has the Senator heard of any movement on the part of the Secretary of Defense to go before the country and incite the people against these producers because they are not willing to produce for 75 percent of a fair price?

Mr. KERR. Madam President, there has certainly been no such intimation. In fact, this Congress and this Government, with the approval of the people, operates on the basis that the producers of every requirement of this Government should receive not only a fair price but a profitable price. Only the farmer, in our entire population, is asked by his Government to produce that which is certainly as important as anything produced—and far more important than most things—on a basis other than 100 percent of parity.

Madam President, I wish to address myself to this question of 75 percent of parity for just 1 moment. I know Senators in this body who favor 60 percent of parity. I know some who favor no parity at all. I personally favor 100 percent of parity. I have heard of those people who favor more than 100 percent of parity.

I have yet to find a farmer who is interested in "6-bit" parity—75 cents on the dollar. When we call on the farmer to help pay the far greater cost of 100 percent of parity to everybody else who does business with the Government, and then say to him:

> But you, my friend, are going to have to settle for "6-bit" parity.

I wish to say, Madam President, that it is inequitable, unjust, discriminatory, and unwise.

I wish to say again that it is no subsidy to the farmer to have a program which will enable him to receive a fair price for what he produces.

But if it were a subsidy, Madam President, it would not be anything new in the history of the relationship between this Government and its citizens.

I have this document, designated a committee print, printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives under date of June 3, 1954. It is one of the most amazing documents I have ever found, seen, or read.

Turning to the first page I find this language:

> The subsidy is the oldest economic principle written in the laws of the United States. It has been used from time to time since the inception of this Government to influence the direction of economic development and to moderate the impact of the normal workings of supply and demand. The principle has been employed to promote science, the arts, research, and for other Government aims and purposes.

Now, listen to this:

> When the First Congress convened in 1789 its first act was to devise a system for administering oaths.
>
> The next business was the enactment of the tariff bill.

That Congress set up a system of subsidies even before they arranged to pay their own salaries.

Reading further:

> Significantly this legislation set up the subsidy principle to encourage the development of an American merchant fleet.

Then this amazing document sets forth some of the subsidies this Government has paid to various elements of its economy:

> Water carriers: The Government granted 6,340,339 acres of public lands to private interests between 1827 and 1866, to encourage canal building and river improvement, in addition to rights-of-way grants.
>
> Railroads: Approximately 183 million acres of Federal and State lands were granted to railroads between 1850 and 1871.

At the then value in excess of $1.1 billion, what it would be worth today, no man knows.

Shipping and air carriers: Many millions have been assigned by the Federal Government in ocean- and air-mail subsidies to foster the development of transportation, as it was in the case of special consideration for railways and waterways. The first mail subsidy was paid in 1845, according to available records.

Many other millions have subsidized the building of ships on American ways. Just recently the press carried a report that the United States Goverment had paid in subsidy approximately $40 million on the superliner *United States*, a private luxury ship that plies between the United States and Europe.

I see further in this document that the losses under CCC price-support programs on the basic commodities over the years have been $53,299,009. Yet the Government paid $40 million as a subsidy on 1 ship to 1 company in 1 year.

Reading further:

In any discussion of subsidies, one of the most commonly quoted sources is the Bureau of the Budget, which, in recent years, has put into the annual Federal budget messages a statement "Current Expenses for Aids and Special Services" for agriculture, business, labor, veterans, and general aids.

By this limited definition, such Government expenditures in the fiscal years 1949 to 1955, inclusive, have totaled $3,773,000,000 for agriculture, $5,873,000,000 for business, $1,435,000,000 for labor, $32,687,000,000 for veterans, and $9,880,000,000 in general aids, as set forth by years in the following table.

Madam President, I ask that the table be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

Aids and special services

[In million dollars]

Fiscal year	Agriculture	Business	Labor	Veterans	General aids
1949	341	773	175	5,549	1,091
1950	601	789	228	5,583	1,264
1951	905	809	197	4,515	1,327
1952	463	1,041	200	4,710	1,364
1953	305	934	215	4,178	1,506
1954 (estimated)	609	918	204	4,057	1,672
1955 (estimated)	549	609	216	4,095	1,656
Total	3,773	5,873	1,435	32,687	9,880

Mr. KERR. I am not saying one word in opposition to any dollar that has been appropriated for any of the other purposes set forth in this tabulation.

What I am asking Senators is why they permit themselves to be misled, misguided, and misinfluenced with reference to modest appropriations to provide the opportunity for economic security for the farm population of the Nation, and apparently have not the slightest qualms in the presence of far greater sums spent for other elements of our population less in number.

I am looking at some of these items I find tabulated in this amazing document that the amount of money spent annually in assistance or as a subsidy to business amounts to $1,041,000,000.

Madam President, according to this tabulation that is very, very close to being an amount equal to the total losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation price-support program on both basics and nonbasics for a period of 20 years.

It is also stated that there is $670 million of annual deficit in the Post Office Department in favor of business mail. Yet, Madam President, men shudder and tremble and call upon the stars to change their course in the heavens when it is contemplated that we spend a reasonable amount, far less in proportion, in order to maintain economic prosperity for one of the great elements of our population.

Madam President, 5 big newspapers and 5 big magazines receive an average annual subsidy from the Government of the United States, according to the statement of the Postmaster General or the Post Office Department, of $7,500,000 a year. Over a period of 20 years, that would aggregate $150 million. The total losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation in 20 years, on the basic commodities, according to this tabulation, have been $53 million, or one-third of that amount.

I think Senators would be interested in knowing who the beneficiaries of this Government subsidy are: Life magazine, $2,151,000 a year. That of itself, Madam President, is almost as much as this Government has lost on the support program of the basic commodities, according to the document which I hold in my hand.

Mr. LENNON. Madam President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. I wonder if the Senator from Oklahoma is aware of the fact that the editors of Life magazine have been very critical about the Members of the Congress who indicated their intention to support the 90 percent of parity for the basics?

Mr. KERR. Oh, the editors of Life were horror stricken.

Mr. LENNON. Madam President, I should like to ask the Senator another question. I wonder if the Senator can arrive at any conclusion as to how a man on the 50th story of a skyscraper in New York, an editorial writer for Life magazine, can tell the farmers of the great State of Oklahoma and the great State of North Carolina what their problems are?

Mr. KERR. Oh, I want to say to my friend from North Carolina, he is not up to date. All the editor yonder on the 50th floor of that great skyscraper has to do is either read one of the daily or weekly bulletins from the present Department of Agriculture or pick up that amazing "gadget" known as the long-distance telephone, and talk to Ezra Benson for 5 minutes, and he can learn more about farm living and farm problems and their solution in a 5-minute conversation with Ezra Taft Benson than he can learn in 20 years of association with a farmer.

Mr. LENNON. Madam President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. LENNON. Is the Senator suggesting that there is a direct pipeline or telephone communication from the Department of Agriculture to the great magazines and daily newspapers which are the beneficiaries of the postal subsidies?

Mr. KERR. There is either a direct line of communication or an exact similarity of thought and attitude, which would otherwise be most amazing.

Mr. LENNON. I share the Senator's views.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for his very timely questions.

From the hearings on postal rate revisions held by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 1st session, on H. R. 6052, July 13 to 19, 1953, I get this further amazing information:

The Saturday Evening Post received from the United States Government, paid for by the taxpayers, a subsidy of $1,631,000 a year; the Ladies Home Journal, $408,000 a year; Collier's magazine, $1,237,000; Reader's Digest, $917,000.

Madam President, the barefoot boy in the Tribune Tower yonder on the Chicago River shudders in horror as he contemplates a dollar being spent by this Government for the benefit of the farmer. Yet he has his long, bony fingers in the United States Treasury for nearly half a million dollars a year in the form of a subsidy. The Chicago Tribune is as shoddy a propaganda sheet as any that has ever tried to mislead the patriotic population of a great country.

I hope the colonel lives forever, because I know he could not rest in peace in any marble sarcophagus if, beyond the grave, information came to him in his publication that the farmers were still getting a few dollars a year from the Government.

The New York Times is a great newspaper, but I must say I do not think our country would cease to exist if the New York Times were forced to pay what it costs to send that publication through the mails. Of course, it sets forth on its masthead that it publishes "All the news that's fit to print." I think probably it does do that, and perhaps more, too. It received $425,000 a year.

The Detroit Free Press received $58,000 a year. Perhaps it would not be so free if it had to pay what it costs to send its publication through the mail.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch received $113,000; the Los Angeles Times, $45,000.

Madam President, I have named 10 publications, both magazines and newspapers, to which our Government gives an annual subsidy of $7,432,000, according to the testimony of the Post Office Department.

Yet the administration which the Postmaster General represents is here today with misinformation and misguided propaganda attacking a program which is designed for the benefit of tens of millions of Americans who make their living on the farm, and is fighting a program which is necessary to their very economic existence.

I ask unanimous consent that the table which appears on page 143 of the hearings before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives, on House bill 6052, to readjust postal rates, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Itemized breakdown of the amounts of deficit occasioned in handling mail of 5 or 6 largest circulation magazines and 4 or 5 largest circulation newspapers

	Quarterly weight	Copies	Quarterly postage at present rate	Cost of handling	Loss
	Million pounds	*Millions*			
MAGAZINES					
Life	47.5	45.8	$1,273,000	$3,424,000	$2,151,000
Saturday Evening Post	34.1	36.9	690,000	2,321,000	1,631,000
Ladies' Home Journal	10.2	7.7	215,000	623,000	408,000
Collier's	17.4	33.1	386,000	1,623,000	1,237,000
Reader's Digest	7.0	23.5	134,000	1,051,000	917,000
NEWSPAPERS					
Chicago Tribune	5.9	9.8	154,000	601,000	447,000
New York Times	5.6	7.6	211,000	636,000	425,000
Detroit Free Press	.8	1.4	17,000	75,000	58,000
St. Louis Post-Dispatch	1.7	2.6	37,000	150,000	113,000
Los Angeles Times	.5	.7	24,000	69,000	45,000

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KERR. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma for a question.

Mr. MONRONEY. Perhaps my distinguished colleague has already mentioned it in his excellent address on the subsidies that are paid to our airlines, but I am sure he is aware of the fact that we spend nearly $80 million a year subsidizing both foreign and domestic airlines. It comes out of the Treasury of the United States, and is used to maintain a service which we feel is essential. It is in the nature of a subsidy to one of the rapidly growing private businesses of the country.

Over the years this subsidy to airlines has amounted to many times the cost of the entire farm price support program for all the basic commodities.

Mr. KERR. And for all the perishable commodities as well. The Senator from Oklahoma is eminently correct. I wish to say this for the airlines of our country: They represent one group that has never come to me or to any other Senator that I know of and tried to seduce men to turn their backs on the American farmer. They have not hesitated to be the beneficiaries of this program. In addition to the $80 million or $90 million of direct subsidies, the Government spends $100 million a year in maintaining services which aid those airlines, as they fly the heavens across this great Nation.

I do not oppose the airline subsidy. It has made a great contribution to the growth and development of our country. But how can men contemplate with a wholesome attitude a program that costs the Government $180 million a year in direct and indirect subsidies to the airlines and then be horrified to think of a program that has cost the country less than a third of that amount to support the prices of agricultural products?

That is not all. This pamphlet has given me information which I might otherwise have died without finding. It is an amazing compilation of information with reference to subsidies being paid by our Government to its people.

I believe that the Census Bureau will have to take a new census to find out what elements of our economy get subsidies, most of whom cry out in horror at the farm program, which is not a subsidy but an investment in the economic strength and security and welfare of our country.

Navigation aids cost $137 million. It may surprise Members of the Senate to hear me admit that I do not know what navigation aids are. Yet I find that my Government appropriates $137 million in the form of a subsidy for navigation aids. I do not know who navigates, or where anyone navigates, or what is navigated.

I believe we ought to look into that if we are to be horrified by a program of price supports that has cost this country an average of less than $60 million a year. I believe we ought to find out about those navigation aids. We ought to know about a program that costs $137 million. Is that not a reasonable suggestion?

Next we come to ship operation subsidies. I always thought that ship operation was in some form or other connected with navigation aids. Are not ships used for navigation? Ship operation subsidies cost $50 million a year.

Some Senators who vote for such ship subsidies each year vote against a price-support program for the farm population, even though such a program costs but a little more than the ship subsidies.

One of the messages which came to the Congress last year was from the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks. I have heard some rather derogatory remarks made about former President Harry Truman, with respect to his being loose and free with money. Before he left office he sent to Congress a recommendation for $25 million or $30 million for ship navigation, in the form of a subsidy or bonus. Mr. Weeks had no more than taken the chair of the Secretary of Commerce before he obtained approval from the Bureau of the Budget and sent an official message to Congress asking for $65 million.

Yet everyone in that part of the country looks with horror upon a program that means the difference between economic security and poverty for so many millions of American citizens.

Madam President, we could count the farm people in one county in any one of 20 farm States and find more individuals who would be benefited from the farm program than a total of those who benefit from the ship operation subsidy.

Here is a little item: Aids to business through the Department of Commerce, other than water and air navigation aids and ship operating subsidies, $19 million a year. There are so many items that they cannot all be detailed and identified in specific language. This is a group of others than those who receive the benefits of the principal programs of subsidy—$19 million a year is asked for this group.

RFC, $56 million.

Corps of Engineers, maintenance of rivers and harbors, $61 million.

Madam President, I ask that pages 3, 4, and 5 of this amazing document, with this detailed information, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The following figures for fiscal 1952 illustrate how the Budget Bureau breaks down "Current expenses for aids and special services," generally referred to as subsidies:

Agriculture

Total	$463,000,000
CCC losses in price supports	184,000,000
International Wheat Agreement	77,000,000
Sugar Act	60,000,000
Grants and aids, in such areas as the Extension Service and experiment station operations	49,000,000
Other Department of Agriculture operations	94,000,000

(From the total of these components the Bureau deducts approximately $2 million which represents the surplus in the farm labor revolving fund. It should be noted, too, that while $60 million is listed as a subsidy under the Sugar Act, this act in fact puts considerably more into the general fund of the Treasury than is paid out.)

Business

Total	$1,041,000,000
Post Office Department deficit in favor of business mail	670,000,000
Navigation aids	137,000,000
Air navigation aid	93,000,000
Ship operation subsidies	50,000,000
Aids to business through the Department of Commerce other than water and air navigation aids and ship operating subsidies	19,000,000
RFC	56,000,000
Corps of Engineers maintenance of rivers and harbors	61,000,000
All other special aids and services	2,000,000

(The total of these figures amounts to $1,088,000,000, but from this the budget office subtracts approximately $47,000,000 of profit made in operation of the Panama Canal and through the Defense Production Act, to arrive at the $1,041,000,000 actual subsidies for business in 1952.)

Labor

Total	$200,000,000

(Practically all of this amount represents grants to States for operation of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs.)

The House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture in January 1954 published figures indicating subsidies amounting to $45,662,835,506 for business compared to farm price-support costs amounting to $1,194,-839,023, as represented by Commodity Credit Corporation losses in the price-support program. The table printed by the subcommittee, including also figures on Government emergency investments, follows:

Comparison of CCC from price-support costs with subsidies and emergency investment

1. Losses under CCC price-support program:	
Basics	$53,299,009
Nonbasics	1,141,540,014
Total	[1] 1,194,839,023
2. Federal expenditures for—	
Consumer subsidies losses:	
CCC	[2] 2,102,067,121
DSC and RFC	[3] 2,143,281,385
Subtotal	4,245,348,506
Business reconversion payments (including tax amortization)	40,787,864,000
Subsidies to maritime organizations	[4] 327,500,000
Subsidies to airlines	[5] 302,123,000
Total	45,662,835,506
3. Federal investment in—	
Military material	[6] 129,000,000,000
Food and fiber (CCC inventories)	[7] 2,687,103,365
National stockpile of materiel	5,700,000,000

[1] From beginning of program in 1933 through Nov. 30, 1953.

[2] From July 1941 through Nov. 30, 1953. The last CCC subsidy program was ended on Oct. 31, 1947, although claims, refunds, and adjustments continued to be processed after that date.

[3] From July 1, 1943, through June 30, 1949. All DSC and RFC subsidy programs were ended by Oct. 14, 1946, but claims, refunds, and adjustments continued to be processed after that date.

[4] Estimated operating subsidies payable through calendar year 1954.

[5] Airmail subsidies through fiscal year 1954.

[6] Deliveries since Korea total $50 million; balance in pipelines.

[7] As of Nov. 30, 1953. Includes price support, supply and foreign purchase, and emergency feed programs.

Most of the costs in the farm price support operations have occurred in the postwar readjustments, during the time that business reconversion payments, according to the table published by the Appropriations Subcommittee, amounted to approximately $40 billion.

The story of Government agricultural price-support operations over the last 20 years, in profits and losses, is set forth in the following table:

Cumulative net results[1] of price-support operations by commodities, Oct. 17, 1933, to Nov. 30, 1953

[Millions of dollars]

Commodities on which there were net gains:	
Cotton, upland	237.9
Cottonseed and products	10.2
Soybeans	3.9

[1] Realized gains and losses, excluding general income and expense. Before charge of $500 million to the reserve for postwar price support of agriculture and recovery of $56,-239,432 from the Secretary of the Treasury under Public Laws 389 and 393, 80th Cong.

Cumulative net results[1] of price-support operations by commodities, Oct. 17, 1933, to Nov. 30, 1953—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

Commodities on which there were net gains—Continued	
Tobacco	1.7
Other (less than $100,000)	-------
Total	253.7
Commodities on which there were net losses:	
Potatoes, Irish	478.1
Eggs	189.6
Wheat	104.2
Peanuts	99.4
Wool	92.2
Corn	87.6
Dried milk	75.2
Flaxseed and linseed oil	67.5
Butter	61.2
Beans, dry edible	40.5
Grain sorghums	35.5
Cheese	27.9
Hemp and hemp fiber	21.5
Sugar beets	16.5
Fruit, dried	14.9
Seeds	14.2
Barley	10.2
Oats	3.9
Grapefruit juice	1.7
Rice	1.5
Naval stores	1.4
All other (less than $1,000,000 each)	3.8
Total	1,448.5
Net loss	1,194.8

At the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, the Director of Budget and Finance of the Department of Agriculture made a special study of farm-program costs, including expenditures for other than direct price-support operations. Mr. Benson informed the House Committee on Agriculture on March 10, 1954 (long-range farm program hearings—Serial R, pt. 18, pp. 2558 to 2573, inclusive) that, if all the programs for stabilization of prices and farm income 1932 to 1953, inclusive, are considered, then the cost to the Government is $7,510,400,000.

Mr. KERR. On page 6, I find this note:

The $1,089,100,000 of the Commodity Credit Corporation totaled above represents the actual losses in the direct farm price-support program, operated by the Commodity Credit Corporation, through 1953.

If we consider the losses which the Government sustained "B. B."—means "Before Benson"—we find that they are modest indeed in the tabulation of so-called subsidies or aids to business in this great country of ours.

This amazing document concludes with the following statement:

The Budget Bureau recognizes that the term "subsidy" has become surrounded with connotations which the dictionaries never intended but which cause the Bureau to hesitate to make use of the term wherever possible.

I must say that I am not surprised that they refuse to be bound by the definitions they find in ordinary dictionaries.

Therefore, there is no officially recognized definition of a subsidy as such, and no unchallengeable compilation can be made of the cost of subsidy down through the years.

But this document made a pretty good try at it.

It can be said, however, that the subsidy is not new, but is as old as our Government; and its dispensation has been confined to no segment of our economy nor to any group of people in the social structure.

Madam President, I wish to discuss briefly the consumer's interest in the farm program. It is my conviction that the consumer has a greater economic interest in an adequate farm program than has the farmer. We are aware that prices received by the farmer for his product have declined 20 percent in the past 18 or 20 months. Yet the prices paid by consumers have increased in that period of time. In January of 1953, the figure was 113.9. I cannot explain just what that figure means, but it is supposed to be the cumulative figure for the Bureau of Labor Statistics index. That is the formula used to give us the Consumer Price Index by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Their tabulation shows that in January 1953, the cost of living was at a figure designated as 113.9. That figure reached an all-time high in September of 1953, when it was 115.2.

Would Senators like to know what the figure is for June of this year? It is 115.1. That is within one-tenth of 1 percent of being at the all-time high so far as the consumer is concerned. Yet the prices received by the farmer are 20 percent less than they were 18 or 20 months ago.

How can men seriously, sincerely, or intelligently claim that the consumer has an interest in seeing the price paid to the farmer reduced?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator recall that 4 or 5 days ago the Secretary of Agriculture, at one of his press conferences, in response to a question from one of the reporters as to the effect of price supports upon consumers costs, stated that even though the price supports were reduced, they would have very little or no effect upon the cost of food? That is a belated acknowledgment, but is the Senator aware of that fact?

Mr. KERR. I was not aware that the Secretary had made that statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was only within the last 4 or 5 days, when he was under interrogation by one of the members of the press corps.

Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is aware of the fact that the representatives of organized labor have testified before committees of the Congress in behalf of the 90 percent price support program and have documented their testimony with considerable statistical evidence and have expressed the opinion that the consumer's interest lies in a fair price for the farmer, and not in a reduced price to the producer of food and fiber which is not passed along to the consumer.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct. I propose, during the course of my remarks, to document and prove that fact.

Mr. LENNON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. LENNON. Was the Senator in the Chamber yesterday afternoon when the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] gave us a practical illustration of what was happening with reference to the drop in the price to the producer of milk in the State of Minnesota, when he said that last summer the price of milk to the producer dropped as much as $1 a hundredweight, and that at the same time the price to retail consumers was actually raised 1.2 cents a quart, showing conclusively that the distributor and not the consumer got the drop in the farm price, particularly with respect to milk?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I was here, and I was greatly interested in that statement.

Madam President, I shall now read into the record a paragraph or two from the statement of a milk producer in the State of Oklahoma. His name is J. I. Keith, and he produces milk for the Tulsa dairy market. In part, this is what he said:

> In December 1952 a dairy farmer here was getting 14.02 cents for a quart of 3½-percent milk that was bottled, and the housewife was paying 26 cents a quart for it.

That is, the producer was getting 14.2 cents. The housewife was paying 26 cents. That was in December 1952.

In March of 1954, the same farmer was getting 10.33 cents, and the housewife was still paying 26 cents.

Mr. LENNON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. LENNON. Does the Senator from Oklahoma know of any instance in which the Department of Agriculture has attempted to use the great influence and weight of his office to see that those savings, if any there may be, are passed on to the consumer?

Mr. KERR. The Department has not done so; on the contrary, it has conducted a so-called investigation into what happened to the great reduction in the price received by the beef producer last year, and came out with a report that it found no undue gouging on the part of the processors as against the producers or the consumers.

The fact of the business is that the Secretary of Agriculture now is, and for months has been, in my judgment, the promoter of and participant in a conspiracy to antagonize the consumers of this country against the producers. He has not only permitted conditions to prevail which are unthinkable but has helped to exaggerate them, and then has reported them to the Nation in an exaggerated manner, seeking to incite the consumer against the producer. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOWRING in the chair). The occupants of the galleries are reminded that they must not applaud.

Mr. LENNON. Did not the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma submit a resolution in the Senate last year calling for an investigation of the differential between the cost of production and the ultimate price to the consumer?

Mr. KERR. No; I was not the author of that resolution. However, I was greatly interested in it, and hoped that some wholesome result might be obtained. However, I was shocked to learn that out of it came nothing but a whitewash by the Secretary of Agriculture of what had happened at that time.

The fact is that the Secretary of Agriculture helped to promote it, and I will tell the Senate how. He set out to spend $100 million, purportedly to support the price of beef. All he did was to raise the price of hamburger, processed meat, and canned gravy. The price of canned gravy reached the point where it was so high that most folks in Oklahoma could not afford to buy it.

The Secretary of Agriculture raised the price of hamburger from 30 cents a pound to 45 cents a pound in 3 weeks. Who profited? The packer; the processor.

Purportedly the Secretary was doing this for the producer. As of now he sits in lofty indifference and, I presume, ignorance——

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 10 A. M. TOMORROW—PROGRAM FOR TONIGHT AND TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Will not the Senator let me finish this eloquent statement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I desire to make an announcement to the Senate, because a number of Senators have inquired about the program for tonight.

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from California, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor; but I am impelled to say that I fear that I shall have lost my thought.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I have received a number of inquiries regarding the program for this evening and tomorrow.

First, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its labors this evening, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I understand, after having made inquiry at the desk, that there are still a considerable number of Senators who desire to speak on this important piece of proposed legislation or on the pending amendment. I hope that we may move along and dispose of as many of the speeches as it is convenient for Senators to make this evening.

I believe I can assure Members now that there will not be any voting on the amendment tonight, but that the Senate will continue in session until about 8 o'clock, depending on whether there are more speeches which Senators desire to make.

It may be that the Senate will continue in session a little longer than that, if there are Senators who desire to make their speeches, so that they will be in the RECORD tomorrow. But it may be understood that there will not be any voting on the pending amendment this evening.

Tomorrow morning the Senate will reconvene at 10 o'clock, pursuant to the order which has just been entered. I am most hopeful that it will be possible to have a vote on the pending amendment tomorrow. Of course, that will depend on the number of speeches which are disposed of tonight.

Senators on both sides of the aisle, and on both sides of the question, have indicated they are hopeful that it may be possible to reach the voting stage soon. Perhaps that can be done tomorrow, without foreclosing any Senator from having an opportunity to make such remarks as he may wish to make.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the majority leader does not intend to have any voting upon the pending amendment tonight; and I assume that there will be no business transacted other than the delivery of speeches.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to have it understood that there will be no voting on the pending amendment, and that no conference reports or anything else, will be brought up tonight, or tomorrow morning, unless both leaders are consulted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for his courtesy in yielding to me. But since a number of Senators had made inquiries, I desired to make this announcement.

Mr. KERR. I quite understand, and I am glad to have yielded.

AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3052) to encourage a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] has the floor.

Mr. KERR. As I view the situation, the Secretary of Agriculture sits in lofty disdain and indifference with respect to the situation of the average producer of beef. Although he has ample funds and authority to do something about the condition, he steadfastly refuses and says, point blank, that if and when he is moved to do anything at all, he will but duplicate the packers' program of last year.

I read further from the statement of the milk producer at Tulsa, Okla., who informs me that in the 15 months from December 1952 to March 1954 the farmer's income from a bottle of milk went down 26 percent, while what the processor received went up 31 percent. He says:

> The first of this month the farmer's price went down again. He is now getting 9.37 cents for a quart of milk that is bottled. The retail price of milk here did finally come down to 25 cents a quart on April 1. But even after that 1-cent-a-quart drop in retail price the situation still remains like this: In the last 16 months the farmer's part of

what the consumer pays for milk has gone down 33.16 percent, and the processor's part has gone up 30.47 percent.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not also a fact that when we went into World War II the consumers of milk were getting full butterfat content in their fluid milk? In order to obtain butter for the war effort the butterfat content of the milk was materially reduced. Since the conclusion of the war, when the demands for butter have not been so great, the processors have continued to sell wartime diluted milk or, rather, milk of wartime quality, which has lost much of its butter content, and because of the sleepy or ineffective operation in the Department of Agriculture, nothing has been done, by way of Government encouragement, to bring up the butterfat content of fluid milk.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct. If that one fault alone were corrected, many things would happen: First, the consumer would get a better milk product. He would have a 4-percent butterfat content, instead of approximately 3½ percent. Second, there would be no surplus of butter in the country today.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the processor whom the Senator has just described would not be reaping extraordinary profits.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The lack of butterfat content in the fluid milk which is delivered to the home does not result in profit to the dairy farmer, but results only in additional profit to the processor, and also in the cost of the Government, because of the surplus butter which is produced therefrom.

Mr. KERR. That is correct. Not only is the situation tolerated, but it was brought about by the Government's permission and, I think, promotion.

I sincerely believe that if there were a Secretary of Agriculture who wanted to see the program succeed instead of fail, he would act immediately to do a number of things, including the one which my distinguished colleague has suggested, toward the end of making the program a success.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Was the Senator in the Chamber today when the junior Senator from Minnesota made a comment concerning Mr. McConnell, head of the Commodity Stabilization Service?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma really believe that this program, which has now been authorized by law, can ever succeed when there are in charge of the program men who are fundamentally opposed to its philosophy?

Mr. KERR. It is impossible for the program to succeed so long as it is controlled, directed, and operated by men who are trying to make it fail.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is an appropriate analysis, is it not?

Mr. KERR. It is an accurate analysis. The Secretary of Agriculture did not take office with the idea of making the program work. He took office to discourage the program and to have the Government discard it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator agree with me that the constant barrage of propaganda which has emanated from the Department of Agriculture in recent months is directed toward arousing resentment on the part of the public against the program and to weaken it and then to bring about its ultimate demise, and its removal from the political scene?

Mr. KERR. Undoubtedly. The Secretary of Agriculture is a good and a sincere man—he sincerely wants this program to be wrecked. He has done more damage to the American farmer than any man who has been in public office in my lifetime, and he has done more damage to the consumer than any man who has been in public office in my lifetime.

Mr. LONG. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Is there any way to connect the Secretary of Agriculture with the promises that were made by the Republican candidate for President in 1952?

Mr. KERR. I must say that is a difficult question to answer. Of course, he can read those promises; but he can also read the law.

I hold in my hand a quotation from what was said by Dwight D. Eisenhower at Columbia, S. C., on the 30th day of September 1952:

> I believe wholeheartedly and without any "ifs" or "buts" in Federal programs to stabilize farm prices, including the present program insuring 90 percent of parity on all basic commodities.

On October 4, 1952, at Brookings, S. Dak., Candidate Eisenhower stated:

> The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90-percent-of-parity price supports, and it is pledged, even more than that, to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent of parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90 percent.

Those were the words of Dwight D. Eisenhower, Madam President, when he was asking the farmers to give him their votes.

Mr. LONG. Madam President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr LONG. The point I have in mind is that, inasmuch as some of our large daily newspapers have taken the attitude that it would be a bad thing to see the farmers guaranteeed even 90 percent of parity, much less 100 percent of parity, which was promised, is it not even a worse thing for a candidate to promise something that he has no intention of doing?

Mr. KERR. In my judgment, Dwight D. Eisenhower intended the farmers to have such supports, but he is insulated by the ignorance of some of his advisers, he is surrounded by indifference, he is victimized by men who are allergic to truth and impervious to fact, and they have deluded and misguided him and made a captive of him. I think President Eisenhower's intentions were good, but he is the victim of a great host of pseudo experts. He is victimized by an epidemic of commissions and committees, and by a group in high office who have made him a captive, and who now make his policies for him.

As indicated by the Senator from Louisiana, they are at fault, premeditatively. In my judgment, the President is the victim through lack of comprehension of what the situation is.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Oklahoma think it is possible that the President might even be surprised to find that no effort is being made to keep the promises he made in 1952?

Mr. KERR. I believe he would be surprised if he found out, but I do not think the group around him will let him find out until he retires from his great office.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma of course knows that we have a Postmaster General, who runs the Post Office Department, and who is in the Cabinet of the President. We have a Secretary of Agriculture, who likewise is in the Cabinet. Might it not be possible that we could send a copy of the promises through the mail, in special custody of the Postmaster General, who might in turn place them, with special delivery by the highest postal official in the country, upon the desk of the Secretary of Agriculture? Then, possibly, we could have someone from Central Intelligence and interpret what those pledges mean to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Perhaps in that way he would get the message and the truth, and perhaps be moved—which I admit is only a fond hope—at least to give cognizance to the fact that such promises were made.

Mr. KERR. I would hope that would happen, but I do not expect it to happen.

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wondered if the Senator from Oklahoma had read the speech which the Republican candidate for President made at Memphis, Tenn., just prior to election. I can only say to him that I was surprised at the language from the Columbia speech, because I had thought I had read and analyzed every speech the President made in the campaign, and I do not recall that language. However, I do recall this language:

> Here and now let me say what I have said to farmers elsewhere. I stand behind the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the basic farm act, approved by both parties and Congress, to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

There then follows the usual reference to the fact that the mandatory price supports at 90 percent will expire at the end of 1954.

It seems to me abundantly clear that the then Republican candidate intended that there was going to be time for study since those programs were to expire in 1954.

The Kasson speech was couched in almost the same language. The National and State Committee for Agricultural Progress, which was very stanchly supporting the Democratic candidates, and which was headed by Democratic workers, said:

General Eisenhower has himself avoided a basic statement on his price-support views by declaring that he and the Republican Party support the present farm law. The present farm law, unless amended, will slide price supports down into the basement in 1954.

I did not go quite that far with my Democratic colleagues, but I trust the philosophy embodied in what the Republican candidate was saying may be understood.

Mr. KERR. I must say I am sure the distinguished Senator from New Mexico interpreted those words of the candidate as he has indicated. I am not going to accuse the President of the United States of having made one statement at one time and a contradictory statement at another time. I am of the opinion that he sincerely meant what he said in South Carolina and in South Dakota. I submit that his language can be interpreted in no other way than as a definite promise by him.

Listen:

I believe wholeheartedly and without any ifs or buts in Federal programs to stabilize farm prices, including the present program insuring 90 percent of parity on all basic commodities.

Mr. President, that is pretty stout language, is it not? Dwight Eisenhower did not say that with any qualification as to what might happen in 1955. He did not say that would be subject to any sliding effect which might come about if the law were not extended. He said, "without any ifs or buts."

Then he said:

The Republican Party is pledged—

Mr. President, of course I may say that could be another case of misplaced confidence. [Laughter.] But it had some significance when Dwight D. Eisenhower embraced it and uttered it. It had a greater dignity than when it was only a pledge of the Republican Party. I am not going to say they have refused to live up to their commitments; but they are going to demonstrate whether they do or not, Mr. President. The record is going to disclose whether they do or not.

Here is what their candidates said they were pledged to do:

The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent of parity price support—

Mr. President, does that sound like a qualified commitment? You do not think it is, Mr. President; no, sir.

Their candidate said:

The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent of parity price support—

And, Mr. President, listen:

and it is pledged to even more than that—

Not less—

to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent parity, with the guarantee in the price supports of 90 percent.

Ah, Mr. President. There is no qualification there.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LENNON in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to his colleague?

Mr. KERR. First, Mr. President, let me say that he who reads a qualification into those commitments, does so on some basis other than that of analyzing the words and their meaning.

Now I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is the quotation my colleague has just read from the Republication National Platform?

Mr. KERR. I was reading the words of Dwight D. Eisenhower, their nominee, spoken at Brookings, S. Dak., on October 10, 1952.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me at this point?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would not it be fair to say that if the only promise the Republican Party had been able to make to the farmers in 1952 was that very flimsy, sort of weasel-worded platform plank, the farmers would never for a single moment have felt they would get the 90 percent of parity or 100 percent of parity. As the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out, it took Dwight D. Eisenhower, with his dignity and great stature and great place in American history, to make the statements and commitments so that the people would believe them. Is not that a fair statement to make?

Mr. KERR. I sincerely believe that the farmers accepted those words at their face value. I do not believe that Dwight D. Eisenhower was trying to mislead them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Earlier today I read into the RECORD Associated Press dispatches which came from the meetings to which the Senator from Oklahoma has been referring. I showed a photostatic copy of the leading newspaper in the Midwest, the Minneapolis Star, which carried the headline: "Ike Pledges 100 Percent Parity."

I also showed a photostatic copy of Look magazine; and I referred to the lead article published just a week before the election, and carrying the headlines: "Where the Candidates Stand on the Farm Issue."

There was not a shadow of doubt, insofar as Look magazine was concerned. Look magazine, issuing hundreds of thousands of copies—yea, millions of copies—throughout the country, said that the Republican candidate on the Republican ticket had made the pledges as the Senator from Oklahoma has been interpreting them. The pledges were so made. The public so believed, and no one disavowed those pledges.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Minnesota is eminently correct, Mr. President. He is so correct that I wish to say to my colleagues that the farm population of the Nation has been shocked and appalled at the evidence of the repudiation by the present Republican national administration of those commitments.

Mr. President, I was referring to the fact that farm prices were down and that the cost of food was up, and that the consumer had a direct and primary pecuniary interest in a program of price supports for farm products.

Mr. President, a few days ago the House Committee on Agriculture issued a pamphlet entitled "Farm Prices and the Cost of Food." At the same time it issued a release. I ask unanimous consent to have the release printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

FARM PRICES AND THE COST OF FOOD

WASHINGTON.—Chairman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of the House Committee on Agriculture, today released a report on a committee staff study showing that farm prices have fallen 20 percent since 1951 while, in contrast, retail food prices are right at their postwar peak.

In June farm prices tumbled 4 percent. From May to June retail food prices advanced one-half percent.

"Thus far," the report says, "almost none of the lower prices received by farmers since 1951 has been passed on to consumers in the form of lower retail food prices." The report continues:

"Further declines in farm prices are expected as more livestock and livestock products come to market and price-support levels are lowered. Consumers can expect little benefit, however, from these lower farm prices unless recent tendencies to increase marketing and processing charges are curbed."

The study of "Farm Prices and the Cost of Food" points out that city housewives today are paying the highest prices on record for bakery products and cereals. Illustrations of how consumer prices may increase while farm prices fall is set forth as follows:

In January 1948, the price of wheat was $2.81 a bushel and the average price of bread was 13.8 a 1-pound loaf. In June the price of wheat was $1.91 a bushel and the loaf of bread sold at an average of 17 cents. Thus, while the price of wheat declined 32 percent, the price of bread advanced 23 percent.

The farm value of the corn in a 12-ounce package of corn flakes was 4.5 cents in the last half of 1947, and the average retail price of the package was 16 cents. In the first 3 months of 1954 the farm value of the corn in this package had dropped to 3 cents, while the average retail price of the corn flakes had jumped to 22 cents.

In the last half of 1947 the farm value of the oats in a 20-ounce package of rolled oats was 6 cents, and the average retail price was 15 cents. Today the farmer gets 5 cents for the oats in the package, but the average retail price of the package has jumped to 18.5 cents.

Farm prices for milk and butterfat in June 1954 were 10 percent below their 1947–49 average, while the retail prices of dairy products were 3 percent higher than the earlier period.

The report points out that in New York and Chicago housewives paid in June 25 cents a quart for milk delivered to their

doors, while farmers who supply milk for the Chicago market received 8 cents a quart and the farmers participating in the New York City market received 12 cents a quart for this milk.

"I believe few consumers realize," Mr. HOPE said, "that the farmer gets only about 2¼ cents for the wheat in the 17-cent loaf of bread, and the price of wheat would have to be reduced by about 75 cents a bushel to reflect a 1-cent cut in the bread cost to the consumer.

"Similarly, there is less than 30 cents worth of cotton in a $3.95 cotton shirt. In the case of tobacco, the farmers in 1953 received about $800 million for that part of their crop consumed in the United States. Federal, State, and local taxes on the 1953 crop—reflected in prices consumers pay—amounted to approximately $2,100,000,000."

Retail food prices have not followed farm prices downward in recent years, but hourly earnings of industrial workers have continued to increase, so that today, the study sets forth, industrial workers can buy more and better food with the earnings from an hour of labor than in any earlier period of history. The report cites figures from the record of the Department of Agriculture, as follows:

One hour's average factory pay bought 3.5 pounds of bread in 1914, 6.4 pounds in 1929 and 10.7 pounds in 1953. The average hour's wage would buy 1 pound of butter in 1929, and 2.2 pounds in 1953; 3.9 quarts of milk in 1929 and 7.5 quarts in 1953; 1.4 dozen eggs in 1929 and 2.5 dozen in 1953; 17.7 pounds of potatoes in 1929 and 32.6 pounds in 1953; 4.4 No. 2 cans of tomatoes in 1929 and 10 cans in 1953.

Mr. Hope pointed out that the increase in costs added to food after it leaves the farms is due largely to the consumer demand for better processing, improved sanitation and more convenient and attractive packaging, plus increased labor costs in processing, transportation and marketing.

The study explains that of each $1 spent by the American housewife for domestically produced food, 56 cents now goes for processing, marketing and transportation charges. The farmer receives 44 cents. Of this 44 cents, approximately 30 cents goes to purchase tractors, trucks, plows, gasoline, fertilizer and other supplies required by farming, thus, the farmer and his family have about 14 cents out of each consumer dollar spent for domestically produced food in return for their work and their investment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I read from the release:

WASHINGTON.—Chairman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of the House Committee on Agriculture, today released a report on a committee staff study showing that farm prices have fallen 20 percent since 1951, while, in contrast, retail food prices are right at their postwar peak.

In June, farm prices tumbled 4 percent. From May to June, retail food prices advanced one-half percent.

If the price of food would go down to nothing, why, Mr. President, there is no telling how much the consumer would have to pay for it. [Laughter.]

The release further states:

"Thus far," the report says, "almost none of the lower prices received by farmers since 1951 has been passed on to consumers in the form of lower retail food prices."

Mr. President, I wish to say that the Secretary of Agriculture has sought the good will and support of the consumer, under false pretenses. He stands convicted on the record, Mr. President, of having promised them something that he is not delivering to them. Oh, he told the country that 90 percent of his mail favors what he advocates. I wish to say that he gets less mail from farmers than has any other Secretary of Agriculture in 50 years. [Laughter.] The farmers have already given up hope. The Secretary of Agriculture makes the Wall Street Journal with his pronouncements, and he gets a great deal of mail from the people to whom he has promised to see to it that they will get food for less money, by having him put his foot on the neck of the farmer.

I wish to say that the Secretary of Agriculture has succeeded in putting his foot on the neck of the farmer, but he has not succeeded in decreasing the price of food to the consumer.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at this point for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Would it stand to reason that the Secretary of Agriculture would not be receiving much mail from housewives, because they are still paying more for food; and obviously he must not be receiving much mail from the farmers, because they are getting less for the agricultural commodities they produce. So obviously there is only one group from which he must be receiving much mail, and that is the group of those who can afford to hire secretaries because they are in the business of processing food, and are receiving excellent incomes.

Mr. KERR. Indeed, that must be so, Mr. President.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me at this point?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would it not be fair to say that the Secretary of Agriculture must just about be winning the world's prize for ineptitude, inasmuch as he has succeeded in bringing about the lowest prices for agricultural products in recent history, and at the same time the highest prices that consumers have had to pay for food in recent history? That is quite an accomplishment, is it not?

Mr. KERR. It certainly is. No man in history has succeeded in reducing to so great an extent the prices paid to the producers of agricultural commodities, or in raising so high the prices which are required to be paid by the consumers of food. The Secretary of Agriculture has achieved an unchallenged record, in that the American consumers of food are paying the highest prices in history for what they eat, whereas the American producers of food have been neglected, and in 18 months have had to suffer a 20-percent penalty in respect to the prices they receive for the agricultural commodities they produce.

Mr. President, let me refer further to the release on the report issued by Chairman Hope, of the House Committee on Agriculture. Man, oh man, Mr. President. Although Representative HOPE is a Republican, how I wish that good man, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, were chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture. He would certainly enter a vacuum, and I believe he could fill it. [Laughter.] In January of 1948 the price of wheat was $2.81 a bushel, and the average price of bread was 13.8 cents for a 1-pound loaf—$2.81 a bushel for wheat, 13.8 for bread.

In June of this year, the price of wheat was $1.91 a bushel, and a loaf of bread sold at an average price of 17 cents. Wheat was down 90 cents a bushel, bread was up 3.2 cents a loaf. Nobody but Benson could bring that about. W. C. Fields in his most expert days could not have juggled those prices in such an unusual consequence of events. It takes a man—I know he works 18 hours a day. He would have to, to accomplish such bizarre results as that, Mr. President.

Thus, while the price of wheat went down 32 percent, the price of bread advanced 23 percent.

Mr. President, what do you suppose would happen to the consumer, if Benson made these boys give their wheat away? There is no telling what they would have to pay for a loaf of bread.

The farm value of the corn—that is corn on the cob—in a 12-ounce package of corn flakes, was 4½ cents in the last half of 1947, and the average retail price of the package was 16 cents. Four and one-half cents for the corn, 16 cents for the flakes.

In the first 3 months of 1954 the farm value of the corn in this package had dropped to 3 cents, or 33⅓ percent, while the average retail price of the corn flakes had gone up to 22 cents, 16 plus 6. That was a price increase of nearly 40 percent.

Mr. President, the consequences will be tragic if Congress insists on bankrupting millions of American farmers and inflicting hardships on their families, merely to prove to the consumer that the farmer is not the villain of the high cost of living, and to prove to the Government that our economy cannot stand the shock of an agricultural depression.

Mr. Benson did even better in the case of corn flakes than he did in the case of bread, although when I found what he had accomplished with reference to bread I thought it was the acme of official manipulation to the detriment of the producer and the consumer, and to the profit of the processor.

The producer and the consumer may not be represented in the Department of Agriculture, but the processor is. He has not had such a bonanza, Mr. President, in the memory of any living man.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I wonder if the Senator has heard of the speeches in the last 2 or 3 days condemning the price-support program for wheat, and leaving the implication that the wheat producers of the Nation were practically villains. I wonder if the Senator has heard those speeches?

Mr. KERR. I have heard them. Oh, how I remember what my father used to tell me, "Behold how much ignorance it taketh to kill a man."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. As one who grew up in the wheat business, some of the remarks

which have recently gone out through the press of the Nation have been most disheartening. They paint an extremely unfair picture.

I wonder if the Senator knows that as late as 2 years ago, February 29, 1952, the then Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry advocating that the farmers of this Nation increase their production of corn to 115 percent over the previous year, of cotton to 105 percent over the previous year, and of wheat to 118 percent.

I warned the Secretary of Agriculture at that time that I thought it would be unwise for the farmer to do so. However, that was a war measure just as much as the production of guns, tanks, and other materiel were a part of the war effort. It was carried under the Commodity Credit Corporation as a farm program.

Yet, in spite of the fact that the farmers complied with the Government's request, today they are being vilified all over the Nation. There is not a bit of sympathy for the plight in which they find themselves for having patriotically complied with the Government requests.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct. They are being penalized for patriotism. They are being vilified because they responded to the call of their country in her hour of great need, and because they met the requirements of our Government. As I said a little while ago, industry met the call of Government by supplying the requirements for war; but a little while ago the Department of Defense sold $1 billion worth of war material at 10 cents on the dollar, and there was no vilification of the producers. There was no effort to call upon them to produce and to sell to their Government what they produced on the basis of a six-bit parity.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG. One speaker after another has pointed out the tremendous surpluses we have accumulated. I wonder if the Senator read a leading article in the Washington Evening Star this afternoon entitled "Drought-Seared Plains States Pray for Rain and United States Aid."

Mr. KERR. No. But a little while ago I said that men who regard an abundance of food as a curse had better never let their sentiments reach the throne of the all-wise heavenly Father, because He might take the measures necessary to relieve them of what they regard as a burden and a curse. Who knows but what before this very year has gone, these so-called surpluses will be regarded as one of the greatest assets our country has. Certainly, Mr. President, a nation of 165 million people, with mouths to feed, with undertakings and responsibilities at home, and commitments abroad, should be happy in the knowledge that it has an abundance of food to spare. It should not be regarded as a curse, and it should not be the cause of a mental attitude whereby there would be inflicted upon those who had produced the abundance a penalty by way of detrimentally affecting their economic welfare.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator is familiar with many of the late crop forecasts by the various railroads which in the past have been very accurate in forecasting crops.

Mr. KERR. I am glad the distinguished Senator from North Dakota brought that up.

Mr. YOUNG. I have here an Agricultural Outlook Digest for release July 23, which says:

> The 4.2 billion bushel corn supply includes a prospective crop of 3.3 billion bushels, second largest in history, and a 950 million bushel carryover next October 1.

Mr. KERR. I know the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is about to tell the Senate what an up-to-date estimate of the situation that is.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to read one paragraph from the latest forecast by the Chicago Northwestern Railroad. It is as follows:

> Total United States crops have been cut appreciably in the last month. As of this writing a 2½ billion bushel total could be the maximum produced.

They are speaking of corn.

> We estimated 3 billion bushels total on July 1.

That is a reduction in their own forecast of 500 million bushels since July 1.

Mr. KERR. Whose forecast is that?

Mr. YOUNG. That is the forecast of the Chicago & Northwestern Railroad.

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. If they are correct in their estimates, or close to being correct, we will not have a surplus of corn but actually have a shortage, and it is a Godsend to the livestock growers that we had a carryover of corn.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is so correct, Mr. President, that the Members of this body, with responsibility for public policy and the welfare of the Nation, should thank the Senator from North Dakota for the information he has brought to us and for suggesting its significance.

Now, Mr. President, reading further from this release of the House Committee on Agriculture, I learn that farm prices for milk and butterfat in June of 1954, were far below their 1947–49 average, while the retail prices of dairy products were higher.

In the last half of 1947 the farm value of oats in a 20-ounce package of rolled oats was 6 cents, and the average retail price was 15 cents. Today the farmer gets 5 cents for the oats in the package, but the average retail price of the package has jumped to 18.5 cents.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to talk about coffee, because it is a red light in the pathway of every Member of the Senate. It is a cautionary signal which should be recognized by every consumer in this country.

The wholesale price of coffee in May 1953 was 55 cents a pound, and in March 1954 it was 87 cents a pound, which is an increase of 32 cents a pound in the wholesale price of coffee, in 10 months.

This country consumes 2,640,000,000 pounds of coffee a year. That is a great quantity of coffee, Mr. President. It makes 100 billion cups of coffee.

I was in a small cafe last night, and I saw a sign on the wall which said, "Coffee, 15 cents a cup." Not very long ago coffee was 10 cents a cup. Mr. President, I can even remember when coffee was 5 cents a cup for the first cup, and they would give a refill without extra charge if a person did not use too much sugar or cream.

I wonder if the Senators know how much it costs the American consumers when coffee goes up a penny a cup. It costs the American consumers $1 billion a year.

If a person figures on the basis of the retail price of coffee today, compared to what it was 18 to 24 months ago, the American consumer is paying $1 billion more for the coffee he buys.

If a person figures on the basis of what he pays for it by the cup, consumers are today paying from $2 billion to $2½ billion more for the coffee they drink in a year than was the case 2 years ago.

That cost is a monument to the Benson philosophy of scarcity. That is the penalty which the consumer pays for a little scarcity of coffee—from $1 billion to $2½ billion a year penalty for a little scarcity in the item of coffee.

We can only surmise what the consumers would pay if there were a scarcity of corn, as has been intimated to be possible by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. We can only suppose what the consumers would pay as a penalty for a scarcity of wheat.

Mr. President, if the Secretary of Agriculture can put the price of bread up 30 percent in the midst of an abundance and with falling prices, we can only suppose what he could bring about in the event of scarcity of wheat.

What I am saying is that the American consumer has as great an economic interest in a farm program of abundance, made possible by a program of fixed price supports, as has the producer. In fact, the consumer has a greater economic interest, because the consumer, is affected not alone by the cost of living. Since we have had such an increase in the midst of abundance, we can only imagine what it would be if the Secretary of Agriculture succeeded in bringing about a few scarcities.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that actually the consumer has a greater stake and a greater interest in having an abundance of food than any other segment of our economy? After all, there is nothing which will come nearer to guaranteeing the consumer food at a reasonable price than the fact that food is in full supply, and that there is an abundance of food available.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct, if he is speaking on the basis of "B. B."—before Benson.

We now have a Secretary of Agriculture who has succeeded in bringing

about a substantial increase in the cost of food to the consumer at the same time that there has been a great decrease in the price received for it by the producer.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, the Senator well knows that if automobiles are in scarce supply, people can make the old automobile last for a little longer; and if radios are in scarce supply, people can listen to their neighbors' radios for a little while even though some people might be willing to pay a much higher price for those articles.

On the other hand, if food is in a scarce supply, people will pay almost any price for food rather than go hungry.

Mr. KERR. And pay more for less.

Mr. LONG. Of course.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct. But the consumer has a further interest in a program of adequate price supports for the producer, because the producer of agricultural products is the customer of the consumer. Consumers are engaged in some productive activity, out of which come goods and merchandise which must be sold to other consumers, and the farmer becomes the consumer of what the consumer of the farm products produces.

The off-farm purchases of American farmers in 1952 were upward of $24 billion. They will be substantially less than that this year, Mr. President. And if the program of 90 percent of parity on the basic products is permitted to expire the off-farm purchases of farmers will be far less next year than they have been this year.

Oklahoma farmers lost $75 million last year because of the decline in the value of their farm products. They will lose another $25 million this year. If the 90-percent-of-parity price supports are not extended by this Congress, the Oklahoma producers and farmers stand to lose another $100 million next year. That process of loss does not begin at one boundary of Oklahoma nor does it end at another. It goes all the way across the length and breadth of the farm areas of the United States. The economy of the farmers, the economies of the States, the economy of those who produce goods, wares and merchandise for sale to the farmers, the economic vitality and welfare of our country, and the very security of our Nation are all tied into the extension of the program of price supports at least as high as 90 percent on the basic farm commodities.

Therefore, Mr. President, I oppose the amendment sponsored by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and other Senators, which has for its purpose a decrease in the level of price supports which will be fixed by the bill now before the Senate for its consideration.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, at the outset of my speech in opposition to lowering support levels on farm commodities I should like to set the record straight as to what the two bills pending before Congress would provide, if approved, by way of a support level for basic farm commodities.

I received a letter today from the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Farrington, with which he encloses a table showing exactly what support level we could expect for all basic farm commodities if either the House or Senate bill should pass. I hope the press will carry these figures, because we need to get correct information to the public.

Under the House bill the support levels for wheat under maximum or minimum set-aside, according to Mr. Farrington of the Department of Agriculture, would be only 75 percent of parity. Under the Senate bill, which has other provisions in it, under the maximum set-aside, the support level for wheat would be 78 percent of parity and the minimum would be 75 percent of parity.

I note the newspapers carried a story yesterday implying that the support level under the Senate bill would be 80 percent of parity. It is true it would be if the special amendment were adopted. There is a provision in the House bill that for 1 year the support level would be 82½ percent of parity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, a letter dated July 5, 1954, from R. L. Farrington, Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, together with a table which he has attached to this letter, showing exactly what support levels we can expect next year under the 2 bills.

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

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., August 5, 1954.

Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: This responds to your request concerning price support levels for the 1955 crops of wheat, cotton and corn.

The enclosed table prepared in the Department shows estimated minimum price support levels for the 1955 crops of wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and peanuts under provisions of (1) the Agricultural Act of 1949, (2) S. 3052 as reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and (3) H. R. 9680 as passed by the House. Where the level shown is 90 percent of parity, it also is the maximum support level. Where the level shown is less than 90 percent of parity, the Secretary has discretion to fix the level of support between the minimum level and 90 percent of parity, after consideration of factors specified in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

As indicated in the footnote to the table, many assumptions must be made in projecting these estimates, most important of which are size of crop, carryover, consumption and compliance by producers with acreage allotments. For example, the following figures were used in connection with the wheat estimate:

(a) Domestic consumption and exports for purposes of calculating normal supply, 900 million bushels.

(b) 1954 estimated production (July 9 crop report), 988 million bushels,.

(c) Carry-over on July 1, 1954, 903 million bushels.

(d) Estimated total supply, July 1, 1954, 1,894 million bushels.

(e) Estimated disappearance during 1954–55 marketing year, 880 million bushels,.

(f) Total carryover July 1, 1955, 1,014 million bushels.

(g) 1955 acreage allotment, 55 million acres with slight adjustment, as applicable, reflecting the varying provisions affecting summer-fallow farms contained in S. 3052 and H. R. 9680.

(h) 1955 estimated production on the allotment (at an average yield of 15 bushels per acre) ranging from 825 to 835 million bushels.

I trust that this is the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

R. L. FARRINGTON,
Solicitor.

Illustrative price support levels for the 1955 crops of wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and peanuts under various legislative provisions [1]

Applicable legislation	Wheat		Cotton		Corn		Rice		Peanuts [2]	
	Percent of parity	Dollars per bushel	Percent of parity	Cents per pound	Percent of parity	Dollars per bushel	Percent of parity	Dollars per hundredweight	Percent of parity	Cents per pound
1. Agricultural Act of 1949	75	1.87	86	30.07	83	1.50	89	4.87	83–86	11.2–11.6
2. S. 3052 (Rept. No. 1810 of July 15, 1954):										
(a) 90 percent support	90	2.24	90	31.47	90	1.63	90	4.92	90	12.2
(b) If based on supply percentage					85	1.54	89	4.87	83–86	11.2–11.6
(1) Minimum set-aside	75	1.87	90	31.47	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
(2) Maximum set-aside	78	1.94	90	31.47	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
3. H. R. 9680 (passed by House July 2, 1954):										
(a) 82.5 percent minimum support	82.5	2.05	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
(b) If based on supply percentage							89	4.87	84–87	11.3–11.7
(1) Minimum set-aside	75	1.87	90	31.47	83	1.50	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
(2) Maximum set-aside	75	1.87	90	31.47	87	1.57	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)

[1] Clearly many assumptions must be made in illustrative price-support calculations of this kind, involving consideration of items such as size of crop, carryover, consumption, and producer compliance. Prices are based on June 15, 1954, indexes, and the following effective parity prices: Wheat, $2.49 per bushel; cotton, 34.97 cents per pound; corn, $1.81 per bushel; rice, $5.47 per hundredweight; peanuts, 13.5 cents per pound.

[2] The "range" shown illustrates the effect on the support level of Commodity Credit Corporation's peanut "diversion operations." The high end of the range illustrates the minimum support level assuming that CCC diverts sufficient quantities of peanuts to domestic crushing or export to reduce carryover to 148,000 tons, reflecting CCC diversion operations somewhat similar to those of recent years. The low end of the range illustrates the minimum support level if there were no diversion by CCC.

[3] No set-aside.

[4] Applicable only if supply percent indicates support level less than 82.5 percent.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the farm price-support legislation before the Senate today is one of the most controversial pieces of legislation we have had to deal with during the 83d Congress. It is one of the most important, too.

To a large degree its outcome will determine not only farm income in subsequent years, but, also, the economic stability of our Nation.

I know of no other way farm prices, particularly those for basic farm commodities, can be maintained at a fair level under present postwar conditions without a high level price-support program. This has been true of every postwar period in our history.

We can prevent farm commodity prices from dropping to disastrous levels if we have the will to do so—and if there is an effective and friendly administration of the program. I doubt very much if our present price-support program could be operated successfully by one who totally disbelieves in both the objectives of the program and its workability.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can my distinguished colleague tell us whether or not that is the feeling of the farmers of the Northwest?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; I think the farmers of the Northwest are almost 100 percent back of the present program of 90 percent price supports.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, at the recent election the vote was over 46,000 to 2,000 in the State of North Dakota; is that not true?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. I am very happy my colleague raised that question.

I should like to put in the RECORD at this point some figures on polls that have been taken in various places.

According to a poll which I recently conducted, the farmers of North Dakota were by 8 to 1 in favor of 90-percent supports as against flexible supports.

Let me give the exact figures. I point out, too, that practically all the returned questionnaires were signed. According to the pool I took, 2,198 farmers favored 90-percent supports and 270 favored flexible supports.

A magazine called Successful Farming took a poll early this year and came up with some very interesting results. In the North Central States 85 percent of the farmers favored 90-percent supports, and 15 percent favored flexible supports. In the Eastern States only 23 percent favored flexible supports, and 77 percent of Eastern States farmers were against them. In the Western and Southwestern States 80 percent of the farmers were for 90-percent supports, and 20 percent for flexible supports. In all States, according to the poll conducted by Successful Farming, the farmers favored 90-percent supports by 82 percent, only 18 percent being in favor of flexible supports.

The State College of Iowa, a great agricultural college, took a poll of the farmers of Iowa and Illinois. It is reported in Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead for March 20, 1954. I should like to read briefly from the poll, because there is some very interesting information in it:

Personal interviews with 588 farm operators in Iowa and the northern two-thirds of Illinois throw light on farm views.

Most farmers in these areas want "a Government price on income-support program." But Iowa and Illinois farmers have different ideas. The table below shows the Iowa-Illinois split.

Farmers in both these States seem to show a preference for 90-percent supports.

In Iowa, 75 percent of the farmers favored 90 percent, and 23.7 opposed it. The remainder, I understand, expressed no opinion.

In the great State of Iowa 75 percent were for 90-percent supports and only 23.7 against.

I might call the attention of the Senate to the fact that 5 of the 8 Republican Representatives from the State of Iowa voted for 90-percent supports recently. I think 7 out of the 8 favor them. The Governor of the great State of Iowa, the second greatest agricultural State in the Nation, has repeatedly stated his position in favor of 90-percent supports.

In Illinois, according to the poll conducted by Iowa State College, 58 percent of the farmers favored 90-percent supports and 40.4 were against.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first page of this article on price supports be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

FARMERS ASK SUPPORTS—IOWA STATE COLLEGE SURVEY SHOWS HOW ILLINOIS AND IOWA FARMERS ARE VOTING

Iowa and northern Illinois

In the present situation, do you think farmers need a Government price- or income-support program?

	Percent
Yes	69.3
No	29.3

Do you think corn needs price or income support at the present time?

	Percent
Yes	64.5
No	33.7

Do you think livestock products need price or income support at the present time?

	Percent
Yes	47.0
No	47.5

What do Corn Belt farmers really want in farm programs? Iowa State College, using its statistical laboratory and department of economics, has gone to farmers to find out. The chart above and the article below tell some of the high points in the ISC survey.

Personal interviews with 588 farm operators in Iowa and the northern two-thirds of Illinois throw light on farm views.

Most farmers in these areas want a Government price- or income-support program. But Iowa and Illinois farmers have different ideas. The table below shows the Iowa-Illinois split:

	Iowa	Northern Illinois
	Percent	*Percent*
For supports	75.0	58.6
Against	23.7	40.4

The farmers not accounted for in the table above were undecided or said they had no information.

This Illinois-Iowa split showed up all the way through the survey. On most questions, Iowa farmers were much more favorable to farm programs than Illinois farmers.

The ISC survey asked all these farmers whether they thought corn needed price or income support at the present time. And again Iowa and Illinois farmers had different views:

	Iowa	Northern Illinois
	Percent	*Percent*
For corn supports	72.7	49.4
Against	26.4	48.4

In Illinois, cash corn farmers showed the greatest interest in corn supports. But in Iowa, general farmers with hogs and cattle showed even more interest than cash crop men.

What about supports for livestock products? Here, Iowa and Illinois still differed. The figures follow:

	Iowa	Northern Illinois
	Percent	*Percent*
For livestock products	52.1	37.0
Against	43.1	56.2

About one-third of those who wanted supports for corn said that supports weren't needed for livestock products if the corn program worked right.

The use of the phrase "at the present time," probably lowered the vote for support of livestock products. As shown in the Wallace-Homestead poll, some farmers who are sure hogs don't need support at the present time are still inclined to think supports may be needed next winter.

Mr. YOUNG. I have here a poll conducted by the State of Kansas. It covered only one county, but that county showed a tremendous majority for 90 percent supports.

In the 80th Congress I was a conferee on the price-support legislation which passed at that time, the Aiken Act of 1948. That was a great step forward, and I supported it. We were amending the Agricultural Act of 1938, which provided from 52 to 70 percent supports. Four of the seven Senate conferees favored a flexible-support program, the Aiken Act, and three were opposed. The House conferees were very much opposed. They wanted a 1-year extension of 90 percent supports. We fought that out until 4 o'clock on the morning of the day Congress adjourned. We agreed on a 1-year extension of the 90 percent supports.

The Republican Party then went into the campaign. We lost in the farming areas in the great State of Illinois, on the issue of flexible price supports. We lost in the great farming State of Iowa among the farmers, and in Wisconsin, Illinois, and Ohio, but only by small percentages.

In that campaign one of the most active opponents of that program was the then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan. He did a beautiful job of defeating the program and defeating the Republicans.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the Republican Party and the Republican President twice vetoed the McNary-Haugen bill and did the greatest favor for the Democratic Party that was ever done so far as agriculture is concerned?

Mr. YOUNG. It took 20 years for the Republicans to regain the confidence of the farmers again. I hope we do not lose it now, and I do not think we will. It is my firm opinion that before the Eisenhower administration ends, before the 4 years are up, the Republican Party is going to write a good agricultural program, and I hope and believe that the Republicans will retain the farm vote.

Mr. LANGER. May I respectfully suggest to my distinguished friend that he has more confidence than I have? I hope that every morning and every night he gets down on his knees and prays for the Republican Party in case they do not give what was promised to us in the campaign.

Mr. YOUNG. The uncertainty of future price-support levels for the past 2 years has had a serious impact upon our farm economy. This uncertainty, in a large measure, is responsible for the United States losing a higher percentage of its wheat exports than any other surplus producing nation in the world.

This despite the fact the United States is maintaining the same wheat export price as our neighbor to the North—Canada.

While our agriculture economy was suffering from greatly reduced exports of most farm commodities, imports of these same commodities reached one of the all-time highs in the history of the United States. Imports of oats, barley, rye, and feed wheat during the past year were in excess of 151 million bushels. These imports had a serious impact on our commodity market. They were commodities that we already had in abundant supply. They were in excess of our needs and replaced United States grain in domestic consumption, causing the Commodity Credit Corporation to take over an equivalent amount under price-support programs.

The storage on this grain, plus additional imports held in bond in the United States, amounts to more than $31,280,000, or a daily cost of $86,890. Foreign purchasers of basic farm commodities, as well as dairy and other products, have come to believe in the past year or more that Secretary of Agriculture Benson would eventually win his fight for lower support prices which, in turn, would mean lower cash prices.

It is a matter of record that most European countries—traditional purchasers of American agricultural commodities—have been depleting their normal stockpiles of important foods. They have been living pretty much on a day to day basis, looking for lower prices in the United States, where in years past they have acquired much of their needed food and fibre supplies.

There are indeed very few domestic users of feed and food grains who presently keep anything like a normal supply on hand. I am hopeful that before we adjourn this session Congress will establish more permanent support levels that will be a better price guide in the future to both producers and purchasers of food in America and abroad.

There are many agricultural commodities, particularly the perishables, which do not lend themselves to any Government program of rigid support prices. The Government of the United States—and I think properly so—both in the interests of consumers and producers has provided considerable assistance in indirectly supporting prices of many nonbasic agricultural commodities.

Only last year the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 865,000 head of cattle at a cost to the Federal Government of approximately $84,300,000. Under the foreign assistance program, an additional $9,400,000 worth of beef and beef products was purchased to stabilize falling cattle prices. The total cost of this program was $93,700,000. The Federal Government will be reimbursed for a part of these costs, probably a large part.

Other help in the form of loans and Federal assistance was made available to the producers of cattle last year. The amount of this assistance was approximately $100 million. A large part of this will be repaid.

Through section 32 funds, marketing orders, and other arrangements, the Federal Government has lent great assistance in stabilizing the prices of many other perishable commodities.

Three basic farm commodities—wheat, cotton, and corn—fall into an entirely different category. They are commodities that can be stored for long periods. They are commodities that can be and are shipped to the four corners of the earth. They are by far the most important commodities in universal worldwide demand and necessary both in times of peace and war.

Fortunately, at the beginning of World War II, we had sizable stocks of these three commodities on hand. All during World War II and since we have been blessed with unusually good weather and good crops.

New developments in agriculture and mechanized farming played an important part, too. The reduction of the horse and mule population from approximately 19 million head in 1930 to the present 5 million head released more than 60 million acres of land for production of food for human consumption.

In spite of all this, there has been a shortage of these commodities during most of the past 11 years. In all but 3 of the past 11 years the Government of the United States urged farmers to produce more and more of these and other farm commodities. The Federal Government assisted the farmers in accomplishing these goals by helping them secure additional farm machinery, additional fertilizer—and oftentimes by deferring farm help from military service which was necessary to meet these goals.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I know the distinguished Senator remembers very well what happened during World War I. I mention it because I think it is a reason why every Senator from the East, from the South, and from other portions of the United States should support 90 percent of parity.

During World War I there was much talk about the people starving and not having enough wheat. The President of the United States called for more and more plantings of wheat. As the distinguished Senator well remembers, in North Dakota hundreds of thousands of acres of land which had been used for grazing were broken up, at the request of the President of the United States, in order to raise more wheat. Every once in a while criticisms would be heard, and it would be said that the land should not have been broken up; that it should have been left to the Indians or used for cattle raising.

Not only was that land broken up, but, as the Senator will remember, out along the railroad rights-of-way, along the tracks, in the parks of cities like Bismarck and Fargo, N. Dak., and Billings, Mont., the ground was broken in order to raise a few more bushels of wheat.

In addition, an order was issued by Herbert Hoover, which was concurred in by the late Senator Taft, who was at that time one of Mr. Hoover's assistants. All over the Middle West land was being broken up, and the orders were that if land owners having land in furrow or in buffalo grass did not break it up by a certain day, then another farmer or another person, who did not own the land, could go in and break it up, and would be protected, because the man who would not tear up his land was considered to be not loyal to his country. Any man who went onto another person's property in that manner and farmed it was protected in what he did.

At that time I was 1 of 14 members of the State council of defense, appointed by the Governor of our State. I remember very well that at Hope, N. Dak., a clergyman of a certain denomination owned a quarter-section of land. He did not tear it up, because he wanted to use the land for hay. A clergyman of another denomination, who wanted the hay, went in and pulled it up. The case came before the State council of defense, of which I was a member. The question arose as to whether a minister of one denomination could dig up a piece of land merely on the strength of his own statement that another clergyman was disloyal to his country. We sustained the action on the ground that an Executive order had been issued.

Thousands of acres of land like that were broken up during World War I. A great many fine pieces of land were ruined. Certainly many fine sections of grazing land in the western part of North Dakota, with which my distinguished colleague is so familiar, were ruined. Now we are criticized for breaking it up. But it was done so that the people of the United States and our allies might have sufficient wheat.

For the life of me I cannot understand why, after we did all that for the people all over the country, some persons now will not support the farmers in their efforts to get a fair price for their product.

They say we are overpricing, and all that sort of thing. Some Members have stated privately in committee that they are going to vote against 90 percent of parity. That is unfair to the farmers, because the farmers of the United States have not had a square deal.

After World War I farmers were encouraged to borrow money from the Government. They were urged to make seed and feed loans, and they did so.

Within 1 year after World War I was over, the Government canceled every single feed and seed loan. In the Northwest, and all over the rest of the country, the Government is still collecting seed and feed loans which are 20 years old, and which carry 6 percent interest. In a great many instances the interest amounts to as much as or more than the principal.

Up near the Canadian border is what is known as the Peace Garden. There the farmers of North Dakota meet farmers from Canada. The Canadian farmer tells the North Dakota farmer, "You are a bunch of suckers in North Dakota. You are still paying 6 percent interest on seed and feed loans. In Canada such loans were canceled immediately after World War I." This makes the farmers in the United States dissatisfied. The same is true in the area in northern Minnesota, where farmers from Minnesota meet farmers from Canada.

I challenge any Senator to tell me why Canada could cancel such loans, which were made to win the war, but the United States of America cannot cancel its loans.

Our farmers are still being compelled to pay interest on those feed loans. The Senator knows very well that in our State, years after World War I, Government representatives checked on the farmers, went to their granaries, and took up the crops, because, they said, the Government had a lien on them. In the State of North Dakota a situation arose in which a farmer would raise a crop, the Government would take it, and leave not even enough for seed the next year.

That question was taken up with Secretary of Agriculture Wallace. We had excellent seed wheat, which we asked to have left there. We did not want to be in the position of having to sell that seed wheat for 30 or 40 cents a bushel, and then have seed wheat shipped in from other areas the following spring at $2 and $3 a bushel. Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. YOUNG. I remember it very well.

Mr. LANGER. I hope Senators from the Eastern and Southern States are listening to the very fine speech of my distinguished colleague.

Mr. THYE. I hope the Senator from North Dakota does not put me in the category of Senators from the Southern and Eastern States.

Mr. LANGER. No; I do not.

Mr. HOLLAND. We would be glad to welcome the Senator to the South.

Mr. LANGER. We are carrying on the fight for the benefit of the farmers.

Mr. THYE. I shall do my utmost to help in that fight, because I see the trend going against the farmers. If this country's economy is not to suffer a serious setback we had better stop that trend.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I listened with interest a few moments ago to the statement of the distinguished Senator with reference to the 1948 campaign. As I understood, the Senator attributed the fact that President Truman and the Democratic Party ticket carried the farm States which he mentioned to the positions taken by the Democratic Party and the Republican Party on farm policies. Is it not true that in their 1948 platform the Democratic Party came out very clearly for a flexible price-support program, and pledged itself to such a program?

Mr. YOUNG. That is true, but Secretary Brannan was campaigning all over the United States in favor of 90 to 100 percent support prices. Senator Barkley, who later became Vice President, had also campaigned vigorously for 90 percent support prices.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that the real farm issue upon which the results in the midwestern farm States were based was the charge that the Republican 80th Congress had not supplied storage facilities for the basic products? Was not that the charge upon which the Republican Party lost those States which were customarily regarded as strongholds of the party of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. YOUNG. I disagree with my very good friend from Florida. I was active in that campaign. I was called to Chicago and Minneapolis by the Republican National Committee. I was in the middle of that campaign. I think I know the real issues that were involved. The storage for farm products was somewhat of an issue, but not the basic all-important issue.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was it not a hot issue?

Mr. YOUNG. No. In California, where there was no storage problem, the Republicans lost. The question of price supports was the main issue there.

Mr. HOLLAND. Has not the Senator from North Dakota confused the 1948 campaign with the 1952 campaign? It was in 1952 that the Democratic Party pledged itself to rigid price supports, and it lost the election in a great many of these same States.

Mr. YOUNG. Not all.

Mr. MAYBANK. In that same campaign President Eisenhower promised 100 percent price supports.

Mr. YOUNG. Unfortunately, the Aiken Act was passed at 5 o'clock in the morning, just before Congress adjourned. It was a far better act than it was generally believed to be by many persons. Not many knew too much about it. Secretary Brannon and Frank Woolley did an effective job of crucifying the Republican Party. Secretary Brannan rose to national fame because of the results he accomplished among the farmers.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that the Democratic Party declared itself in favor of flexible price supports, and that the Democratic Congress which followed, the 81st Congress, promptly reenacted, in somewhat improved fashion, the Aiken-Hope bill, in the form of the Anderson bill, so as to include flexible price supports?

Mr. YOUNG. That is true, but at the same time they were advocating 100 percent price supports under the Brannan plan.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the feeling of the Senator from North Dakota that the States which were mentioned voted for the Democratic Party in spite of its platform, and in spite of its performance, and simply because the Secretary of Agriculture was not in accord with either?

Mr. YOUNG. We have exactly the same situation now. President Eisenhower during the last campaign advocated 90 percent supports, and the present Secretary of Agriculture was advocating flexible price supports immediately after the campaign. I think Secretary Benson is doing in President Eisenhower's term of office what Secretary Brannan was doing during President Truman's term of office.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Was not the thing that cost the Republican Party the midwestern farm States and the northwestern farm States in 1948 the fear on the part of the farmers that the Republican Party would reduce support prices?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. I do not think there is a thing in the world the farmers worry more about than the loss of farm income. Thousands of farmers had lost their farms not too long prior to that time.

Mr. EASTLAND. The loss of those States to the Republican Party was not caused by what was in the platform or by what anybody said; it was caused by mistrust on the part of the farmers. They thought the Republican Party would reduce support prices. Is that not the situation in a nutshell?

Mr. YOUNG. I do not think the Republican Party platform advocated 90 percent support prices. I think the Republican Party platform itself was very clearly in favor of flexible supports.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Republican Party platform of 1952 advocated 100 percent support prices.

Mr. YOUNG. No. I think the platform itself did not, but President Eisenhower himself came out in favor of such supports.

Mr. EASTLAND. Why did he do that? Was it not because he realized that in 1948 the farmers did not trust the Republican Party? He sought to alleviate that mistrust by stating that he was in favor of 100 percent of parity price supports. Is that not true?

Mr. YOUNG. President Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson were conscious of the farmer's interests when they both spoke at Kasson, Minn.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota if it is not a fact that if controls had been placed on acreage planted to wheat and corn

in 1952, we would have prevented, to a great extent, the beginning of the huge surplus. So it was failure on the part of the administrators of the farm program to exercise the authority they had under the act that permitted the beginning of the accumulation of the surplus. Is that not true?

Mr. YOUNG. I think that is absolutely correct. The controls had to be set the year before. Secretary Brannan made a serious mistake in not calling for wheat quotas in 1952.

Mr. THYE. If he had applied the controls in 1952, they would have been applicable in 1953. In 1953 there were not in effect controls over some of the other farm acreage that there were on wheat acreage, which affected the 1954 crop.

But those were the factors which commenced to bring about the accumulation of the surpluses. We had an abundant crop last year, and also the previous year; and, of course, those abundant crops were factors which led to the loading up of our storage warehouses and the bringing into existence of the present surplus.

Where I differ today with the Secretary of Agriculture—and I differ with the administration and I differ with those who advocate knocking down the supports at this time—is that although we have demonstrated our ability to control farm production, we have not demonstrated our ability to deal with the accumulated surpluses. It stands to reason that if we have warehouses full of corn, wheat, cotton—and they were put there under a 90-percent support program—if we decrease the support to 75 percent, it not only will affect the amount of grain produced in the crop year when the 75-percent support is in effect—and the same can be said of any other reduction in the supports—but it will also affect the price of the commodities in storage. The effect would be exactly the same as if the price of the inventories of corn, wheat, and cotton had been decreased to the same extent that we decrease the support program.

So when we finish, we shall have decreased the entire farm income of the Nation to the same extent that we have decreased the supports; and, in that event, the farm economy will be further out of balance than it is at the present time.

That demonstrates the fallacy of trying to impose lower supports before we have demonstrated our ability either to dispose of the accumulated surpluses or to reduce the acreage to a point where we no longer accumulate surpluses such as the ones we have accumulated in the past 2 years.

One who does not recognize the danger signals in regard to the situation in which the farmer today finds himself, simply does not recognize the facts, because the figures to which I have referred are not taken out of the air, but are taken from the office of the statistician of the Department of Agriculture.

Let me read:

Farm mortgage debt in 1945, which was the lowest in the period from 1914 to the present time, was $4,760,000,000, but has risen every year since that time, until today it stands at an estimated $7,800,000,000, an increase of 63 percent in 8 years.

Mr. President, anyone who accuses the farmer of driving Cadillacs, or accuses the farmer of trying to live in the luxury of the millionaire class, simply is not familiar with the facts, because when we examine the figures taken from the official records, we find that farm-mortgage indebtedness—the indebtedness on the farmers' real estate—has increased by 63 percent in 8 years. So we had better start trying to plan a program which will bolster the prices the farmers receive, and will strengthen the farm economy, instead of doing just the opposite.

The fact is that when a farmer goes to town, to buy a tractor or a ton of fertilizer or ton of feed for his poultry or his dairy cows or his hogs, he has to buy on the Korean war inflationary price levels. Today a tractor costs twice as much as it did in 1947. Someone may challenge that statement, but the exact figure comes so close to that, that one would have to sharpen his pencil and figure in very small fractions before he would arrive at a smaller figure; and, even so, it would come very close to the figure I have just stated. It should be remembered that in 1947 pork was selling for $28 a hundred, and beef was selling for around $34 or $38 a hundred, and some of the really choice, prime steers probably were bringing close to $40 a hundred. At that time a farmer could purchase a tractor for approximately $1,800, whereas today the same tractor cannot be purchased for less than approximately $3,000. The same is true of the price of combines.

Such price increases constitute some of the factors which are causing the increase in farm indebtedness. The farmer has not fully realized that he has been going in the red, because for so many years he had been on a par with many of the other segments of cur economy. Therefore, when he did start sliding down, he had not only credit, but a little reserve on deposit, or a Federal Government bond or two which he could use. So he kept going.

But when we examine the statistics, and see that farm indebtedness has increased 63 percent in 8 years, we realize that we had better recognize that danger signal and start doing something about that situation. The short-term indebtedness likewise has more than doubled.

These are factors which, if not generally recognized now, certainly will be recognized in several years. Mr. President, let no one think they will not be.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the hearings of the Appropriations Committee the Senator from Minnesota made an excellent argument in regard to the need for greater appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration. He pointed out that whereas many years ago the farmer's electricity bill amounted to only a few dollars a month, today his electricity bill is much higher, because today he has to use a great deal of electrical equipment. Is not that about what the Senator from Minnesota stated when he appeared before the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. A moment ago the Senator from Minnesota referred to the great increase in the cost of tractors and other articles which the farmer must purchase. As the Senator from Minnesota stated when he appeared before the Appropriations Committee, the greatly increased use of electrical equipment by the farmer has resulted in a great increase in the size of the farmer's electricity bills, and that means a much greater load on the transmission lines. In fact, the transmission lines have become overloaded; and, as a result, it has been necessary to rebuild the transmission lines or to build new ones in order to make it possible for the greatly increased electrical load to be carried.

Is not that what the Senator from Minnesota stated to the Appropriations Committee when he appeared before it in connection with his request for increased appropriations for the REA?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, some years ago the farmer's electricity bill was rather small, but today it is much larger. In fact, the load on the transmission lines has increased so greatly that the lines are inadequate for the present load, and that is why the REA requires more funds.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from South Carolina is correct, Mr. President. I said that in view of the fact that today the farmer must get along with less hired help, because wages are very high, and constitute a large factor in the farmer's total costs, he is trying to make electric power serve him in connection with doing his daily chores. In that connection he uses milking machines; pumping machines, to pump water; electric motors to elevate grain, straw, and hay; and other electrical equipment to do a great many of the chores which are part of the daily operations of the farmer. So today he is using electrical equipment to do much of that chore work, in order to avoid using manpower. The result is to increase to a great extent the amount of electricity the farmer uses. The existing transmission lines can carry only a certain number of kilowatts and when the capacity of the lines is exceeded, the farm REA unit has to be rebuilt. We recognize that the load on the farm REA lines has doubled, and therefore a much greater capacity is needed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I also wish to say——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield further to the Senator from Minnesota, in order that he in turn may yield further to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I also wish to say that every piece of steel or iron going into electrical equipment also costs much more today.

Mr. THYE. There is no question of that. Everything the farmer buys has

increased greatly in price. It would simply shock a person to look over the old records—those of 10 years ago—and then compare the prices of those days with 1954 prices.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from Minnesota, and I also thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for yielding this much time to me. I am so much interested in the problem with which we are faced, that it is difficult to resist the urge to express a thought or two in regard to this problem, in the time in which the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is making his speech, or to refrain from answering questions when we are discussing the economic problems of the farmers.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the Senator's comments are greatly appreciated. In fact, I think the Senator from Minnesota and I are worrying about the same thing. We feel very strongly that any decrease in support prices at this time would be very disastrous.

I wonder how many in the Senate realize that only a little more than 2 years ago—on February 29, 1952—the then Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the Senate Agriculture Committee to outline the Government's program to increase production of cotton, corn, wheat, and other commodities. We were at war 2 years ago, and there was grave concern on the part of many Members of Congress lest this war might spread into an all-out world war III conflict. Our supplies of these three important commodities on hand at that time were lower than most Government officials charged with the security of this Nation would like them to be.

The actual carryover of wheat on July 1, 1952, was 256 million bushels. On August 1, 1952, the cotton carryover was only 2,789,000 bales; on October 1, 1952, the carryover of corn was 487 million bushels; while the carryover of food fats and oils, on October 1, 1952, was 857 million pounds. Obviously our food and fiber supply was insufficient to meet our security needs at that time.

The goal set for corn production only 2 years ago in 1952 was 115 percent of the production of the previous year, 1951. The production goal for cotton was 105 percent of the previous year; and the production goal for wheat was 118 percent of the previous year.

We were asking farmers at that time—only 2 years ago—to increase the production of barley, rye, flaxseed, and many other commodities.

We must bear in mind that for 9 years—1941 through 1949—the Government of the United States divided our short supplies of food and fiber with the rest of the world through limitations imposed by export licenses. Yes; we even had a provision written into the appropriation bill for fiscal year 1948 prohibiting the export of any wheat when the expected carryover on July 1 was below 150 million bushels.

Those figures were obtained from the Library of Congress.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that they also prohibited the export of cotton?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. And Brazilians were selling their cotton at 60 cents a pound, when across the border in New Mexico they had to sell the cotton for 45 cents a pound under price control.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Those figures I am sure of, but they prohibited the export of cotton.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

We held our price of cotton down and we held our price of wheat down.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a further fact that cotton is under acreage control now?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. So I do not understand what the argument is about. They asked the people to vote for acreage control, and then they come around and take away what little they have.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator from North Dakota in what he is saying.

Mr. YOUNG. For its great patriotic part in meeting our Government needs during the World War II and the Korean war, industry was given substantial guaranties. It cost the Government of the United States $45 billion to pay industry for its conversion to peacetime economy. Many industries, even yet, are producing war commodities at handsome profits.

Farmers—the producers of the important basic farm commodities—only a little more than a year after meeting the last war production goals, are now being "kicked in the teeth" for having so patriotically complied with the Government's requests for more production.

At the time the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the Senate Agriculture Committee on February 29, 1952, I expressed concern about the penalty farmers eventually would have to pay for increasing their production. I felt then that price depressing surpluses would be created and that the farmers would pay a bitter price after having complied with these Government requests. How true that prediction has been.

I would like to read a part of a discussion between Secretary Brannan and myself which appears on page 10 of the Senate Agriculture hearings of 1952 entitled: "Farm Price Supports and Production Goals." The hearing reads in part as follows—this was only 2 years ago:

Senator YOUNG. I think from the farmer's own personal viewpoint he would be far better off now to cut down in production, because this surplus he is creating is holding the prices down to support levels. If support levels drop more the prices are bound to drop. It could not be otherwise. He is digging his own grave by increasing his production.

That is what I told Secretary Brannan in February 1952.

Secretary BRANNAN. Well, Senator, I do not think anybody could argue with you about that, except I hope that the farmers do not curtail their production.

Senator YOUNG. I do not think they will, but I feel it is the duty of Congress to see that some reasonable guaranty is given the farmers if they meet these production goals, and that they will not, as a result, find themselves in a difficult financial situation and probably bankruptcy.

Secretary BRANNAN. I agree with that, too, Senator.

Quite naturally, to meet these years and years of Government urging of greater production to meet war needs, wheat, cotton, corn, and other farm producers greatly expanded their production facilities. Producers of these basic farm commodities, I think, had reason to believe that their Secretary of Agriculture would now look upon their problems with an understanding heart. The farmers thought they would be able to look to their Secretary of Agriculture as one to defend their cause and to explain their many problems to the rest of the Nation.

Far too often today the farm picture has been greatly distorted and misrepresented by the Department of Agriculture. This is particularly true with respect to our present agriculture surpluses and the cause of their accumulation. Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson and Under Secretary True D. Morse have not, in my opinion, accurately presented the facts to this Nation with respect to our present surpluses and the reasons for their accumulation.

Most agricultural authorities throughout this Nation completely disagree with their oft-repeated charges that we would not have had these surpluses if flexible support prices had been in effect. The history of agriculture production just will not support their case. Under present conditions, when there are but few remaining profitable commodities that farmers can switch their production to, flexible supports would have little effect in bringing production in line with demand. The producers of basic commodities are ready and willing to curtail their production. There is an effective way to do it under our present farm price support machinery.

This is the first year, 1954, since World War II that the Government of the United States has even asked farmers to decrease their wheat and cotton production through the imposition of quotas. Farmers approved these quotas by an unprecedented majority last year.

I think the approval was by a surprising majority this year, in view of the fact that farmers had no definite knowledge of what support level they could expect. Also wheat farmers were voting to sustain a further cut of 13 percent in wheat acreage for crop year 1955—or a total cut of 34 percent over a 2-year period. On top of that they faced certain restrictions in regard to diverted acres. In view of all that I am surprised that the wheat farmers of this Nation gave such a favorable vote as they did on the question of wheat quotas for next year.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not so convinced that in the farmer's mind, who, after all, is an American sitting at home, who only hears portions of what goes on in Congress in listening to agricultural programs, he was sure he knew

what he was voting for. The farmer in the Wheat Belt, where wheat is the principal crop, knew he was voting to cut his acreage with the understanding that the Government would give 90 percent of parity. I know in Virginia and South Carolina the wheat farmer only gets 75 percent. He does not expect any more. But the cotton farmer in South Carolina expects 90 percent, and the wheat farmer in North Dakota and South Dakota expects 90 percent. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. When they voted to cut their acreage they expected fair play on the part of the agriculture administration; they expected 90 percent of parity, in my judgment. I would not put words into the Senator's mouth. He is making a great speech and a great record.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. But I believe when the cotton farmers voted to cut their acreage they expected 90 percent, and I believe the Dakota farmers expected 90 percent when they voted to cut their wheat acreage, and likewise the farmers of Minnesota, the State from which the distinguished Senator [Mr. THYE] comes.

May I add that I did not thank him for his address when he made it, but I want to thank him for it now.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for paying me that compliment.

Mr. MAYBANK. They expected 90 percent when they voted to cut the acreage.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from North Dakota is making a great contribution to agriculture in his address and in his efforts in behalf of agriculture which he has so ably carried forward in all the years I have had acquaintance with him.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much.

It was very surprising to me that the wheat farmers voted by more than a 70-percent majority for quotas when they did not have too much of a choice. Most of them felt that the support level probably would only be 75 percent of parity. If they got 75 percent, which is a low support level, then they were restricted in what they could plant on their diverted acres.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I hold in my hand the livestock selling agency report of the Central Livestock Association, Inc. It is a market letter dated August 3. It reads:

> Cows, weak to 50 cents lower. Good young cows, $12 to $13.50. Good weighty cows, $11 to $12. Fair and medium, $10 to $10.50. Canners and cutters, $8 to $9.50. Defective and thin, $2 to $7.

Mr. YOUNG. Those prices are exceedingly low. With a drought from coast to coast and from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, and with the probability that our corn crop will be short, what would happen now if we had only a normal carryover? We would have zooming prices on corn. Of course, nothing could be more disastrous to the interests of the cattlemen than high corn prices.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The only reason I read those figures into the RECORD was to lay the foundation for this thought: Suppose corn had sold at depressed prices last year. It would have, if we had not had 90 percent on our seal-up program. The cattle raiser would have put his animal in the feed lot. Instead of selling the animal at a thousand-pound weight, he would have fed it to about a 1,400 or 1,500 pound weight. He would have put more beef on the market, and thus would have depressed prices far below the prices I have just read.

Some people seem to think that feed prices must be kept so low that the producer of the feed will have to sell it to the livestock feeder in order to get rid of it.

The result would be, however, that prices in the livestock industry would be depressed further, with the result that the price of livestock would be lowered, because there would be an increase in the weight on the hoof so to speak, and there would be more meat produced when an animal was slaughtered.

I have not been able to follow the thinking of some people who have so violently criticized the seal-up of corn and wheat, because we have had such favorable growing weather that we produced a great deal more than we had anticipated. I believe the program has saved the livestock industry, instead of injuring it, as some people contend.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator very much for his contribution. Later I shall point out that Under Secretary Morse feels that the 90-percent support program on corn has had a wholesome effect on hog prices, although Secretary Benson disagrees. I believe the average farmer in States like Iowa realizes that a stabilized price on corn means a stabilized price on livestock. That is the reason why farmers in Iowa—as well as in every other poll that I have seen—have voted 2 to 1 for a continuance of the 90-percent-price-support program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator agree with me that stabilized prices are the finest thing for any businessman and the finest thing for a farmer?

Mr. YOUNG. That is certainly true.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. With stabilized prices it is possible to make plans for the future, and it is possible to do a much better job. It is possible to have much greater satisfaction in business. I know that is true of businessmen.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes. Does the Senator not agree with me that most businessmen in our area have come to realize the value of 90 percent supports for farm commodities?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. Is it not true that when agriculture is stabilized, we also have stabilized business conditions in the agricultural regions?

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator certainly is correct. I appreciate his comments very much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I agree also with our friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] in the observation he made a moment ago, that stabilized prices for grain crops stabilize livestock prices, too. In other words, they go together.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If grain prices go up and down violently, livestock prices will go up and down violently. Especially is that true of pork and pork products.

Mr. YOUNG. I wish more Members of Congress would come to realize that. The Senator from Colorado is well stating what most farmers know to be true. The Senator from Colorado was a farmer himself for many years. He was a good grain buyer. I believe he would still make a good grain buyer. The Senator from Minnesota has been a farmer all his life. We are having a great deal of trouble trying to persuade some of the lawyers in the Senate, as well as certain other Members who have little knowledge of these problems, to agree with us.

Wheat and cotton quotas are getting results. In spite of a very favorable year for wheat production, the estimated production as of July 1 is 180,215,000 bushels below the production of a year ago. Recent extremely high temperatures and lack of rainfall in the northern producing area undoubtedly will reduce this estimate even further.

The cut in acreage this year for wheat was 21 percent. This will result in an actual reduction in wheat supplies over a year ago of approximately 15 percent. That indicated that wheat quotas can be successful in reducing supplies. The Department of Agriculture has asked the wheat producers to cut their acreage another 13 percent next year. Wheat farmers will comply.

The 21 percent reduction in wheat acreage for the present year, plus the 13 percent required for next year, will mean a loss of approximately one-third of the wheat farmers' income through acreage reduction. On top of this, the Benson plan proposes that wheat supports be dropped from 90 to 75 percent of parity, which would mean another loss of about 38 cents a bushel.

Secretary Benson also proposes to switch over from our present formula for determining parity to the so-called modernized parity formula. This would mean another 34 percent drop in wheat-support prices. Thus, a wheat farmer loses on the average of approximately 34 percent of his income through acreage reduction, and at the end of the proposed transitional period another 30 percent in support prices through reduction in support levels and a switch over to the so-called modernized parity formula.

This at a time when farm-operating costs remain near an all-time high. There are few, if any, business ventures that could stand a similar loss in income and survive.

Mr. President, this is not what we proposed to farmers 2 years ago during the election. I challenge anyone in the Senate of the United States to point out a single speech by President Eisenhower

during his campaign 2 years ago in the Midwest, or anywhere else, where he ever mentioned flexible price supports. I have yet to find one speech in which the Republican Party proposed flexible supports.

What I have said about the proposed new wheat price support program can be applied to many other farm commodity producers. This is the kind of sound economics that we heard so much about during the late twenties and early thirties. It is the kind of sound economics that can lead us into another economic tailspin.

Our present price-support program can be made to work. I fear, however, that unless the Department of Agriculture soon takes a more friendly view and a more aggressive attitude in the disposal of surpluses, there is grave danger the whole program will collapse. This is undoubtedly what many people are hoping for. If this farm program is destroyed it will be a sad day for America.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am interested in the observation the Senator makes about the political campaign of 1952. No doubt the Senator recalls very well the campaign of 1948, when the candidate on the Republican ticket was a little gunshy about coming out for parity and for a stabilized agriculture and things that would bring about a stabilized agriculture. As a result, there was great uneasiness all through the farm belt. As a result of his failure to adopt a reasonable and sensible and necessary farm program in 1948, I believe, Candidate Dewey lost the election.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator from Colorado would agree with me that the issue in the 1948 election was price supports, and not so much the storage issue.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I might add to what the Senator from Colorado just said that it must be remembered that President Truman campaigned for flexible supports in the fall of 1948. President Truman criticized the Republican Party on the matter of farm storage, but on price supports Mr. Truman very vigorously supported flexible price supports.

Mr. YOUNG. President Truman did not say too much about price supports during the campaign, but his Secretary of Agriculture was very active and very effective in his denunciation of the Aiken Act, which the Senator from Vermont and I supported.

Mr. AIKEN. The Democratic platform very strongly supported flexible supports in 1948.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. As I pointed out earlier——

Mr. AIKEN. Secretary Brannan started campaigning against the 1948 act after election when, much to his and everybody's else's surprise, he found that his party was to stay in power longer.

Mr. YOUNG. That is not correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado rose.

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. AIKEN. Let us not put the Senator from Colorado on the spot. We would not want to cost him the election in Colorado this fall.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Colorado knows the people out there, and the people know the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think anything we could say would cost him the election.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I was campaigning in Colorado in 1948, and I was very close to the farm vote. Secretary Brannan came out to Colorado, and he made 4 or 5 speeches. He drew vast audiences of farmers. Secretary Brannan is not a great orator, as all of us know, but he had those farmers sitting on the edge of their seats listening to every word. I know that they were very uneasy.

I used that word "uneasy" one time during that campaign. When I returned to Denver, there was a whole trainload of reporters on Dewey's train. The reporters interviewed me and asked me about the Farm Belt. I told them the farmers were very uneasy about the conversation between Mr. Stassen and Mr. Dewey up in New York, and they were very anxious to find out for certain what Candidate Dewey's position was. Their uneasiness indicated to me that they were going to vote the Democratic ticket.

Colorado voters, who had not supported Candidate Roosevelt in 1944 and in 1940, but had voted Republican, reversed themselves on the farm issue only and supported President Truman.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Colorado is absolutely correct.

Would the Senator from Vermont be interested in my reply?

I think almost every Senator living in the Midwest or Northwest knows what the campaign issue was in 1948. It was the farm price-support program. The Republican Party lost the election in the farming areas of California, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, Ohio, and we certainly did not have a storage problem in the farming area of California. I do not think there was any storage problem in the farming area of Wisconsin. I think price supports were the big issue. I say that respectfully to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Although the Republican and Democratic platforms both endorsed flexible supports in the fall of 1948, nevertheless there was an issue between the two platforms in the fall of 1952, when the Democratic platform read:

> We will continue to protect the producers of basic agricultural commodities under the terms of a mandatory price-support program at not less than 90 percent of parity.

The Republican platform said:

> We favor a farm program aimed at full parity prices for all farm products in the market place.

Then it goes on:

> Our program includes commodity loans on nonperishable products, "on-the-farm" storage, sufficient farm credit, and voluntary self-supporting crop insurance. Where Government action on perishable commodities is desirable, we recommend locally controlled marketing agreements and other voluntary methods.
>
> Our program should include commodity loans on all nonperishable products supported at the level necessary to maintain a balanced production.

The Democratic platform came out flatly for 90 percent. The Republican platform came out for supports at a level necessary to support balanced production. So we did have a clear-cut difference between the two platforms in 1952. That was the first time that we had had that difference.

In 1948, the Senator may recall, it was the action of 2 Republican Members of Congress who were vigorously proposing the taxing of farm cooperatives and also the misstatement regarding farm storage which the Republican management never took the pains to refute and which Secretary Brannan and President Truman and other high-ranking members of the party spread through the Midwest, which did not do us any good.

I was in Illinois after the election, and one farmer told me he sold 1,500 bags of beans for $1.65 less than the market price because he took as gospel what Candidate Truman and Secretary Brannan said, that he could not get a loan on those beans because there was no storage for them.

Mr. YOUNG. I do not suppose one farmer in a million in the Midwest ever knew anything about what was in the Republican or Democratic platforms. They did know what Secretary Brannan was advocating, as they now know what Secretary Benson is advocating. Unfortunately, the farmer attaches much more importance to what Secretary Benson says about agriculture now than to the statements of the President of the United States. That was true in the opposite way during the Truman administration. President Truman, as I recall, was never for 100 percent support. At least no message to Congress ever indicated he was. Secretary Brannan worked for 100 percent supports all over, and he got the farm vote in 1948. The farmers look to the Secretary of Agriculture as spokesman for the administration on farm matters.

Mr. AIKEN. Why did he not get the vote in 1952, when the Democratic platform strongly endorsed 90 percent?

Mr. YOUNG. Not one farmer in a million ever sees a platform, and cares less about it.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Democratic Party has always voted for 90 percent parity.

Mr. YOUNG. It is what the candidate for President himself has to say or what the Secretary of Agriculture has to say.

Mr. MAYBANK. The present President said he was for 100 percent. Am I wrong?

Mr. YOUNG. No; I never interpreted President Eisenhower's position to be for 100 percent price supports.

Mr. MAYBANK. What did the Senator interpret him as saying?

Mr. YOUNG. As being for 90 percent.

Mr. MAYBANK. But he said the farmer should share the same as any-

body else. He said that in Memphis, Tenn., as I recall.

Mr. YOUNG. I think he was sincere——

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, I never question the sincerity of the President. He thought the farmer was entitled to 90 percent and should be treated the same as anyone else.

Mr. THYE. I honestly believe that President Eisenhower desires to bring about 100 percent of parity for agriculture. I believe he is sweating it out down at the White House right now.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. THYE. I believe he is willing to do everything he can. There are those who have had strong convictions, who have convinced themselves as well as many of their associates, that all we have to do is get the price support down low enough to force a few fellows out of business—they are referred to as the borderline cases who should be out of business—and the rest of the farmers will prosper, for after 1 or 2 bad years economically they would be back where the market would give them 100 percent.

I believe the President is just as honest and just as sure as he can be that the farm leaders who are advocating this flexible price support program are right, and he is trusting that they are right. He may be misled.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with what the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has said. I have never even intimated anything against the President of the United States. The President believes in 90 percent of parity, and believes the farmers should be treated the same as anybody else. In the press conference today he said the world should be treated fairly and justly. I have never questioned that.

But, as the Senator has said, there are certain people—I need not name names, for the Senator knows them down at the White House—who are very sincere in their beliefs, but who are mistaken, in my judgment.

I say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] that we have been here a long time. I say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]—whose former colleague, Harold Stassen, was Governor of a State at the time I was Governor of a State—that those people do not know the farm problems. I do not think the Senator from Minnesota will differ with me on that point. I know the Senator from North Dakota will not. The people who want this to happen are sincere, but it is not going to happen.

Mr. YOUNG. I say to my friend the Senator from South Carolina that if the politicians and officials in Washington, D. C. are really interested in knowing what the farmers are thinking, all they have to do is to read the various polls which have been conducted by the leading farm publications of Iowa and other States. Then they can tell pretty well what the farmers are thinking. They would be much better advised to study some of those polls, instead of listening to a few politicians.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The farmer does more thinking than do city folks, who are continually going to the moving picture theaters or somewhere else. The farmer stays at home and thinks and thinks—until election day.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am a strong believer that through one means or another the Federal Government must act to maintain a fair price for dairy commodities. This great industry would be bankrupt if the present program were abandoned without a good substitute program to take its place—one that would make certain prices of dairy commodities would be maintained at or near 90 percent of parity. Much more can be done to dispose of our dairy surpluses. With the wide authority in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of surplus commodities, it is unbelievable to me that much, if not all, of our present dairy surplus could not be disposed of both at home and abroad.

If the present price-support program for dairy commodities is unworkable, then the Department of Agriculture should give immediate consideration to other proposals and especially those recommended by the National Milk Producers Federation. If necessary, support prices, through production payments, should be given a trial.

For more than a year and a half now, Mr. President, I have read almost daily press stories about speeches delivered by either Secretary Ezra Taft Benson or Under Secretary True D. Morse. The theme has always been the same—a denunciation of our present price-support program. There have been some glaring inconsistencies in these speeches which may have gone unnoticed by many people, but certainly not by farmers.

For example, in the April 1953 issue of the Farm Journal in one of the first of Secretary Benson's many prepared articles, he had this to say:

> It has become so profitable to turn corn over to the Government that hog farmers can't afford to feed their own hogs. Hog numbers have further declined, and farrowing is off this spring, at the very time corn supplies are at a near record. It shows how fixed-support prices can gum things up.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I wish to comment on that quotation in the statement of Under Secretary True Morse.

Mr. YOUNG. This was a statement by Secretary Benson, carried in the Farm Journal for April 1953.

Mr. THYE. I amend my remarks to refer to the honorable Secretary of Agriculture.

It was the extremely low pork price in 1951 and 1952 which actually drove many a farmer out of the business of producing pork, because the farmers had been so adversely affected financially that they gave up in discouragement and sold out everything in their hog lots. I could take the Secretary or anybody else to farm after farm, and show him hog lots which are absolutely empty and were empty last year, because of the fact that the farmers were hurt in previous years. That is why there was a reduction.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and I sat across the table from Secretary Brannan when pork was down to less than 80 percent of parity—if my memory serves me correctly, it was down to 79 percent—and we said:

> What are you going to do to stabilize the pork prices?

The Secretary shrugged his shoulders and said:

> You denied me the type of farm program which would have enabled me to deal with it.

I called his attention to the section 32 funds and said, "You may use those funds to buy some surpluses."

Finally, the Secretary, after many, many weeks of having us ask him time after time what he was going to do about it, went into the market and bought some pork. However, if my memory serves me correctly, it was the 13th of May before he did so. All the pig crop the farmers had raised from the fall of the previous year had gone to market, and the farmer did not get any benefit from the income which the Secretary brought about by buying pork products in the month of May 1952.

Those are some of the factors which drove the farmers out of the pig business and brought about a shortage of pigs in this calendar year, for which housewives have paid dearly. In the fall of 1953 they paid dearly, because there were not enough pigs produced, since in the year 1952 we had foolishly permitted pork prices to reach the ruinously low level which drove many farmers out of business.

Mr. YOUNG. I recall very vividly the conversation the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] held with the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan.

By this statement I think Secretary Benson makes it clear that high support prices for corn have affected the number of hogs produced.

A few months later at Galveston, Tex., on September 22, 1953, Under Secretary Morse, speaking before the grain dealers national convention, takes an almost completely opposite position from Secretary Benson's article in the Farm Journal. I quote from Under Secretary Morse's speech:

> One of the unusual developments of the past year was the failure of farmers to respond to the very profitable corn-hog ratio—

As Senators will recall, Secretary Benson said there was an unfavorable corn-hog ratio.

> One of the unusual developments of the past year was the failure of farmers to respond to the very profitable corn-hog ratio, by increasing production. It raised the question of whether it has become too easy merely to raise corn to sell to the Government—rather than to go to the trouble of feeding hogs even if more profits are realized.

Here we have Secretary Benson saying it was not profitable to feed hogs, and Under Secretary Morse claiming it was

profitable to feed hogs the past year—previous to his September speech. In this case the record bears out the contention of Under Secretary Morse. There has been a favorable corn-hog ratio ever since Secretary Benson took office. Most of the credit for this favorable corn-hog ratio should be given to the 90-percent-price-support program for corn. Hog producers realize this, and that is why in almost every poll that is taken of corn-hog farmers there is an unusually strong sentiment in favor of continued high price supports for basic farm commodities.

Let us further examine the cross purposes which, apparently, the Secretary and Under Secretary are working at. Secretary Benson, in his television appearance with Vice President NIXON on Monday, June 28, 1954, said, and I quote:

> Take hogs, for example. Two years ago hog prices declined sharply. There was some demand at that time that the Government step in and support hog prices. But this was not done. So what happened? Very promptly farmers reduced hog numbers, and just as promptly hog prices started moving up. Today hogs are selling at well above parity and the Government did not have a thing to do with it, except the Government stayed out of the hog business. The farmers did their own adjusting.

You will note from this statement by Secretary Benson that he says the Government did not have a thing to do with the better prices for hogs during the past year or more.

Under Secretary Morse again takes an almost completely opposite position. In his speech before the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association in Chicago, Ill., on February 13, 1954, he completely contradicts Secretary Benson's statement. I wish to quote a part of his speech, and I do not think it is out of context:

> Corn is not a cash crop and should not be dealt with as such. It is sold primarily as meat, milk, and eggs. Only about 25 percent is sold in commercial trade.
>
> About one-half of the corn that is fed is sold as pork. Hog prices have no price supports, yet the principal feed grain for hogs has carried a high, rigid price support. It is this situation that has encouraged the present surplus of corn—while housewives are paying over 119 percent of parity equivalent for bacon, ham, and other pork products.

Here the Under Secretary bemoans the fact that hog producers were receiving 119 percent of parity for their bacon, ham, and pork products and blames it all on the 90-percent-price-support program. Of course he is right. I do not think, however, that he should be critical of farmers receiving 119 percent of parity for their bacon, ham, and pork products after the very low prices they had to sell them for just a short while before.

If it had not been for the 90-percent-price-support program, we would have had a great surplus and depressed prices for hogs last year, at the very time we witnessed heavy marketings of cattle at bankrupt prices. Bad as the situation was with respect to cattle prices, it would have been far worse if corn prices had been lowered in 1952, and farmers had continued to produce hogs in surplus.

What is true of the relationship between corn and hog prices is also true of the relationship between the prices of corn and other feed grains, dairy products, poultry, and other commodities. In the long run cheap feed grain prices would react against the very people they would seem to benefit, for, traditionally, low feed prices have always been eventually reflected in low prices for meat and dairy products.

Would any cattle producer seriously contend that an abundance of "two-bit" corn over a prolonged period of time would not drag down the prices of, not only beef, but other meat products? I think not. Ninety percent price supports for corn have resulted in normal supplies at reasonable prices. It has taken at least a part of the gamble out of the cattle-feeding business. It has taken a part of the wild fluctuations out of fed cattle prices. Most cattle producers have come to realize this in recent years. They recognize that cheap, bankrupt feed prices in the long run will do them no good. They recognize that fair prices to the producers of the feed grains, despite the contentions of the present top officials in the Department of Agriculture, are not in the best long-range interests of the cattle producers.

It is for this reason that I am supporting the provision in S. 478 which would provide mandatory price supports for oats, rye, barley, soybeans, and grain sorghums on a feed-ratio basis for corn. This is substantially the same method by which the support levels for these feed grains have been set in recent years. It becomes more necessary to make these support levels mandatory because of the constant and persistent fear on the part of the producers that the present Secretary of Agriculture plans to eliminate the price-support program for feed grains.

This amendment, I think, is in line with President Eisenhower's views. I quote some very plain words from his speech in Kasson, Minn., on September 6, 1952:

> As provided in the Republican platform, the nonperishable crops so important to the diversified farmer—crops such as oats, barley, rye, and soybeans—should be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops.

Before moving on to other phases of this price-support legislation, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to just one more of the many glaring inconsistencies in the positions of the Secretary and Under Secretary of Agriculture.

It is claimed, and I think rightfully so, that we have a sizable surplus of dairy commodities on hand. Production should be decreased. Is this the advice that the Department of Agriculture has been giving to farmers? No, I think not.

In Under Secretary True D. Morse's speech at the Grain and Feed Dealers Convention at Galveston in September of 1953, he had this to say:

> Dairying again looks more attractive as compared with beef cattle. More farmers will apparently be seeking the stability and security of income which milk cows produce under good management. New farmers and those who have not established a financial position should be encouraged to consider dairying. It is an enterprise especially adapted to family-operated farms.

Mr. President, I would interpret this speech by Under Secretary Morse to mean that he thought more farmers should go into the dairy business and to increase dairy production. This was only last fall. Now, however, he is just as loud as many others in condemning our present surplus of dairy commodities.

How can farmers or Members of Congress look to the Department of Agriculture for good advice when there are such glaring inconsistencies in their all too many speeches?

Mr. President, it has not been pleasant for me to condemn the present officials of the Department of Agriculture. What else can I do, may I ask? Day after day, and month after month, they continue to condemn the price-support programs I have fought so hard for these many years.

Far more important is the ill-advised program they are sponsoring, which, in my opinion, would bankrupt our agricultural economy, segment by segment. Intentionally or otherwise, by their various speeches and articles, they have tended to set one farm producer against another, and the consumers against the farmers. I have never known a time when there was a greater lack of accurate information regarding agriculture than at the present time. The farmers have looked in vain to their Department of Agriculture to set the public straight on the many unfortunate articles carried all over the United States, and designed purposely to put agriculture in a bad light.

On Friday, July 9, 1954, the Alsop brothers' column, carried in the Washington Post and Times Herald, read:

> The cost of production of wheat is around a dollar a bushel, Benson said. The Government-guaranteed price is $2.21. As long as that's the situation, no wonder all sorts of suitcase and drugstore farmers are planting wheat, and millions of acres are being plowed that ought to be left in grass. This thing is unbalancing our agriculture, and it can't go on.

This, I understand, is a quotation from Secretary Benson.

Gov. Dan Thornton of Colorado, said, at the recent Governors' convention in New York, that wheat was produced in his State for as low as 55 cents a bushel. There may be some isolated cases in an exceptionally good year when wheat could be produced as low as $1 a bushel. Farmers will thoroughly disagree with these careless statements, as will Department of Agriculture economists who have been making cost studies for years.

It has been contended by many that the 90 percent price-support program is the cause of the recent dust-bowl conditions in an area embracing a part of Kansas, Colorado, Texas, and Oklahoma. It is implied that flexible price supports would remedy this situation. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In prolonged periods of abundant rainfall, wheat can probably be produced as cheap or cheaper in this area of low-cost land and wide-open spaces than in almost any area of the United States. When dry cycles return, farmers, in

areas such as this—and there are others further to the north—usually find themselves in serious financial straits. There are many hazards in the production of wheat in most areas of the United States.

Will flexible or lower supports remedy this dust-bowl situation? If the history of the past means anything, they would not. Probably one of the worst dust-bowl conditions the Nation ever experienced occurred in 1934–36. The national average price for wheat for the 2 previous years, 1932 and 1933, was 38 cents and 39 cents a bushel, respectively. Prices had declined steadily from the boom year of 1929.

These greatly lowered prices did not solve the dust-bowl problem then, nor would they now. It must be remembered, too, that during this period of declining wheat prices, the farmers increased their wheat acreage. Indeed, the wheat acreage seeded in 1934, following the extremely low prices in 1932 and 1933, was increased by approximately 2.5 million acres.

Mr. President, the prices received by farmers have steadily declined during the past 5 years. The drop has been very sharp in recent months. This loss in income is having a serious effect on our farm economy. It has greatly reduced farm purchasing power. The loss in purchasing power has adversely affected other segments of our economy, including sizable layoffs of labor in certain areas of the United States.

Have the consumers benefited by this great drop in farm commodity prices? The official records say "No."

The Bureau of Labor Statistics a few days ago announced that the index of food prices, based on the 1947–49 level, had risen to 113.8, as of the middle of June. This means that the cost of food to consumers has risen 13.8 percent since the 1947–49 base period. The present index figure on food costs is only a fraction of a percent below the all-time high reached in 1952. During exactly the same period the index of prices received by farmers for the same food commodities has dropped 8 percent, or to an index figure of 92, as compared to the 1947–49 base period. I know of no better proof that lowering farm prices has not been reflected in lower food costs to consumers.

The great food-consuming public is being taken for a ride by advocates of lower price supports who claim that lower prices in farm commodities will be of benefit to consumers.

Mr. President, this unreasonable spread between what producers receive for their food commodities and what consumers have to pay represents a most serious situation, about which the administration, and particularly the Department of Agriculture, ought to be concerned. It warrants an immediate and thorough investigation by both the Department of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a price-cost study entitled "Farm Prices and the Cost of Food," issued by the House Committee on Agriculture.

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

FARM PRICES AND THE COST OF FOOD

The following charts, tables, and items of information on farm and retail food price trends and related facts have been compiled from official Government sources. They are presented in this manner to aid in giving a clear picture of the extent to which recent farm price declines have and have not been passed on to urban consumers.

FARM AND RETAIL FOOD PRICES, 1946 TO DATE

When war-imposed (OPA) price controls were removed in the fall of 1945, both farm prices and retail food prices advanced rapidly.

Farm prices advanced 29 percent between 1946 and their peak in 1951, 5 years later. The advance in retail food prices was even greater (45 percent) between 1946 and their postwar peak in 1952. Since 1951, peak prices received by farmers have fallen 20 points or almost back to their 1946 level. In contrast, retail food prices now hold within a fraction of their 1952 peak. In June 1954 farm prices declined 4 percent; retail food prices advanced 0.5 percent.

Thus far, almost none of the lower prices received by farmers since 1951 has been passed on to consumers in the form of lower retail food prices.

Further declines in farm prices are expected as more livestock and livestock products come to market and price-support levels are lowered. Consumers can expect little benefit, however, from these lower farm prices unless recent tendencies to increase marketing and processing charges are curbed.

Prices received by farmers and retail food prices, 1946 to date

[1947–49=100]

Date	Prices received by farmers [1]	Retail food prices
1946	86.9	79.0
1947	102.2	95.9
1948	105.9	104.1
1949	92.5	100.0
1950	95.1	101.2
1951	112.2	112.6
1952	107.0	114.6
1953	95.9	112.8
1954—January	96.2	113.1
February	95.9	112.6
March	95.1	112.1
April	95.5	112.4
May	95.9	113.3
June	92.0	113.8

[1] The base used for computing farmers' prices is customarily 1910–14. A conversion to 1947–49 was made here to permit comparison with retail food price index which is based upon 1947–49.

Sources: Economic Indicators and Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

FARM PRICES OF WHEAT AND RETAIL PRICE OF CEREALS AND BAKERY PRODUCTS

The city housewife today is paying the highest prices on record for bakery products and cereals, yet farm prices for wheat are down to 1949 levels again.

Following the removal of price controls in the fall of 1945, prices received by farmers for wheat moved upward to a peak in 1947. Retail prices of cereals and bakery products also increased rapidly from 1946 to 1948. Farm prices for wheat declined sharply as a result of good harvests and a drop in exports in 1948 and 1949 and then recovered somewhat in 1951 and 1952 as a result of increased demands associated with the Korean war. Since 1952 the farm price of wheat has dropped 10 percent and would have dropped further except for existing price supports.

In contrast to the ups and downs of the farm price of wheat, the retail price of cereals and bakery products has moved only in one direction since World War II—up.

In 1953, while farm prices were declining 6 percent, retail prices of cereals and bakery products increased 2 percent. Further increases in retail prices have occurred in 1954 although farm prices of wheat are now at their lowest levels for several years. In view of this record it is difficult to see how urban consumers expect to benefit from lower support prices on wheat.

In January 1948 the farm price of wheat reached a peak of $2.81 a bushel and the average price of a 1-pound loaf of bread was 13.8 cents. Today the farm price of wheat has dropped to $1.91 a bushel yet the average price of a 1-pound loaf of bread has increased to 17 cents. Thus, while the price of wheat declined 32 percent, the price of bread has advanced 23 percent. The farm value of the wheat in a 1-pound loaf of bread is 2.7 cents.

In the last half of 1947 the farm value of the corn in a 12-ounce package of corn flakes was 4.5 cents and the average retail price was 16 cents. In the first 3 months of 1954 the farm value of the corn in this package of corn flakes had dropped to 3 cents, while the average retail price of the corn flakes had jumped to 22 cents.

Similarly in the last half of 1947 the farm value of the oats in a 20-ounce package of rolled oats was 6 cents and the average retail price was 15 cents. Today, 7 years later, the farm value of the oats in the package has dropped to 5 cents but the average retail price has jumped to 18.5 cents.

Average prices received by farmers for wheat, and retail prices of cereals and bakery products, 1946 to date

[1947–49=100]

Date [1]	Average prices received by farmers for wheat	Retail prices of cereals and bakery products
1946	81.3	75.0
1947	109.8	94.0
1948	100.5	103.4
1949	89.7	102.7
1950	91.6	104.5
1951	99.1	114.0
1952	99.1	116.8
1953	93.0	119.1
1954—January	94.9	121.2
February	96.3	121.3
March	97.6	121.2
April	96.3	121.1
May	93.5	121.3
June	89.3	121.3

[1] Average prices are for calendar year for farmers' prices.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics and U. S. Department of Agriculture Statistical Service.

FARM PRICE OF MILK AND RETAIL PRICE OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Both the farm price of milk and butterfat and the retail prices of dairy products reached a peak in 1952. Since then farm prices have dropped 20 points while retail prices dropped 9 points.

Although milk used for manufacturing purposes and butterfat prices were supported at 90 percent of parity in 1953, the farm price of these products averaged 10 percent lower than a year earlier while retail prices were down only 1.7 percent.

Farm prices for milk and butterfat in June 1954 were 10 percent below their 1947–49 average while retail prices of dairy products were 3 percent higher than in the earlier period.

Although most of the drop in the support level for butterfat has been reflected in lower retail prices for butter, marketing margins have widened for cheese.

In the first 3 months of 1951 the retail price of American-processed cheese averaged 58 cents a pound. The farm value of the milk in a pound of cheese averaged 35 cents. In the first 3 months of 1954 the average retail price of American processed cheese had increased to 59 cents a pound

while the farm value of the milk had dropped to 29 cents.

Prices received by farmers for dairy products, and retail dairy product prices, 1946 to date

[1947–49=100]

Date	Dairy product prices received by farmers [1]	Retail dairy products prices
1946	97.4	85.6
1947	99.3	96.7
1948	109.5	106.3
1949	91.6	96.9
1950	90.1	95.9
1951	103.6	107.0
1952	110.2	111.5
1953	99.3	109.6
1954—January	96.0	109.7
February	95.6	109.0
March	94.9	108.0
April	90.1	104.[illegible]
May	90.1	103.5
June	89.7	102.9

[1] The base used for computing farmers' prices is customarily 1910–14. A conversion to 1947–49 was made here to permit comparison with retail prices which are based upon 1947–49.

Sources: Bureau of Labor Statistics Reports and Agricultural Marketing Service USDA.

Farmers who supply milk for the Chicago market received 8 cents a quart and farmers who supply milk for the New York City market received 12 cents a quart in June 1954 for the milk for fluid use which cost urban housewives 25 cents a quart delivered to their doors.

PRICE SPREADS ON OTHER FARM PRODUCTS

A shirt—a $3.95 cotton shirt—contains about 30 cents' worth of cotton. That is what the farmer gets. Cutting back the price of cotton would mean very little in the price of a shirt.

In the case of tobacco, the producers in 1953 received about $800 million for that part of their crop consumed in the United States. Federal, State, and local taxes on the 1953 crop, by the time it reached the consumers, amounted to approximately $2,100 million.

A 5-cent peanut candy bar contains about one-half cent's worth of peanuts, and if the confectioners got their peanuts free this would not change the price on a 5-cent candy bar—although a few more peanuts might be added.

HOURLY EARNINGS OF INDUSTRIAL WORKERS AND RETAIL FOOD PRICES

Retail food prices have not increased as much as the hourly earnings of industrial workers during the past 20 years of farm programs.

Since 1948 in particular, hourly earnings of industrial workers have continued to increase while retail food prices have leveled off and farm prices have declined almost 20 percent.

Industrial workers can now buy more food with the earnings of an hour of labor than in any earlier period in history. One hour's average factory pay bought the following quantities of specific foods in 1914, 1929, and 1953:

		1914	1929	1953
Bread	pounds	3.5	6.4	10.7
Round steak	do	.9	1.2	1.9
Pork chops	do	1.0	1.5	2.1
Butter	do	.6	1.0	2.2
Milk	quarts	2.5	3.9	7.5
Eggs	dozen	.6	1.4	2.5
Potatoes	pounds	12.4	17.7	32.6
Oranges	dozen	------	1.3	3.6
Bacon	pounds	.8	1.3	2.2
Tomatoes	No. 2 cans	------	4.4	10.0
Cheese	pounds	1.0	1.4	2.9

[1947–49=100]

Date	Average hourly earnings of industrial workers	Retail food prices
1934	41.9	46.4
1935	43.3	49.7
1936	43.7	50.1
1937	49.1	52.1
1938	49.5	48.4
1939	49.9	47.1
1940	53.7	47.8
1941	54.5	52.2
1942	62.5	61.3
1943	69.4	68.3
1944	73.5	67.4
1945	74.8	68.9
1946	81.6	79.0
1947	93.0	95.9
1948	101.7	104.1
1949	106.1	100.0
1950	109.9	101.2
1951	118.8	112.6
1952	125.0	114.6
1953	132.8	112.8
1954—January	136.6	113.1
February	135.9	112.6
March	135.9	112.1
April	----------	112.4

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics reports.

BREAKDOWN OF CONSUMER'S FOOD DOLLAR

Out of each dollar spent for food in the United States 5 cents goes for imported foods, fish, and other products not produced on American farms. Out of each dollar spent by the American housewife for domestically produced food, 56 cents now goes for processing, marketing, and transportation charges. The farmer receives 44 cents. Of this 44 cents, approximately 30 cents goes to purchase tractors, trucks, plows, gasoline, fertilizer, and other supplies required by modern farming.

Thus, the farmer and his family have about 14 cents out of each consumer dollar spent for domestically produced food for their work and their investment.

The farmer's share of the consumer dollar has dropped in recent years and months as farm prices have declined, while retail food prices have remained at 1952 peak levels.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the leaders of the lower-price-support movement have continuously and viciously attacked the price-support program for wheat. Let me give you just one typical example showing that lower prices for farm commodities are not reflected in lower food costs to the consuming public.

In January 1948, wheat prices on the farm reached a peak of $2.81 a bushel, and the average price of a 1-pound loaf of bread was 13.8 cents. Today, the average cash farm price of wheat has dropped to $1.91 a bushel; yet the average price of a 1-pound loaf of bread has increased to 17 cents. The present farm value of the wheat in a 1-pound loaf of bread is 2¼ cents.

What is true of wheat is also true of almost every other farm commodity.

Mr. President, the lowering of price supports for basic farm commodities, dairy products, and other commodities would not be in the long-range interest of the Nation.

The lower prices, advocated by those who believe in flexible supports, would have a serious impact on the economy of the Nation.

From the inception of price-support programs, the cost to consumers has been very little. Only a little over a billion dollars has been spent for the whole 21-year period. It is true that at the present time, costs are sharply increasing. That is to be expected in our present difficult postwar period. The cost of this program will be infinitesimal, compared with the cost of another depression, which would surely result if farm prices were permitted to drop any lower, and they almost surely would if flexible supports were permitted to go into effect.

Mr. President, all our major farm organizations have recognized in some degree that 90-percent supports are necessary when farmers are required to reduce greatly their acreage, by means of acreage allotments or quotas. The most direct and accurate way I know to set forth their positions is to quote from the statements made by the major farm organizations themselves.

Roger Fleming, secretary-treasurer of the American Farm Bureau Federation, states their position on this score quite clearly in his letter to me, dated July 19, 1954. He states that the American Farm Bureau Federation will support a proposal which would provide for 90 percent of parity price support during any year in which marketing quotas are instituted immediately following a nonquota year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Fleming's letter be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the master of the National Grange, in a letter to the Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, stated very clearly the position of his organization.

Mr. President, I think his letter is so concise and to the point that I am going to read one rather long paragraph from it:

> Those who would admittedly like to see the Agricultural Act of 1949 become effective by default of any new legislation being approved, or those who have persistently insisted on moving rapidly and almost exclusively to flexible price supports for the basic six farm commodities as the only solution to the farm problem, have refused to take into full account the drastic changes in our farm income and supply situation that have taken place since 1949. Over the long pull, it is the feeling of the Grange that flexible price supports are basically valuable and desirable. On the other hand, flexible price supports right now would do little to increase consumption of most commodities here at home. They would not lower prices enough in most cases to enable the American farmer to compete for his fair share of the world's market at the world market price level. Flexible price supports at this time would do little to discourage production of those commodities in burdensome supply, since flexibility of production can be attained only when some other crop is more profitable or less unprofitable. There are few crops currently in this category.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of Mr. Newsom's letter printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the position of the National Farmers Union has long been for permanent supports at 100 percent of parity. That is a matter of record.

Mr. President, I respectfully urge every Member of the Senate to give thoughtful consideration to all the serious implications that could flow from a reduction at this time in the price supports for basic and other farm commodities.

I urge that 90 percent supports for basic commodities be continued for at least 1 more year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various telegrams and certain other communications I have received on the farm price-support issue be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

FARGO, N. DAK., *August 3, 1954.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Sentiment among number of farmers recently contacted that farmers should have privilege of voting on two-price plan for wheat included in House bill. Quality should receive priority in two-price support price if our State to receive equitable treatment.

G. J. STAFNE,
Secretary, North Dakota Farm Bureau.

BOTTINEAU, N. DAK., *August 3, 1954.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Senator AIKEN's proposed amendment to be substituted for S. 3052 utterly unsatisfactory. Does not provide disposal program. Very unfair to producers of manufacturing milk. We urge enactment dairy provision in S. 3052 as reported by committee July 15.

ROGER A. BOND,
Bottineau Cooperative Creamery.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND LABOR,
Bismarck, N. Dak., July 19, 1954.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: I am at this time again taking the liberty to write you with regard to the national farm program legislation now before Congress and the widely discussed 90 percent of parity versus the 75-percent to 90-percent sliding scale. I know I now speak for the majority of farmers in North Dakota whom I have the honor of representing. I note from various newspaper reports coming from Washington statements made by various Senators and House Members who are arguing for the sliding scale. I also note from reports that the House has passed the compromise bill of 82½ percent to 90 percent of parity.

It would be very interesting to know how those favoring the 82½ percent arrived at that figure and from there to 90 percent. It is almost inconceivable for anyone to understand how Members of Congress can arrive at anything less than 90 percent of parity and expect American agriculture to maintain a stability so that farmers can keep on operating.

For your information as well as others who will receive a copy of this letter, I want to set forth a few facts from my own observations, and I know that my own observations are no different than any other farmer's in the United States. While I hold the position of Commissioner of Agriculture and Labor in North Dakota, I still have a farm and am operating this farm and so from personal experience and personal knowledge I can easily set forth my own experience and here it is.

No farmer can operate for any length of time and lose money, which will be the result to every farmer under this so-called sliding scale parity. In fact a 90-percent parity is a losing proposition, but it takes longer to curtail operations to the point where a farmer will be unable to operate. However, if by chance the climate conditions are favorable so the farmers have an overproduction instead of a normal crop based on averages over 10 or 20 years, then he can keep even with the expenditures. If he doesn't have this overproduction in bushels he would be unable to operate very long even at 90 percent of parity.

There has been and still is a steady increase in the expense of farm labor. All farm equipment has steadily increased in price. I just wonder if Members of Congress know that just a few items which I would like to mention have increased from 10 percent to 20 percent in price in the last 4 years. I wish to mention a combine or harvester which sold for $2,700 4 years ago now costs $3,700 to $3,900. A tractor which sold 5 years ago for $1,500 is approximately $3,000 now, and so I could mention every piece of equipment that the farmer has to buy has increased by approximately the same ratio. Can it be possible that Members of Congress are so uninformed on the cost of operation in American agriculture that they can honestly and sincerely reduce the income by Federal statute so as to make it impossible for the people engaged in agriculture in America to have a decent standard of living or at least a standard of living comparable to every other class of society.

The indisputable fact remains that it is agriculture in this United States that makes it possible for the high standard of living that we have in this Nation. Therefore, it is not only practical but it is sensible that American agriculture should be protected the same as industry, utilties, and what have you.

As to the surplus of food commodities that is created and may be created under a decent and just parity formula, I can hardly understand why Congress and the President should be so deeply concerned over the money invested in those items when they have shown not too much concern over the hundreds, millions, and billions that they have appropriated and spent on foreign countries which will never be paid back, or these Government subsidies which have been and are being paid to private industry in this country which far exceed the amount that has been paid to agriculture that will stabilize the economy of this country. It is hard to understand that they will oppose a program that will result in a stable economy for all activities in this Nation, and then spend billions on programs in foreign lands which in turn add nothing to the stability of this Nation other than increase the tax burden on agriculture as well as everybody else to pay for these giveaway programs.

I know some of the members on the Agricultural Committee, of which Senator AIKEN is chairman, have disagreed on this so-called formula of a sliding scale and voted for the 82½ percent up to 90 percent. I think I can understand Senator AIKEN and the other Members who are looking for cheap food for the States in which they reside which are unable to produce enough for their own consumption so they would like to see the rest of American agriculture suffer to the advantage of themselves. This, I think, is a shortsighted motive on the part of people who are supposed to represent the Nation as a whole and not only their own State.

I wish to emphasize to you, your committee, and the Senate that if you are looking for a man-made depression you are on the right road under this 82½ percent to 90 percent of parity. I am now speaking from past experience, and I think my experience justifies me to call this to your attention and the Members of Congress because I have farmed for 48 years in North Dakota and am still farming. There is nothing that Congress could do that would wreck American agriculture more than what is now being proposed in Congress.

I trust and I pray that the United States Senate will vote in the majority for the continuation of the 90 percent of parity, not only for 1 more year but for at least 2 more years.

In conclusion, let me state that the large surpluses of food commodities which we have on hand and which are being blamed on the support price should be of little concern to Congress from a standpoint of cost and also from a standpoint of having too much food on hand. Let us grant that a portion of it may become unfit for human consumption, but commonsense should teach us that it is better to have too much food on hand than to not have enough. The part that may become unfit for human consumption, if there is any, would be a very small investment on the part of this Nation when you do consider the buying power and the effects from the buying power that it will add to the total economy of this Nation. People in agriculture are the backbone of this Nation both in buying power and production, and for those reasons that buying power must be maintained in order to maintain a stable economy for all other segments of this country.

I trust that this letter is not too lengthy for you to read, and I also hope that you will consider the facts as I see them and I am sure that you cannot help but agree with me on the fundamentals which I have set forth. It would be entirely too lengthy a correspondence to set forth any mechanics and detailed explanations, so I have only stated a few facts and fundamentals and I trust that Congress is capable of working out the mechanics so that we can have a stable agricultural economy.

Yours very truly,
MATH DAHL, *Commissioner.*

FARGO, N. DAK., *April 13, 1954.*

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We on the Farmers Union local at the North Dakota Agricultural College urge your support of rigid price supports for basic farm commodities and 100 percent of parity and we urge you to work continually for legislation for the betterment of agriculture.

HAROLD SOLBERG,
Legislative Secretary, North Dakota Agricultural College.

PENDLETON, OREG., *April 22, 1954.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Oregon Wheat Growers League vigorously supports extension of 90 percent supports for 1 more year. This will allow time for farmers and lawmakers to completely understand two-price or domestic parity plan. We do not feel administration's flexible price program will solve wheat problem. It will result in further reduction of income to growers on top of anticipated increase in acreage cuts.

RICHARD K. BAUM,
Oregon Wheat Growers League.

BURNSTAD, N. DAK., *April 26, 1954.*

Senator YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

We of the Burnstad Commercial Club go on record this 12th day of April in favor of

100 percent parity for all basic farm commodities. We do not favor any tendency toward flexibility of price support but urge Congress to maintain a production control program which is essential in order to have stabilization price supports.

BURNSTAD COMMERCIAL CLUB,
J. R. BURGAD, *President.*

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *June 15, 1954.*

Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned are very definitely in favor of an extension of the 90 to 100 percent support law on basic crops, for such time as necessary to maintain a parity of living for farm families.

SLOPE COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
EVERETT BOCK, *President.*
NEW ENGLAND, N. DAK.

RAY, N. DAK., *June 15, 1954.*

Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

By order of the stockholders of Farmers Union Oil Co., Ray, N. Dak., at the annual meeting held in Ray, N. Dak., June 11, 1954, we request you continue 90 percent of parity price supports on basic farm crops.

ARTEUR JOHNSON.

PEKIN CO-OPERATIVE ELEVATOR CO.,
Pekin, N. Dak., June 18, 1954.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. YOUNG: At a meeting of the stockholders of the Pekin Co-operative Elevator Co. held June 16, 1954, in the village of Pekin, at which 36 stockholders were present, the following resolution was duly adopted.

Be it resolved, That the representatives of this State of North Dakota in the United States Congress be urged to support legislation which will assure adequate income to farmers and to oppose any further cut to farm prices thereby reducing the farmers' take-home pay.

Sincerely,

E. J. BINA,
Secretary.

EDMORE, N. DAK., *June 23, 1954.*

Senator YOUNG:

At the annual meeting of the Farmers Shipping and Supply Co., a company consisting of over 400 members, a resolution was adopted and passed asking our Senators and Congressmen that they support legislation calling for 90 percent of parity price support on agriculture products.

FARMERS SHIPPING AND SUPPLY,
H. O. NIELSEN, *Manager.*

SUTTON, N. DAK., *June 25, 1954.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate the work you are doing on the farm legislation. Hope for success for extension for 90 percent of parity.

SUTTON FARMERS UNION LOCAL.
Mrs. HUGO HOCHBERGER,
Secretary.

BUSTON, N. DAK., *July 13, 1954.*

Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We commend you on your fight for 90-percent parity. We strongly urge that you continue your efforts for this legislation.

BUFFALO COULEE FARMERS UNION,
STERLING INGWALSON, *Secretary.*

HETTINGER, N. DAK., *July 15, 1954.*

Senator MILTON YOUNG and
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We oppose the Benson flexible farm program, we are for extension of 90 percent on basic commodities. We urge that Congress revoke the orders by Benson on the selections of county committeemen so that experienced men may continue their work.

ADAMS COUNTY REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE,
LAVERN SCHROEDER, *Chairman.*

PENDLETON, OREG., *July 21, 1954.*

Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Umatilla County Farm Bureau is heartily in accord with the two price certificate plan as stated in the farm bill. We urge the Agricultural Committee support to this amendment. We are entirely in favor that 90-percent parity be extended until a new farm program as amended is adopted.

UMATILLA COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
EBER HOWARD, *President.*

ST. PAUL, MINN., *July 21, 1954.*

Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We here in GTA know courage when we see it. We have seen it in your fight for farm income. Whether or not you win you're tops with us.

T. C. CROLL,
Assistant General Manager, GTA.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *July 21, 1954.*

Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You are doing a swell job for farmers. Win, lose, or draw, we will back you to limit.

FARMERS UNION HERALD,
R. S. GILFILLAN.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *July 21, 1954.*

Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On eve of showdown, want you to know we truly appreciate what a fight you are making for farmers. Regardless of outcome, you have the record in your favor.

GORDON ROTH,
GTA Public Relations Director.

LA MOURE, N. DAK., *July 21, 1954.*

Senator M. R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

One thousand LaMoure County Farmers' Union farm families appreciate very much your great effort in our behalf. Keep it up. We are back of you.

LA MOURE COUNTY FARMERS' UNION,
W. J. MANGIN.

LA MOURE, N. DAK., *July 21, 1954.*

Senator M. R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Stockholders of the LaMoure Farmers' Union Grain Co., assembled in annual meeting, June 19, 1954, adopted the following resolutions and ask that same be transmitted to you. We wish to commend you for the terrific fight made by you in behalf of agriculture and for fair farm prices. We believe that a prosperous agriculture means a prosperous nation. In view of that fact, we request that you continue to give your very best effort for 90 percent of parity. A continued fight is necessary until such time our Department of Agriculture will realize that farmers cannot exist on a sliding scale of parity.

CLARENCE WELANER,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee
(Representing 340 stockholders).

LA MOURE, N. DAK., *July 21, 1954.*

Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Following your fight for the farm bill very closely and wish to commend you on your valiant fight.

Yours very truly,

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, FARMERS
UNION OIL CO.

LA MOURE, N. DAK., *July 21, 1954.*

Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thanks for the great fight. Keep it up. We are back of you.

ARNOLD GUTSCHMIDT.

MERRICOURT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator MILT YOUNG,
Senate Building:

We wish to commend you on your fine support on the farm program and bid for your continued support in the final hours of farm legislation.

DICKEY COUNTY FARMERS
UNION,
MRS. ALBERT KLIMA,
Secretary.

MERRICOURT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Building:

We wish to thank you for your support on farm legislation. Hope you continue your fight to obtain a good farm program.

MERRICOURT STAR LOCAL,
MRS. ED KLIMA, *President.*

RAY, N. DAK., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG:

We of headquarters local of Ray, N. Dak., want you to know that we are behind you in your fight for 90 percent price supports on basic farm crops.

ORVEL GUSTOFSON,
President, Ray Headquarters Local.

RAY, N. DAK., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG.

DEAR MILT: Just to let you know that we at the Farmers Union Oil Co., of Ray, N. Dak., appreciate the fight you are putting up for us on the 90 percent price supports. Hang tough for parity.

CLARENCE H. POTTER,
Manager, Farmers Union Oil Co.

RAY, N. DAK., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building.

DEAR MILT: We, the 350 stockholders of Ray Farmers Union Elevator Co., want you to know that we are proud of the brave fight you are putting up for 90 percent price supports on basic crops. Thanks, and keep it up.

RAY FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.

EPPING, N. DAK., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: You are doing a great job for us on the 90 percent price support for basic crops. We hope you have enough votes to put it over. Keep up the good fight.

Sincerely,

STOCKHOLDERS OF EPPING FARMERS
UNION OIL CO.,
CHARLES E. BEAN, *Manager.*

BLAISDELL, N. DAK., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG:

We wish to compliment you on your excellent work on Senate Agricultural Committee. We feel that 90-percent of parity is absolutely essential for the North Dakota farmer if we are to stay in business.

BLAISDELL FARMERS CO-OP ELEVATOR,
E. O. SJAASTAD.

BUXTON, N. DAK., *July 23, 1954.*

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:

Your courageous fight for farm prices, supports, and parity for farmers deserves our highest commendation and support. Congratulations. Carry on.

OLE L. OLSON,
President, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association.

GRENORA, N. DAK., *July 23, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: We wish to express our appreciation of your untiring efforts on behalf of the farm support program. Our members realize the effect on our crops and everyone should we lose our fight for a fair price for basic farm products.
GRENORA FARMERS UNION OIL CO.,
GEHARD SNEVA, *Secretary.*

MCGREGOR, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR MILT: Keep up the valiant fight you are putting forth for 90-percent price support for basic crops for 1 more year; 135 stockholders hope you can get enough votes. Thanks.
W. L. ROLOFF,
Manager, Farmers Union Elevator Co.

BUTTE, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
We compliment you on your fight for 90 percent of parity. Keep it up.
FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.,
ADOLPH SCHOTT, *President.*
GORDON OLSON.
JACK EVANENKO.
HAROLD ANDERSON.
HENRY SKORICK.

DEVILSLAKE, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senate:
Do everything you can to maintain 90 percent price supports. Less than that combined with rust and everything else we have to contend with will ruin this State.
S. B. HOCKING.

MOTT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building.
DEAR SIR: We, 76 members of Solon Farmers Union, urge your support of 90-percent parity and the package bill for farmers.
Yours truly,
ALVIN SULLIVAN, *President.*
BURT, N. DAK.

WHITMAN, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Building:
You have our backing in your fight for 90 percent support. Give them a battle.
JUSTIN S. EVANSON,
ERICK NEUMANN,
ALBERT THRANDT,
HENRY GONVSTKI,
HERMAN KAEDING,
Directors, Kramer Equity Elevator Co.

FONDA, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
Keep fighting for 90 percent of parity.
FARMERS GRAIN CO.,
GERHART LUND, *Secretary.*

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building.
DEAR SIR: In behalf of our membership, I wish to congratulate you for your fight for farm parity. Keep up the good work.
FARMERS UNION CREAMERY ASSOCIATION,
ROY MAVIS, *Manager.*

KARLSRUHE, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator YOUNG:
Your support 90 percent is surely appreciated. Keep up the fight.
KARLSRUHE CO-OP ELEVATOR,
JACK KELLER, *Secretary.*

WILLOW CITY, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
Keep up good work on farm parity.
WILLOW CITY FARMERS ELEVATOR CO.
M. J. KITZMAN,
BEN SANDERSON,
HARRY ANDERSON,
OTTO ERDMAN,
WALTER SHERWIN,
FRAZER GORDON,
WILLIAM BIBERDORF, *Directors.*

GLENBURN, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator M. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
We are behind you in fight for 90 percent support.
L. F. ANDERSON, *President.*
B. O. DAHL, *Secretary.*
A. H. JELMSTAD, *Manager.*

LA MOURE, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building:
We appreciate your fight for farm parity.
FARMERS CO-OP CREAMERY ASSOCIATION.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I like your stand on the price-support program.
ROBERT WIDDEL.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Don't give up your fight for 90 percent parity.
DON BIVINS.
SAWYER, N. DAK.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
Our Nation's economy rests on outcome of farm program. We appreciate your outstanding efforts and work for reasonable farm program.
WARD COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
INEZ N. HALVORSON, *Secretary.*

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your outstanding efforts for farm program to save small farmers. Urge you to keep fighting.
ARNOLD HAUGE.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
We must have reasonable farm program. Keep up your good work.
LAWRENCE ERICKSON.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good fight for decent farm program. Appreciate your work.
VERNON F. CARLSON.
GLENBURN, N. DAK.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I approve your fight for parity. Don't give up.
E. P. CHRISTENSON.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your untiring efforts in fight for reasonable farm program. Keep up the good work.
E. P. CHRISTENSON.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
I support your great fight for 90 percent parity.
W. R. BLUME.
GLENBURN, N. DAK.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
My neighbors and I support you on parity fight.
GEORGE WITTEMAN.
MOHALL, N. DAK.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Know we can depend upon you for continued fight for decent farm program.
ARTHUR SOLBERG.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
I approve your fight for 90 percent parity.
EMERY ANDERSON.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
Keep up your fight for a farm program that will keep farmers on the land and business prosperous.
E. W. SMITH,
Manager, Farmers Union Oil Co.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I appreciate your fight for the farm program.
WILLIAM PHILIPS.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Keep up the good fight for parity for farmers.
CLARENCE MILLER.
VELVA, N. DAK.

VELVA, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator:
We, the board of directors of the Velda Farmers Union Elevator Co., are back of you on your good work for 90 percent of parity.
OLE HARNESS,
President.
SWEN GRUNSETH,
Secretary.
NELS SOLHEIM,
D. A. PALMBERG,
GLENN MILLER,

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
We deeply appreciate outstanding effort you have made for a reasonable farm program in face of terrific opposition and pledge solid backing of organization in approaching show-down vote in Senate. Good luck.
NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION,
GLENN J. TALBOTT, *President.*

WILDROSE, N. DAK., *July 23, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
We, the stockholders of Wildrose Farmers Union Oil Co., want you to know that we are behind you all the way in your fight for 90 percent price supports for the basic crops. We hope you can convince enough Senators to vote with you. Thanks.
WALTER MCBETH,
Manager.

RYDER, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
You have our support for 90 percent parity price.
RYDER FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR,
C. F. BLOOM, *President.*
ARNOLD LARSON, *Secretary.*
R. G. MILLER, *Manager.*

SALEM, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG, *Senator,*
Washington, D. C.:
Thanks for your courageous fight on the farm bill. Keep working for at least 90 percent of parity.
NEW SALEM FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILT YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR MILT: Don't give up your valiant fight for 90 percent supports for basic crops for another year. We appreciate the fight you and the eight members on the Senate Agriculture Committee are putting up for us. All of the 2,400 farm families in the Williams County Farmers Union are behind you and your fellow Senators who are working so hard for us. Thank you.
CLAIR AMSBERRY,
President, Williams County Farmers Union.

LA MOURE, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Very good fight. Don't weaken now. Folks here back you.
HERBERT JOHNSON.

CARPIO, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are behind you 100 percent. High support prices are a must are the words of these farmers: Joe Olson, John and Martin Score, K. V. C. Bryans, Edna R. Stoa, Leonard Danielson, Sev. Vaagen, Robert Olson, O. J. Watne, C. A. Ward, Clifford Dahlseng, John Stoland, Burton Graff, Thompson Bros., Roy Axness, and Lloyd Feldner.
O. K. ASBE.

ALAMO, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR MILTON: We, the members of the Farmers Union, Ellisville local, want you to know that we are behind you all the way in your fight for a farmers program of 90-percent price support for basic crops for 1 more year. We hope you can convince enough Senators to vote with us. Thank you.
JOHN KRABSETH,
President, Ellisville Local.

REGENT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your wonderful support of the farm bill greatly appreciated. Thanks.
C. E. WOODRUFF, Jr.,
President, Hettinger County Farm Union

BOTTINEAU, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are behind you 100 percent in your fight on the farm bill. Keep up the good work.
RUSSELL FOLLIS, *President,*
PAUL BERGMAN, *Vice President,*
A. A. LARSON,
J. J. OLSON,
HENRY SIVERTSON,
R. E. TABLEMAN.
Bottineau Farmers Union Elevator Co.

BRADDOCK, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:
Emmons County farm families, members of our organization, are solidly behind you in your fight for parity and security of farm families on the land. Your vigorous efforts over the years in behalf of agriculture are appreciated, and we know you will continue at this crucial at time.
MRS. GRANT F. PETERSON,
Secretary, Emmons County Farmers Union.

HEBRON, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
Work and vote for 90-percent parity.
ED GEISZLER.

HARVEY, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
We compliment you for the stand you are taking on the farm support of 90 percent of parity. Keep up the fight. Speaking for 250 stockholders of the Harvey Farmers Union Elevator Co.
JOHN J. RIPPLINGER,
President.
JOHN DECK,
Vice President.
ALBERT REISWIG,
Secretary.
EMANUEL TEBEL,
United States Director.
EDWIN KELLER,
Director.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
I hope you win the fight for parity for farmers.
L. J. HAMBECK.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
Farmers contacted are for you and your great fight for 90 percent parity legislation.
FRED A. HULETT.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
My neighbors and I back your stand for parity.
WALTER WEMER.

VALLEY CITY, N. DAK., *July, 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
A marvelous fight for farmers. Give them hell.
Mr. and Mrs. A. N. WINGE.

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
I appreciate your stand for 90 percent farm price supports and the farm package bill. Stand firm and use your utmost influence. Thank you.
FRANK KAISERSHOT.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *July 22, 1594.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge you to hold steadfast to right 90-percent parity farm program. If President should be misled into vetoing this he will reap the consequences.
HANK WILLIAMS, *Appam.*
CLARENCE H. POLING, *Grenora.*
OSCAR J. ANDERSON, *Grenora.*
CLIFFORD V. LARSON, *Alamo.*
S. R. SIVERSON, *Wheelock.*
CASPER SYLTE, *Marmon.*
SIG BROGGER, *Williston.*

BUXTON, N. DAK., *July 23, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
Win or lose on 90 percent price support we certainly appreciate the fight you have made.
TRAILL COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
ORLANDE ORDEGARD, *President.*

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 23, 1954.*
Senator YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
Farmers are backing you on the parity legislation.
R. F. LEE.
DOUGLAS, N. DAK.

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 23, 1954.*
Senator YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
I hope you win the parity fight for farmers.
HAROLD HANER.
DOUGLAS, N. DAK.

FILLMORE, N. DAK., *July 23, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
We wish to express our appreciation and compliment you on your support of the 90-percent parity program. We are behind you 100 percent. Keep up the good work.
FILLMORE EQUITY ELEVATOR CO.,
MANAGER AND BOARD MEMBERS.

WHEELOCK, N. DAK., *July 23, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:
We, the senders of this telegram, believe in 100-percent parity for agriculture. We surely are entitled to that protection under the Constitution of the United States. Keep up fight for at least 90-percent parity.
Henry Grondale, Clair Kerbaugh, Thor Billgren, Melvin Haug, A. Barke, Ira Knox, Arnold Anderson, Simon Pepper, Vernon Anderson, Marshall Simpson, Arne Berntson, Duane Hoehn, Richard Aslakson, W. Raymond, H. Borstad, R. Gergen, Ernest Soine, A. Prosser, H. Lund, E. Hanson, O. Drager, Elmer Olson, J. Daniel, Ray Co-op Credit Union.

FLASHER, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate:
Please support 90-percent parity and oppose the giveaway of atomic energy power. Thanks.
FLASHER CONSUMERS CO-OP ASSOCIATION,
C. C. SHEARER,
EMLIN HANSEN, *Manager.*

FLASHER, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate:
Please support 90-percent parity and oppose the giveaway of atomic energy power. Thanks.
FLASHER COMMERCIAL CLUB.

FLASHER, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate:
Please support 90-percent parity and oppose the giveaway of atomic energy power. Thanks.
FRANK GUSTIN.

FLASHER, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate:
Please support 90-percent parity and oppose the giveaway of atomic energy power. Thanks.
FLASHER FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR,
M. L. SCHMIDT, *Director.*

FLASHER, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate:
Please support 90-percent parity and oppose the giveaway of atomic energy power. Thanks.
FARMERS UNION BIG FIVE LOCAL,
ELWIN TIMPE, *Chairman.*

FLASHER, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate:
Please support 90-percent parity and oppose the giveaway of atomic-energy power. Thanks.
FLASHER FARMERS UNION OIL CO.,
JOHN TOMAN, *Secretary.*

FLASHER, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate:
Please support 90-percent parity and oppose the giveaway of the atomic-energy power. Thanks.
RUBE STOLBERG.

FLASHER, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate:
Please support 90-percent parity and oppose the giveaway of atomic-energy power. Thanks.
MOR-GRAN-SOU ELECTRIC CO-OP,
WALLACE TIMPE, *Manager.*

HEBRON, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Do all in your power to continue fight for 90-percent parity on basic farm commodities Anything less would be disastrous to the American farmer, also continue fight against giveaway of atomic energy.
JOHN M. TREIBER.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Just want to let you know that the farm people of North Dakota surely appreciate your outstanding work for the 90-percent of parity and your fight opposing the atomic giveaway. Keep up the good work. We are backing you.
HELGE E. NYGREN,
President, North Dakota A. R. E. C.
FLASHER, N. DAK.

LEITH, N. DAK., *July 20, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:
We the members of the Leith Farmers Union local wish to thank you for your fight for 90-percent supports on the basic commodities. We are certain that you will continue an attempt to broaden the floor to include perishable products. We are also opposed to the severe income restriction which Brother Benson wishes to impose. We do not see how the family farmer is to exist with no income.
WENER HEHN,
President.
Mrs. ED HEIM,
Secretary.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT A

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., July 19, 1954.
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: This letter is with respect to S. 3052, the general farm program bill soon to be considered by the United States Senate. The bill as reported by the committee needs substantial revision if it is to serve the real interests of farmers and be consistent with the public interest.

Based squarely on policies approved by the official voting delegates of the member State Farm Bureaus, the American Farm Bureau Federation will support proposals that—

(1) Prevent extending rigid 90-percent price supports on cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and peanuts.

(2) Eliminate the dairy provision that forces an increase in price support levels from 75 to 85 percent of parity and authorizes the Brannan plan for dairy products.

(3) Eliminate the unworkable amendment requiring mandatory supports on grain sorghum, oats, barley, and rye at levels that reflect the relative feed value of each to that of corn.

(4) Provide for 90 percent of parity price support during any year in which marketing quotas are instituted immediately following a nonquota year.

(5) Provide for a congressional mandate that U. S. D. A. neutralize the adverse effect of other producers of acreage diverted from production of crops under acreage control programs. This should include congressional direction to the Secretary of Agriculture to require control of diverted acres from supported crops as a condition precedent to receiving agricultural conservation payments.

(6) Authorize creation of a soil fertility bank. We firmly believe that from the standpoint of all parties concerned—farmers, consumers, the general public, and the Government itself—it is far more sound public policy to store fertility in the soil than to continue to produce surpluses of soil-depleting crops for Government storage.

(7) Require the Secretary of Agriculture to take into account quality differences in establishing loan rate differentials on wheat.

In addition, the Farm Bureau opposes inclusion in the legislation of any proposal for an unrepresentative referendum on the unsound multiple price-certificate plan for wheat.

We respectfully solicit your cooperation in developing and enacting a sound farm program bill.

Sincerely yours,
ROGER FLEMING,
Secretary-Treasurer.

EXHIBIT B

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., June 30, 1954.
Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOPE: H. R. 9680 contains many provisions that point the way toward a permanent solution to the farm problem through a commodity-by-commodity approach which we could not hope to achieve if all commodities were put under a single flexible price-support plan through a return to the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949. We believe the Agricultural Act of 1954 embodies real progress in the right direction, and sincerely hope that it will be passed by the Congress and approved by the President.

The Grange realizes that changes must be made in the present farm program, since segments of it do not serve agriculture and the Nation well. The current surplus situation is untenable and new approaches are necessary. It is our feeling, however, that basic price moves should be made rather gradually, and that this bill embodies essential elements of such gradualism.

It is the feeling of the Grange, furthermore, that the present controversy over the level of price supports for the basic six farm commodities, is being magnified all out of true proportion. This is for the reason that high fixed versus flexible price supports is not the heart of the farm problem. The heart of the farm problem at the present time is bringing supply into balance with demand. This process is currently going forward, and H. R. 9680 adds impetus to this movement.

Those who would admittedly like to see the Agricultural Act of 1949 become effective by default of any new legislation being approved; or those who have persistently insisted on moving rapidly and almost exclusively to flexible price supports for the basic six farm commodities as the only solution to the farm problem, have refused to take into full account the drastic changes in our farm income and supply situation that have taken place since 1949. Over the long pull, it is the feeling of the Grange that flexible price supports are basically valuable and desirable. On the other hand, flexible price supports right now would do little to increase consumption of most commodities here at home. They would not lower prices enough in most cases to enable the American farmer to compete for his fair share of the world's market at the world market price level; flexible price supports at this time would do little to discourage production of those commodities in burdensome supply, since flexibility of production can be attained only when some other crop is more profitable or less unprofitable. There are few crops currently in this category.

The differences in points of view by the various groups involved in this price support struggle seem to us to be predicated largely on a difference of appraisal of the effect that a further decline in farm income might have upon our total national economy. The Grange is dedicated to the proposition of bringing about a situation whereby agriculture may shift from a wartime level of production to peacetime requirements without its having to suffer a period of severe deflation, which it has always had to do in the past following periods of war-born inflation.

H. R. 9680 also gives expanding recognition to competitive price mechanisms, while at the same time cushioning farm price problems until new measures can become operative.

Very sincerely yours,
HERSCHEL D. NEWSOM,
Master.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have enjoyed very much the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. He has made an extremely able speech. In fact, I should say the same of the remarks of the many other Senators who have spoken today.

Mr. President, I come from a State which is deeply interested in 90 percent of parity. I do not think it is necessary for me to speak at length on this subject, because my record on this issue is perfectly clear. I spoke on this subject when the wool bill was before us. As I see in the chair at this time, presiding over the Senate, the distinguished

senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], I am reminded of those who founded the first agricultural society in America. Whether it was founded by the people of Pennsylvania or by the people of South Carolina is not a matter of great importance. I merely wish to point out that I am always interested in agriculture, and I am always in favor of what will be of aid to agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). The Chair will say to the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina that the Chair would like to take him, some evening, to Philadelphia, to the dinner meeting of the Farmers' Club, which has been in continuous existence since prior to the Revolutionary War.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the same may be said of our Agricultural Society in South Carolina; and I shall be very glad to have the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania accompany me to the meetings of that society.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 12 members of our Farmers' Club, and they still have dinner by candle light.

At the beginning, each of the members of the club had to have quite a little land, and they did experimental work; and they made the benefits of that work available to the farmers in the vicinity of Philadelphia.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished presiding officer that, after all, South Carolina sent delegates to Philadelphia, for the Declaration of Independence convention, as the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania well knows. When South Carolina defeated Sir Peter Parker in Charleston harbor, on June 28, 1776, the people of Charleston rang the first liberty bell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state that the folks of South Carolina are always very welcome in Pennsylvania.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Chair. Let me state that the name first was Carolina, rather than either North Carolina or South Carolina—as the Senator from Pennsylvania well knows.

Mr. President, it would be well for all Senators to remember that we are considering this farm legislation in the shadow of a revealing report just issued by the House Agriculture Committee. I am glad that the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has already referred to that report.

There is no news of a startling nature in the report. It simply confirms facts already known to all of us who are familiar with farm prices.

The report states, in part:

> Thus far, almost none of the lower prices received by farmers since 1951 have been passed on to consumers in the form of lower retail food costs.
>
> Further declines in farm prices are expected as more livestock and livestock products come to the market and (Government) price-support levels are lowered.
>
> Consumers can expect little benefit, however, from these lower farm prices unless recent tendencies to increase marketing and processing charges are curbed.

That is the pattern, Mr. President—a pattern established over the years. The farmer pays higher prices for the things he must buy. Consumers pay higher prices for the commodities produced by the farmer. The higher prices paid for his commodities by the consumer just never seem to accrue to the income of the farmer.

This is an age of guaranties and insurances for almost everyone—I say almost.

Labor has a guaranty under work contracts negotiated through the bargaining power of its leaders. Many of these contracts carry a parity clause—tied directly to the cost-of-living index.

There are other forms of parity. Sometimes it appears as a subsidy—direct or indirect.

It is interesting to note the increasing attacks by the metropolitan press on agricultural parity. Yet from the same press there is never a word of censure of the approximately one-half billion dollars appropriated annually to the Post Office Department to subsidize the handling in the mails of newspapers, books, and magazines.

Likewise, there is no great hue and cry over the millions of dollars in direct subsidies paid to merchant shipping lines, nor is great attention called to the millions of subsidy dollars handed to the airlines of the country for carrying the mail.

These expenditures of tax money, Mr. President, are subsidies in the most direct form. They are outright payments for the performance of an unprofitable service.

We do not request a subsidy for the farmer. All he wants is parity—an opportunity for equality of economic stature, an opportunity to share with others in a balanced economy. There are many scales—balances of sorts—throughout the various segments of our economy. Yet there is one segment—the very backbone of our economy—which seems to be always on the short side of the fulcrum. The proverbial short end of the stick is the usual resting place of the American farmer on the economic scale.

Knowing the rural population as I do, having come from a rural area, I appreciate from firsthand knowledge the farmer's plight. Unless 90 percent of parity on the basic commodities is guaranteed by law, I shudder to think what will happen to the farmer's income when the gamblers reopen the bucketshop at every crossroads. In past years I have seen the kind of gambling that results from price instability on the exchanges and in the market place. I have seen the price of wheat go down 50 cents a bushel and the price of cotton go down 20 cents a pound in 1 day. If we fail to maintain the 90 percent of parity program—and as a result there is no price floor under wheat, corn, and cotton—we will see that happen again.

The daily newspapers are headlining stories exposing the business operations of promoters who have gambled in housing. We have seen how FHA insurance in the hands of shrewd speculators and promoters has pyramided profits. That is only a sample of what will happen to the farmer, in reverse, when he loses his contractual assurance of 90 percent of parity.

As I said in the beginning, parity in various forms is assured to other segments of our economy. Surely this Congress is not going to put itself on record as discriminating against the farmer.

If we reduce the farmer's parity, we are taking a cut of his income which is low enough as it is. The farmer works from sun-up to sundown, and he spends his money. He buys manufactured goods. When we deplete his income, we injure the Nation's economy. We cannot, in good conscience, give less than this small assurance to the farmers of this Nation.

Along the same lines, I am saying that I trust and hope that the Congress of the United States will approve the 90 percent of parity on the major crops, which have shown no loss, or appreciable loss.

I know my good friend, the distinguished former Governor of Vermont, GEORGE AIKEN, is on the other side, but we have not been showing any major loss in subsidizing the railroads—and we should have done it; in subsidizing steamships—and we should have done it, to keep American labor going; in subsidizing the mills of this country through our tariffs—and we should have done it. I hope that we will not forget the farmer in his dire need.

REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 2058, Senate Resolution 304, relating to funds for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO SAFEGUARD THE EXERCISE OF THE TREATYMAKING POWER

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the proposed amendment be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 181) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by

the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"SEC. 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution, or which is not made in pursuance thereof, shall not be the supreme law of the land nor be of any force or effect.

"SEC. 2. A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation valid in the absence of international agreement.

"SEC. 3. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty, the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the fight for protection against treaty law has only just begun. This fight to prevent the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States from being undermined by treaties and executive agreements will be carried on in elections, in national organizations, and in Congresses until it is settled to the satisfaction of the overwhelming majority of the American people. That majority would rather live without fear under a government of constitutional restraints than live in jeopardy under a government of men.

This revised treaty-control amendment is not introduced with any expectation of action in this Congress. My purpose is to facilitate the educational and political activity of patriotic Americans in the months ahead. They are handicapped in such work today because the text of the original amendment was modified three times following its introduction as Senate Joint Resolution 1 on January 7, 1953. In my judgment, the new text embodies the best features of all the proposals that have been considered by the Senate. I intend to reintroduce this amendment on the first day of the 84th Congress.

The threat of treaty law has not abated. The treatymaking ambitions of the United Nations and its agencies continue to reflect a zeal to regulate the political, economic, and social rights and duties of people everywhere. Those who seek to make the United States a mendicant province in some U. N.-operated world government are determined to destroy the concept of national sovereignty. This they hope to accomplish at the U. N. Charter Revision Conference in 1956. These are but a few of the recent developments underlining the need for a strong treaty control amendment. Before discussing these and other recent developments, however, I would like to explain briefly the origin and legal effect of the new language.

ORIGIN OF SECTION 1

Section 1 of the proposed amendment reads as follows:

A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution, or which is not made in pursuance thereof, shall not be the supreme law of the land nor be of any force or effect.

This section has been endorsed in principle by the Eisenhower administration.

The language making a treaty in conflict with the Constitution of no force or effect originated with the American Bar Association. Later the American Bar Association and I recommended the same limitation for international agreements other than treaties. The Senate Judiciary Committee, only 4 of its 15 members dissenting, reported the proposed amendment in that form. This portion of section 1 was approved by the Senate on February 15, 1954, by the overwhelming vote of 62 to 20.

Section 1 of the new amendment contains the additional requirement that treaties and other international agreements must be made in pursuance of the Constitution. Credit for this suggestion must go to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. On February 17, 1954, the Senate approved the "inpursuance" provision offered by Senator FERGUSON by a vote of 44 to 43. This narrow margin was not due to strong opposition but primarily because the "inpursuance" requirement had not been the subject of committee consideration.

ORIGIN OF SECTION 2

Section 2 of the new amendment provides:

A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation valid in the absence of international agreement.

This section represents the area of disagreement between myself and administration spokesmen. Language substantially similar to that quoted above was first proposed by the American Bar Association and on June 15, 1953, approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

That portion of the language above requiring legislation to make treaties effective as domestic law was voted down in the Senate by a vote of 50 to 42 on February 25, 1954.

That portion of section 2 requiring legislation to make executive agreements effective as domestic law failed by 1 vote—60 for and 31 against—to receive the required two-thirds. This provision was the heart of the substitute amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Several Senators voted against the George substitute because it did not prevent the Congress from enacting legislation implementing an executive agreement that would be unconstitutional in the absence of such agreement. The proposed new language remedies that defect.

ORIGIN OF SECTION 3

Section 3 reads as follows:

On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty, the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

The distinguished majority leader, Senator KNOWLAND, is responsible for the above language to prevent treaties from being approved by only a handful of Senators. Both the administration and I have endorsed Senator KNOWLAND's contribution to the amendment. On February 16, 1954, the Senate approved this provision by a vote of 72 to 16.

LEGAL EFFECT OF THE REVISED TEXT

A word as to the meaning and effect of the various provisions of the joint resolution just now introduced is appropriate.

Section 1 will have two related effects.

First. It will carry into effect the principle as to which there seemed to be substantial unanimity of opinion when Senate Joint Resolution 1 was under debate, namely, that a treaty or other international agreement should have no force or effect if it was in conflict with the Constitution.

Second. It will provide that treaties and other international agreements in order to be valid must be made in pursuance of the Constitution.

Testifying in the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1, Secretary of State Dulles indicated that a treaty to effectuate internal social reforms, even though not in direct conflict with the Constitution, would not be one made in pursuance thereof. The Attorney General expressed the same opinion when he told the Senate Judiciary Committee:

Our Federal system did not contemplate having treaties deal with matters exclusively domestic in their nature.

Addressing the annual meeting of the American Bar Association in September 1953, Mr. Dulles suggested that the treaty power would not be exercised in pursuance of the Constitution if it were used in the following manner: "to effectuate domestic reforms, particularly in relation to economic and social matters, and to impose upon our country socialistic conceptions which many felt were alien to our traditional American ideals."

Accordingly, the administration, although not convinced of the necessity of an amendment, interposed no objection to the provision requiring the treaty power, like the legislative power, to be exercised only in pursuance of the Constitution.

Article VI of the Constitution, the supremacy clause, today provides that laws of the United States in order to be the supreme law of the land must be made in pursuance of the Constitution although treaties in order to be such supreme law are those "made, or which shall be made, under the authority, of the United States."

While some opponents of the amendment have asserted that under the supremacy clause treaties and statutes stand on an equal footing, both being subordinate to the Constitution, this difference in language led Mr. Justice Holmes to remark in Missouri against Holland that, while "acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution," it was open to question whether the authority of the United States means "more than the formal acts prescribed to make the Convention."

And Missouri against Holland, in turn, led the late Chief Justice Hughes to say

to the American Society of International Law in 1929 that he was unwilling to give an opinion that there was any implied limitation on the treatymaking power—that the Supreme Court had intimated that there was none.

Section 1 would thus insure that the Constitution would set the limits on the substance of treaties and not merely prescribe the method of their making.

Section 1 will put treaties and other international agreements where they belong—subject to the Constitution and invalid if they either conflict with it or are not made, as Federal laws must be, in pursuance of it. Any contrary inference from the language of the Constitution or from the cases would be impossible.

There can be and there should be but one paramount law—the Constitution itself. Both laws of the United States and all actions of the Federal Government should be subject to it. The theory that treaties stand on a level with the Constitution itself or can alter or amend that Constitution, should not be allowed to develop or to exist.

Section 2 would prevent any treaty from being internal law of the United States simply by reason of its own existence. There would be no more self-executing treaties as domestic law. Legislation would be necessary to effectuate a treaty as internal law.

This is substantially the same as section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, with the difference that the new section 2 has eliminated as superfluous the words "which would be" immediately preceding "valid in the absence of."

Section 2 also deals with international agreements other than treaties, including executive agreements not previously authorized or approved by Congress. Section 2 would prevent an executive agreement from having the effect of internal law of the United States by virtue of its terms self-executing in form. There would be no possibility of one-man law within the United States. The doctrine of the Belmont and Pink cases would be nullified.

Obviously, if the Congress authorizes executive agreements by legislation in advance, such legislation would have to be within the already delegated powers of Congress. No reason is apparent why subsequent implementing legislation giving effect to such an agreement as internal law should not be confined within the same limits, and section 2 would do this.

Because it is widely conceded that the Congress now has power to regulate executive agreements under the "necessary and proper" clause, the present joint resolution does not contain the following provision included in Senate Joint Resolution 1:

> Congress shall have power to regulate all executive agreements.

No objection was made to the elimination of that provision during the Senate debate since it was regarded as merely declaratory of existing law. To prevent a repetition of the disastrous experience at Yalta, legislation to regulate the making of executive agreements is now pending before the Congress. To supplement any treaty-control amendment that may be adopted, I particularly hope that the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] will reintroduce his resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 2—in the next Congress.

Section 3 is self-explanatory, and its substance, in one form or another, has been regarded as advisable by almost everyone. It would tend to prevent approval of treaties with a mere handful of Senators present and voting.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE FIELD OF TREATY LAW

Since the defeat of Senate Joint Resolution 1 in the United States Senate, four important new developments have strengthened the position of the proponents of the amendment.

First. The United Nations Human Rights Commission has refused to insert a provision in the Human Rights Covenants recognizing the right to own property and to have it protected against arbitrary interference by government.

Second. Mr. Dulles announced on March 16, 1954, that the President can now wage war without a declaration by Congress in the event of attack on one of our treaty allies in Europe or South America, thus reaffirming his Louisville speech of April 1952 before the American Bar Association that a treaty can take powers from Congress and confer them on the President.

Third. Sir Winston Churchill disclosed on the floor of the House of Commons in April 1954 the terms of the secret executive agreement of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill relating to the use of atomic weapons and peacetime application of atomic energy.

Fourth. The current debate on the subject of United Nations Charter revision has revealed a determined effort on the part of influential persons and organizations to scuttle the sovereignty of the United States at the proposed U. N. Charter Revision Conference in 1956 in favor of some form of limited or full world government. In hearings before the Wiley subcommittee on U. N. Charter revision, many world government enthusiasts have made it clear that they seek to transform the United Nations from an organization of sovereign states into a superstate either by treaty or by executive agreement, or if that is not feasible, by the even more dangerous process of informal charter amendment, that is, by far-fetched interpretation or by unwarranted usurpation of power.

Indicative of the philosophy dominating the United Nations Commission on Human Rights is the fact that after holding over 400 meetings, the Commission has refused to approve for the so-called draft of the so-called International Covenant on Human Rights, a provision recognizing the right to own private property and to be secure in its enjoyment against the arbitrary seizure by government. This discloses the extent to which the Human Rights Commission is controlled by Communists and Socialists.

On March 3, 1954, over United States and Turkish objections, the 18-nation Human Rights Commission voted to shelve indefinitely all discussion of property rights.

The chairman of the United Nations Human Rights Commission at the eighth session, Dr. Charles Malik, of Lebanon, had this to say of the Socialist and Communist influences dominating its work:

> I think a study of our proceedings will reveal that the amendments we adopted to the old texts under examination responded for the most part more to Soviet than to western promptings. For the second year an unsuccessful attempt was made to include an article on the right to own property. * * * The concept of property and its ownership is at the heart of the great ideological conflict of the present day. It was not only the Communist representatives who riddled this concept with questions and doubts; a goodly portion of the non-Communist world had itself succumbed to these doubts. A study of this particular debate will reveal the extent to which the non-Communist world has been communistically softened or frightened. It seems incredible that in these economic matters, which reflect indeed much more than mere economic divergencies, the Western World is so divided itself as to be incapable of presenting a common front against communism.

On March 16 Secretary of State Dulles asserted that in his opinion President Eisenhower had authority, without consulting Congress, to wage war in Europe or South America in the event any of our treaty allies under the North Atlantic Treaty and the Rio de Janeiro Treaty were attacked. At a press conference that day the following questions were directed to Mr. Dulles and the following answers given by him—New York Times, March 17, 1954:

> Question. Sir, does the fact that the Senate of the United States has ratified the North Atlantic Alliance mean in the event of an attack on an ally we could, within constitutional procedures, retaliate against the attack without action in the Congress?
>
> Answer. This is a matter which, as you know, was debated very thoroughly in the Congress and in the Senate; at the time that treaty was ratified I was in the Senate; it is my opinion that the provisions of the treaty, which state that an attack upon one of the allies is the same as an attack upon all—or in other words that an attack upon one of our allies is the same as an attack upon the United States—and that is also, I may say, in the Rio pact—that gives the President of the United States the same authority to react as he would have if the United States were attacked.
>
> Question. Thank you, sir.
>
> Answer. Whether he would use that authority in every case is a matter for his discretion. In my opinion he has it.
>
> Question. He has the right?
>
> Answer. In my opinion he has the right.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Question. Mr. Secretary, if I may go back to one point of yours, you said that in Europe the President had the same authority under the NATO and Rio treaties to retaliate as if the United States was attacked. Well, last Wednesday he seemed to give a pledge that he would not use that because he said that there would be no involvement in war without congressional approval.
>
> Answer. But if the Senate has given approval in advance, that is a different matter.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Question. Mr. Secretary, in order to clarify something in my own mind at least, is it your understanding that the President's right to order instant retaliation applies only in the case of an attack either on the United

States or another North Atlantic Treaty power because of the understanding that Congress has given?

Answer. The United States has two treaties that I referred to: One is the so-called Rio Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, which contains the provision that an attack upon one is the same as an attack upon all; that same provision is found in the North Atlantic Treaty. In my opinion—whatever it is worth as a lawyer, and as one who was in the Senate when the North Atlantic Treaty was adopted—I believe that that authorizes, is a consent in advance to, the President reacting against an attack upon one of our allies named in those treaties in the same way that he would be authorized to react in the event of an attack upon the United States itself. I repeat, however, that the fact that the President has that constitutional authority as the result of those treaties in my opinion does not necessarily mean that he would use it. He would use his discretion, I think, as to whether or not to react instantly, or whether to get either a formal declaration of war by the Congress, or whether to have consultations which satisfied himself that that was the will of the Congress. That would be discretionary with the President.

Question. Mr. Secretary, doesn't the President have that same power under the United Nations Charter itself?

Answer. In my opinion, no.

It is thus plain that Mr. Dulles still firmly believes just as he did in his address before the American Bar Association in Louisville in April 1952, namely:

Treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given the people by their constitutional Bill of Rights.

The disclosure by Sir Winston Churchill in April 1954 of the secret Roosevelt-Churchill atomic agreement has produced consternation, at least in this country. On April 18, 1954, the columnist Raymond Tucker had this to say in the Sunday papers carrying his column:

The furious storm in the American Congress and British House of Commons over the ultrasecret Roosevelt-Churchill atomic agreement has renewed and reinforced demand for the Bricker and George amendments to the Constitution. That proposal, which was defeated by a single vote in the Senate, would outlaw personal and private diplomacy involving the destinies of peoples and nations.

The secret executive agreement made by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill at Quebec gave Britain a veto power over our diplomatic and military policies insofar as the use of A-bombs and H-bombs are concerned. It is without precedent. It involved an international commitment of the gravest character. It was made in wanton disregard of the security interests of the United States. The provisions of the secret Quebec agreement relative to the postwar uses of atomic energy ignored Congress' general power to legislate and the specific legislative power conferred on the Congress by article IV, section 3, of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

Finally, the nature of the opposition to any limitation on the treaty power has been revealed in the current debate on United Nations Charter revision. To be sure, many advocates of world government seek that end only through formal amendment of the Constitution of the United States. I have commended such people for the respect they have shown for the spirit of our Constitution. In addition, I have always recognized that many sincere and high-minded people who oppose my amendment are not attracted by the world-government idea. The fact remains, however, that the primary source of opposition to my amendment comes from those who seek to set aside the American Declaration of Independence and nullify many of our constitutional protections.

This has been made clear in the hearings before the Wiley Subcommittee on U. N. Charter Revision.

Our Declaration of Independence would necessarily become a meaningless document and an historical relic if the United States were ever reduced to a province in any form of Federal world government. This recommendation, however, has been presented time and again to the Wiley subcommittee in the form of amendments to the charter that would destroy the independence of the United States. Any charter amendments that may be adopted at any U. N. Charter revision conference would no doubt be regarded as treaties, and hence would require the advice and consent of the Senate. If any such amendments that may be adopted undermine the concept of national sovereignty, they can, under our present Constitution, be made effective by the action of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting at any time over the next hundred years. We must, therefore, have a constitutional amendment that will assure the American people an opportunity to pass judgment on any revision of the U. N. Charter that compromises or undermines the independence of the Republic.

A number of world-government enthusiasts advance the reactionary theory that the United Nations Charter should be amended, if necessary, by interpretation rather than by formal amendment. This theory is advanced in staff study No. 2 of the Wiley Subcommittee on U. N. Charter Revision. In fact, the authors of that remarkable document maintain that the charter, without the advice and consent of the Senate, has already been validly and substantially amended. They say:

We are by no means examining the charter that was drafted in San Francisco in 1945. We are examining the charter of 1954 as it has been amplified by custom and usage, resolutions of the various U. N. organs, and treaties, like the Atlantic Pact, which are consistent with the charter and have a heavy impact on the U. N. system. If we should proceed now to consider amendments to the old charter rather than the new, it would be very much like a surgeon planning a major operation on the basis of a diagnosis made 9 years ago.

That the U. N. Charter can be amended without Senate approval is the most illiberal proposition ever advanced in a Senate document. It is based on the wholly false premise that the United Nations Charter is a world constitution. The United Nations Charter is a treaty. The Senate advised and consented to its ratification in 1945. I shall never stop insisting that the United Nations Charter and all other treaties to which the United States is, or may become a party, are contracts rather than constitutional documents. That was the sense in which the Founding Fathers used the word "treaty" in the Constitution.

For example, Hamilton explained the treaty power in the Federalist, No. 75, as follows:

The power of making treaties * * * relates neither to the execution of the subsisting laws, nor to the enaction of new ones. * * * Its objects are contracts with foreign nations, which have the force of law, but derive it from the obligations of good faith. They are not rules prescribed by the sovereign to the subject, but agreements between sovereign and sovereign.

To repeat, the advocates of world government seek to repeal the American Declaration of Independence. Some would do it by amending the United States Constitution, others seek the approval of the Senate on U. N. Charter amendments, while still others hope to reach world government by informal amendment of the United Nations Charter. The end result is the same—the United States would cease to be a sovereign, independent nation. When independence is destroyed, our liberties are lost. That is one of the most important reasons why we need a constitutional amendment safeguarding the power to make treaties and executive agreements.

Many opponents of my amendment advocate a system of international or world law directly applicable to individuals. More specifically, they urge adoption of the United Nations Draft Statute for an International Criminal Court. This proposed treaty is inconsistent with the complaint lodged against George III in the Declaration of Independence "for transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses."

The principle of the U. N. draft statute for an International Criminal Court has already been embodied in the NATO Status of Forces Agreement approved by the Senate on July 15, 1953. By the terms of this treaty, and for the first time in American history, American soldiers serving abroad in the uniform of their country are made subject to trial in foreign courts under foreign law and without the constitutional protections to which they would otherwise be entitled. The making of this treaty proves how threadbare is the argument that the President and the Senate can always be trusted not to make any dangerous treaty. Although no constitutional amendment can empower the Supreme Court to order the release of Americans in foreign custody, the adoption of an adequate treaty-control amendment will go very far toward eliminating the discrimination as between State Department diplomats stationed abroad and American soldiers drafted and sent abroad to defend foreign soil.

The Constitution of the United States and its Bill of Rights cannot survive the

loss of national sovereignty. Most world government plans call for a universal bill of rights along the lines proposed in the U. N. human-rights covenants. These proposed covenants, if adopted by the United States, would repeal the heart of the Bill of Rights, including the great first amendment freedoms of speech, press, religion, and assembly.

At the time I first proposed a constitutional amendment to safeguard the exercise of the treatymaking power, I said that the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States were at stake. That was on February 7, 1952. The danger is just as great today as it was then. Now is the time for all patriotic Americans to insist on a policy of enlightened nationalism and to reject in no uncertain terms the rabid internationalism that has brought to so many American homes such untold sorrow and to the Nation itself unprecedented danger.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following additional reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 6672. A bill to increase the public debt limit; with amendments (Rept. No. 2225).

By Mr. DWORSHAK, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 9630. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute an amendatory contract with the Black Canyon Irrigation District, Idaho, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2226).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 114. A bill authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2227).

By Mr ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 3043. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of Arizona or on the Navaho Indian Reservation in the State of New Mexico for religious, educational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases (Rept. No. 2228).

By Mr. KUCHEL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 8365. A bill to confirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to allotments of lands of the Mission Indians in the State of California prior to the expiration of the trust period specified in the act of January 12, 1891, as amended (Rept. No. 2229).

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 3627. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (Rept. No. 2230).

By Mr CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

S. 2631 A bill to prohibit the payment of Government retirement benefits to persons convicted of certain offenses (Rept. No. 2231).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1893. A bill for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlastos (Andreas Georges Vlasto) (Rept. No. 2232);

S. 2532. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Latina Mozzicato and Giovanni Mozzicato (John Mozzicato) (Rept. No. 2233);

S. 2973. A bill for the relief of Henry Duncan (Rept. No. 2234);

S. 3033. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary (Rept. No. 2235);

S. 3163. A bill for the relief of Myung Sik Hong (Rept. No. 2236);

S. 3327. A bill for the relief of Rev. Lorenzo Rodriguez Blanco and Rev. Alejandro Negredo Lazaro (Rept. No. 2237);

S. 3341. A bill to provide punishment for certain confidence game swindles (Rept. No. 2238);

S. 3728. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Eckerl Strickland (Rept. No. 2239);

S. 3756. A bill for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser (Rept. No. 2240);

H. R. 818. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Martha Staack (Rept. No. 2241);

H. R. 670. A bill for the relief of George Economos (Rept. No. 2242);

H. R. 4620. A bill for the relief of Natale Joseph John Ratti (Rept. No. 2243);

H. R. 4881. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code in reference to the survival of things in action (Rept. No. 2244);

H. R. 6113. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to the smuggling of goods into the United States (Rept. No. 2245);

H. R. 7088. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cazzato (Rept. No. 2246);

H. R. 8034. A bill for the incorporation of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War (Rept. No. 2247);

H. R. 9390. A bill to extend certain civilian-internee and prisoner-of-war benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to civilian internees and American prisoners of war captured and held during the hostilities in Korea (Rept. No. 2248).

H. R. 9882. A bill to incorporate the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association (Rept. No. 2249);

S. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week of November 28, 1954, through December 4, 1954, as "National Salvation Army Week" (Rept. No. 2250);

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution designating the period from October 11 to October 16, inclusive, 1954, as National Nurse Week (Rept. No. 2251); and

H. Con. Res. 254. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens (Rept. No. 2252).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 346. A bill for the relief of Alick Bhark (Rept. No. 2253);

S. 1625. A bill for the relief of Milan K. Jovanovic (Rept. No. 2254);

S. 2109. A bill for the relief of Claire Heiszler (Rept. No. 2255);

S. 2669. A bill for the relief of Andree M. Doyle (Rept. No. 2256);

S. 2682. A bill for the relief of Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri (Rept. No. 2257);

S. 3116. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the punishment of any individual who travels in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution or punishment for indecent molestation of a minor (Rept. No. 2258);

S. 3413. A bill for the relief of Shigeko Nakamura Bulmer (Rept. No. 2259);

S. 3625. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Juana Padilla de Cabalero (Mrs. Juana Padilla de Ontiveros) (Rept. No. 2260); and

H. R. 1912. A bill for the relief of Hayik (Jirair) Vartiyan, Annemarie Vartiyan, and Susanig Armenuhi Vartiyan (Rept. No. 2261).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1336. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees (Rept. No. 2262);

S. 1341. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees (Rept. No. 2263); and

S. 3101. A bill to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2264).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 3534. A bill to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls (Rept. No. 2265).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2540. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946 (Rept. No. 2266).

By Mr. BRICKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

H. R. 8898. A bill to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended (Rept. No. 2267).

RECESS TO 10 O'CLOCK A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, August 6, 1954, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 5, 1954:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

E. George Siedle, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice John C. Allen, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

James Bradshaw Mintener, of Minnesota, to be Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

G. Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1958, vice Robert W. Williams, resigned.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Herbert G. Homme, Jr., of North Dakota, to be United States attorney for Guam, vice James G. Mackey, resigned.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Silas H. Anderson, Bynum, Ala., in place of B. E. Kilgore, removed.

William J. Murphy, West Blocton, Ala., in place of D. C. Moore, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Robert L. Davis, Fountain Hill, Ark., in place of F. E. Denson, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Philip H. Krauter, Arvin, Calif., in place of C. B. Childers, resigned.

Ronald P. Fawcett, Colfax, Calif., in place of C. C. Schultz, resigned.

John O. Davis, King City, Calif., in place of J. M. Arnold, retired.
Retta L. Moslander, Nubieber, Calif., in place of E. M. Oates, resigned.
Viola A. Tuggle, Salida, Calif., in place of Nellie McGinn, retired.

COLORADO

Theodore M. Erickson, Wheat Ridge, Colo., in place of R. R. Broad, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Clarence D. Sorensen, Dwight, Ill., in place of Hugh Thompson, resigned.
Noel E. White, Fox Lake, Ill., in place of H. D. Carlson, retired.

INDIANA

Byron V. Hoover, Carlisle, Ind., in place of Ozro Latshaw, deceased.
Robert D. Sanders, Franklin, Ind., in place of H. E. White, retired.
Apphia L. Hess, Griffith, Ind., in place of L. S. Miller, resigned.
Richard L. Pickett, Sheridan, Ind., in place of J. F. Durr, transferred.

IOWA

Keith P. Carroll, Frederika, Iowa, in place of C. L. Bowers, deceased.
Carl Lambert Youngquist, Gowrie, Iowa, in place of A. C. Lundvick, retired.
Leonard D. Tucker, Knoxville, Iowa, in place of H. E. Reichard, removed.

KANSAS

Herman F. Kiesow, Osage City, Kans., in place of E. F. Hammond, resigned.

LOUISIANA

James F. Roberts, Downsville, La., in place of M. P. Jones, retired.
Joseph Lubin Jewell, Jr., Maringouin, La., in place of H. T. Best, Jr., transferred.

MICHIGAN

Merrill C. Warner, Bedford, Mich., in place of L. F. Porter, deceased.
Charles H. Hinman, Hastings, Mich., in place of R. G. Hubbard, retired.

MINNESOTA

Lavern A. Ewert, Waldorf, Minn., in place of A. C. Ewert, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Austin Learned, Edison, Nebr., in place of P. W. McCoy, deceased.

NEVADA

Emma S. Park, Minden, Nev., in place of R. T. Williams, retired.
Dixie Vera L. Westover, Montello, Nev., in place of M. R. Bracken, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Philip T. Hilton, East Rochester, N. H., in place of H. M. Lowell, resigned.

NEW YORK

John Wesley Sinnickson, Center Moriches, N. Y., in place of T. E. Havens, resigned.
Eva H. Chambers, Dresden, N. Y., in place of M. D. Leach, retired.
Ignatius Fafinski, Dunkirk, N. Y., in place of D. P. Scannell, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Agnes E. Butts, Big Bend, N. Dak., in place of A. J. Irwin, resigned.
Leon C. D'Heilly, Neche, N. Dak., in place of V. C. Douville, resigned.

OHIO

Ruby F. Stone, Belpre, Ohio, in place of F. S. Troutman, deceased.
Louis Matthews Ables, Jeromesville, Ohio, in place of C. D. Faber, deceased.
John Chester Ward, Mount Vernon, Ohio, in place of F. J. Lawler, retired.
Donald G. Kirkton, New London, Ohio, in place of J. L. O'Hara, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Floyd P. Johnson, Davis, Okla., in place of O. V. Lowther, removed.

OREGON

Joseph D. Naughton, Joseph, Oreg., in place of M. W. Sprague, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Walter F. Rhine, Canonsburg, Pa., in place of S. J. Bondi, removed.
Harold J. Robbins, Derrick City, Pa., in place of A. M. Warner, deceased.
Gene M. Hatter, Donaldson, Pa., in place of J. H. Opie, deceased.
William R. Clark, Loysville, Pa., in place of J. S. Barclay, retired.
E. Phillip Tyson, Gardners, Pa., in place of G. C. Myers, retired.
Frances S. Dague, Houston, Pa., in place of W. E. Sickles, resigned.
John C. Gainer, Pequea, Pa., in place of E. E. McClune, removed.
Anna C. Salsgiver, Smithmill, Pa., in place of Georgeanna Chenchark, transferred.
Anthony J. Trenga, Wilmerding, Pa., in place of Daniel Leger, retired.
Harold C. Allebach, Worcester, Pa., in place of S. L. Brunner, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

Earle W. Belknap, Wakefield, R. I., in place of E. F. McCarthy, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lowell J. Beck, Claremont, S. Dak., in place of M. A. Olson, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Joe M. Carden, Jr., La Follette, Tenn., in place of Irene Miller, removed.

TEXAS

Mable W. Francks, Brady, Tex., in place of A. L. Davee, resigned.
William L. Cowan, Dublin, Tex., in place of T. J. Shillingburg, deceased.
Johnnie C. Dormier, Megargel, Tex., in place of E. V. Haden, resigned.
Johnie Floyd Hokit, Ozona, Tex., in place of A. O. Fields, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Wilton Clements Mock, Damascus, Va., in place of H. H. Rhea, retired.

WASHINGTON

Loring E. Bundy, Edwall, Wash., in place of M. P. Hutton, resigned.
George A. Morrison, Vashon, Wash., in place of J. E. Ober, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Leo Kartheiser, Chilton, Wis., in place of Joseph Schmidlkofer, retired.
Burton M. Syverson, De Soto, Wis., in place of J. D. Robertson, resigned.
Herbert L. Latimer, Genoa, Wis., in place of A. B. Zabolio, retired.

WYOMING

Howard O. Bebout, Hudson, Wyo., in place of Osta Bebout, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 5, 1954:

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Cooper Hudspeth, Fort Smith.
James L. Latshaw, Fulton.

CALIFORNIA

Elinor W. Dickenson, Moraga.

CONNECTICUT

Eugent F. Bull, Kent.

FLORIDA

John J. Hoy, Lake Placid.
Milton E. Knellinger, Palm Harbor.

ILLINOIS

Arlington E. Gittings, Oquawka.
Lloyd Newnom, Pearl.
Lynn L. Simmermaker, Shipman.

KANSAS

Martin L. Pearsall, Caney.
Carl F. Rebman, Edgerton.
Charles W. Taylor, Edna.
Lester E. Tucker, Osborne.
Henry C. Thomas, Piedmont.

LOUISIANA

Louis B. Moseley, Oak Grove.
Joseph K. Mayes, Pelican.

MAINE

Hercules B. Roy, Frenchville.
Henry L. Bryant, Tenants Harbor.

MICHIGAN

Byron R. Fowler, White Cloud.

MINNESOTA

Allan J. Slezak, Hope.
Peter D. McCarron, Sherburn.

MISSOURI

Wayne W. Wilson, Bethany.
Mildred S. Parker, Cowgill.
Marie L. E. Koehler, Grover.
James D. Williams, Ionia.
William R. Zink, Knob Noster.
Harry J. DeGuire, Liguori.
Mary C. Hazleton, Princeton.

NEBRASKA

John H. Schaller, Bellevue.
Kenneth L. Bergstrom, Merna.
Leslie J. Johnson, Silver Creek.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Harris C. Pushee, Lyme.

NEW JERSEY

Lester A. Sabo, Carteret.

NEW YORK

John B. Connelly, Goshen.
Walter M. Lowerre, Haines Falls.
Robert R. Austell, Middletown.
Henry E. Holley, Otisville.
Jack L. Edleson, Tarrytown.

NORTH CAROLINA

Gladys T. Ratledge, Advance.
Louis M. Ensley, Balsam.
Hazel B. Sebastian, Hays.
Hoy C. Correll, China Grove.

OHIO

William C. Fulton, Belle Center.
Lois M. Sams, Beloit.
Leonard Allison LaFollette, Buchtel.
Victor L. Will, Canal Winchester.
Dorothy H. Pettit, East Fultonham.
Ernest H. Wilson, Marengo.
James O. Drake, North Jackson.
Mildred J. Lockwood, Okeana.
Neil H. Adams, Sycamore.
Earl W. Schnetzler, Waterville.

OKLAHOMA

M. Marvel Gregory, Weleetka.
Treva O. Courtney, Yale.

OREGON

Richard V. Carleson, Rickreall.

PENNSYLVANIA

Elsie P. Bigger, Eagles Mere.
Paul R. Leonard, Manns Choice.
George B. Carpenter, Ulysses.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Elizabeth J. Cooper, Mayesville.
Clarence Ozell Hester, Ocean Drive Beach.
Martin D. Watkins, Jr., Westminster.
James L. Sheppard, Yemassee.

TENNESSEE

Josephine H. Vandergriff, Briceville.
Len K. Mahler, Cookeville.
Laverne M. Tabor, Crossville.
LeRoy M. Cook, Gallatin.
Charlene M. Reece, Jonesboro.
Frank W. Medley, Monterey.
Lucile S. Busler, White Pine.

VERMONT

Edward F. Baccei, Proctor.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate August 4 (legislative day of July 2), 1954, and omitted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

POSTMASTER

Thomas W. Robison to be postmaster at Lecompte, La.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou who hast entrusted our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress with a high vocation, grant that they may take great pride in their loyalty and devotion to the welfare of our country.

May every citizen earnestly seek to add splendor and nobility to the life of our Republic by cultivating those lofty spiritual virtues which were the secret of the strength and greatness of the Founding Fathers.

Show us how we may be the worthy partners of all who are striving to build a social order that has in it the spirit of brotherhood and good will, of justice and righteousness, of kindness and charity.

Inspire us to do Thy will and help us to hasten the coming of the time when every human need shall be supplied and there shall be peace on earth.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate in the session of the House today.

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

There was no objection.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution which makes the following provision:

> That the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study of the procedures and practices under the Trading With the Enemy Act during the period from December 18, 1941, to the present day.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I am doing this is that two bills have been introduced. They are identical. One was reported out of the Senate committee, S. 3324. The other bill was introduced by me in the House, H. R. 9985. These bills would restore enemy property that was confiscated under the law passed in 1945.

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely contrary to any jurisprudence or any law that this country has ever acted under that we should confiscate enemy property. It is also contrary to English law, and that dates almost back to Magna Carta. The confiscation of alien property started in 1945. This policy was engineered and finally gotten through the Congress, through the offices of Harry Dexter White, who has since been, and is now acknowledged, to have been a true Communist. He was also one of the principal authors of the Morgenthau plan. Both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman refused to give their sanction to this policy, and it was only gotten through the Congress by tying it up to the War Claims Commission, in other words, giving it a sentimental slant by saying that this money would take care of injured war prisoners.

Since the end of World War II this Government has poured millions of dollars into the rehabilitation of both Germany and Japan in order that they may be strong allies and bulwarks against communism. At the same time we have been withholding privately owned property from individual citizens of these countries. We have been giving with one hand and taking away with the other, and have alienated people whom we are trying to make our friends.

If the Congress is sympathetic to this legislation, it will be most helpful to the Adenauer government in Germany, who are friendly to our cause in Europe. The enemies of the regime are now saying: "What has friendship for the United States done for Germany? We are still disunited, we have not obtained EDC, and our property remains confiscated. It would be far better to restore these properties rather than pour your billions into Germany and Japan, which is humiliating and makes only for ill feeling and enmity."

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY SUPPLIES AND RESOURCES POLICY

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, the President announced the formation of a Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy.

The White House announcement stated that the Committee would be composed of the heads of the Department of State, Department of Defense, Department of Justice, Department of the Interior, Department of Commerce, Department of Labor, and the Office of Defense Mobilization. Its chairman will be Mr. Arthur Flemming, who heads the Office of Defense Mobilization. The Committee is to submit its recommendations to President Eisenhower not later than December 1.

The Committee's scope of study embraces areas of vital importance to our national well-being.

This is demonstrated by the following excerpt from the announcement:

> At the direction of the President the Committee will undertake a study to evaluate all factors pertaining to the continued development of energy supplies and resources and fuels in the United States, with the aim of strengthening the national defense, providing orderly industrial growth, and assuring supplies for our expanding national economy and for any future emergency.

This is a task worthy of the Committee's obvious stature. To help perform it, Mr. Flemming is empowered to appoint, as members of a special task force, from outside the Government, experts in each one of the areas to be studied.

Industries specifically mentioned for review are oil, natural gas, and coal.

Previous efforts at studies of this sort have been somewhat disappointing. It is my feeling that this was largely due to the fact that sufficient attention was not given, at the outset, to the selection of people possessing sufficient practical, experienced knowledge in the field they were studying. I am sure that will not be the case in the selection of the aforementioned task force. The White House announcement clearly indicates a heartfelt desire to conduct a fundamental study, without preconceived philosophies as to the ultimate result.

As my colleagues in the House know, I have often addressed myself in the past to a number of problems which appear to fall within the direct purview of this Cabinet Committee. For example, the formation of such a committee recognizes the growing need for a solution to such problems as that presented by excessive oil imports.

I addressed myself to this problem at length in the House on June 23, as well as on other occasions.

On June 23 I delineated the conditions which make for a dangerous oversupply of oil. In so doing I discussed the role of excessive imports in this oversupply picture.

The seriousness of the situation is unchanged today. Oil inventories stand at a level of 40 million barrels in excess of those of a year ago. Allowed production of oil has been repeatedly reduced in a number of States to attempt to alleviate a situation which poses a serious threat to the industry's economic stability. Yet oil imports in 1954, as indicated by contemplated programs, will exceed those of 1953. This will continue a trend which has been going on throughout the postwar period, when imports have risen from about 377,000 barrels daily in 1946 to over 1,050,000 barrels per day at the present time.

Foreign oil cannot continue to enter the country in such volume without seriously impairing the industry's capacity to produce oil for emergency needs. The industry must be healthy in time of peace in order to be ready in time of war.

The new Cabinet Committee's scope of review will certainly embrace the oil imports problem, which is so closely related

to the defense considerations stressed in the White House announcement.

The formation of such a committee is a tribute to this administration's wisdom in dealing with problems vital to our national defense.

The Congress, too, must survey this problem. It is sufficiently complex and important to utilize the thinking of the best men in all areas and levels of government.

The outcome of such thinking may well provide the answer to a question vital to our very security, "Shall we produce our own fuels or be reliant on areas which we may not be able to hold in time of war?"

It is a question which must soon be answered.

STORAGE CAPACITY FOR GRAIN

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, while the Department of Agriculture is generally looked upon as the agency of the Federal Government which specializes in assisting farmers, the present administration is also giving agriculture practical assistance through other governmental departments and agencies.

The Small Business Administration, for example, through its financial assistance to business firms is helping to meet the needs of farmers in many ways.

New storage capacity for 9,444,360 bushels of grain will result from small business loans approved by the Small Business Administration during the past 6 months.

All of this new storage capacity will be available to help take care of the 1955 crop. Most of the construction resulting from these loans will be expansion of present facilities in areas where the need for grain storage exceeds present capacity.

Following are the Small Business Administration loans approved to date for construction of added grain storage facilities by State totals:

Arizona, $135,000; Arkansas, $65,000; Colorado, $80,000; Idaho, $108,000; Kansas, $836,000; Michigan, $90,000; Mississippi, $150,000; Missouri, $150,000; Nebraska, $409.500; New York, $150,000; Oklahoma, $613,000; Texas, $843,000; Washington, $150,000.

One-fourth of all the loans approved by the Small Business Administration to help small-business enterprises are going to small firms in rural areas engaged in business activity closely related to and of benefit to the farming community.

Small Business Administrator Wendell B. Barnes said in commenting on his agency's lending activities.

Of the 553 small-business loans, totaling $32,320,562, tentatively approved by the Small Business Administration through July 20, 139 loans, totaling $7,240,000, are in rural areas, he pointed out.

In addition to grain storage elevators, these firms include livestock and poultry feed mills, alfalfa-processing plants, bean storage and processing plants, food canners, proprietors of frozen-food locker plants, poultry processors and meat packers, dairies, farm-machinery dealers and manufacturers of specialized farm equipment, seed dealers, chicken hatcheries, fertilizer dealers, fruit packers, and distributors or propane gas.

The small-business financial-assistance program—

Mr. Barnes said—

embraces small firms in all sections of the country. While much of our activity is in the large industrial centers, we are also doing an effective job in the rural areas, where small firms are enlarging their activities and improving their services to farmers.

Many of our loans are made with the cooperation of rural banks and they are helping provide new jobs as well as aiding in the development of our basic agricultural resources.

As examples of small-business assistance loans made to small firms in rural areas, Mr. Barnes cited the following:

A 7-year loan was made to a small tomato cannery in Indiana. The proprietor, who employs up to 100 persons in the peak canning season, was having difficulty in accumulating sufficient working capital to permit the most efficient operation of his plant. The local bank was providing short-term loans to help finance the canning pack, but could not make a term loan. A Small Business Administration loan of $28,700 provided modern equipment enabling the plant to operate more efficiently.

A proprietor of a small dairy in New England, employing seven persons, lost his barn, dairy, equipment, and home in a fire and required a term loan to pay his contractors and suppliers. A Small Business Administration 7-year loan of $35,000 permitted him to rebuild his business.

A businessman in a small Texas community saw an opportunity to develop a new business, pressure-creosoting fence posts and poles. He plans to hire 8 to 10 persons when his plant is in operation. In addition to meeting the farm demand for fence posts, he had industrial customers, and a 5-year bank-participation loan for $30,000 was arranged.

A 6-year bank-participation loan for $25,000 was approved to help a small firm in Wisconsin. The firm manufactures farm mowers which can be attached to tractors. At peak operations in the fall and winter months, the firm employs 50 persons in the community.

A processor of citrus fruits in California was granted a 5-year loan of $80,000 for working capital, with a local bank participating in the loan on a deferred basis. The firm has 27 employees and manufactures fruit concentrates and extracts.

A processor of dairy products in Kentucky with 52 employees was granted a 6-year loan of $60,000, with a local bank participating. A part of the loan will be used for working capital, and part for adding new equipment. Additional dairy-product processing facilities are needed in the area since many farmers are converting from beef-cattle raising to dairy herds.

A flour and feed mill in Oklahoma received a 5-year loan of $71,000, with local bank participation. Proceeds of the loan will be used to construct additional storage space for feed grain and seed.

An industrial foundation in Arkansas, comprised of some 150 local businessmen, was granted a loan of $166,666.66 to construct a poultry-processing plant in an area where new industry and additional employment were badly needed. A local bank participated in the loan. The increased equipment of this plant will provide an outlet for poultry and increase farm income in a large surrounding agricultural area in two States.

A processor of feed and seed peas in Idaho, employing from 4 to 20 persons, received a loan of $200,000, with a local bank taking 25 percent of the loan on a deferred participation basis. Proceeds of the loan to be used to purchase seed peas from contract growers, and for processing the crop.

A loan of $30,000 was made to a poultry processor in Minnesota to build new facilities. The loan, for 10 years was made in participation with a local bank. As a result of expanding its operations, the firm expects to be able to employ 10 additional persons.

A small firm in Oregon, which specializes in constructing and modernizing farm buildings, was granted a 5-year loan of $7,000 to be used in expanding operations. The firm now has 10 employees, and the loan was made in participation with a local bank.

A retailer of seeds, farm supplies, and machinery in Virginia received a 3-year bank participation loan of $22,000. Proceeds of the loan are to be used for working capital and consolidating obligations. The firm, which is located in a drought area, has 7 employees, and has been in business since 1866.

An Illinois processor of poultry and eggs received a 10-year deferred participation loan of $98,000 to be used for working capital and to purchase additional equipment. The firm, which now employs an average of 103 persons, expects to be able to hire several more when its anticipated expansion is completed.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

CONFISCATION OF ALIEN PROPERTY

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply interested in the remarks just made by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] with reference to the question of private enemy property confiscated in the course of war. It used to

be an established principle of international law, or at least it was so considered when I went to law school, that enemy property was simply sequestered for the duration of hostilities and returned to the proper owners when the war was over. That principle should, I think, be adhered to, and I think it most regrettable that there should ever have been any substantial body of opinion to the contrary. I regret to say that I think the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be somewhat at fault for departing from the principle because we did, shortly after the end of World War II, report some legislation which earmarked, for the payment of certain claims, the Alien Property Fund. That, I think, was entirely wrong. If the claims were good claims, they should have been paid out of the Treasury. If they were not good claims, they should never have been paid at all, even if we had endless enemy property kicking around. This is only another illustration of the ease with which a government succumbs to the temptation of raiding a fund which should be preserved for its owners. The alien enemies were not criminals. The only theory on which their property was seized in the first place was to prevent its being used to aid the enemy in the prosecution of the war. Let us bear in mind that precedents which we now establish may some day be cited against us.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight Saturday night in which to file a report on the bill H. R. 9678.

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

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], dealing with a legislative matter in which all Members are entitled to know what is going on, use the microphone to make his request so that he can be heard.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman renew his request?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight Saturday night in which to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 9678.

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

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa would like to reserve a point of order against the conference report on the bill H. R. 9678. Is this the proper time?

The SPEAKER. No. That would be in order when the conference report is called up for consideration.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF PRACTICES IN RETAIL DISTRIBUTION OF FLUID MILK

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on July 2, 1954, I introduced House Joint Resolution 554 and explained the resolution to the House on the same day. My remarks will be found on pages 9204 and 9205 of the RECORD for July 2. This resolution was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on July 2. That was over a month ago. As of today, no hearings have been scheduled or held on the resolution. The resolution, as you will note, is short and to the point. This is a matter which the people of the Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin, whom I represent, and many other rural areas are interested in. The resolution directs the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation of certain practices in the retail distribution of fluid milk to determine whether such practices are a restraint of trade and in violation of certain Federal laws.

Long and extended hearings are not necessary as the investigation asked for will be carried out by the Federal Trade Commission. It will not be necessary for the congressional committee to also investigate the practices at this time. There are many areas in the Nation where fluid milk can be produced at less cost per quart than in some of the areas now serving large metropolitan areas. The city consumer will receive the direct benefit in lower cost of production if such milk were not being kept out of the market.

I have written a letter today to the various members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce asking that action be had on this resolution so that the investigation can be started and a report completed before the next session of Congress. This report is necessary so legislation can be introduced to correct the same. I believe that the city consumers are just as much interested in this matter as the producers of milk who are now being shut out by present practices. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state at this time that if the Congress fails to act on this matter during this session I expect to introduce the same resolution in the next session and shall make an early effort to have it acted upon and passed so that the farmers and city consumers of the Nation will know the facts. I herewith submit a copy of my letter to the members of the committee and a copy of my resolution and ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 5, 1954.*

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On July 2, I introduced House Joint Resolution 554 which had been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is my hope that the resolution will be passed in this session of Congress so that the Federal Trade Commission can make an investigation and report its findings and information to the next Congress.

My personal opinion is that since the Federal Trade Commission will be making the investigation, it will not be necessary for the committee to hold long and extended hearings on the resolution.

I will appreciate it very much if the resolution is reported out by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for action before the present session of Congress adjourns.

Your help in this, as a member of the committee, will be greatly appreciated. I am enclosing a copy of House Joint Resolution 554.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER JOHNSON.

House Joint Resolution 554

Joint resolution to provide for a study and investigation of certain practices in the retail distribution of fluid milk to determine whether such practices are in restraint of trade or otherwise in violation of certain other laws of the United States

Resolved, etc., That the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission is authorized and directed to make a thorough study and investigation of all phases of the retail distribution of milk, to determine whether any action, conduct, or other practice in such retail distribution which results in the exclusion from the markets of a particular area of fluid milk produced outside of such area, is in restraint of trade, an unfair method of competition in commerce, an unfair or deceptive act or practice in commerce, or otherwise violates the antitrust laws.

IMMUNITY FOR SUBVERSIVES

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to predict that if the bill that was passed by this House yesterday under suspension of the rules, giving the Congress the right to grant immunity to witnesses becomes law, we will be faced with one of the greatest scandals the country ever has had. Instead of that bill catching and convicting subversives, it will be the means of giving immunity to subversives who otherwise might be indicted and convicted and sent to prison. Happily, the bill must go to conference, and I trust that when it comes back if it does, that this House will give it more careful consideration than it received yesterday, and that we then get a better bill than was passed yesterday.

REVISION OF WAGE-HOUR LAW

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I have been greatly concerned with the needed and necessary revisions of our present wage and hour law. In accordance with my view on this subject

and my experience, I am introducing today amendments to the wage-hour law.

The bill I have introduced today for the revision and improvement of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 would do the following:

Increase the present statutory minimum wage from 75 cents per hour to $1.25 per hour.

Add roughly 9 million additional workers to the number now covered by the FLSA.

There are about 24 million covered as of today. Under my proposed bill this figure would become 34 million—still less than half of the number of all gainfully employed persons.

This bill would wipe out many of the unjustified exemptions both in the original 1938 act and in the 1950 version of the FLSA.

The elimination of exemptions to the wage and hour provision, which I propose, would alone add about 6 millions to those covered. This 6 million, however, is not in addition to the 9 million figure above.

I call attention to certain basic facts about our national economy which should be borne in mind when considering this legislation.

This proposed bill reestablishes the machinery in the 1938 act for the establishment of tripartite industry committees to recommend minimum rates for a particular industry which would be higher than the basic nationwide $1.25 rate.

There are in my bill a number of fairly technical but quite important and highly practical revisions of the 1949 version which experience has proven to be necessary both from the standpoint of administrative feasibility and fair treatment for both employer and employees.

This bill would not affect a greater proportion of the total working force than did the original FLSA in 1938.

It would primarily affect industries whose wage standards have lagged and those employers who have failed to grant prevailing wage increases.

This proposed increase in the statutory hourly minimum from 75 cents to $1.25 is certainly modest when compared with the rise in average hourly earnings of factory workers from 62 cents to $1.79—June 1938 to March 1954—a step-up of $1.17.

The cost of living for lower income groups has risen by more than 120 percent since the FLSA first became law.

Productivity in the American industry has been rising at the rate of $3.25 to 3.5 percent per year per man-hour. This increase alone would justify the proposed increase in the statutory minimum wage.

The actual prevailing minimum wage in industry today is $1.25 or higher. By increasing the statutory minimum wage in 1955, the Congress would stimulate and strengthen the entire American economy by eliminating remaining areas of substandard wages and by increasing purchasing power. The passage of the 1938 bill sparked an almost sensational upturn in our national economy. The effect of the 75-cent minimum rate which became effective in 1950 was less dramatic, but its beneficial effect was pervasive and its total effect was most helpful. The stereotyped advance predictions about firms being forced out of business because of the requirement of paying 75 cents an hour simply did not materialize. Indeed, the great bulk of industry that was paying below 75 cents an hour voluntarily brought their wages into line when they saw that Congress was going to act to raise the statutory rate.

My principal justification, however, for introduction of this legislation is that from the standpoint of social ethics it is not possible to permit millions of workers to remain outside the protection of this law. Both social justice and sound economics require immediate revision and extension of the FLSA.

In his March 30 message to the Congress on foreign economic policy, President Eisenhower announced that it is now United States policy to refuse tariff reductions to products "made by workers receiving wages which are substandard in the exporting country." The President also urged the raising of wages abroad by consultative procedures such as provided by the International Labor Organization.

In the conclusion of this message the President said that for our own security as a Nation our allies must become economically strong.

While I most certainly agree with all that the President says about the necessity for improving substandard wages abroad, these remarks apply with even greater force to our economy here at home. To keep America strong we must constantly strengthen the foundation of our economy. And that foundation is our purchasing power. The 75 cents minimum wage is out of date; it no longer provides adequate purchasing power; it no longer provides a decent American standard of living for that section of our population which is working for such substandard rates of pay.

I am introducing this bill at this time so that the terms of the act and its economic effect can be studied during the next several months, thus facilitating early hearings by the Labor Committees of the House and Senate.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN FUEL OIL

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to remind my colleagues of the news release under a London dateline announcing an agreement that will turn into the channels of world trade the great Iranian oil reserves.

When this trouble broke out between England and Iran it was necessary for the American companies that were in the cartel with the Anglo-Iranian oil interests to divert their production from Saudi Arabia and Iran to take care of the European markets. Once more this Iranian oil under their cartel arrangement will supply the European market. That means that Saudi Arabian and Iraq oil will be added to the great inflow of Venezuelan oil that has disrupted our domestic oil industry and threatened it.

I am just calling attention to the fact that the 84th Congress must give attention to this serious situation.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF AUGUST 9

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to inquire as to the program for next week.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. I understand while I was busy talking to someone consent was given to adjourn over until Monday, which is entirely agreeable to me, as the gentleman from Indiana had already spoken to me about it.

May I inquire with respect to the program for next week?

Mr. HALLECK. In response to the gentleman's inquiry I may say first of all that today there are two rules outstanding which we expect to dispose of, together with the bills they make in order.

As the gentleman from Texas has pointed out we will then adjourn over until Monday.

The discharge petition on the postal pay bill, as I understand, will be called on Monday.

For next week, barring some unforeseen contingency, so far as I know there is no legislative program for the House to work on except conference reports.

I have just been informed by a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia that the District Committee has reported out a few bills which will be in order on Monday next, inasmuch as that is the calendar day for the consideration of the District of Columbia bills. So far as I know there is no serious controversy about any of those bills.

Private and Consent Calendars: Whether or not there will be a further call of the Private or Consent Calendars I do not know. I will not promise that there will be. It is possible that if there are measures that should be acted upon we could arrange to do that without a formal calling of those two calendars.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield that I may address an inquiry to the majority leader?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Will the discharge petition take precedence over all other legislation coming up on Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. I think it will, as I understand the rules. As a matter of fact, since the gentleman has mentioned that discharge petition, if the gentleman from Texas will yield——

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

Mr. HALLECK. I think it ought to be pointed out to the membership that that discharge petition makes in order one of the most effective gag rules I have ever seen in my time. It prohibits all amendments except those offered by the committee. It limits debate to 1 hour.

There were some very bitter things said the other day when we called up the postal rate and pay bill under a motion to suspend the rules. Then we had 40 minutes' debate, and that was supposed to be too short a time. Under the discharge petition, of course, debate will be limited to 60 minutes instead of 40.

As far as I am concerned personally, in view of the fact that it does provide for the calling up of a bill under a gag rule, I trust some of the people who signed the petition will not complain hereafter if we bring out some so-called gag rules.

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course, the only way that can be prevented is to amend the rules of the House.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; but one who puts a discharge petition on the desk assumes the primary responsibility for the form in which the rule is presented, as well as the discharge petition. Of course, those who sign the discharge petition, I take it, are under some obligation to know the sort of a rule which is provided.

Mr. RAYBURN. With reference to gag rules, it all depends on who is in the majority. We always complain when we are in the minority about gag rules, and the gentleman's party complained when they were in the minority, but we go right on gagging in more ways than one.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. In the consideration of the bill on Wednesday a week ago and in 40 minutes of that debate we had two important bills under consideration, the increase for postal workers and the increase in postage rates, whereas on Monday we will have an hour of debate on just one bill, the Corbett postal bill.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Only yesterday we passed a rather important bill with only 40 minutes of debate.

Mr. RAYBURN. We do that all the time.

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

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas, also the gentleman from Indiana, who has left the floor at this time. I do hope and trust that the leadership will see fit to bring out the Washita project, which was recommended by the President of the United States—it was No. 1 on his list in his budget message, and one that has been approved by the Senate. It is an emergency project, it is worthwhile, it has been reported by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and I hope the House leadership will recognize the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to call up that bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. I agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma that he has a very fine bill, and it should be passed.

AMENDING SECTION 405 OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1953

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9077) to amend section 405 of the District of Columbia Law Enforcement Act of 1953, to make available to the judges of such District the psychiatric and psychological services provided for in such section, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 405 of the District of Columbia Law Enforcement Act of 1953 is amended by striking '(1) The probation officers' and inserting in lieu thereof '(1) In criminal cases, the judges of the district court and the probation officers.'"

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 622 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of further conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 50 of the 83d Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000 additional including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, following the word "thereof", insert "within the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Territory of the Virgin Islands, and British possessions in the Caribbean area."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 629 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 22 of the 83d Congress, incurred by the select committee appointed to study and investigate the problems of small business, not to exceed $35,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sums heretofore made available for conducting such study and investigation, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$35,000" and insert "$25,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 631 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 439, 83d Congress, incurred by the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1954, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise engaged.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

CONGRESSIONAL PRAYER ROOM

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I have had a number of inquiries about the location of the prayer room which was authorized under a resolution which I introduced about 2½ years ago, approved unanimously by the House last July 17, and by the Senate unanimously in May of this year. I am glad to announce that the Speaker has made room No. P-65 available for this purpose. It is just west of the rotunda on this level. I know the newspapermen will not believe me when I say that this is an announcement I would much prefer to make in executive session. They know that I appreciate publicity as much as anyone, but publicity should not be sought in this instance. I am making this announcement solely for the information of the Members. And it is an important announcement. I pray the indulgence of the newspapermen to that extent, but not to suggest, of course, that our personal feelings color any reports they make of the prayer room. I am well enough acquainted with their standards not to make that mistake. However, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that something was required of the press in this situation beyond the professional standards which they scrupulously maintain. They have been objective but they have been sensitive to the underlying considerations which motivated us. In the tradition of the American newsman they have given the story to the public and yet they have respected our desire to avoid exploiting this resolution. They have shown in this area of activity the same perception they have developed in political matters. It is not something I have just discovered about them. I recall, for example, a 1942 experience. My friend Ed Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, sent one of his reporters to cover a visit I made to the camp for Japanese-Americans transferred to my State. Their young people invited us to participate in a Christian service, and the reporter eagerly grasped the chance to add an account of this meeting to his story. The service began with the singing of Martin Luther's famous hymn, A Mighty Fortress. I was asked to speak. The Press-Scimitar article appearing next morning began:

> It was an amazing experience attending a service in Arkansas of Japanese-Americans just removed from California, singing songs written by a German, out of a book published by Presbyterians, and listening to a Baptist politician speak.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] stressed the importance of the prayer room when the resolution was originally considered. I remember his words, "Mr. Speaker, this is a notable occasion." The Congress of the United States had never done anything like this before. But I want to confess to my colleagues that after it was done I was amazed at the complex problems that arose in connection with the establishment of the room for our personal use, this place of retreat and meditation. I found on examination that it involved a keener understanding of our patterns of government and the relation of religion to politics. The two are indeed related. I think it was Disraeli, at least one of the great British statesmen, who, upon being invited to address an audience, was told upon arrival that he would be permitted to speak about anything except politics and religion. He said, "Finding that I was not permitted to speak of the two subjects of most importance to mankind, I promptly left the meeting."

I believe people might be surprised at the number of times men in these seats have prayed silently for themselves. I know that I have been inspired on occasions by an intimate opening of the mind of a colleague in reverently insisting that prayer is needed. What we want in the prayer room is a place of retreat where encouragement can ge given to that attitude of reverence and meditation; where one can find the resources that lie outside himself.

I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, that both the action of the Senate and of the House on this delicate subject has been accomplished in exactly the right way. I am personally indebted to the present distinguished Speaker of the House for his wise counsel and to the distinguished former Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] for sound advice.

At first, one Member expressed reluctance. We are taught in personal petitions, he said, to seek a secret place. If that were taken literally, there would be no prayers in formal church services. It should not be taken literally, but in effect, it is a secret place. Privacy will be afforded. It is not a prominent room. It will be for the use of Members only and I am sure the public will recognize the physical limitations and will approve our decision.

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

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. There is no emblem that would indicate that this meditation room is for the use of any particular creed or denomination or sect? That has been carefully avoided, has it not?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am glad to have the gentleman from Iowa bring out that fact. The gentleman will recall that with the third member of our committee, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], we carefully canvassed the matter of symbols. In all of our activities we have worked with Mr. Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, who has expressed a desire to equip the room in a way that will meet the highest standards.

I am anxious to have presented on this occasion a full account of progress on the room so I trust the House will bear with me.

I had a chance to show the room to one of our great church leaders recently and I asked him, "Can you help us with the symbols, particularly one that will represent our faith in God as the Father of all?" There is no ready answer to that question. The Bible itself should stand for that faith. But all of the symbols will be compatible with our belief in the separation of church and state and our complete commitment to the ideal of freedom of worship.

The resolution itself says that there shall be in the room a symbol of freedom of worship. I think the flag of the United States may best represent that guaranty, and the flag will be in an appropriate place.

In the same article in our Constitution in which freedom of worship is guaranteed, and in which the prohibition of the establishment of any official faith is stated clearly, there is a secure guaranty that there shall be no prohibition of the free exercise by an individual of his faith, and the two concepts are tied together. For that reason the emphasis is rightly upon the individual and this, Mr. Speaker, makes it possible for all faiths to share in the facility.

The central feature of the room will be a beautiful and attractive stained-glass window in subdued colors and of magnificent design—and I pause to mention the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] for that contribution from his district. It is not only the gift of the company that manufactures the windows but also of the skilled workmen who have donated their services. In the design is a candle, the symbol of light, a scroll, with no visible words but the Architect tells me that it represents the Sermon on the Mount, with its message of mercy and of love and brotherhood—and then below an open book, the book of the law. These are all appropriate symbols, it seems to me.

I appreciate the kindness of the gentleman from Iowa in yielding to me. As evidence of the interest in this provision, I would like to refer to a conversation a few days ago with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], who handed me the following quotation on prayer from a book he had just read:

> To pray * * *. It is so necessary and so hard. Hard not because it requires intellect or knowledge or a big vocabulary or special techniques, but because it requires of us humility. And that comes, I think, from a profound sense of one's brokenness, and one's need. Not the need that causes us to cry, "Get me out of this trouble, quick," but the need that one feels every day of one's life—even though one does not acknowledge it—to be related to something bigger than one's self, something more alive than one's self, something older and something not yet born, that will endure through time.

This is an excellent statement of our need.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there are many things that have been done by this Congress of which I have been critical. I am happy to have this opportunity to rise to say that, in my opinion, one of the finest things that this Congress has done, one of the finest things that any Congress has done, or could do, is the fulfillment of the project so eloquently described by our distinguished colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS]. He and his colleagues have devoted themselves wholeheartedly to a truly divine task, and the results they have brought about will be a lasting monument, not only to this Congress, but to this Government of ours which has ever been in the forefront of the

fight for human liberties and particularly for the right to worship God in accordance with the dictates of one's own conscience.

Without violating the concept of separation of church and state we here set a living example of how men of differing faiths can nevertheless live together as brothers under the one ever living God.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the establishment of a special room for prayer and meditation here in the Capitol of the United States is a most significant one. This is not the first or only recognition given to religion and to the things of the spirit. Every session of the House of Representatives and every session of the Senate of the United States is opened with a chaplain's prayer. The motto on the coins of the United States, "In God we trust," is a public affirmation of religious truth.

Religion and morality have long been recognized as good and necessary in themselves, but also as essential to the working of a democratic political system. George Washington's statement that religion and morality were the indispensable supports of political prosperity, have been accepted and repeated many times by both political and religious leaders in the United States. Whereas the first amendment clearly forbids the Federal Government from establishing a church, the amendment was not intended to create an irreligious or antireligious government. The Government has demonstrated, from the beginning of our national existence, a special and open concern for the religious life of the citizens of our country. Religious publications are given special consideration under postal-rate laws and regulations. Chaplains are provided for the men and women in the armed services, and chapels provided. The objective and rule has been to provide such service without discrimination—without special preference.

The goal of our democracy has not been uniformity or strict conformity, but rather it has been political unity, allowing for individual and group differences. Fundamental to our political philosophy is the fundamental respect of the dignity of every person as endowed with "unalienable rights" which no government may take away.

This whole American experience, as it relates to our religious freedom, has been admirably treated by Father John Courtney Murray in an article entitled "American Pluralism," appearing in Thought magazine.

Father Murray in his article points out that America has proved by experience that political unity and stability are possible without uniformity of religious belief and practice, and without the necessity of governmental restrictions on religion.

For a century and a half—

He points out—

the United States has displayed to the world the fact that political unity and stability are not inherently dependent on the common sharing of one religious faith.

This is the best argument, the argument from history, against those who argue that religious differences necessarily make for political differences and instability, and also from experience the argument against those who argue that religious life will not flourish unless underwritten and prescribed by the state.

Father Murray points out moreover, that American experience demonstrates not only that there can be stable political unity in a society religiously pluralistic, but that political unity can be positively strengthened by the exclusion of religious differences from the area of governmental concern and authority. Religious differences and conflicts have never had more than an accidental and temporary significance in American politics. We have in America, Father Murray observes, consequently been saved from the disaster of ideological political parties.

The third and most striking aspect of the American experience, the article notes, is the fact that religion itself has benefited by our free institutions, by the maintenance of separation between church and state. Father Murray concludes with the observation that the goodness of the first amendment, as it has generally been interpreted and applied, is "manifest not only by political but also by religious experience;" that "by and large—for no historical record is without blots—it has been good for religion to have simply the right of freedom. This right is at the same time, the highest of privileges and it too has its price." That price is not envy and enmity, the price of privilege, he points out, but the price is sacrifice, labor, added responsibilities imposed by freedom.

It is my hope that the establishment of the common room will serve not only to symbolize the diversity that characterizes the United States, but that it will serve also as an instrument for the advancement of understanding, of tolerance, and truth.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, approval by both Houses of the establishment and furnishing of a room for mediation and prayer in the Capitol, causes a great many Members of the Congress much satisfaction.

Apparently many Members have felt this need for some time. In times of extra pressure and stress, mankind has always turned to the Almighty for help, strength, and guidance. The opportunity for quiet seclusion and meditation, convenient to the Houses of Congress, with suitable religious atmosphere and furnishings, but entirely nonsectarian, should be provided by this room.

The Capitol Architect has sufficient funds for refinishing, rearranging, and equipping the room, except, of course, for a stained glass window, seemingly an essential of such a room.

I am happy that the Judson Studios of Los Angeles, whose principals live in my district, saw fit on the very day that the resolution was offered, February 12, 1953, to call me on the long-distance phone, offering to donate such a window. This is more than a company offer. The highly skilled workmen, several of them immigrants from Europe, have insisted that they donate their time as a contribution not only to their adopted country, but to the high purpose of this project.

Several designs for the stained glass window have been suggested. The committee had the suggestion that the window depicit various scenes enacting the Sermon on the Mount. In order to make it strictly nonsectarian, the studio has in mind various instances in American history in which the help of the Almighty was invoked by prayer—Washington at Valley Forge, and so forth. Final design, of course, must be approved by the committee under the direction of the Capitol Architect. Work, however, is to proceed immediately in the hope that the room may be dedicated upon the convening of the 84th Congress.

I wish to congratulate the sponsor of the resolution, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas, and the then chairman of the House Prayer Group, the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, of New York, for their assistance to the Honorable KARL M. LECOMPTE, of Iowa, chairman of the House Administration Committee, and his committee, as well as Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana, chairman of the Senate Rules Committee, in making effective the resolution.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 632) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations contemplated by clause 16, rule XI, incurred by the Committee on Rules, not to exceed $2,500, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

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

FAVORING WAIVER OF STATE RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS IN ELECTIONS OF FEDERAL OFFICIALS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) favoring the waiver of State residence requirements in elections of Federal officials.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the concurring), That the Congress expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the immediate enactment

of appropriate legislation to enable a person to vote for Federal officials, when such person would be eligible to vote for such Federal officials but for the residence requirements of the State in which he is residing.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could we have an explanation of what this resolution provides?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I might say to the gentleman from Mississippi that this resolution was offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS]. It recommends without any other provision that the several States negotiate among themselves and negotiate to make an arrangement whereby a citizen who moves from one State to another may be permitted to vote in the State of his original residence until such time as he has established residence in the State to which he has moved. It is purely a matter of recommending negotiation to the States.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, how long can this condition or status go on?

Mr. LECOMPTE. It just recommends that the States consider that in negotiations with each other. There is no time limit on it. It has already been done in some States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I do not like the idea of the Federal Government recommending to the States how to handle their voting laws.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It is entirely a recommendation. The gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee, will tell you that.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is very much like some of the memorializing statements that we get from our State legislatures. I might just say, Mr. Speaker, if I may, that really the resolution is somewhat meaningless because it is merely a recommendation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What prompted a resolution of this kind?

Mr. LECOMPTE. It was introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts, as I say, who has found that a considerable number of people are losing the right to vote by moving from one State to the other and not being permitted to vote until they have had a year's residence in the new State to which they have moved.

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

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REFERENCE OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 301

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Administration has found itself with House Resolution 301, which seems to have the elements of a claim and the committee voted to ask to have this bill referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which has jurisdiction of claims. I have spoken to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], and it is agreeable to him.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be rereferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I at this time extend my remarks and include a very short table which shows the amount of money that has been allocated from the contingent fund for investigation by special and regular committees of recent Congresses, including the 82d and 83d Congress up to this time, and showing the amount of money that was left unexpended. Of course, the picture will not be complete as to the 83d Congress.

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

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Appropriations for investigations (House of Representatives)

Congress	Appropriation	Balance
79th	$1,270,219.19	$836,456.71
80th	1,887,204.03	532,792.37
81st	1,678,987.90	487,150.99
82d	2,864,500.00	634,891.63
83d	2,654,550.00	[1] 1,092,208.19
Pending:		
H. Res 622	25,000.00	
H. Res. 629	25,000.00	
H. Res. 631	25,000.00	
H. Res. 682	2,500.00	
Total	2,732,050.00	

[1] June 30.

HILARIO CAMINO MONCADO

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2887) for the relief of Hilario Camino Moncado.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Hilario Camino Moncado shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hilario Camino Moncado and Diana Toy Moncado shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Hilario Camino Moncado and Diana Toy Moncado."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING HATCH ACT

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7745) to amend certain provisions of the act of August 2, 1939, commonly known as the Hatch Act, relating to employees of State or local agencies whose activities are financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object. However, it might be wise if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will give some brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why does not the gentleman permit consideration of the bill, and then have this discussion under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this extend to State employees?

Mr. CORBETT. Let me answer the gentleman from Texas first. This is a very minor change in the law. Presently, when a State employee is found to have violated the Hatch Act, the penalty is fixed at 18 months separation from State employment. The Commission has long wanted the right of some discretion regarding penalties because even a minor offense like wearing a campaign button could result in 18 months separation. So the bill provides first that the punishment for violation can extend from zero up to 18 months, depending on the nature of the offense. Secondly, it does add a protection to the rights of the individual State employee to exercise his citizenship privileges. That is all it does.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this extend to State employees appointed by a State administering State laws, even though they may be partially financed by Federal funds?

Mr. CORBETT. No, it does not. It deals only with the State employees who are not under civil service. It gives them protection rather than extending any further limitations on them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. May I ask the gentleman what prompted legislation of this type?

Mr. CORBETT. The very fact that the Federal Government, through the Civil Service Commission, could, if it

wanted to, put some 327,000 employees in jeopardy on their positions. Secondly, the thing which prompted it most keenly is the fact that the penalty is cruel and harsh, requiring 18 months separation from employment with the State, regardless of how minor the offense.

Mr. BURLESON. Particularly, for the benefit of the gentleman from Missisippi, [Mr. WILLIAMS], the law now brings State employees under the provisions and penalties of the Hatch Act, who are serving a State agency, which agency is in whole or in part financed by public funds. Is that a correct statement of the present law?

Mr. CORBETT. That is correct.

Mr. BURLESON. As I understand the measure proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, State employees are removed from the general provisions of the Hatch Act, where they are not paid by the Federal Government.

Mr. CORBETT. Let me say, and I particularly want to address myself to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] because I think we are doing what he wants done, rather than the opposite. All prohibitions against coercion or influence are retained. We are simply saying to the individual that he has a right to exercise his full rights as a citizen. That is all. He has no right to coerce and no right to influence. These prohibitions are held. I think we are doing what the gentleman would like to have us do.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand, if one of these State employees wore a political button of any party or any candidate, they would be violating the law, as it now stands.

Mr. CORBETT. And subject to removal for 18 months. If the governor of a State, for instance, would ask an appointed Cabinet officer to make an address for him in a political campaign, he would be in violation.

I might say to you that even if his secretary addressed a letter, as this law is now written, they would be in violation of the act and subject to being suspended for 18 months by order of the Civil Service Commission.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1955

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9936) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. TABER, Mr. CANNON, and, on chapter 1, 2, 4, 11, 12, and 13, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, and Mr. GARY; on chapter 3, Mr. CLEVENGER, Mr. BOW, and Mr. ROONEY; on chapter 5, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. BUDGE, and Mr. FERNANDEZ; on chapter 6, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. WHITTEN; on chapter 7, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. FENTON, and Mr. NORRELL; on chapter 8, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. JONAS of North Carolina, and Mr. THOMAS; on chapters 9 and 10, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. CEDERBERG, and Mr. RABAUT.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

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

There was no objection.

LABELING OF PACKAGES CONTAINING FOREIGN-PRODUCED TROUT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 687 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2033) relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear on the menus of public eating places serving such trout. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use, and then will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 687, which will make in order the consideration of the bill, S. 2033, relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear on the menus of public eating places serving such trout.

House Resolution 687 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, basically this bill is intended to protect the small American trout producing industry against unfair foreign competition. According to the report on this bill various restaurants throughout the country are advertising on their menus "Rocky Mountain Trout," or "Eastern Brook Trout," when actually the trout they serve is foreign produced and imported into the United States. The contention of the domestic trout producers is that over a long period of years during which great effort and money has been devoted to improving the product, the American producers of trout have built up a reputation for their product under the name of "Rocky Mountain Trout," or "Eastern Brook Trout." These domestic farmers of trout now claim that the misrepresentation of the origin of the trout by restaurants is injuring the reputation of the domestic trout as well as the market for it.

Specifically S. 2033 would amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to require that the packages of trout be stamped and labeled with the name of the country from which the trout came.

The second major provision in this bill would make it mandatory for restaurants to have the country from which the trout came printed on the menu in order that the public may know just what type of trout they are eating and therefore be able to judge the merits of the fish accordingly. If the restaurant does not use menus then it is mandatory for the restaurant to have displayed prominently within the restaurant itself the country from which the fish came.

I think that it should be noted here that the bill, if it is passed, will not go into effect for 6 months after the date of enactment.

Mr. Speaker, as the report on this bill points out, there is no limitation in this piece of legislation on the importation of trout from abroad. Neither does the bill regulate the manner or conditions under which foreign trout must be produced in order to qualify for importation into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly approve of this bill; it not only protects our domestic producer of trout from unfair competition but safeguards the trout-producing industry which stocks our streams as well as supplies our tables with this delicious fish.

I hope that the rule will be adopted and that the House will pass this bill which means so much to an important domestic industry.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I guess it may be said that this bill sounds a little fishy.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is worthy of the consid-

eration of the Members of the House. I would be reluctant to designate as ridiculous any measure that comes out of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I will therefore state to you what this bill does, and you may draw your own conclusions.

The bill made in order by this rule amends the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; and it does two things.

Of course, we might have a lot of important things to do around here in the last few days of the session but it seems we have got to deal with the question of fish and how the restaurants shall run their establishments in connection with fish. I thought they did a very good job themselves, but it seems now that we know more about their business than they know themselves.

This bill requires that trout, just one class of fish, must carry a label on the package showing what country they come from. That is not so objectionable, but when they get to the restaurant operator he has got to put on his menu the origin of that fish; in other words, he has to show the place of their birth, and their pedigree on the menu if he does not want to go to jail.

That might strike some people as being rather absurd. We ought not to do that to the restaurant and hotel operators. We have a very fine restaurant operator here in the House. He looks like he has been successful in running a restaurant. I believe he is. I believe he knows how to do it, and I think we ought to let him go on and run his business in the good old American way without telling him what kind of fish he has got to put on the menu and what the pedigree of that fish is, the point of origin, who was the father and grandmother, and where it was spawned.

Now, ought we take serious time to do a thing like that? Or ought we to defeat this rule that never should have been brought here?

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman, but I have not very much time. I will yield later. Let me first finish my statement.

Fish is a very important subject. There happen to be about six classes of trout. I could not pronounce the names and neither could you, but there are about six kinds of trout. There are about 6,000 classes of fish. Why should we discriminate against the trout? Why should we not make the restaurant menu show the pedigree of every fish, of all the 6,000 kinds of fish spawned in the world? Why discriminate against trout?

Seriously, I want to say that the trout fishermen, the people who raise these trout, are doing themselves a disservice. By the way, they say they are trout farms. Of course, "farm" is a very popular term around the House here and I suppose they call them trout farms because they think that gives it the farmer appeal and that everybody is going to vote for it because it is going to help the farmer, so they call these lakes trout farms. They raise trout. It is a very worthy enterprise. But they are going to cut their own throats.

Take our good friend from Chicago who has been successful running a business. He is a pretty sound, hardheaded old businessman. He may love trout and all that, and he wants to help all of these folks, but here is what is going to happen. Primarily he is a businessman. So when you pass a law saying that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] has got to put the pedigree of the trout on his menu or go to jail, do you know what John is going to do? John is going to quit selling trout. These trout people are fixing to ruin their own business, yet they do not realize it.

If we want to provide that foreign fish brought in here shall be labeled as to pedigree, that is all right, but to say that a restaurant keeper has got to guarantee the pedigree of every fish he puts on a plate he serves to you and me, is that not ridiculous? This bill would ruin the trout farmers. It would stop people from selling trout.

Unfortunately, I have to leave the House in just a few moments. But I want to ask my friends to do one thing for me. You know, a lot of you folks come down to Virginia. We have a specialty in Virginia. That is, Virginia ham. Restaurants put on their menus "Virginia ham." You order Virginia ham thinking you are getting a nice piece of Virginia ham, but when you get it, you know it never got any nearer to Virginia than a week before when it was murdered in Chicago, smoked, and sent down to Virginia a few days before. Yet, they call it Virginia ham. Do you not think it is just as important to protect my Virginia ham as it is to say what kind of fish, what his pedigree is, where it came from, where he was born, and where he died? They ought to protect my Virginia ham. I want you to offer an amendment to protect Virginia ham. You are all interested in Virginia ham.

We have a number of different kinds of shrimp from various parts of the country. Why not say where those shrimp came from? We have some very fine oysters, Lynnhaven Bay oysters. If they are going to serve these Lynnhaven Bay oysters why do we not make them say that they are Lynnhaven Bay oysters?

Mr. Speaker, let us forget about this fish business a while and get down to some serious business.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Virginia and I usually find myself wholeheartedly in agreement with him. However, he has oversimplified the matter which is before the House.

Last year in the United States there were 17½ million people who bought fishing licenses. Most of them wanted to fish for trout. There are 325 so-called trout farms, to which the gentleman referred, 325 in the United States. They are one of the most important sources of supply for restocking the trout streams in this country.

Another example of oversimplification: Thirty-one State fish and game commissions wrote to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee urging the adoption of this legislation. If these 325 small businesses in the United States are forced out of existence, then either the States or the Federal Government will have to replace the production of eggs, fingerlings, and of legal sized trout which are planted in the streams of this Nation.

There is another feature to this. We have here a practice which is downright dishonest. All of the manufactured products that come into this country from foreign nations must bear a label on them "Made in Japan" or "Made in Germany." These trout are shipped in frozen, in great big boxes, and as the gentleman from Massachusetts remarked the other day, you cannot get trout eggs out of a frozen trout. They ship them in these great big boxes, and on the outside of the box it will say "Produce of Denmark" or "Produce of Japan." But, you open up the box, and what does it have inside of it? Individual bundles of trout. And, incidentally, they are not even the same species of fish that are raised in this country. But, it will say on the package containing maybe a dozen trout, "Rocky Mountain rainbow trout," "Sierra Mountain trout," "Eastern brook trout," a deliberate attempt to deceive the people of this country who want to eat that type of fish.

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

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. When the application was made for a rule on this bill and the testimony was adduced, the thing that concerned me was why the sportsmen would be interested in this particular legislation. My mind is perfectly open. I am seeking information. Bear in mind that in a good many States—I know it is true in my State—trout is a game fish. I speak now of fresh-water trout, of course. It is a game fish, and it is not permitted to be taken commercially. They cannot be served in the various restaurants of the State. Therefore, it would seem to me that from a sportsmen's angle, the sportsmen would be opposed to this bill rather than endorsing it. Would the gentleman throw some light on that question?

Mr. BUDGE. I shall be happy to attempt to. I think the resolutions which were considered by the committee and which are part of the record bear the endorsement of the National Wildlife Federation, the Isaak Walton League, and the endorsement of 31 fish and game departments as well as several sporting magazines. They are interested in it for this reason:

The streams of the various States are stocked normally over a 60- or 90-day period during the calendar year. During the remainder of the year, in order for the fish farms to stay in business, they must sell trout on the commercial market. It is a year-round operation. They cannot operate for just 2 or 3 months. But a great many of the States and a great many individual organizations, sporting organizations, and a great many private individuals buy eggs and fingerling trout and legal-sized trout to put into their streams and lakes,

and they buy them from these commercial hatcheries. They augment the State and the Federal hatcheries in that regard, and that is where the sportsmen's interest comes in.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I wonder if he could tell us how many States prohibit the sale of trout commercially.

Mr. BUDGE. Well, I notice that the gentleman just said that his State prohibited it. I am also informed that the State of Virginia prohibits the sale of any trout in a public eating house. So I cannot understand why the gentleman from Virginia would be too excited about it, in view of the fact that you cannot sell any kind of trout in his State, whether it came from Virginia, Denmark, Pennsylvania, Idaho, Japan, or wherever they did come from.

Mr. COLMER. I may say that that is not true in my State. As I understand it, in my State, trout may not be taken for commercial purposes, but that does not prevent our purchase of imported trout. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BUDGE. The State of Virginia goes even further than that and prohibits the sale of it in any public eating house, which, as I have said, goes a lot farther than this bill. It seems to me, it is one thing to say that we are going to have trade all over the world which will be beneficial to everybody. This bill does not in any way attempt to prohibit the importation of a foreign product. It does not attempt to put any tariff on it. It simply says that if you are going to sell that product in the United States, be fair about it; do not attempt to sell it as an American product. I think somewhere along the line we have got to take a look at the little fellow in this country who is trying to stay in business. If he goes out of business, you are going to have 17½ million trout fishermen in this country who are going to want to know why. Incidentally, those 17½ million trout fishermen buy an awful lot of rubber boots. They burn a lot of gasoline. They buy a lot of meals. They represent probably the greatest sports recreation in the United States. Baseball rates about 14th compared with trout fishing.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, the House will see fit to approve the resolution and the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill came before the Committee on Rules, I was somewhat amazed and puzzled about the mechanics of enforcing this measure, if it is enacted into law. Over the weekend I happened to be back home in my district and I was approached by a number of people who own restaurants. I believe one of those restaurants is known throughout the Nation. It is right at the edge of Chicago on a main highway, Phil Schmidt's Restaurant, which is known as a great fish and steak house. Mr. and Mrs. Schmidt, the proprietors, talked to me about this legislation. They said if this bill is enacted into law it would cause great confusion and redtape in the operation of their restaurant. They sell a great many brands of fish. They would have to put on extra help in order to regulate their menus. They were very much aroused over the possibility of this bill becoming a law. Of course, if this bill would affect their restaurant, it would affect every restaurant that uses a menu in selling their food. It would involve a great deal of redtape in the operation of all restaurants.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Would the gentleman be kind enough to explain what that additional redtape would be, and what would be the great burden that would be placed upon those restaurants? That is difficult for me to understand.

Mr. MADDEN. I am not a restaurant man. I merely have the word of the proprietors of several restaurants in my district of what would happen if they tried to carry out the provisions of this bill.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would not an obvious case be that if you had a restaurant that served both domestic and imported trout the owner would have to follow the trout all the way through to be sure that he served the kind indicated on the menu?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Is it not a fact that you would have to trace the ancestry of the fish that he was putting on the table in order to comply with the law?

Mr. MADDEN. I think that is correct.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is there anything in the law that would require them to print this information in the English language?

Mr. MADDEN. The bill does not set out any specific regulations.

Mr. McCARTHY. When it comes to Japanese trout, they might just put down one of the oriental symbols. Would that satisfy them?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know. I am not the author of this legislation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does not the gentleman think the bill ought to go into that eventuality?

Mr. MADDEN. I think the gentleman is correct.

I think one of the things that scares the average restaurant proprietor is this section, quote: "The significance of making this a prohibited act is that section 303 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with a few exceptions in certain cases for acts done in good faith, makes the commission of such a prohibited act a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment for not more than 1 year or not more than $1,000 fine or both for the first offense. This section makes repeated violations felonies punishable by imprisonment for not more than 3 years or by a fine of not more than $10,000 or both such imprisonment and fine." That would scare the average restaurant proprietor because it would expose him to unnecessary and malicious prosecutions on an offense where possibly he might not be violating the law with criminal intent.

Let me call your attention to another fact. If this law were passed it would mean that the Food and Drug Administration would have to have a great number of people added to their force in order to enforce the law. As I understand, Congress in this session reduced the appropriation of the Food and Drug Administration. My information is that the food and drug department of our Government today is deplorably undermanned for inspectors to go around inspecting foods and drugs and other necessities. If the department is called upon now to put on additional help in order to patrol the restaurants to learn whether or not they are serving a certain type of fish, I think it is an unfair infliction to impose on the department and restaurants of our country.

I might also mention another angle in this connection. It generally is the American inclination when you go into a restaurant and order something imported to think it is just a little bit better than the domestic type. Of course, they charge more for most of these imported goods. Nevertheless, I am afraid it might end to defeat what the trout people are attempting to accomplish. People might go into a restaurant where imported trout is being sold and say, "I would rather have that than the domestic trout." So it might hurt the domestic trout business considerably. Furthermore some hotels and restaurants if they were exposed to this ban might refuse to sell any brand of trout.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I doubt very much what the gentleman is saying, and I have a very high regard for the gentleman's opinion. Nevertheless, it is plain that when they ship these trout in here in refrigerated cases and mark them "Montana trout" or "Idaho trout" or "Colorado trout" or some other kind of trout, they recognize immediately that the American people want domestic trout.

Mr. MADDEN. I get the gentleman's point.

Mr. GAVIN. That is misrepresentation.

Mr. MADDEN. I might state that that could be avoided by having the original package labeled as to the source from which the trout or other fish came.

Mr. GAVIN. That is what they are trying to do.

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Indiana with regard to this rule, which I believe is more or less an open rule, whether or not if the pending resolution were to be adopted I should have an opportunity

to offer an amendment which would include our Brooklyn Gowanus Canal guppies and Prospect Park bullfrogs in the provisions of this bill. Would such an amendment be in order?

Mr. MADDEN. Maybe such an amendment would be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not think this legislation would be before the House if these restaurants ever got around to serving Mississippi catfish. If they ever ate Mississippi catfish, they would never want this trout.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks, I include this telegram:

WHITING, IND., *August 1, 1954.*

Representative RAY J. MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Restaurant owners this district urge you to do everything possible to avoid passage of S. 2033 now scheduled for House action. This bill would establish dangerous precedent. Letter follows explaining.

PETER C. SMIDT,
Vice President, Phil Smidt & Son, Inc.; President, Lake County, Indiana Restaurant Association.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides that every restaurant in the United States must print on its menus the name of the area from which the trout comes, and if they do not have menus, they must put placards or conspicuous signs on the walls of the restaurant indicating the geographical area from which the trout came. What will eventually happen if we pass a bill of this character where we force signs indicating: "Idaho trout," "Colorado trout," "Danish trout," "Canadian trout," and so on? We are encouraging American producers to demand identical restrictions. Finally we will force restaurateurs and hotel men to put on their menus Cuban sugar, Mexican shrimp, Italian olive oil, Brazilian coffee, Canadian salmon, Spanish onions, Haiti beets, Portuguese sardines, Irish potatoes. Everyone and his brother would want protection against foreign competition. The menu will be cluttered with all sorts of geographical terminology. And if the restaurant proprietors do not print menus, they would have to plaster their walls with the names of almost every nation on the globe. Remember this too. How in thunder are you going to enforce a ridiculous law of this character? The Pure Food and Drug official appeared before the committee and said that there were no less than 525,000 eating places or restaurants in this Nation. I do not know how many hotels there are with their coffee shops and their restaurants—probably another 25,000 or 30,000 making perhaps a total of 550,000 places where you can eat. How are you going to enforce a provision like this? The Pure Food and Drug official who testified said it would be woefully impossible for the Pure Food and Drug Division to enforce this statute. He said:

It is the view of the Department that the value to patrons of public eating places of knowing that the trout served is of foreign origin would not justify the substantial cost of adequate regulation.

Over the years, in an effort to give the most public protection possible with its limited funds, the Food and Drug Administration has given first attention to those matters which directly affect the public health with next attention to the violations involving filth, decomposition, and insanitation. This has meant that the purely economic aspects of enforcement have given very limited attention. Present indications are that because of a further reduced budget investigation of economic violations will have to be largely discontinued, this fiscal year, and that some work designed to keep filth out of food will have to be stopped. Decreasing the amount of attention to the health and sanitation aspects of enforcement in favor of the enforcement of this measure if it were to become law could not, in our opinion, be justified. The Department must therefore respectfully recommend against the enactment of these bills.

Beyond that, if the restaurateur or hotel man does not satisfy the provisions of the act, what happens to him? He goes to jail for a year and/or he pays a fine of $1,000. I have been informed by the Hotelmen's Association and the National Association of Restaurant Owners that they are not going to sell trout and that they are going to instruct all of their members to be very cautious and to refrain wherever possible from the sale of trout. So the proponents of this bill are just going to be "hoist on their own petard"—they are not going to sell more trout, they are going to sell less trout.

We have not only the Pure Food and Drug Administration opposing it. The State Department opposes it and the Department of the Interior opposes this bill. We have three branches of the executive opposing this bill. I wonder whether the leaders and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who abet passage of this bill are going to follow the administration. The administration apparently does not want this bill and we, on this side, predominantly do not want the bill either.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Will the gentleman from New York explain why the State Department is opposed to this bill?

Mr. CELLER. Because it violates the treaty we have with Denmark. It violates the treaty we have with Canada. It violates treaties that we have with other countries because they must give equal treatment to the importers of various products equal to the treatment that they give to those who process and sell domestic articles. This particular bill violates that provision and for that reason it is a violation of a treaty and they of the State Department are unalterably opposed to the bill.

But, I might say in closing, this is apparently time for strange and bizarre bills.

Last week it was the frying pan bill. This week it is the trout bill. We seem to be going from fish to the frying pan.

I am informed that the bill passed unanimously in the other body to please one particular Senator who was running for reelection. I understand that many Members on this side are having their pictures taken with the President to get reelected. They are seeking to ride in on the coattails of the President. Now we are having one Senator riding in on the tail of a fish so that he can get reelected.

The representative of the Department of the Interior objected to the bill, as follows:

I recommend against enactment of the proposed legislation.

The bills would amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to prohibit the sale, offering for sale, possession for sale, or serving of trout produced outside the United States, its Territories or possessions, unless the trout is packaged, wrapped, and clearly labeled to indicate its foreign origin and to require that in serving such trout the menu of the eating place indicate the name of the country where the trout was produced.

The exact purpose of the bills is somewhat difficult to determine, although it may be assumed that they are intended to aid the marketing of domestic, hatchery-raised trout. In this connection, it should be noted that the requirement of having each fish wrapped individually probably would raise the cost per pound of imported trout by only a few cents. The present differential in wholesale price between domestically raised trout and the imported, hatchery-raised trout is around 40 cents per pound. Thus, the additional cost would be absorbed easily and the imported trout still would undersell domestically produced trout. The question of whether the requirement that all eating places indicate on the menu the origin of the trout being served would affect in any way their consumption is equally difficult to determine. In some instances, at least, the labeling of a product as having been produced in a foreign country seems to enhance its popularity with the consuming public.

Here is the opposing statement—in part—of the representative of the State Department:

The bill provides that each part of the contents of each package of imported trout be wrapped separately and the country or origin of the trout be stated on each wrapper. The bill also provides that each public eating place serving imported trout shall indicate on its menu or by means of a conspicuous notice the foreign country in which the trout was produced.

By providing special conditions applicable only to imported and not to domestic products, this bill is inconsistent with reciprocal international commitments which this Government has obtained for the purpose of protecting the interests of American exporters in foreign markets. The United States has negotiated treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation and other international agreements with many countries, some of which are producers of trout for export, containing provisions to the effect that products of either party shall be accorded, within the territories of the other party, national treatment in all matters affecting internal taxation, sale, distribution, storage and use, that is, treatment of the foreign product equal in these respects to that accorded to the domestic product. The United States Government, since soon after its establishment, has sought such reciprocal commitments from other countries to assure to American nationals the opportunity to engage in international trade on an equitable basis. The proposed bill would require the United States, inconsistently with such commitments, to deny national treatment to one class of imported goods. If additional requirements to indicate the origin of trout were considered

desirable, such requirements could be imposed on domestically produced trout and foreign trout alike, without any departure from the established policy of the United States to accord national treatment to the goods of friendly foreign countries.

The Danish Government indicated that Danish trout is sold in competition principally with other imported foods, such as Mexican shrimp, Cuban lobster tails, Japanese frog legs, etc. The treatment required in the bill for trout would thus create a special handicap for the foreign sellers of trout in meeting the competition of these other imported foods.

While there seems to be a real question as to the reasonableness of undertaking the administrative burden of enforcing compliance with so special a regulation in the very large number of eating places in the United States, this aspect of the bill does not fall within the purview of this Department. However, because of the probable adverse effect on friendly countries and because of the conflict with United States trade policies and commitments, the Department recommends against enactment of H. R. 4201.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill. I am opposed to the rule. This bill has a fishy stench that could be smelled from Maine to California. Even the New York Fulton Fish Market smells like perfume in comparison.

There has been great pressure on the Rules Committee to get this bill out of the commitee. I asked for permission to testify before the Rules Committee to indicate my opposition to this bill. Somehow or other, all of a sudden the Rules Committee had an executive session and I was foreclosed from indicating my opposition to this bill. I was not given an opportunity to express my feelings.

There is also another strange and unusual thing about this bill, and that is the report of the committee. If you have had an opportunity to look at the report you will find that it contains only the pros and not the cons. The opposition is not indicated in the report. This report contains the favorable opinions of the Sport Fishing Institute, the National Wildlife Federation, Outdoor Life, and other similar opinions, but not the opposition that has been indicated by the Interior Department; not the opposition that has been indicated by the State Department, and not the opposition that has been indicated by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. That is something unusual. We do not see that very often. We usually get a clear picture of the pros and cons.

In my own humble opinion, if we are foolish enough to pass this bill, and I think the Members of this House are fully familiar with its purposes, I do not think the President will sign it, because of the opposition of those departments.

Because of the limited time, there has been some question as to why the different departments have objected.

I want to read into the RECORD the opposition of the State Department. This was a reply to me in answer to a question I posed to the Department. This letter is dated July 29:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 29, 1954.

The Honorable PAUL A. FINO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FINO: Reference is made to your letter of July 27, 1954, requesting the views of the Department of State regarding the trout-labeling bill, S. 2033.

The bill as passed last year by the Senate and reported on June 11, 1954, with minor amendments by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (H. Rept. No. 1850), provides that imported trout offered for sale in the United States shall be packaged and that each package shall state the country of origin of the trout. The bill also provides that each public eating place serving imported trout shall indicate on its menu or by means of a conspicuous notice the foreign country in which the trout were produced. In responding to an inquiry from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Department of State, on June 26, 1953, recommended against enactment of S. 2033 because it would conflict with United States foreign trade policies and commitments and because of the probably adverse effects it would have upon our relations with foreign countries.

The United States has negotiated treaties and other agreements with many countries, some of which are producers of trout for export, containing provisions to the effect that products of either party shall be accorded within the territories of the other party national treatment in all matters affecting internal taxation, sale, distribution, storage and use; that is, treatment of the foreign product no less favorable than that accorded to the domestic product. In conflict with these commitments, the proposed bill would deny national treatment to one class of imported goods, in that it would require the packaging and labeling of imported trout but not of domestically produced trout. However, it would impose special marking requirements, such as those relating to the serving of imported trout in restaurants, going far beyond the general marketing provisions in section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in a manner generally inconsistent with the purpose of the provisions in treaties and agreements with other countries.

It is also the view of the Department that these provisions, if enacted, would adversely affect the United States trade of a number of friendly countries. The provisions of the bill would in a number of ways discourage the use of imported trout. The packaging and labeling requirements would increase marketing costs and possibly the ultimate selling price of foreign trout. The requirements with respect to menus and notices may be annoying and troublesome to implement and may also result in additional expense to restaurants serving such trout. Denmark has on more than one occasion expressed its concern to the Department regarding this bill. Its aide-memoires have pointed out that the proposed legislation would hamper the Danish trout export trade with the United States and that this trade represents an important source of Danish dollar earnings. Japan, another important exporter of trout to the United States, would also find its dollar earnings adversely affected. Canada has also expressed its concern over the restrictive nature of the bill. The economic welfare and continued goodwill and support of these countries are essential to the security objectives of the United States, and their purchases of American goods contribute to our own economic well-being.

Sincerely yours,
THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

I also have a reply to my inquiry to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of that Department, said by letter to me dated August 2, 1954:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINO: In response to your letter of July 27, 1954, concerning the position of this Department on S. 2033, we are pleased to enclose herewith for your information a copy of our report of July 6, 1953, to the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, recommending against enactment of the bill, and a copy of the prepared statement of Mr. Malcolm R. Stephens of our Food and Drug Administration presented to a subcommittee of the House committee on July 7, 1953.

There has been no change in our position.

What does this bill propose to do? Well, first it requires any foreign trout to be properly packaged and labeled. The existing law takes care of that because it specifically requires proper labeling. So there is no need for any duplication of our laws. Secondly, the bill requires every restaurant in the United States to print on its menu the name of the country from which the trout comes. That in and of itself is objectionable. But when we say that if the restaurant owner does not do these things, he is risking the possibility of going to jail and being fined, if by mistake he lists on his menu the wrong fish, then we are going too far in trying to help the trout raisers.

This is a bad bill. It is bad legislation and should not be passed. I trust the Members of the House will vote against the rule.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members that on yesterday Miss Jerolyn Ross, 17 years old, a constituent of mine the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Fred Ross of Meridian, Miss., was elected president of Girls Nation.

Anyone who knows Miss Ross, her personality and her ability, will know why she received such an honor. Her distinguished young friends were immediately impressed by her knowledge of the many issues to be considered by Girls Nation. After her nomination for president by the nationalist party, her election became certain as other delegates had an opportunity to meet her and hear her presidential program.

Miss Ross is typical of the fine young women of Mississippi, and I am especially proud of the recognition which has been given her. We need have no worries about our Nation's future as long as we

produce such fine young leaders as Jerolyn Ross.

The American Legion is to be commended for its sponsorship of the Girls and Boys Nation program. The fine Mississippi department of the Legion and auxiliary are certainly entitled to the greatest credit for girl's and boy's State programs it has conducted in Mississippi, the action of the national groups is proof of the value of the program in Mississippi.

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

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, may I say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD], that I have no desire to detract from the attractive and talented young lady, Miss Ross, who has received this signal honor. On the contrary, I desire to felicitate and congratulate her as well as to congratulate my distinguished and able colleague in whose district she resides, but I hope that it will not be amiss for me to also call attention to the fact that last week when the Boys' Nation convention was held here in Washington that it was another outstanding young Mississippian who was honored by being elected president of that organization. I refer of course to Eddie Perry, a constituent of mine, whose home is down on the beautiful gulf coast of Mississippi, Bay St. Louis.

So, we have the unusual situation here of an outstanding boy and an outstanding girl being selected to head up these two splendid youth organizations both from one State, the great State of Mississippi which my colleague [Mr. WINSTEAD] and I have the honor to represent here in the Nation's House of Representatives. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if a parallel situation has ever existed or for that matter ever will again.

Mississippi has traditionally been hailed as a great agricultural State, a rural State, if you please. But what my colleague [Mr. WINSTEAD] and I are emphasizing here is that while we may grow fine cotton, corn, and other agricultural crops down in Mississippi, that our truly great crop is the crop of splendid young men and young women. I am sure that our colleagues here would pardon us if we seem to take, as we do, pride in this historic event which happened here in the Nation's Capital, within the past week. All Mississippians are proud of Jerolyn Ross, of Meridian, Miss., and Eddie Perry, of Bay St. Louis, Miss. I am sure that you join with me in an expression of approval to that great patriotic organization, the American Legion, in sponsoring these splendid youth organizations.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this point to insert in my remarks an article regarding Miss Jerolyn Ross, which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning.

(The article referred to follows:)

JEROLYN ROSS, 17, HEADS GIRLS NATION

(By Patty Cavin)

The rafters of American University's Hurst Building were raised at least a foot and a half in midair last evening by shouts, roars, and screams of "Hooray," as members of Girls Nation welcomed their new president, Jerolyn Everette Ross, of Meridian, Miss., candidate of the minority Nationalist Party. Miss Claudia Anderson Liebrecht, of Manhasset, Long Island, took vice presidential honors.

The 98 teen-age delegates, here for a week of citizenship study under the sponsorship of the American Legion Auxiliary, sat on pins and needles through an 8 p. m. speech by Miss Bertha Adkins, assistant to the chairman of the Republican National Committee. (Miss Adkins obligingly cut her talk short to a fact-packed 15 minutes.)

There was a moment of dazed silence when the returns were announced by Mrs. J. Pat Kelly, of Atlanta, Ga., chairman of the Girls State Committee. The tall, suntanned 17-year-old president, and former governor of the Magnolia Girls State, let out a howl, then broke into a flood of tears. First to dash up and give her a hug was the defeated candidate of the Federalist Party, pretty blonde, Ann Davis, of Bountiful, Utah. "I pledge you my complete support," she said.

Miss Ross' election as president climaxed 3 days of rigorous campaigning on the part of the 98 delegates. They set up a mock government when they arrived last Saturday, complete with a two-party system. As one delegate dutifully explained, "There's really no difference between the Federalists and the Nationalists. We're both against apathy."

The new "Veep," Miss Claudia Liebrecht, formerly served as secretary of state and chairman of the platform committee at the recent Girls State convention in New York. She defeated Miss Mary Froebe, of Charlotte, N. C.

A pep talk on politics was the nature of Bertha Adkins' speech. She pointed out that the White House, the Congress, and Government departments were being run by candidates chosen by parents of the Girls Nation delegates.

"The Government will soon be yours," she said, "and will be as good as you choose it to be."

"Your experience in Girls Nation," she continued, "has shown you the importance of political activity. You are not only responsible for electing your officials * * * you are responsible for selecting them."

John Foster Dulles provided the afternoon highlights of the Girls Nation schedule yesterday. The distinguished, white-haired Secretary of State received the delegates at 2 p. m. in the second-floor auditorium of the old State Department Building where he usually holds his press conferences.

"I'm really going to enjoy this," he quipped, "not having to answer questions from the boys."

The Secretary explained that his grandfather had been Secretary of State 60 years ago, when the office was much more leisurely. As Secretary in the Eisenhower administration, however, he works 12 hours a day including many weekends, and has traveled over 150,000 miles negotiating for peace with other countries.

Russell L. Riley, Director of the International Education Exchange Service, took over at 2:30 to brief the girls on cultural ties with other lands. They also heard Miss Mary Trent, a Foreign Service officer, sketch the advantages of overseas foreign service work. Robert C. F. Gordon, a member of the State Department's policy reports staff, finished up with a chat on American interests and United States bases abroad.

While the rest of the group returned to American University, their headquarters for the week, the two Girls Nation presidential candidates were whisked to Voice of America headquarters for a special overseas broadcast.

Pat Priest, daughter of Ivy Baker Priest, Treasurer of the United States, pinchhit for her mother and held an informal press conference at the Treasury for Girls Nation members in the morning. Mrs. Priest, who had planned to receive the delegates at 9 a. m., then take them on a Treasury tour, was unexpectedly called out of town.

Inauguration of President Ross, and her appointment of the Girls Nation cabinet are today's Girls Nation high points. The cabinet will be chosen at 8:15 a. m., preceding a bus trip to Arlington where the delegates will conduct a wreath-laying ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a telegram from Phil Shmid & Son.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe that I am the only Member of Congress who is in the restaurant business. I have been in that business for over 30 years. I am a member of the Chicago Restaurant Association and the National Restaurant Association, both of which organizations oppose this legislation. The American Hotel Association is also opposed to it and in a letter I received the other day they stated that if this bill is passed they will not serve trout in any of the dining rooms of any of their hotels.

Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to amend section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by making it a crime, punishable by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or not more than a $1,000 fine, or both, for a first offense, and not more than 3 years and a fine of not more than $10,000 for a second offense, for any person to possess, in a form ready for serving, or serving at a public eating place, trout produced outside the United States unless there appears on the menu the word "trout," preceded by the name of the country of origin, or, in the absence of a menu, displaying a sign to such effect therein; or for any person to sell, offer for sale, or possess for sale as food any trout produced outside the United States unless such trout is packaged, or if in a package which is broken while held for sale, for each unit of sale to be contained in a package and for each package to be marked with the country of origin.

The proponents of the bill state that it is a measure to prevent fraud and protect the domestic industry against fraudulent practices. The agency of the Government to which has been entrusted the protection of consumers against fraudulent labeling, packaging, and sale of food products is the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and particularly the Food and Drug Administration of the said agency. This section of the law in question is proposed as an amendment of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and it is therefore particularly important to note the basis of the objections to this bill which

has been made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and placed in the record of the hearing. I quote from a letter written by the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency—now the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—to the late Senator Tobey, dated March 31, 1953, setting forth the reasons for the agency's objection to the bill:

In the enforcement of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act we have investigated importations of fresh-water trout. This law requires all packages of the product to bear the word "trout." The laws enforced by the Bureau of Customs require products imported into the United States to be labeled with a statement of the country of origin. The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act prohibits removal or alteration of required labeling while an article is held for sale, and the customs laws provide penalties for removing markings concerning the country of origin if this is done to conceal the source. It appears, therefore, that existing law already requires proper labeling of packages of fresh-water trout from abroad.

In considering the provisions of this bill with respect to the serving of foreign trout in public-eating places we should bear in mind that there are about 525,000 such places in the United States, and that enforcement of the measure would require that the practices of these places be kept under surveillance.

In our view the value to patrons of public-eating places of knowing that the trout served is of foreign origin would not justify the substantial cost of adequate regulation. We must, therefore, recommend against enactment of the proposed legislation.

Mr. M. R. Stephens, Associate Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Food and Drug Administration, appeared at the hearings held by the House Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and voiced the same objections as those contained in the letter from Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby.

No other food has been thus singled out for such treatment and a serious question arises as to the legality of a law which reaches down into the local restaurant and attempts to dictate how a particular item on its menu should be listed. Restaurants sell a great variety of food products, many of which come from all corners of the earth. If this requirement were enacted into law, then the same provision could be enacted in other laws where an imported product competes with one produced in this country. A restaurant menu would then take on a ridiculous look, with many prominent and conspicuous notices of country of origin. A menu might contain such listings as Chinese rice; Spanish onions; Canadian salmon; Cuban sugar; Brazilian coffee; Mexican shrimp, and so forth ad infinitum, and woe be unto that restaurateur who forgets to list the particular country of origin or makes an error in his listing because the penalty of up to 3 years in jail would be hanging over his head.

The separate wrapping and labeling of each individual fish which would be required by this legislation is a hardship imposed upon the foreign product whereas no such requirement would be in effect for the domestic product. The proposed bill interferes with our international relations and trade, and accordingly, our State Department has opposed the legislation in question, and in a letter of April 1, 1953, written by Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary, for the Secretary of State, to the late Senator Tobey, which appears on page 53 of the record of the House committee hearing, the following observation was made:

By providing special conditions applicable only to imported and not to domestic products, this bill is inconsistent with reciprocal international commitments which this Government has obtained for the purpose of protecting the interests of American exporters in foreign markets. The United States has negotiated treaties of friendship, commerce and navigation, and other international agreements with many countries, some of which are producers of trout for export, containing provisions to the effect that products of either party shall be accorded, within the territories of the other party, national treatment in all matters affecting internal taxation, sale, distribution, storage, and use, that is, treatment of the foreign product equal in these respects to that accorded to the domestic product. The United States Government, since soon after its establishment, has sought such reciprocal commitments from other countries to assure American nationals the opportunity to engage in international trade on an equitable basis. The proposed bill would require the United States, inconsistently with such commitments, to deny national treatment to one class of imported goods. If additional requirements to indicate the origin of trout were considered desirable, such requirements could be imposed on domestically produced trout and foreign trout alike, without any departure from the established policy of the United States to accord national treatment to the goods of friendly foreign countries.

Congress certainly has a great many more important things to consider than how this relatively inconsequential product should be listed on restaurant menus and how it should be packed. It is a presumption upon the time and effort of Members of Congress to attempt to adopt such special interest legislation. The existing provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and all the various local laws and ordinances, certainly afford ample protection against the fraudulent sale of all kinds of food by distributors or in restaurants. Section 403a of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act already provides that a food shall be deemed to be misbranded if its label is false and misleading in any particular. Any foreign produced trout labeled "Rocky Mountain trout," or by any other name which would indicate a place of origin other than its actual origin, would come under the condemnation of this existing provision of the law.

There is no need for the legislation in question and it will serve only to impose a burden on our domestic industry as well as raise additional barriers to international trade and tend to further deteriorate our already precarious international trade relations.

I am opposed to this rule and it should be defeated.

AMERICAN HOTEL ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., July 28, 1954.

Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KLUCZYNSKI: Pursuant to our conversation with you, we are authorized by our principals to tell you that the American Hotel Association believes that if S. 2033, the trout-labeling bill, should be enacted into law, as the bill now reads, the hotels of the country would be obliged to cease serving trout on their menus.

The hotels, and we would think that the same principle would apply to restaurants, simply would not dare run the risk of handling trout, imported or domestic, which might have been erroneously labeled by our suppliers, and face the extremely heavy penalties provided for any violation of the act.

We think it is also pertinent that the Food and Drug Administration continues to vigorously oppose this legislation. They complain that they never could enforce it without neglecting almost all other important activities. We understand that Mr. George Larrick, the present Commissioner, is prepared to publicly make this statement if questioned. His telephone number is Executive 3-6300, extension 3712. Or if he cannot be reached, Mr. Don Counihan is authorized to speak for him.

Respectfully,

M. O. RYAN.

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

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. It would appear to me if trout, either foreign or domestic, have any friends around here, that the worst thing on earth you could do for the trout business is to pass a law that would make the restaurant keeper afraid to serve trout at any time. Is that not the way the restaurant people feel about it?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I am sure that is the way they and I feel about it. It is just legislating these people out of business.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting to hear that the State Department is against this trout bill. That is nothing unusual for the State Department. Only 4 years ago they were shipping 8 million pounds of fillets into the United States, that is, salt-water fillets. Four years afterward it jumped from 8 million to 120 million pounds. But they do not think that that is bad for the fishermen or the fish handlers in the United States, so they are against it. They are against anything, in my opinion, that would help the United States if some foreigner is interested in it. With them the foreigner comes first. I know that is kind of a tough thing to say.

I believe it was said there were 525,000 restaurants or hotels who sell trout. Well, I would just like to have you Members think it over for a few moments and see how many hotels or restaurants you have been in where you have seen trout listed on the menu. This proposition here today is a proposition to protect a few raisers of trout in this country.

It is unusual to find the right locality to raise trout. You have to have the water at a certain temperature; and it has to be the same all the time. It has to be spring water. The man who runs a trout farm—and it is a trout farm—strips the trout in the spring and sells the eggs to State hatcheries, to State governments, or to anybody interested in the idea of this outdoor recreation of fishing. If you want to drive these people out of business, you will not have any

trout—that is all. They are not going to ship eggs from Japan or some other place. And what is wrong, anyway, in labeling the stuff that they are selling? It is done everywhere. In Massachusetts we have laws on the books that compel people to tell what kind of product they are selling. For instance, we sell Cape Cod scallops. They have got to be Cape Cod scallops. You cannot sell these sea scallops. Of course, Members may not know anything about that, but a bay scallop in Massachusetts is one of the sweetest, tenderest things to eat that there is in the world. But a sea scallop is fishy.

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

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is it not true that restaurants will label anything when it is to their advantage; but when they want to deceive the public, perhaps, then they object to labeling certain things when such labeling would work to the advantage of our American industry?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Why, certainly. Half the menus we see in some of these grand hotels do not tell us what we are ordering, anyway; and we do not know until we ask the waiter what it means.

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

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I wanted to say briefly what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX] has already said, that anyone picking up a restaurant menu will find a number of things that are labeled, such as Hawaiian pineapple, or some other product that comes from a specific place. I see no objection to this, and I do not know the reason why there should be all this objection to it on the floor.

Mr. NICHOLSON. We have listened to the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI]. I do not know whether he has a restaurant or a hotel, or what he has, but if he wants to sell trout under this bill, all he has to do is to say whether it is Japanese trout or Danish trout, and it will not hurt his business one bit. But, on the other hand, not to do it will hurt the man who is raising these trout for the benefit of the whole Nation. And they certainly are doing it.

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

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEAMER. Is it not true that practically all manufacturers label their products? For instance, pottery makers put a stamp on the bottom of their product, manufactured in this or that country, or the product of this or that country. The same principle is applied to many food products. For instance, is it not true that restaurants serving oleomargarine must carry signs to inform the public that they are serving oleo?

Mr. NICHOLSON. That is true. All this gets back to the State Department again. There is not anything in this bill that would prohibit Japan or Norway or Denmark, or any other country, from sending in all the stuff that they want to ship in here.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the "Isaac Walton" from Brooklyn talked about some kind of fish—the Gowanus Canal guppies, a species of fish found in the Gowanus Canal, evidently in his district. Apparently the gentleman's knowledge of fish other than that which he buys at a fish market is confined to that particular area of Brooklyn, the Gowanus Canal or Lavender Lake and the Hudson River; I do not believe he is too well qualified to talk about trout, the subject matter before us today. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] also said that a great deal of pressure had been brought on Members of Congress with reference to this proposed legislation. From the remarks that I have heard from the Members opposing this legislation it is quite evident that the hotels and the restaurants have brought considerable pressure on Members who do not want this bill passed because it might affect their business and the customers might know what they were eating. Johnny Mock, a great conservationist back in my State of Pennsylvania, recently in his column in the Pittsburgh Press states this case better than I could, and I should like to read excerpts from his column, All Outdoors, about the need for trout-labeling legislation.

TROUT BUSINESS AT STAKE

"All we ask is that the other fellow be honest in his dealings."

So advised an official of the nationwide association of trout propagators—and because the other chap isn't honest, thousands of fishermen throughout the country may eventually be denied a sport now being enjoyed.

Strange as it may seem, it is the deception practiced by exporters of foreign trout, their agents and those who serve the trout to the public, which is threatening the welfare of the enterprise that supplies trout for farm ponds, fee fishing sites and privately stocked waters, thereby reducing the ever-increasing pressure on public waters. Trout for such projects are obtainable in no other way, since Federal and State hatcheries are not permitted to sell any of their production.

Continuing he states:

Because of a devalued currency, the foreign trout have been underselling the domestic trout. However, in the quality there is no comparison.

To overcome the superiority and prestige of the American-reared trout, the exporters mislabeled and misrepresented their product, passing them on to the restaurants and hotels as domestic trout—and the latter served the inferior product as one produced in this country.

As a result of this deception, those who have enjoyed eating trout, conscious of the poorer quality, blamed their dissatisfaction on our propagators and quit ordering what was once the most delicious portion of a delightful meal.

Now I might state to the Members, this is a trout-labeling bill, to correct these conditions and the restaurant proprietor will have to state exactly what he is serving his customers, foreign or domestic trout and that is as it should be.

I understand the shippers of trout export them to this country in refrigerated cases and package the trout in bunches of 12 or more. They label the packages "Rocky Mountain Trout," "Montana Trout," "Idaho Trout," or use the name of whichever State is most appealing to their trade. By this deceptive method the customer is led to believe he is eating domestic trout. All this legislation does is to label them for what they are and where they came from—Japan, Denmark, or wherever these trout do come from—so that the people will know just exactly what they are buying and eating.

My good friend Johnny Mock continues:

To remedy the situation to some extent a measure known as the trout-labeling bill was introduced in Congress last year. It is not a subsidy, a tariff, nor does it restrain the importation of foreign trout. Designed to do away with the deception, it will put an end to tricking the American public and give it the opportunity to choose between the two—domestic or foreign trout.

Specifically, the bill requires exporters to have on the package the name of the country in which the trout originated and to make the eating places identify the trout on their menus in the same manner.

In short, it merely requests the other fellow to be honest in his dealings. It it far short of the protection which should be given to the American propagators—but that's all they are asking for.

The Senate version of the bill was unanimously approved at the last session of Congress.

Given a hearing in the House, it was reported out unanimously by Congressman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON'S Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. On the Consent Calendar it was objected to. The Rules Committee, after a hearing, gave it a rule. Thus after two hearings, the opposition to the bill failed to gain any committee support.

To stand by while the deception continues can result in only one outcome—the destruction of a medium which is absolutely necessary to the continuation of a national pastime and recreation, one which is of direct and indirect interest to the 17,652,478 individuals who purchased fishing licenses last year.

Charity begins at home. Let's put it into effect.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse this proposed legislation. It will help the domestic producers of trout protect this growing business, a protection to which he so rightfully is entitled.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

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

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. So that it may be specifically understood, I am certainly in support of this bill and I hope the House will support it overwhelmingly.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania is in support of this bill, just as I am.

I have before me a report from the committee, and I read there certain of the sponsors of this bill. They are the Isaac Walton League of America, the National Wildlife Federation, the Sports and Fishing Institute and many others, undoubtedly including the sporting associations and clubs in your own congressional districts. I might add that

those associations, if they are similar to the ones in my district, where they are strong, are made up principally of men who never get into the restaurants where this make-believe trout about which we are talking is served, but they are individuals who go out and work hard and then go trout fishing to enjoy the sporting life of a fisherman. They do not go to the high-priced restaurants and eat this fish in most instances, but they go out and catch the trout which live in the streams of our country.

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

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Members on both sides of the aisle have spoken to me about this bill, and I have looked into the matter as best I could and have come to the conclusion that I shall support the rule and the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. I hope the House will do likewise.

These friends of yours and mine who belong to the various sporting clubs and fishing and hunting associations all over the Nation are in favor of this bill not because, I repeat, they want to go to the high-priced restaurants and pay for trout, but because they want trout fishing within your own congressional districts improved, and to get that they know there must be in this country these independent producers, these small businessmen who raise trout, and who make the trout available for propagation in the streams of your congressional districts. Your friends at home want this bill passed so that this business can be protected and so that American-grown trout will again become prevalent in your streams. That is why I am for this bill.

I am not worried about the restaurants, because very few of the 535,000 restaurants in our country serve trout, and, if they do, it is my experience that most of them are honest enough to sell what the American citizen thinks he is buying. If the American public is going to buy foreign trout, then the restaurateur will tell him so, but if they will not, if they are honest restaurant men, sell as Rocky Mountain trout something grown somewhere else.

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

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. I do not quite understand the language on lines 10, 11, and 12 on page 3. Will the gentleman tell me what that means?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. No, I have not translated it myself as yet. Referring to page 3, lines 10, 11, and 12, perhaps, the gentleman will tell us.

Mr. BURDICK. I do not know.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. They are the kinds of trout which are grown in this country, I presume, which we want to protect so that our children and their children can go out and catch American grown trout.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, I want to know if it includes suckers and bullheads. We have a lot of them.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It includes anything of high American quality.

If I may complete my statement, if we are to have American industry protected here and if it is worthwhile to protect that industry and protect the growth that comes to our country as a result, in finishing I would like to bring this matter to the climax, which, I think, is the important one, namely, if we are to protect this industry and make it possible for live trout to be available for propagation in the trout streams of our country under the guidance of the local fish and game associations, we can best do it by supporting this legislation which will permit the American industry to increase in size, improve its production and, thus, increase trout fishing throughout the streams of our country.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were—ayes 90, noes 86.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eighteen Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ALLEN of Illinois and Mr. MADDEN.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 107, noes 84.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. I thought there was a similar objection prior to the vote and that the Speaker counted a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is correct.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The Chair inquires of the majority leader if he wants to put the vote over. A sufficient number have demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have just discussed the matter with the minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and he tells me that he had an agreement with some of the Tennessee Members that if there was to be a record vote today it would be put off until a later date in view of the fact that the Tennessee primaries are being held today. In view of that statement of the minority leader, I have no alternative except to ask unanimous consent that further proceedings in connection with the bill now under consideration be postponed until Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that a measure is to be called under discharge petition on Monday, will the vote on the pending matter be the unfinished business?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that the roll call on this rule will follow action on the discharge petition.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 698) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That ELIZABETH PRUETT FARRINGTON, the Delegate from Hawaii, be, and she is hereby, elected an additional member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Armed Services, and Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

DIRECT HOME AND FARMHOUSE LOAN AUTHORITY OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8152) to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and Messrs. KEARNEY, AYRES, TEAGUE, and DORN of South Carolina.

AMENDING ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House conferees on the bill H. R. 9757 may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report.

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

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES BUREAU OF MINES

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ex-

tend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, those of us in the Congress who have worked hard over the years to build up the excellent United States Bureau of Mines, including its remarkably successful mine safety program, were simply flabbergasted last week by a report issued by the Department of Interior, parent organization of the Mines Bureau.

It was one of the most cold-blooded "get Government out of business' hair" documents I have seen in a long time, even though this administration seems to be working overtime at ridding the Government of functions which help all of the people.

In brief, the suggestions made by a survey team appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and approvingly endorsed by him include:

First. Pulling the teeth of the mine safety law by redirecting its purpose from that of policing unsafe mines to education in mine safety. When the Mines Bureau had only the power to educate and recommend, fatalities soared. Since it has had the power to close unsafe mines, and require compliance, fatalities have dropped to zero.

Second. Eliminating much of the Mines Bureau's research work in the conversion of coal to synthetic liquid fuels, while at the same time expanding the Bureau's work in the search for new petroleum reserves this looks strictly like oil industry propaganda to kill off coal-to-oil research.

Third. Getting rid of the Government's helium, zirconium, and titanium research and development operations. These materials, so vital to national defense, would never have been developed as they have been if the Government had not undertaken the heavy expense of the research work. Now the whole business is to be turned over to possible private monopolies which could place the Government at their mercy.

SABOTAGING THE MINE-SAFETY PROGRAM

To us in the coal areas, the most important and most shocking of these recommendations is the one to throw the mine-safety program back into the shape it was in prior to the passage of the new law in the 81st Congress—the one which gave the Federal inspectors the right to enforce their recommendations. As chairman of the House Labor Subcommittee which handled this legislation, I lived through the terrific fight which preceded its passage and heard over and over again all the old arguments advanced to block the bill which are now trotted out to seek to destroy its effectiveness.

The survey team, composed of a college professor, a copper company official, a coal corporation executive, a leading oil man, and an industrial materials expert, even went so far as to recommend that the United States inspectors give a mine a day's advance notice before showing up to make an inspection. The reason it gave for that tipoff suggestion was as follows:

> This procedure would save the time of the inspectors, the mine-safety committee, and the mine management. When an inspector arrives unannounced, after a shift starts, time is wasted in getting together the proper people for the inspection.

What about the lives which would be wasted if these inspections came only after a day's coverup warning? This suggestion was so extreme, the Department of Interior said it would reserve judgment on that one.

But it is seeking to put into effect others to consolidate the whole eastern part of the United States, with its wide variety of diverse Mines Bureau problems, into a single region; to close down oil shale research and drastically reduce work on coal gasification or liquefaction; to drop helium, zirconium, and titanium operations, and so on.

LIKE TURNING SEC OVER TO THE STOCK MARKET

It struck me that this report was as fantastic as if the Securities and Exchange Commission were to suggest turning over to the States or to the stock exchange the policing of the laws on honesty in securities; as if the Civil Aeronautics Board were to let the States or even the airlines regulate commercial aviation; as if the Interstate Commerce Commission were to let the States or even the railroads handle all railroad safety enforcement.

Under the mine-safety program, lives have been saved that would otherwise have been lost. We cannot ridicule that kind of record.

JOBLESS MILLIONS AND FAMILIES IGNORED IN GOP RUSH TO ADJOURN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to ask if the Eisenhower administration intends to adjourn this Congress without doing something about the Nation's serious economic situation. There are many areas in all parts of the country where there is considerable suffering and distress because of enforced idleness of many thousands of working people. My district is especially hard hit.

How can the Republican leadership continue to ignore the plight of these people, or to say that it is not a serious matter?

Several days ago I was shocked by the insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by one of our Republican colleagues from Ohio. It pooh-poohed recession talk and pointed to the record profits of General Motors and other giant corporations for the first 6 months of 1954. But people in my district do not accept the administration philosophy. They do not believe that what is good for General Motors is necessarily good for the Nation. In fact, a General Motors contract caused very serious unemployment and distress in my district when a tank contract was shifted to GM.

The prosperity now being enjoyed by big monopolies is of little comfort to the millions of workers and their families who must live on inadequate unemployment insurance benefits. It means much less to those whose unemployment insurance checks are running out.

Tax advantages voted by this administration to monopoly interests have permitted increased profits to empires like du Pont, General Electric, and General Motors, despite reduced sales. Yet the Eisenhower leadership has refused to make adequate improvements in unemployment insurance benefits, or to aid the average citizen with tax relief or a public works program.

The rush by this administration to give to the special interests natural resources, tax advantages, public lands, and the people's investment in atomic secrets is a sorry contrast to its do-nothing policy on issues involving the health, prosperity, and welfare of the people.

Let us have some action before we quit.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 690 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2420) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or Committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], and yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 690, which will make in order the consideration of the bill (S. 2420) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

House Resolution 690 provides for an open rule, waiving points of order with 1 hour of general debate. The rule

would also provide for the consideration of the committee substitute amendment as an original bill for purposes of amendment. A separate vote may be demanded on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. One motion to recommit with or without instructions would be in order.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would authorize the President to turn over certain property to organizations designated by the President to be used for the rehabilitation and resettlement in the United States of persecuted persons. The property involved in this bill was property owned by persecuted persons who died without heirs.

A limit of $3 million would be established by this bill regarding the total value of the property which may be turned over to these organizations.

According to the report on this bill, Mr. Speaker, efforts in this general direction have been going on for several years.

The Bureau of the Budget has approved of the objectives outlined in this bill and it has the approval of the Department of State.

Mr. Speaker, since this rule is an open one and therefore open to amendment I can see no valid objection to the House adopting the rule. I hope that the House adopts the rule so that we may proceed to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2420) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2420, with Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, in 1946, an amendment was enacted to the Trading With the Enemy Act, which provided that the property which was vested in the Alien Property Custodian that had belonged to persons who either were persecuted or killed by the enemy forces during World War II should be returned to those persons if they were alive and to their heirs if they had died. The United States, therefore, has declared in effect that this property does not belong to the United States. This bill in effect would provide that the President of the United States should designate certain organizations to act as the heirs to that property, and provide for the disposition of the funds. There is a limit placed upon the amount of property which may be so turned over. That limit is $3 million. Through amendments to the bill we have provided that the funds would have to be expended in the United States and upon destitute persons.

Mr. Chairman, a similar bill was passed by the Senate in the 80th Congress as S. 2764; in the 81st Congress as S. 603; in the 82d Congress it was reported to the Senate but was not acted upon prior to adjournment. It was reported previously by our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but it was not acted upon prior to adjournment.

At this time we hope that this bill S. 2420 may be finally enacted by both Houses and become law. The bill was not heard by the committee in this session of Congress because it had been heard before. There were ample hearings held in both the House and the Senate. It is merely a matter of policy to be decided in the Congress.

I believe the bill should be adopted with the amendments offered by the committee. I may state to the House that these amendments were offered by virtue of the committee first having ordered reported the bill and a minority report having been filed. Before the bill was actually filed in the House as reported it was sought to remedy these defects, those which were considered to be such defects by the minority. It was thought that the minority would be pleased with the amendments and that the bill would be acceptable to them. However, there still seems to be some objection to the bill although it was passed out of our committee by a very, very substantial majority vote and the minority opposed was greatly reduced.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to join myself with the remarks the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has made. I think this is a fair bill, one that has been very carefully studied and with the amendments adopted it certainly ought to justify a great majority of the Members of the House voting for it. It is a bill that aims to bring justice to a certain group of persons. It should be enacted into law.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the distinguished former majority leader and present whip.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is not a great deal that I can add to what the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has said about this bill except perhaps to highlight some of the facts behind it.

First as to the objections of the minority which are set forth in the minority report. They are based mainly on the fact that the committee has not given sufficient time or study to the problem. As the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] pointed out, this bill was passed by the appropriate Senate committee on three different occasions; passed unanimously by the Senate on 2 occasions, but on 1 occasion the Senate could not get to it before adjournment. It was also reported out by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As a member of the War Claims Subcommittee of that committee, of which the gentleman from California is the chairman, I may say that that committee unanimously reported out this legislation.

The principle involved, which is the important thing, is something that I believe we all know about, and with which a great majority of us agree. Certainly the bill itself has been given a good deal of study over the past number of years, both in this House and in the other body.

As you all know, I am sure, the Trading-with-the-Enemy Act provided that funds or property in this country of enemy aliens should be vested in the Alien Property Custodian. Many of the people who have been in this country were persecutees, namely, Jews who were persecuted by the Hitler regime of Germany and who came to this country to escape that persecution. Where possible, they brought their property, their money, with them. When war was declared they were enemy aliens because they were German and, therefore, their property was confiscated. The Attorney General and the Alien Property Custodian obviously could see that the law was never intended to apply to those people. They were not enemies of this country, they were enemies of the Hitler regime. They were enemies of our enemies. To help them, an amendment was passed that in such cases their money and property could be returned to them.

What is the purpose of this bill, you may say, if we have such a law—and do. Many of these people whose property was taken from them, persecutees, as I shall call them, died during the pendency of these proceedings and, therefore, cannot ask to get their money or property back. In the normal case their heirs would be entitled to it. It is no secret, everybody knows what happened to the Jewish population in Germany. Entire families, 6 million Jews, as you know, were wiped out by Hitler. Therefore, this legislation is intended to cover those people who have no heirs. Their families have been wiped out. There is nobody to ask for that money. It is being held by the Alien Property Custodian. The administration says it should be turned over.

Incidentally, may I point out that the military government law in Germany today, which was administered by General Clay, has a similar law which states that such money should be turned over to an organization which will use it for the benefit of persecutees of similar religions or similar political groups, which is all we are trying to do here. The organization which was set up at that time in Germany by the administration, and approved by General Clay, is a similar organization; in fact, the same organization as I believe will be selected by the President. But in this case this legislation says that such organization, or successor organization, shall be approved by the President and under certain safeguards will take that money or property and distribute it among persecutees but not the direct heirs of the

people from whom the money had originally been taken.

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

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

Mr. HINSHAW. May I say to the gentleman and the Members of the House that the husband of my secretary was hired by the United States Military Government of Germany to go over to Germany and appraise the gold and jewelry which had been found in places like Buchenwald and elsewhere. That gentleman upon arriving there for his duty found large milk cans and ammunition cans filled with such things as gold teeth and inexpensive jewelry of all kinds and descriptions, and some of value, which the Germans had very carefully saved after destroying the bodies of their victims. It was a most awful sight and a horrible experience to go through. It is quite true that 6 million died at their hands and that so-called genocide was practiced in a very large way.

That property was turned over, as I understand, with such value as it had, for liquidation to apply to the resettlement of the survivors in other countries and for their transportation, and so on. It was a humane thing to do, one in which the United States participated as a military government. It is worthy of the United States to participate again in this disposition of property for which there are no heirs and no claimants.

The United States does not claim the property and no heirs claim the property.

Mr. KLEIN. I thank the gentleman. I agree with him.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman, but I will say before he says anything, that I respect the gentleman and have served with him a long time and have the highest regard for him. His opposition to this bill, I am certain, is an opposition which he feels as a matter of principle.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for his statement and he has stated my position. The property which the gentleman from California talks about, of course, has nothing to do with the property that is involved here.

Mr. KLEIN. That is right.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The property that is involved here is property which is owned by those people who have disappeared, and it is claimed have no known heirs and the property is located in this country. Is that correct?

Mr. KLEIN. That is correct, yes, sir.

In an endeavor, as the gentleman from California pointed out, to get this very, very worthwhile legislation out, and this is legislation which almost everybody favors, including the executive department, the President, the administration, when I learned there were certain members of our committee opposed to it and proposed to sign the minority report—I went to them and asked them what the objections were. In an endeavor to get this out by unanimous consent and get it passed by unanimous consent, I introduced in the committee four amendments which would take care of—at least I thought they would—all the objections. Let me point out just what they are. We will have an opportunity to vote on them in a few minutes. The bill was passed by the Senate and came over amended in these four instances so as to take care of the objections of some of the minority. Some of them were satisfied and some of them were not. The objections that were made were—first, that the money that was taken from the Alien Property Custodian, this heirless property, and given to the successor organization to dispose of, might be distributed by that organization to anybody who would apply and not to somebody who actually needed the money. Therefore, we wrote into the law and into the amendments an actual needs test. In other words, before a person could qualify to get any part of this money, he would have to show among other things, which I will come to in a minute, that he was actually in need and needed the money—that he had been on relief and things of that kind. That was one of the amendments.

The next objection was that some of the members of the minority felt that much, or a part of this, money might go for administrative expenses or for legal fees for lawyers representing the claimants. In order to dispose of that objection, we wrote into this legislation an amendment that no part of these funds could be used for legal fees or administrative expenses at all. This means that some of the associations and some of the charitable organizations interested in this type of legislation have agreed to pay out of their pockets, or prominent wealthy people will agree to pay the money out of their pockets, any legal fees or any administrative expenses, so that no part of this fund will be diminished by that type of expense.

The third objection was that a new organization might be set up, then for that purpose, and even though the President must approve of the organization, that it might be a fly-by-night organization. Therefore, we wrote into the law another amendment which says that the organization, in order to be eligible to be appointed, must have been in existence as of January 1, 1950. We went back that much so that it must be, and will be, a well established organization. As a matter of fact, it is contemplated it will be, as pointed out, the same organization appointed by General Clay in Germany under Military Government Law No. 59, which is almost identical with this for distribution.

The last and the fourth amendment, which we introduced and which was adopted in the committee, was to the effect that money which was obtained might be used for just a particular religion or a particular class of persons. Actually, in all fairness, and I do not think it is any secret since the hearings before the subcommittee brought it out, over 90 percent of those funds were funds from Jews. However, in order to avoid any possibility of the bill not passing, we agreed to an amendment which provides that the people must be actual persecutees. They must be in need, and they can be of any religion. They do not have to be of the same religion, they do not have to be of the same political class as the law reads in the military-government law.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. As I understand the bill, the purpose of these funds is for the relocation and rehabilitation of persons who are in this country. I presume they have come to this country, either in some capacity or other, by reason of persecution and are displaced persons.

Now, can the gentleman tell me after a lapse of 9 years, how many persons are in the category that would be entitled to such moneys from this organization?

Mr. KLEIN. I cannot tell you how many, but I can tell you the approximate amount. It will probably be less than a million; it will be probably between $500,000 and $1 million

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. No. The gentleman did not understand me. I have reference to the number of persons for which this money could be used.

Mr. KLEIN. I cannot give the gentleman that figure.

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

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The largest population of Hitler's persecutees is in my district. There are not less than 25,000 families in my district who have that kind of origin. It is my belief that a material portion of those families contain old and indigent people who will actually qualify under this law. I shall have an opportunity later to explain that.

Mr. KLEIN. I thank the gentleman, and I believe he has answered the question.

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

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to say in connection with the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that there are a great number of persecutees in my district. I represent the great industrial Calumet region of Indiana. A great number of these unfortunate people are struggling to become established and this legislation would be a great aid for them.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] made a statement as to what happened to the Jews in Germany at the time of Hitler's rampage. I was in Europe a month ago with the Committee Investigating Communist Aggression which this Congress created. I had an opportunity to go through Dachau. Dachau will be one of the exhibits which will forever reveal the barbarism and criminal minds of Hitler and his cohorts. That deplorable period will rank with the barbarism, atrocities, and murders committed by Stalin and his henchmen. I think this legislation is necessary legislation. This property does not belong to the Government. It does not belong to anybody outside of the descendants of, and should be used for the welfare of, the people who were persecutees. A great number of them are living in this country in destitution. This legislation

is not only necessary legislation but it is humane legislation. It is charitable legislation.

I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] and the members of this great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for bringing this bill to the floor of the House. I understand it has passed the Senate unanimously, and it should be passed here.

Mr. KLEIN. I thank the gentleman. Since the gentleman has mentioned the fact that this money does not belong to our Government, we have made it very clear that this is the policy, that this is not money belonging to the Government. On August 8, 1946—and I remember that date perfectly, because that is my birthday—we passed an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act, which provided that types of people such as this or their heirs should be able to apply to get it back. Let me read one significant sentence in the majority report:

> This amendment established a clear-cut distinction between the property of those persons who were in fact our enemies during the last war, and those who, as evidenced by their extreme persecution at the hands of their governments, were in fact the enemies of our enemies. It was thus made clear that the intention of the United States was not to profit from the assets of the latter class of individuals.

So, Mr. Chairman, this bill would simply be an act of decent justice.

The Government does not want this money; the Government is not entitled to it. What are we to do with it?

Since we cannot return it to the people who originally owned it, I think the fairest and best thing to do is to use it to alleviate as best we may the unfortunate circumstances of those we have heard about today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill which, together with its predecessors, has had quite a history.

In speaking on this bill I do not want to be at all misunderstood. I have not the slightest bit of religious intolerance in my being, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], my good friend, recognized when he said he knew it was a matter of principle with me that I have always opposed this legislation. That is entirely correct. I have told him that and I have told him and others who have likewise been interested in this legislation that I would feel the same way whether it was any other race or any other religion involved, and I have not the slightest desire to imply that I am opposed to it because of the type of legislation it is.

I took the position on this bill—and it has a strange history. It is true it passed the Senate three times. I do not know whether they ever held hearings of any kind; I do not know whether it was ever debated at any time. I doubt it. The last time we had this legislation before our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was 4 years ago. It is true our committee held hearings. It is true the committee reported out a bill, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] and I filed objections, or at least we appeared before the Rules Committee in objection to the granting of a rule, and a rule was denied; it was never granted by the Rules Committee.

This time, 4 years later, the bill was reported out without further hearings of any kind.

I objected to it when it was reported out, but the committee reported it out anyway because the majority of the committee was for it. Some other members of our committee filed minority views, and the bill was recalled by the committee, then rewritten, as the gentleman from New York said, with these four amendments covering objections that were raised by the minority views. Then the bill was reported out again.

I was never afforded—nor were my other colleagues who were opposed to the bill and who are absent today and not able to be here—were never notified of any hearings before the Rules Committee, so we had no opportunity to appear before the Rules Committee.

I want to make my position absolutely clear. I just do not understand where there is any justification whatsoever for this legislation. There is nothing that I can conceive of that was more inhuman than the treatment of the Jewish people by Hitler. On the other hand, there were many thousands of other people who got the same kind of treatment from Austria, particularly from Poland, from people out of Germany who were opposed, both Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, people who were liquidated.

It is claimed in this legislation that there is property in this country belonging to some of those people. This legislation is so worded that it applies and will apply to the people of the Jewish faith and of the same political and racial views. I believe it is unquestioned that at least 90 percent, if not more, of this property that is involved would go to the people of the Jewish faith. The bill as it is drawn would turn to the limit of $3 million of this property over to these 2 Jewish organizations. Originally the bill was so open it could have been possible to create ad hoc committees to which it could have gone. I make no complaint about these two Jewish organizations because they have done great work over the years in the matter of help to their own people. But this money, as I take it, and they say, it does not belong to the United States but I say it will escheat to the United States so that when we take the view that it is not property belonging to the Government of the United States, literally that may be true at the present moment but it is property which could and should well become the property of the United States and under the theory of escheat to the United States where there are no lawful heirs.

It is claimed they cannot find the heirs of these people who are the owners of this property. I suppose they have been liquidated or they have been scattered. At least it is claimed that they have not been located. But I never heard of the theory of attaching a lawful right of ownership to somebody because they were of the same race or religion or political belief and that they were likewise persecuted.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. I just want to say to the gentleman that I knew that was his objection and that is why we amended the legislation so it does not provide for application to any particular race or religion.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Of course, under the legislation as amended, as the gentleman stated, it will enure to the benefit of these 2 Jewish organizations to the extent of at least 90 percent.

Mr. KLEIN. I did not say that. I said 90 percent of the people whose money this is were Jews, but actually we have amended the proposed bill so that it does not apply to any particular group.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I think the gentleman and I agree it does mean 90 percent of this would, under the bill as amended, go to persons who would be of the Jewish faith.

Mr. KLEIN. There is no secret as to how I feel on that. Certainly they are the ones who ought to get it because it was their money; but in order to get this legislation through I was willing to offer that amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Anyway, there is no question but what that is the issue. I take the position that regardless of what race it might be or what religion it might be, I cannot pursue and follow out the thinking of the majority of my committee in this regard. While there is a minority who agree with me on the committee, personally I can see no moral or consistent reason or justification for the passage of this type of legislation without hearings to bring us up to date.

I addressed an inquiry to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] which the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] said he would speak on. We had no testimony before the committee either at the previous hearing 4 years ago or at the present time as to how many of these people who were persecutees, so to speak, were in this country and in need of assistance. There is not a particle of information on that.

Therefore I feel it would be well for this bill to be recommitted and I shall offer a motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further consideration.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS.]

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides that property in the United States which has been or may in the future be vested and which is heirless or unclaimed shall be used, through designated successor organizations, for the relief of surviving persecutees or their dependents. It requires, in the House version, that the expenditure of the funds made thus available be for the benefit of needy persons. It thus recognizes a principle which has been a basic element in American foreign policy for many years.

From the beginning of its occupation responsibilities in Germany, the United States has shown itself solicitous of the rights and the needs of surviving persecutees. It has long ago taken legislative steps to insure that the property of persecutees—religious, racial, or political—in the United States shall be returned to those persons who were regarded by the Nazis as their first enemies. The United States has repeatedly urged, as a matter of foreign policy, that measures be enacted to make heirless property available for relief of persons who were persecuted, who are in need, and who have lost their health, their property, and their livelihoods as a result of the same type of persecution under which heirless property came into existence.

Enactment of this measure will thus reinforce the foreign policy of the United States. It will underline our continued interest in the relief of the surviving persecutees, and the establishment of remedial measures where these still remain to be taken.

Much still remains to be done, for example, in Austria, where negotiations toward this end have been under way for more than a year, and where the principles recognized by the Austrian Government are still far from completely implemented—particularly as concerns heirless property. It is understood, also, that work on the problem is being done in certain neutral countries, but has not been completed. Enactment of S. 2420 will emphasize the moral basis upon which the foreign policy of the United States must and does rest.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with an extraordinary situation, and extraordinary situations call for extraordinary remedies. This is a technique which we have in this bill which has been utilized in connection with very much larger amounts of property which were found in Germany. In addition to that, as everyone knows, the German Government has worked out certain reparations or what might be called reparations to the tune of $700 million, some parts of which also go to relief and rehabilitation. But—and here is the big but—here is the reason for the great desirability of this bill, the utilization of these funds will be in the United States where—and I would like to urge this to the House as a fact—they are urgently needed. Let me give you some proof of that. There is an organization—and I am getting the papers from my office and I will fill in the name of the organization and the address and the fellow who heads it in the RECORD—there is an organization which has been fighting very hard for justice in this matter in bringing to me case after case after case of Nazi persecutees, older people, little people on pensions, little people whose bodies and souls were broken by the Nazis, either directly because they were in concentration camps or because they lost everything in the world, not in terms of money alone but also their families and kith and kin, and these people are too proud and from their origin and background are not the kind of people to go on relief. To them this bill is a godsend, particularly for that purpose, and in my opinion the most vital amendment put into this bill, which absolutely commends it to the House, is the provision that this money shall be spent in the United States. I do not think, for me, certainly, you need an emotional appeal upon this particular subject. I think I bespeak the views of every Member when I say that we would welcome, I think all of us regardless of faith, any means to express the type of feeling or sympathy which is in our hearts for this tremendous holocaust which has overtaken the Jewish people in connection with the Hitler persecution. I would like to say, I think, what the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINE] said about the reservation of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] was a futile thing, and I know the gentleman well enough and I would like to join with him in that tribute to him. It represents a certain amount of dedication and courage to oppose a bill of this kind, and I pay you tribute for proceeding as you did.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I pay tribute to the members of the Jewish faith. They have been my doctors and many others are my close personal friends. But, speaking of these unfortunate people, of course, there are many other people in this country who were persecutees of Hitler who are not members of the Jewish faith, such as the Germans, both Catholic and Protestant, and also a great many Polish people, who fled and finally have gotten over into this country. I have them in my own area, but they get no consideration under this type of legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. As I understand, one of the amendments that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] sponsored would see that there is consideration regardless of faith background, and I would like to say to the gentleman that to the utmost limit of my power I have always and I pledge myself now to see that this fund is used regardless of faith for those who have been hurt, and I did that at great sacrifice in connection with the problems in Europe, and I fully intend to do it in this country.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] said something about the fact that this was something new, that we were trying to do. I want to read another portion of the majority report on page 3.

> The legislation is also in line with certain international commitments of the United States. On numerous occasions, the United States, together with the allied governments, has taken the position that the heirless assets of persecuted persons should be used for rehabilitation and resettlement of surviving persecutees. For example, the interallied agreement embodied in the final act of the Paris Conference on Reparations, December 1945, specifically provided that heirless assets found in neutral countries should be used for this same purpose. A specific program for carrying out this recommendation was embodied in the Five-Power Agreement of June 1946.

In other words, this is something that has been done before. We have it in the military government.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. May I say that that refers, of course, to the resettlement agreements which immediately followed the war and were administered in Europe, not in this country. France and England and all of the other countries entered into the administration of it.

Mr. KLEIN. That is true. But the principle of using funds of that kind for the rehabilitation of persecuted persons is not new. The only thing new that we are doing in this country, that we have not done before, is that we waited all this time for the heirs of these people to ask for this money but obviously, they are dead and there is nobody to ask for it, which is the reason why we ask for this legislation.

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

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to say that after long and careful consideration the committee reported this bill recognizing that in this particular instance, as a matter of policy, justice was being done. What I wanted to point out, which I believe has some bearing on the matter, is included in the committee report on page 3. I do this because of its importance. This establishes a very clear policy and expresses the difference between this and some other proposals that have to do with amendments to the Trading With the Enemy Act. The committee report says this:

> This amendment established a clear-cut distinction between the property of those persons who were in fact our enemies during the last war, and those who, as evidenced by their extreme persecution at the hands of their governments, were in fact the enemies of our enemies.

That is precisely the difference between this kind of legislation that we have before us and other proposals that we have had affecting various war claims. I wanted to state that in support of this legislation.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, some months ago on the floor of the House, I called to the attention of the Congress the fact that a moving picture was being filmed at Silver City, N. Mex. The fact of its production was not in itself of any great general interest, but the composition of its backers and principals was a matter of considerable significance to those who have labored in the battle against Communist aggression and Communist propaganda activities. The picture, which was to become a center of international controversy, was titled "Salt of the Earth," and purported to tell the story of minority-group miners and their families; their relationships with their employers and each other. In subsequent reviews, Salt of the Earth

has been variously described as "delightful," "a moving love story," "a triumph of artistic beauty," "moving and dramatic," and "terrific." Other national publications have called the picture Red propaganda.

When I made my speech on the floor of the House, Mr. Chairman, I pointed out that no picture made by or participated in by fifth-amendment witnesses could conceivably be designed to further the best interests of the United States of America. In spite of the favorable reviews received by the picture in some American newspapers, the fact remains that the picture was produced in large part by those who have refused before congressional committees to state whether or not they are now members of the Communist Party.

When I made my speech on the floor of the House I said that the moving-picture production being filmed at Silver City, N. Mex., would prove to be, in fact, a new weapon for the Soviet Union. At that time and for many months thereafter I was belabored by the Communist press, fellow-traveling journalists, the artistic and scientific muttonheads who should be equipped with seeing-eye dogs, and an odd assortment of individuals who defy compartmentation. I was accused of attempting to impose "censorship" on the visual arts. This, in spite of the fact that the production, Salt of the Earth, was widely condemned throughout the moving-picture industry by producers and union leaders alike. The people who make moving pictures know well the power and the propaganda impact that can be carried on film, and in the earliest stages of discussions which were later to lead to the production of Salt of the Earth, farsighted men in the moving-picture industry anticipated exactly what has since transpired.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I charge that Salt of the Earth and other propaganda pictures of like ilk are new weapons for the Soviet Union. The People's Daily World has just reported that the picture has been awarded highest honors in the International Film Festival held in Prague, Czechoslovakia. The report of the Red kudos is as follows:

SALT OF EARTH, REVUELTAS, WIN TOP PRIZES IN PRAGUE INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL

(Special to the Daily People's World)

PRAGUE.—The independently made United States movie Salt of the Earth shared the grand prize with the Soviet film Faithful Friends in the Eighth International Film Festival just ended in Karlovy Vary (the former Carlsbad Spa) in Czechoslovakia.

Rosaura Revueltas, Mexican star of Salt, won the award for the best acting performance by a woman.

The citation to the American movie said: "It is a work of great artistic and ideological value."

Faithful Friends is Soviet humor at its best.

The countries represented in the film festival competitions included Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Great Britain, Holland, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Rumania, Sweden, Switzerland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States of America.

The prizes were awarded by an international jury headed by A. M. Brousil, rector of the Academy of the Dramatic Arts and Music in Prague.

The festival opened on July 11 and ended on July 24. The prizes were announced on July 25. There was a moving moment during the presentation of the grand prize when V. Meruriyev, who played the lead in Faithful Friends fervently embraced Miss Revueltas, after handing the principal festival prize to her.

The actress stopped over in Czechoslovakia on the way back from a visit to the Soviet Union. She saw the completed version of Salt for the first time in Moscow. Miss Revueltas, it will be recalled, was arrested by United States immigration officers on a manufactured charge and deported to Mexico while the movie was still in production in Silver City, N. Mex.

Salt of the Earth was a big hit at the Karlovy Vary film festival. It is now making the rounds of people's film festivals in Czechoslovakia.

Soviet and satellite film honors are not being bestowed these days on any film production which does not further enhance and glorify the Soviet system or seek to forward its purposes of economic and political aggression. It is interesting to note that the Soviet film, Faithful Friends, shared the top honors with Salt of the Earth. The faithful friends of the Soviet Union in Hollywood have been faithful indeed.

It is quite likely that the "moving love story" will net the producers a substantial profit on their investment. It is quite likely that additional productions will be forthcoming from the same source. I shall continue in my efforts to keep the Congress and the American people informed as to the activities of those "faithful friends" whose work wins such high approval behind the Iron Curtain.

It is assumed that Rosaura Revueltas, the Mexican actress who created such a furor when her deportation from the United States was ordered, had an enjoyable and productive visit in the Kremlin. Her protestations of innocence with respect to her alleged sympathy for the Communist conspiracy can now be evaluated for what they were worth at the time they were uttered.

Salt of the Earth is doing the job it was designed to do. It is carrying distortion, inaccuracy, and American-made Red propaganda to millions of human beings who are apt to accept this vehicle of hatred and bitterness as a true expression of life in the United States.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF].

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few of the remaining seconds that I have to commend the members of the subcommittee for bringing this bill out. I understand that it passed the other body on three separate occasions, but has always been buried in the final logjam that confronts us at the end of every session. I think the bill is a fine bill and will go a long way toward restoring much of the prestige of the United States in Europe that has been lost over the past few years. I know that now when it has passed the other body, there will be no difficulty in getting it passed in the House and to the White House where the President has already signified his approval of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will now read the substitute amendment printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(h) The President may designate one or more organizations as successors in interest to deceased persons who, if alive, would be eligible to receive returns under the provisos of subdivision (C) or (D) of subsection (a) (2) thereof. An organization so designated shall be deemed a successor in interest by operation of law for the purpose of subsection (a) (1) hereof. Return may be made, to an organization so designated, (a) before the expiration of 2 years from the vesting of the property or interest in question, if the President or such officer or agency as he may designate determines from all relevant facts of which he is then advised that there is no basis for reasonable doubt that the former owner is dead and is survived by no person eligible under section 32 to claim as successor in interest by inheritance, devise, or bequest; and (b) after the expiration of such time, if no claim for the return of the property or interest is pending. Total returns pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed $3 million.

"No return may be made to an organization so designated unless it files notice of claim before the expiration of 1 year from the effective date of this act and unless it gives firm and responsible assurance approved by the President that (i) the property or interest returned to it or the proceeds of any such property or interest will be used on the basis of need in the rehabilitation and settlement of persons in the United States who suffered substantial deprivation of liberty or failed to enjoy the full rights of citizenship within the meaning of subdivisions (C) and (D) of subsection (a) (2) hereof; (ii) it will transfer, at any time within 2 years from the time that return is made, such property or interest or the equivalent value thereof to any person whom the President or such officer or agency shall determine to be eligible under section 32 to claim as owner or successor in interest to such owner, by inheritance, devise, or bequest; (iii) it will make to the President, with a copy to be furnished to the Congress, such reports (including a detailed annual report on the use of the property or interest returned to it or the proceeds of any such property or interest) and permit such examination of its books as the President or such officer or agency may from time to time require; and (iv) will not use such property or interest or the proceeds of such property or interest for legal fees, salaries, or any other administrative expenses connected with the filing of claims for or the recovery of such property or interest.

"The filing of notice of claim by an organization so designated shall not bar the payment of debt claims under section 34 of this act.

"As used in this subsection, 'organization' means only a nonprofit charitable corporation incorporated on or before January 1, 1950, under the laws of any State of the United States or of the District of Columbia with the power to sue and be sued."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is here-

by amended by striking out the period at the end of such sentence, and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "except that return may be made to successor organizations designated pursuant to section 32 (h) hereof if notice of claim is filed before the expiration of 1 year from the effective date of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2420) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 690, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota moves to recommit the bill S. 2420 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota) there were—ayes 18, noes 37.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings in connection with the passage of this bill be postponed until Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota withdraw his point of order of no quorum?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I withdraw the point of order of no quorum, Mr. Speaker.

INTERNAL REVENUE ACT, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 268) relating to the enrollment of H. R. 8300.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 8300) to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States, is authorized and directed—

(1) In section 116 (a), to strike out "to the extent" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "from domestic corporations, to the extent."

(2) In the last sentence of section 404 (d), to strike out "applies is" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "applies, is."

(3) In section 556 (b) (6), to strike out "403" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "404."

(4) In the table of sections immediately preceding section 641, to insert after "subparts" the following: "A."

(5) At the end of section 691 (b) (2), to strike out "received.—" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "received."

(6) In section 804 (a) (3), to strike out subparagraph (B) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) the reserve earnings rate, bears to a denominator comprised of the aggregate of the excess of taxable incomes (computed without any deduction for tax-free interest, partially tax-exempt interest, or dividends received) over the adjustment for certain reserves provided in section 806."

(7) In section 853 (e) (2), to strike out "sections" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "section."

(8) In section 1033 (b), to strike out "of residence," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "of the residence."

(9) In section 2513 (b) (2) (A) and in section 2513 (c) (1), to strike out "March" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "April."

(10) To add at the end of the table of sections immediately preceding section 4341 the following "SEC. 4345. Cross references."

(11) To strike out section 4551 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4551. Imposition of tax.

"In addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law, there is hereby imposed upon the following articles imported into the United States, unless treaty provisions of the United States otherwise provide, a tax at the rates specified. For the purposes of such tax, the term 'United States' includes Puerto Rico.

"(1) In General: Lumber, rough or planed or dressed on one or more sides, except flooring made of maple (other than Japanese maple), birch, or beech, $3 per 1,000 feet, board measure.

"(2) Wood dowels:

"(A) Dowels made of fir, spruce, pine, hemlock, larch, or cedar (except cedar commercially known as Spanish cedar), 75 cents per 1,000 feet, board measure.

"(B) Dowels made of Japanese maple, Japanese white oak, teak, box, ebony, lancewood, or lignum vitae, $3 per 1,000 feet, board measure.

"(C) Dowels made of wood and for which no rate of tax is specified under subparagraph (A) or (B), $1.50 per 1,000 feet, board measure."

(12) In section 4601 (2), to strike out "duty." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "duty; and."

(13) In section 4601, to strike out paragraphs (3) and (4).

(14) In section 4601 (5), to strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(3)."

(15) In section 4602, to add at the end thereof the following:

"Each reference to any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 in any agreement entered into, or in any proclamation of the President made, under the authority of such section shall be deemed also to refer to the corresponding provision of this title."

(16) In section 4773, to strike out "4732 (c)" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "4732 (b)."

(17) In section 4883 (c), to strike out "4884 (a) (4)," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "4884 (a) (3)."

(18) In section 5044, to strike out "of his delegate" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or his delegate."

(19) In section 7601 (b), to strike out "7211" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "7212."

(20) In the table of subparts preceding section 351, to strike out "Special rules" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Special rule."

(21) In section 2031 (a), to strike out "by determined" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "be determined."

(22) In section 2038 (a) (2), to strike out "of where" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or where."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill S. 2420.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to join with many of my colleagues in supporting the amendment of the Trading With the Enemy Act, S. 2420.

This bill has for its purpose the disposition of property which belonged to men and women persecuted by our enemies during World War II. The rightful owners of this property are unknown; either they have been killed, leaving no heirs, or the property is not in such condition as to be recognized as belonging to anyone in particular. At the present time, it is in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian.

We in this body feel that the United States Government has no lawful claim to this property. Since it is impossible to return it to its owners, we are proposing, under this legislation, to arrange for it to be turned over to certain organizations which would use it for the rehabilitation and resettlement in the United States of persecuted people.

Similar bills have been introduced in both the Senate and the House several times in the past few years. However, at no time was one of these bills passed by both Houses of Congress. S. 2420 has been passed by the Senate and, if it is passed here, will go to the President to be signed into law.

It is fitting that the assets of these persecuted people be distributed among those who suffered in like measure the atrocities and tortures of war. Approximately 90 percent of the owners of the property in question were Jewish. We feel that if they were living it would please them greatly to know that the property is to be disposed of by two Jewish organizations and that a great

part of it will be used for the relief of deserving members of that proud people. Their cruel and irrational treatment by the Nazis will in part be avenged.

I would like to bring out, also, that this bill provides that such property, the value of which is not to exceed $3 million, is to be used for the relief of persecuted in need. Thus, it is not limited to members of the Jewish racial group. Knowing of similar work done under the United States Military Government in Germany, we may rest assured that this law will be administered carefully and fairly.

I heartily endorse the provisions of this bill and hope that it will soon become law.

REFERENCE OF COMMUNICATION TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Executive Communication 1783 from the Attorney General, transmitting the draft of a bill to provide rewards for information concerning illegal introduction into the United States or illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States of special nuclear material and weapons, be re-referred from the Committee on the Judiciary to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 9936

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight Saturday night to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 9936.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire what will be the situation on Monday with reference to the bill S. 2420, upon which I made the point of order that a quorum was not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state that the vote will have to be taken all over again on Monday next.

AMENDING THE HATCH ACT

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I renew my consent request for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7745) to amend certain provisions of the act of August 2, 1939, commonly known as the Hatch Act, relating to employees of State or local agencies whose activities are financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from the United States, with amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 12 of the act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities" (5 U. S. C., sec. 118k (a), (b), and (c)), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. (a) No officer or employee of any State or local agency whose principal employment is in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency shall (1) use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or a nomination for office, or affecting the result thereof, or (2) directly or indirectly coerce, attempt to coerce, command, or advise any other such officer or employee to pay, lend, or contribute any part of his salary or compensation or anything else of value to any party, committee, organization, agency, or person for political purposes. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects and candidates.

"(b) (1) If any Federal agency charged with the duty of making any loan or grant of funds of the United States for use in any activity by any officer or employee to whom the provisions of subsection (a) are applicable has reason to believe that any such officer or employee has violated the provisions of such subsection, it shall make a report with respect thereto to the United States Civil Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission'). Upon the receipt of any such report, or upon the receipt of any other information which seems to the Commission to warrant an investigation, the Commission shall fix a time and place for a hearing, and shall by registered mail send to the officer or employee charged with the violation and to the State or local agency employing such officer or employee a notice setting forth a summary of the alleged violation and the time and place of such hearing. At such hearing (which shall be not earlier than 10 days after the mailing of such notice) either the officer or employee of the State or local agency, or both, may appear with counsel and be heard. After such hearing, the Commission shall determine whether any violation of such subsection has occurred and whether such violation, if any, warrants the removal of the officer or employee by whom it was committed from his office or employment, and shall by registered mail notify such officer or employee and the appropriate State or local agency of such determination.

"(2) If the Commission finds that such officer or employee has not been removed from his office or employment on or before the date on which the Commission's determination becomes final, or that he has been so removed and has subsequently (within a period of 6 months) been appointed to any office or employment in any State or local agency in such State, the Commission shall make and certify to the appropriate Federal agency an order requiring it to withhold from its loans or grants to the State or local agency to which such notification was given an amount equal to 2 years' compensation at the rate such officer or employee was receiving at the time of such violation; except that in any case of such a subsequent appointment to a position in another State or local agency which receives loans or grants from any Federal agency, such order shall require the withholding of such amount from such other State or local agency: *Provided*, That in no event shall the Commission require any amount to be withheld from any loan or grant pledged by a State or local agency as security for its bonds or notes if the withholding of such amount would jeopardize the payment of the principal or interest on such bonds or notes. Notice of any such order shall be sent by registered mail to the State or local agency from which such amount is ordered to be withheld. The Federal agency to which such order is certified shall, after such order becomes final, withhold such amount in accordance with the terms of such order.

"(3) Any determination or order of the Commission shall become final upon the expiration of 30 days after the mailing of notice of such determination or order, except that if, in accordance with subsection (c), a determination or order is stayed, and thereafter such determination or order (whether or not modified) is affirmed, such determination or order shall become final upon such date subsequent to such affirmation as the Commission shall prescribe.

"(c) Any party aggrieved by any determination or order of the Commission under subsection (b) may, within 30 days after the mailing of notice of such determination or order, institute proceedings for the review thereof by filing a written petition in the district court of the United States for the district in which such officer or employee resides; but the commencement of such proceedings shall not operate as a stay of such determination or order unless it is specifically so ordered by the court. A copy of such petition shall forthwith be served upon the Commission, and thereupon the Commission shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the record upon which the determination or the order complained of was made. The review by the court shall be on the record entire, including all of the evidence taken on the hearing, and shall extend to questions of fact and questions of law. If application is made to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and it is shown to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence may materially affect the result of the proceedings and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, the court may direct such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Commission may modify its findings of fact or its determination or order by reason of the additional evidence so taken and shall file with the court such modified findings, determination, or order, and any such modified findings of fact, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. The court shall affirm the Commission's determination or order, or its modified determination or order, if the court determines that the same is in accordance with law. If the court determines that any such determination or order, or modified determination or order, is not in accordance with law, the court shall remand the proceeding to the Commission with directions either to make such determination or order as the court shall determine to be in accordance with law or to take such further proceedings as, in the opinion of the court, the law requires. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals as in other cases, and the judgment and decree of such circuit court of appeals shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States on certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 28, secs. 346 and 347). If any provision of this subsection is held to be invalid as applied to any party with respect to any determination or order of the Commission, such determination or order shall thereupon become final and effective as to

such party in the same manner as if such provision had not been enacted."

SEC. 2. Subsection (e) of section 12 of such act of August 2, 1939 (5 U. S. C., sec. 118k (e)), is hereby amended by striking out "the first two sentences" and inserting in lieu thereof "the first sentence."

SEC. 3. Section 18 of such act of August 2, 1939 (5 U. S. C., sec. 118n), is hereby amended by striking out "or in the second sentence of section 12 (a) of this act."

SEC. 4. Determinations made or orders entered after February 1, 1954, by the Civil Service Commission in cases arising under section 12 of such act of August 2, 1939 (5 U. S. C., sec. 118k), shall be governed by the provisions of such section as they are amended by this act.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] objected to the passage of this bill because of an understandable misunderstanding about the contents of H. R. 7745. I have discussed the measure with the gentleman and he agrees that the bill does do what he would have it do.

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I objected to the consideration of this bill when it was presented earlier today. I did so because, after a cursory look at the bill, it appeared to me that it extended the Hatch Act to cover State employees. However, after having the bill explained to me by its sponsor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], I have found that it does exactly the opposite.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to withdraw my objections to the bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer several amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. CORBETT: Page 1, line 8, after the word "principal", insert the word "public."

Page 3, line 4, after the word "employee", strike out the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof the word "or."

Page 3, line 17, strike out the words "of 6 months" and insert in lieu thereof "set by the Civil Service Commission which shall not exceed 18 months."

Page 6, line 14, strike out "sections 239 and"; strike out all of line 15, and down to the period in line 16, and insert in lieu thereof "28 U. S. C. 1254."

Page 7, line 5, strike out "February" and insert in lieu thereof "August."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

INTERIM AUTHORITY TO SPEAKER AND CLERK OF HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill (H. R. 7745) to amend certain provisions of the act of August 2, 1939, commonly known as the Hatch Act, relating to employees of State or local agencies whose activities are financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from the United States.

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

There was no objection.

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to give the Alabama delegation and any other friends in Congress here an opportunity to say a word about a great man and a good man, a wonderful soldier and statesman, just an all-around good and great American, LAURIE BATTLE, who is retiring from the Congress this session.

LAURIE BATTLE, as you know, did not run for his seat here in the House this year and he will retire to private life in Birmingham, one of the great cities not only of Alabama but of the earth.

You men here who have served so long with this wonderful and fine man will miss just as we of the Alabama delegation will miss him. But I imagine he will be coming back very often and some day he make take his seat again, who knows, because in that district they love this man who has served so well, who has worked so hard, who has done such an outstanding job not only for his district and for his State but for his Nation.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I served with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] on the Foreign Affairs Committee. He is author of the Battle Act for the control of the East-West trade. He has made magnificent contributions not only to the committee but to the policy of our whole Nation and I think the Nation owes him a debt of gratitude. I wish him Godspeed and the best in the days ahead.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure also of serving for 2 years on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE]. I want to attest to his contribution to the very valuable work of that committee. His record of wise legislative accomplishments is a very fine one.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank our friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT] to say a word about our beloved LAURIE BATTLE.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] for yielding to me. It is not so often that we stand on this floor to pay tribute to a young man, but this afternoon such is the case because LAURIE BATTLE is still a young man.

LAURIE BATTLE's service in this House is a matter of history. I want to say that he is a self-made man. LAURIE came up the hard way; that is, in part, he worked his way through college and by his grit, by his self-determination and by his desire to better himself in life, he attended several colleges, among them being the Birmingham-Southern College in his hometown of Birmingham, the Vanderbilt University, and Scarritt College, Ohio State University, and the University of Alabama.

LAURIE soon saw the need of national defense in this country and he attempted to do something about it. He offered his services to the Alabama National Guard and served an enlistment in the National Guard of the State of Alabama. Then in World War II he enlisted as a private and by that self-determination and by his desire to serve his country and his fellow man he served with distinction in the Pacific and in other areas during that awful conflict of World War II. When he was discharged, by his integrity and by his work he was discharged with the rank of major.

He entered the 80th Congress here in 1947 and applied himself to his committee work. He soon secured membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. We all know the work that he did on legislation which I think has meant much to this Nation and to the cause of democracy in the world. The legislation that he sponsored has become known in legislative history as the Battle Act. I am not going into the history of that act, but I do believe when a final history is written of this period a great deal of credit will be given to LAURIE BATTLE for his sponsorship of the resolution and bill through the House which provided that this Nation would not sit idly by and see nations that we were helping, nations that were supposed to help us in securing democracy in this world, trade with the enemy. So this House passed the bill which, in the final analysis, meant cutting off military, and financial aid, and economic aid to nations who violated the Battle Act.

I think a rather delightful thing concerning this Battle Act was due to the fact that the day this act was passed by the House, within 24 hours of that time, Mr. and Mrs. BATTLE had born to them a little Battle No. 3, and LAURIE, in making his remarks upon the floor at that time stated that it had been suggested to him that he name the baby H. R. 4550. Since that time there has been another child born to that happy union.

LAURIE, in closing these few remarks, I want to say to you that you leave the Halls of Congress here with the admiration and the love not only of your fellow

colleagues from the State of Alabama, but I am sure that I speak the sentiments of this whole body when I say to you and your lovely family that we wish for you in the years to come every happiness, health, and prosperity.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I should like to confirm what the gentleman from Alabama has just said about our colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE]. As chairman of the Oklahoma delegation, the Oklahoma delegation expresses its appreciation of the wonderful service the gentleman has rendered in a thorough, courteous, cooperative, and honest manner here in the House.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my few humble words extolling the virtues of our colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE], who is retiring from active service in this House which he has graced and honored during the brief period that he has been here.

LAURIE BATTLE comes from my adjoining State, the good State of Alabama. I have watched his record during the time he served here in the House with ever increasing approval. LAURIE BATTLE is not a politician in the sense that we speak of politicians. If he were, he might not be leaving us; he might just be transferring over to another body. I like to think of LAURIE BATTLE here in this House of Representatives as a great patriot, a man who always approached the problems that arose here on this floor from the standpoint of how that particular problem and his attitude toward it was going to affect the Nation rather than how it was going to affect LAURIE BATTLE and his political future. I think that our friend, Laurie, has done a splendid job in this House. I wish we had more and more of his kind. Like Abou Ben Adhem, may his tribe increase.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to say that I think I bespeak for the membership of this House generally on both sides of the aisle when I say that LAURIE BATTLE leaves us with the confidence, the respect, and the good wishes of all with whom he has served. You know, it is not so important how long you serve in this House but how well you perform while you are here. Measured by that yardstick, LAURIE BATTLE has done a good job.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the views expressed here in tribute to the gentleman from Alabama, LAURIE BATTLE. I personally have found it not only a great pleasure but a profitable experience to have had the opportunity to serve in the Congress of the United States with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE]. It may certainly be said of him that he is a scholar, a statesman, and a gentleman. We are all going to miss him very much, and I regret personally that he has seen fit to terminate his service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Wisconsin and also thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] for the fine statement that he has made.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOYKIN. I am glad to yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with those who have spoken so favorably of my colleague, a member of my own committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I have had a real opportunity to know LAURIE BATTLE. While I cannot speak for the committee, I feel that I express the sentiments of the committee when I say that we are all going to miss him. I know of no individual member of that committee who has been more diligent in the tasks assigned to him. The Battle Act will stand as a monument to his work here.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the day will come when he will again be associated with us here or in some other body, because we need young men like LAURIE BATTLE in the service of our country.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank my colleague very much for that statement, and I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, LAURIE BATTLE and I came to Congress together in the 80th Congress.

I have watched LAURIE BATTLE through the years as we have served here together. I can truthfully say that I know of no Representative in this House who has served with a more sincere determination to represent the best interests of all of his people; who has served with greater courage or greater devotion to duty than has LAURIE BATTLE.

It was my pleasure to live as Laurie's neighbor in the same apartment development here in Washington for several years, and I came to know Laurie and his family very well. They were wonderful neighbors, and his family is one of which he may well be proud.

Not only is Laurie, in my opinion, one of the finest Representatives that we have had in this Congress since I have been here, but he is also one of the finest young men I have ever known in my life. He is a Christian gentleman. He is a man of sterling character, and he has earned and deserves the respect and admiration of the people of this country, the State of Alabama, and the State of Mississippi, which I have the pleasure to represent.

I wish him well as he leaves this body. I am glad to be able to say that I can count LAURIE BATTLE as one of my friends. I hope that our friendship will continue throughout the years, even though he may not be in Congress in those years. LAURIE BATTLE is a living example of what I would wish my son to be.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman for that fine statement.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOYKIN. I am glad to yield to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a keen pleasure for me to have the opportunity to join with Alabama's great delegation in saluting one of its fine Members, LAURIE BATTLE. In the brief time I have been a Member of this Congress, I have come to like and to admire this fine southern gentleman. It has been a pleasure to associate with him in the baseball competition which has taken place between the two sides of the House for a very worthy cause in the District of Columbia. I have always found him, whether as a member of the Democratic baseball team or as a Member of the House, to be a great sportsman, a conscientious and able legislator, a truly fine gentleman, and, in the words of the gentleman from Mississippi, a great American. I know the House will miss him and I know that all of us wish him all success and all good fortune in the years which lie ahead.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to join with other Members in paying tribute to our colleague, LAURIE BATTLE. I had the honor of serving with him as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. He was a valued member of the committee during the 80th Congress when I was honored with being chairman of the committee.

I have respected LAURIE BATTLE for his industry, his ability, and his sincerity. His service and his contribution to the work of the committee were outstanding. He is a great American with a deep sense of justice. He is devoted to the best interests of his country and to his fellow men. Our kindest wishes are extended to LAURIE BATTLE and to his family.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have always especially liked the Members of the Alabama delegation. Several of them have served on our Committee on Veterans' Affairs and I have found them wonderfully fine and cooperative. Mr. BATTLE is a much respected friend and colleague and an able legislator. A real southern gentleman, he is everything that is splendid in Alabama and in the country. I am so sorry he and his family will leave Washington, and hope they will sometime return. I wish them great happiness and success.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentlewoman.

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

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. It has been my pleasure to know LAURIE BATTLE since he first came to Congress. Since I came to Congress I have known many Members but I can truthfully say I have never known a finer man in or out of Congress than LAURIE BATTLE. In my opinion he is one of the greatest legislators and public officials our State or

any other State has produced in many years.

LAURIE BATTLE possesses what I conceive to be the necessary qualifications and traits of character to be a good public official. First, he is ruggedly honest. Second, he has ability. Third, he has courage.

LAURIE BATTLE has done a magnificent job as Representative from the Ninth District of Alabama, which is possibly one of the most difficult congressional districts in America to represent. It has one of the biggest populations of any congressional district in America, and in that district you find groups whose interests are constantly in conflict.

LAURIE has voted his convictions from the day he got here. Many times the votes he cast here on certain bills were politically unwise. They were antagonistic to the interests of some of those groups in Jefferson County, Ala. But those people did not hold out on Laurie because of the votes he cast here. They had faith and confidence in him and in his sincerity. Year after year for four consecutive terms he came back to Congress with the biggest majority any Member of the House I have ever known has received in that congressional district that is so difficult to represent.

LAURIE has made a great contribution here to the legislation that was designed to better secure our Nation. The Battle Act has been a great help so far as the security of this Nation is concerned. It is one of the great pieces of legislation that has been passed since the end of World War II. Laurie has had the courage to vote his convictions. I have never known him to dodge a vote when he was in the city of Washington or any other time, and certainly not when he was here in Washington. He has had the courage to stand up and be counted on every issue. To say that we will miss him is very true. I hope that when he leaves here, as a Member of this House, he will have the same degree of success in whatever undertaking he applies himself to as he has enjoyed as a Member, and with him certainly will go our best wishes. I shall always treasure my friendship with LAURIE BATTLE because he is a sincere man, he is a true man, he is a dependable man and his friendship is based on sincerity which unfortunately in Washington is something that is very hard to find. Many times, we find here that friendship is based on convenience and necessity—but not so with LAURIE BATTLE. He is a true, loyal, patriotic American, and I wish for him in the future years of his life the best of everything.

Mr. BOYKIN. Thank you, Congressman ANDREWS. At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues in giving expression to the high regard and good wishes which I hold for LAURIE BATTLE as he returns to private life.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] has served in the Congress during a very difficult period of this country's history. It has been a period when we have been faced with the problem of making the adjustments following the titanic struggle of World War II. As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs he has played a most significant part in the formulation of our national policy, which has had for its objective the building of American allies on the one hand, and enunciating a position of firmness in our dealings with Russia, on the other. Over these years Russia's actions have made the conclusion inescapable that she will have it no other way than to be our enemy. A testimonial of LAURIE BATTLE's activity in the field of formulation of foreign policy is the Battle Act, the sponsorship of which gave him a national reputation.

As LAURIE BATTLE leaves the House of Representatives he has the satisfaction of knowing that he represented Alabama's largest city in such a manner that he was overwhelmingly reelected at the end of each 2-year term as long as he chose to seek the position.

The influence of his public service will live a long time. His accomplishments will continue to be a source of pride to his friends.

Again I want to express my very best wishes for the success and happiness of LAURIE BATTLE, his lovely wife Jan, and their children.

Mr. BOYKIN. Thank you kindly, Congressman ELLIOTT. At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman ROBERTS.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that a prophet is not without honor save in his own country. But that truism does not apply to a member of our delegation who is leaving the Halls of Congress—LAURIE BATTLE has honor in his own country and he has it because of the fact that people know he is a man who is sincere in purpose, a man who is fearless in action, a man who has the courage of his convictions. LAURIE BATTLE is still a young man—I say that because we are the same age—but I do not know of any man who in such a short time has attained more of the high honors in this land of ours than has our colleague and friend.

LAURIE has had excellent training and experience, and I think that he drew upon that experience and that background to make himself one of the outstanding legislators of this body. As a matter of fact, in his second term he offered a bill, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, H. R. 1516, which brought a great deal of stability to the Post Office Department, in that it provided for the reclassification of the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service. It established uniform procedure for computing compensation, and for other purposes. This became Public Law No. 257. Later, the act which bears his name, "The Battle Act," was passed. To my mind, and I think to the minds of most Members of this body, that act has had much to do with strengthening our defenses against the constantly growing threat of communism.

A great many good things have been said here today about LAURIE BATTLE, and it is difficult to add to the glowing tributes that have been paid to him. Not only has he been an outstanding legislator, but he has been an outstanding patriot. Any man who enters the service as a private and in the short period of 3 years becomes a major, has an unusual amount of ability. He was overseas for about 16 months, and in that time he was awarded the Bronze Star Medal, the Philippine Liberation Medal, the Victory Medal, the American theater ribbon, the Asiatic-Pacific ribbon, and eight battle stars.

Since he has been in this body he has been cognizant of the needs of our veterans and has, on every occasion that I can recall, supported veterans' legislation that was beneficial.

LAURIE BATTLE will be missed in the Alabama delegation. He has always been cooperative. He not only represents his district but he has been willing to cooperate on anything that is for the betterment of our great State of Alabama. As he goes back to other pursuits, I hope that his efforts will be crowned with success. I know that he takes with him the love and devotion of the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. SELDEN.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to one of Alabama's distinguished sons, LAURIE BATTLE. It has been a high privilege to have known and worked with Laurie as a Member of the House of Representatives, and it is with sincere regret that I see him leave this great legislative body.

I am proud of the fact that LAURIE BATTLE was born in Shelby County, Ala., 1 of the 8 counties of the district I now represent. He is the son of a Methodist minister, the late W. R. Battle, who was known and loved throughout the State of Alabama. Laurie received his education in Alabama's public schools, Birmingham Southern College, Vanderbilt University, Scarritt College, Ohio State University, and the University of Alabama. His record at all of these institutions was outstanding.

Entering as a private, he served in the Air Force during World War II and was discharged with the rank of major. Only a few months after his release from active duty. Laurie was elected to the 80th Congress from Alabama's Ninth Congressional District, at the age of only 34.

Upon election to the 80th Congress, LAURIE served first as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. He was appointed to the Foreign Affairs Committee during the 81st Congress where he has served for the past 6 years. He has been an outstanding member of this great committee and is perhaps best known for the legislation that bears his name, the Battle Act.

LAURIE BATTLE's ability, his sound thinking, and his vision and foresight have earned him the respect and the admiration of the entire membership of this House. The people of his district, the State of Alabama, and the entire Nation can be grateful that we have had a man with the ability and the character of LAURIE BATTLE to serve as a Member of Congress during these crucial times. Certainly we are indebted to him for his

years of unselfish and devoted public service.

We regret to see you leave, Laurie, but upon your retirement from the House of Representatives, we wish for you, your lovely wife, Jan, and your three fine children the very best that life can bestow. We commend you for your past accomplishments, and we wish for you a future of success and happiness.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and further ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of LAURIE BATTLE.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I wish to pay tribute to our colleague, LAURIE BATTLE, who is retiring as Representative from the Ninth District of Alabama which he has served so loyally, devotedly, and energetically since the 80th Congress. He served as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 80th Congress and was appointed to the House Foreign Affairs Committee on January 18, 1949, during the 81st Congress, and has served on that committee ever since.

During the 82d Congress, LAURIE BATTLE served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy. Acutely conscious of his responsibilities and the importance of foreign economic policy in the foreign affairs of our Nation, he conducted a thorough study of the question of the trade of the free world with the Soviet bloc—East-West trade. As a result of this thorough and painstaking study, there emerged the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1949, which is known around the entire globe as the Battle Act, after the name of the distinguished author LAURIE BATTLE. The Battle Act has been successful in curtailing the shipment of strategic items by our allies to Iron Curtain countries. In June 1951, he served as chairman of the Economics Section of a Special Study Mission to Europe made up of members of the Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, and Appropriations Committees. Other members of this section included the Honorable Christian A. Herter, now Governor of Massachusetts, the Honorable Richard B. Wigglesworth, and the Honorable Frederic R. Coudert, Jr. He filed a report with the Foreign Affairs Committee just prior to its consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. I know that much of the reorganization of the administration of our foreign aid program following the Mutual Security Act of 1951 resulted from the recommendations made by his group.

LAURIE BATTLE has always taken his responsibilities as a Member of Congress and as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee very seriously. To him public service is a great opportunity and a high responsibility. This fundamental philosophy of LAURIE BATTLE'S has been constantly demonstrated during his service as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. No matter how small the bill being considered by the committee, LAURIE BATTLE has always given it just as much careful attention as he has the larger and more important measures. He brought to the Foreign Affairs Committee a sense of sincerity, a public consciousness, and a willingness to spend many arduous hours in bringing forth the best possible legislation in the public interest, all of which qualities will be sorely missed.

I know that with his retirement there go the best wishes of his friends, his colleagues in the Congress, and his associates on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great loss to the House of Representatives that LAURIE BATTLE is retiring from Congress at the end of this term. As former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and now ranking minority member, I have served on that committee with LAURIE BATTLE for a number of years and have firsthand knowledge of his energy, integrity, ability, and devotion to duty. I know of no Member of Congress who has accomplished more during an equal tenure of years. He is the author of the famous Battle Act, which has done much in curbing trade with Russia and Iron Curtain countries. He was last year appointed by President Eisenhower as a member of the Foreign Economic Policy Commission, in which position he did yeoman work. Those are just two of his many achievements since he came here.

I must say, too, that I have a keen sense of personal loss in LAURIE BATTLE'S retirement. I have come to know and love him and his fine family during the years they have been in Washington, and I am sure I speak for the entire membership of our committee and of the Congress itself when I say that it will be hard to fill his place and that we shall truly miss him.

I confidently believe that Laurie has a great future no matter what activity of life he decides to enter. I hope he will decide to come back here. But in any event, our thoughts and best wishes are with him and his family always.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] could not be here. He gave me a statement and asked me to read it. He says:

> Mr. Speaker, perhaps no man has ever made warmer friends among his colleagues in Congress than has our friend LAURIE BATTLE. He is loved and respected by all of us, and we wish him, as he leaves us at the end of this session of Congress, every success in all his undertakings.
>
> Laurie has made an excellent record representing the great Ninth District of Alabama. In his quiet, calm, and dignified way he has written a record here in the Congress which will be long remembered. Those of us in the Alabama delegation are going to miss him greatly.

That is the gentleman from Alabama ALBERT RAINS.

I am going to ask in a few minutes that LAURIE BATTLE take some of this time that I have, but before I do I do just want to say that he could have stayed here as long as he wanted to. Although he might have been opposed he would have defeated the opposition by a tremendous majority, because the people in that great district love and respect him. His city of Birmingham is the greatest city in Alabama, maybe in the world, but certainly in the State of Alabama at this time now, for now they are bringing in iron ore from Venezuela and will have one of the largest steel developments there in the world, and that great river system—he has helped develop everything there. Since he has been the Congressman from that district it has practically doubled in size. So I say to you that LAURIE BATTLE could keep on coming back here.

These men here, the men in the Congress of the United States, your colleagues, who represent every human being in America, hate to see you go, but whatever your undertakings happen to be they will be delighted and glad to help and work with you because we know you would never want anything except the things that would be helpful to the people of this great Nation.

I have known LAURIE BATTLE ever since he came here. I have known his wonderful wife, Jan, and his fine children. I know his brother. I know his office force. He has one little girl there who is on the job all the time. I would like to mention her by name but the only name in the world I know her by is "Pat," but she sure stands pat for Laurie and his great district and she has done a fine job, and I do not think there has ever been a better secretary in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I could talk forever about this young man who has done so much and is such a young fellow, and who will have so many opportunities. If he puts in the same amount of time, the same thought, the same work in his future undertakings that he has here he can go to any length that he wants.

The good Lord knows exactly what is best for all of us, and I know he knows what is best for LAURIE BATTLE. As one of our colleagues said, his father was a minister, and he said he was one of the greatest in the country. Well, I think that LAURIE BATTLE is one of the greatest Representatives, in my judgment, who has ever served in the Congress of the United States—and I have been here a long, long time.

I hate to see you go, and if you should ever want to come back I hope you will come. God bless you forever.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield the rest of my time to my great colleague [Mr. BATTLE], of Birmingham, Ala.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, to say that I am grateful or overwhelmed would be an understatement. I believe the first speech I ever made on the floor of this House was about 6 o'clock one Sunday morning when we eulogized the departure of one of our friends. It is different when it happens to you.

I am most appreciative, Frank, to you as the dean of the Alabama delegation, to each and every Member of the Alabama delegation, and to my other friends in the House for this occasion today.

I have served as a Member of the House of Representatives for 8 years—at least by January 3, 1955, my 8 years will have been completed. Working day in and day out, year in and year out, so closely as we have, one gets to know his colleagues mighty well.

Mr. Speaker, I have developed a deep respect for the Members of the Alabama delegation and for those who are honoring me today, an appreciation of your ability, and a warm feeling of affection for you as persons and as friends. I have shared your joys and your sorrows, both legislatively and personally, along with your families and office staffs. As a delegation, we have always worked together in the interest of Alabama. As Members of Congress, we have always worked together for the security and well-being of our country.

Mr. Speaker, we have an able delegation from Alabama. They are always on the job, they are conscientious, and they have served our State well. I am leaving the job of representing the State of Alabama in good hands. We have had differences, of course—differences of opinion, differences of philosophy, and differences of interest—but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a natural process of free government. May we ever be free enough to express our differences of opinion and settle them in an orderly way. To paraphrase one of our earlier patriots, I would like to say that it has been, and will always be, my purpose to fight for the right to differ.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues know, I believe—I certainly hope so—that I have done my best to serve my district, to serve our State, to cooperate with the Alabama delegation and I have done, above all, what I believed to be right, irrespective of the consequences.

In conclusion, I would like to say thank you from the bottom of my heart to each and every Member here today for their kind expressions and for the expressions of those who could not be here. I want to thank especially the older Members of the delegation and of the House for their help, and I also want to thank the newer Members for their cooperation, assistance, and friendship as well.

Mr. Speaker, I shall never forget this occasion. I will always be grateful to you, each and every one of you, who have spoken here today or expressed yourselves, and to all of my friends with whom I have served in the House of Representatives during the past 8 years. I will always be deeply grateful to my staff, and to my family. I will always be deeply grateful to the people of the Ninth District of Alabama for giving me the opportunity of serving in Congress, in the House of Representatives, the greatest deliberative body in the world. May it ever be so.

Thank you very much.

FOREIGN AID IS NO BARGAIN FOR WISCONSIN TAXPAYERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NICHOLSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in matters relating to foreign policy, my friend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and I have held opposite views. On July 28, in the Senate, he opened the debate on the mutual security bill of 1954—foreign aid. It was an able presentation in support of the full amount provided in the measure and generally expressed the views of those who have supported that legislation. I respect that point of view but differ almost wholly with it in view of present world conditions. I have asked for this time to answer in part the argument that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has made, namely, that the foreign-aid spending has been of great benefit to the people of the State of Wisconsin.

He says that Wisconsin agriculture in the past 5 years has exported $175 million worth of farm products. Industry, he states, for that same period has exported about $111 million of industrial or manufactured items, or a total of $286 million of income for business and agriculture. So much for what we received in my State, and I do not minimize the amount my State has received and the work it has provided for Wisconsin people.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Senator did not mention what the foreign aid spending is costing the taxpayers of Wisconsin. This is a glaring omission, in my opinion, because it fails to give the people in my State the true picture, but only one side of it. I shall attempt to answer the important question as to what Wisconsin is paying for this program and submit some pertinent facts.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that foreign aid is no bargain for the taxpayers in my State, in spite of $286 million of goods sold under it. The record is clear.

We have engaged in foreign-aid giving from July 1945, for 9 long years, and the total net aid provided in that period has been in excess of $59 billion. For economic aid we have advanced more than $38 billion, and for military assistance more than $21 billion.

This program for the period that I have mentioned cost the taxpayers of my State $1,223,680,000. Only 11 other States paid more than Wisconsin.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has been the charge upon Wisconsin for the 5-year period mentioned in the Senator's speech? Keep in mind that the income, according to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], amounted to $286 million.

However, the cost or charge upon the taxpayers of Wisconsin was actually $504,370,400. It is my contention that the foreign-aid program has not helped the people in Wisconsin but actually they have paid almost twice as much to support the program than they have received. I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that the program has been no bargain for Wisconsin taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of the foreign-spending program justify their positions with the argument that our dollars will prevent the onward march of communism in Europe and Asia.

The record is abundantly clear that the expenditure of money is not stopping aggressive communism. Here is the record and it cannot be successfully refuted.

Before World War II, the world's only Communist country was the Soviet Union, containing 170 million people in 8.1 million square miles.

During World War II, Soviet Russia swallowed up Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, plus parts of Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, China, and Japan.

Just after World War II, Communists directed by Moscow took over all of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. Soviet troops occupied East Germany and East Austria. Later, Yugoslavs broke with Moscow.

By 1950, Chinese Communists backed by Russia had conquered all of mainland China. In that year, Communists in North Korea attacked South Korea on Moscow's orders. Later, truce terms left North Korea in Communist hands. In 1951, Communist China conquered Tibet, on India's borders.

Now, in Indochina, Communists take over another 12 million people or more.

Net result: In 15 years, Communists have taken an additional 5.5 million square miles of territory and nearly 600 million people. The Communist empire today embraces 13.6 million square miles, one-fourth of the earth's land surface, and 800 million people, a third of the population of the earth.

In all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, these facts are a complete refutation of the argument that American dollars have stopped communism militarily or politically.

IMPORTS OF CRUDE OIL IN THE UNITED STATES ARE RUINING OUR DOMESTIC MARKET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to again call to the attention of the Congress the problem presented through excessive petroleum imports.

This problem is of concern to the Congress. It is of concern to the people of this country. It is not a partisan issue. The solution of it is basic to our economic well-being. It is essential to our national security.

It deserves the thoughtful attention of our national administration.

I have no desire to hamper the progress of the present administration. I want to be of help. I want to assist our administrative leaders as well as my colleagues on a subject important to our national welfare.

A few weeks ago, President Eisenhower pointed with pride to the comparative advantage the United States has over Russia in the production of oil. At the same time he suggested the influence for peace this advantage gave to the United States.

I do not want our country to lose that position. We are the one great power outside the Iron Curtain having within

its boundaries sufficient petroleum products to meet continued industrial expansion and for national security. Whether we remain in that position depends upon policies of our Government.

Whatever can be done to insure sound policies for national security and well-being should be the concern of all, whether in a legislative or administrative capacity.

I find no positive policy nor legislative or administrative program that now promises to preserve our position as to oil.

There is presently a world surplus of petroleum. Vast areas outside the United States have been opened for the production of oil, largely by American companies. This oil is valuable to the entire world and should be so developed and distributed.

We have learned in the United States that unwise development of our oil reserves results in great waste.

The impulse to find excessive markets causes waste of the producing reserves from which the oil is taken. Where this excessive production of oil is thrown onto markets, it can cause premature abandonment of older producing areas and an eventual loss of this valuable product.

Currently, oil produced from the new areas of production is from wells producing from one to six thousand barrels per day. The average per well production in the United States is less than 13 barrels per day. In my State of Kansas, our wells are producing on the average of nine barrels per well per day.

The conclusion is obvious: Unless some intervening program of restriction on the movement of this vast volume of oil now being produced at much less cost than the oil in the United States, our own ability to produce will be retarded.

When that is done, our country, and the friendly countries looking to us for petroleum supplies, will become dependent on areas outside of our own country for security.

Oil from the Middle East is becoming to an increasing extent, the source for the requirements of Europe and the entire Eastern Hemisphere. That market, once a valuable trade area for oil produced in the United States, is being lost to our producers.

Already the production in our States is being restricted. Kansas production has reached the minimum that can be imposed under our law.

Neighboring oil-producing areas have likewise been restricted. I understand that in Texas, our largest oil-producing State, production is now being restricted to a 15-day-per-month basis.

The market areas are now flooded, prices are being reduced and great concern is expressed throughout the industry.

Because the situation to which I am directing your attention is becoming more serious day by day, I invite the thinking of the Congress and the administration as well to give consideration to dealing with it before it becomes even worse.

Should other solutions fail, I will at an appropriate time again offer a proposal for congressional solution. Last year I offered a bill to restrict these oil imports to 10 percent of our requirements.

Administrative leaders urged the Congress not to take such legislative action until a more complete study had been made. The Congress responded to this request and authorized a commission, suggested by the President, to study and report on this problem.

The Commission was appointed. If they studied the question of oil imports they failed to advise or recommend to the Congress what action we should take. If they advised the administration, that advice has not been acted on or passed on to Congress.

I think it is well known that the importance of this situation is recognized at the highest level in the administrative branches of Government.

On May 28, 1953, the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Douglas McKay, made a statement before the National Petroleum Council, in which he said he had discussed this question with the President and the National Security Council and that the statement made was concurred in by the President. That statement by the Secretary reads as follows:

For the past several weeks there has been considerable debate on those provisions of the Simpson bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which would limit imports of crude oil and residual fuel oil. The nature of the issues and the merits of the arguments are well known to all of you.

I testified before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in opposition to those provisions of the Simpson bill which would place statutory limitations on crude oil and residual fuel oil imports into this country. I testified in opposition to those provisions because I felt that their enactment into law would be more harmful to the overall economy of the country than the benefits to be derived.

So that you may understand more fully my position, I want to quote you the following sentences from my testimony:

"I recognize the importance of domestic petroleum production to national defense and the contribution it makes to the national economy and that of the oil-producing States. I also realize that the petroleum industry is unique in that discovery and development of new reserves constitute a major and vital activity of the industry. Oil and gas produced must be replaced by a vigorous and progressive search for new reserves or the Nation's ability to produce petroleum would rapidly deteriorate.

"I recognize how important it is that the strength of the domestic industry be maintained. To maintain this strength requires an economic climate that promotes the competition, progress, and technological development that has brought the industry to its present high degree of capability. The domestic industry today is undergoing a period of readjustment. The rate of growth in demand has leveled off after the rapid gains which followed the Korean outbreak. At the same time the expansion of supply has brought about a more normal reserve capacity. Demand is now dropping seasonally at the close of warm winter. Domestic production has been reduced in recent months, and there should be a corresponding cut in imports. There is evidence that already the industry is effecting such adjustments."

My belief that the industry, acting individually, will effect such adjustments in the level of imports is based upon faith that the individual interests of each importing company will lead to that desirable level of imports necessary to preserve the health of the domestic industry and the security of this Nation more readily than can be achieved by resorting to undesirable and inflexible statutory restraints.

I am hopeful that those companies importing crude oil or products will show industrial statesmanship in this important matter and that each company, acting individually and wholly on its own individual judgment, will exercise that restraint in respect of imports necessary to the health and security of the Nation.

I have discussed this matter with President Eisenhower and the National Security Council. I can say to you that President Eisenhower concurs in these views.

For the 6 months immediately preceding the statement wherein Secretary McKay urged "a corresponding cut in imports," total petroleum imports amounted to 1,080,000 barrels per day. For a comparative 6 months ending May 1, 1954, imports have averaged 1,090,000 barrels a day.

Imports were not reduced, but domestic production was stagnated. Production of crude oil in the United States for the 6 months ending May 1, 1953, averaged 6,540,000 barrels per day; for the 6 months ending May 1, 1954, this production has been reduced to 6,375,000 barrels per day. This reduction was forced in the face of greatly increased producing capacity.

There should be a distinction in our national policy as between materials essential to our national defense and the less important commodities. For the first time, this distinction was recognized in the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, when the Senate, without objection, adopted an amendment offered by Senator SYMINGTON, which reads as follows:

SEC. 2. No action shall be taken pursuant to such section 350 to decrease the duty on any article the continued domestic production of which, in volume sufficient to meet projected national defense requirements, as determined by the President, would be threatened by such decrease in duty.

Here is not only recognition of the importance of essential materials, but, as well, a recognition of the fact that it is not a partisan issue. This amendment was offered by a Democrat and accepted without objection by the entire Senate.

On January 30, 1954, Honorable Felix Wormser, Assistant Secretary of Interior, in a speech before the Colorado Mining Association Convention at Denver, referring to a similar situation as to all minerals, stated:

In an effort to correct this situation, the President, as you know, has appointed a Minerals Policy Committee, consisting of four Cabinet members, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of the Interior. The other members are the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, together with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget acting in an advisory capacity.

Efforts have been made in the past to formulate a minerals policy. The National Minerals Advisory Council of recent memory, endeavored to do the job, without success. It is perhaps the most difficult task the Government can perform in the minerals sphere. I know you will be interested to learn that a vast amount of groundwork has already been done by this committee. It should not be too long before results are crystallized to

such an extent that a report can be made to the President for his consideration. But I ask you not to be impatient in awaiting the completion of this important task.

The question of remedial action as to oil imports has long been before the Tariff Commission and other agencies of Government. On May 3, 1949, the Tariff Commission dismissed an application for "escape clause" relief made by the Independent Petroleum Association of America with the following statement, in part:

The present situation with respect to inventories, which has resulted in some current scaling down of both production and imports, thus appears to have been due almost wholly to factors other than past changes in the duty. The Commission will continue to observe closely further developments in the industry, and its action in dismissing the present application for an investigation does not prejudice in any way future consideration of the question of petroleum imports as related to the escape clause.

For the 6-month period prior to the signing of that order, petroleum imports into the United States amounted to 590,000 barrels per day; for 6 months ending May 1, 1954, imports amounted to 1,090,000 barrels per day. In other words, imports have practically doubled without further action by the Commission. Here we have assurance that the Tariff Commission is continuing to be alert as to this problem.

The continuing study by the Tariff Commission, the consideration that has been given by the Interior Department, and the awareness of the problem at the Cabinet level should provide a basis for such administrative action as may be necessary.

The problem continues. We have extended the trade agreements law for another year.

The Congress has deferred action, but it cannot afford to long postpone the time this problem must be met.

How long a condition that is recognized by all as being injurious to the welfare of our country can be permitted to continue without serious threat to the security of our country, I do not know. There is little chance of legislative action now during the closing days of this Congress. There is abundant time for such administrative corrections as are within their power.

In order to bring the problem I have just discussed down to date, I call attention to a recent article that appeared in the Journal of Commerce reciting the fact that one of the large oil companies has slashed crude buying in the State of Kansas to 70 percent. Here is what the article says. It appears in the Journal of Commerce for July 28, 1954:

SOHIO TO SLASH KANSAS CRUDE BUYING TO 70 PERCENT

Effective August 1, 1954, and continuing until further notice, Sohio Petroleum Co. will reduce its purchases from leases served by Kaw Pipe Line Co. in Kansas to 70 percent of actual purchases made in June of 1954.

In common with the industry, Sohio has substantially reduced refinery runs as compared to last year.

The leveling of United States demand, carryover from the winter season of unusually large products stocks—especially gasoline, loss of some Canadian markets, and the lack of effective regulation of crude-oil production in certain areas have resulted in excessive supplies of crude oil, the company stated.

Despite maximum effort to reduce purchases in other areas, including the institution of purchase prorationing, crude-storage facilities available to Sohio continue to fill and are approaching physical capacity limits. As a result, this further action has become necessary.

So it appears that while we continue to increase imports from foreign countries, we slash crude buying in the United States.

MRS. ELIZABETH PRUETT FARRINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama, who is leaving the Congress, I hope only for a short time.

Mr. BATTLE. I thank the gentlewoman. I want to express my very deep appreciation for her kind words of a few moments ago and say that I regret leaving such a wonderful public servant as she is.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my very great pleasure that the new delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable BETTY FARRINGTON, is a Delegate in this Congress of the United States. She is a friend of long standing. I have always loved her and admired her work for the Republican Party, her work for Hawaii, and her work for the country. She and our colleague the late Joe Farrington, worked hand in hand for the same principles and for the same causes. I have never seen a warmer welcome extended to any person in all of my experience in the Congress, and that has been some 30 years, than was extended to BETTY FARRINGTON yesterday when she was sworn in as Delegate. It was a tribute to her and her work as well as a tribute to Joe Farrington. I think it means that the Delegate, BETTY FARRINGTON, will be a great success in her work as Delegate in the House of Representatives and in every way of great value to Hawaii because of her knowledge of legislative procedure and governmental procedure, and her knowledge of the Territory of Hawaii and all its problems, and of great value to our country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BOGGS, for today and the remainder of the session, on account of official business.

Mr. PRESTON, for today and the remainder of the session, on account of official business.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. VORYS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9678) to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in two instances and to include an editorial.

Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) in two instances.

Mr. BAILEY.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. CRUMPACKER.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, the remarks he made earlier in the day and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARRETT (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS, the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole on the bill relating to trading with the enemy, and to include extraneous material.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2763. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to modify the duty on the importation of wood dowels, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 9, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 622. Resolution providing for additional funds for studies and investigations by the Committee on the Judiciary; with amendment (Rept. No. 2623). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 629. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 22; with amendment (Rept. No. 2624). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 631. Resolution to provide expenses for the special committee authorized by House Resolution 439; without amendment (Rept. No. 2625). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 682. Resolution to provide necessary expenses for the Committee on Rules; without amendment

(Rept. No. 2626). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 218. Concurrent resolution favoring the waiver of State residence requirements in elections of Federal officials; with amendment (Rept. No. 2627). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TALLE: Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Report pursuant to section 5 (a) of Public Law 304 (79th Cong.) (Rept. No. 2628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 906. An act to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HESELTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3379. An act to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act, so as to exempt from its application fabrics and wearing apparel which are not highly flammable; with amendment (Rept. No. 2630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TALLE: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9648. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEARNS: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1585. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1611. An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2633). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3506. An act to repeal the act approved September 25, 1914, and to amend the act approved June 12, 1934, both relating to alley dwellings in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3655. An act to provide that the Metropolitan Police force shall keep arrest books which are open to public inspection; without amendment (Rept. No. 2635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10158. A bill to provide for the payment of fees to counsel assigned to represent indigent defendants in felony cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 2636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Committee of Conference. H. R. 9678. A bill to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2637). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. R. 10186. A bill to provide that the Atomic Energy Commission shall make a study and investigation with respect to the use and development of atomic energy for peaceful pursuits; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (by request):

H. R. 10187. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the payment of appraisers', auctioneers', and brokers' fees from the proceeds of disposal of Government surplus real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 10188. A bill to authorize reciprocal fire-protection agreements between departments and agencies of the United States and public or private organizations engaged in fire-fighting activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 10189. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of fine-arts programs and projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 10190. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. Res. 699. Resolution to amend House Resolution 161; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. Res. 700. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make a full and complete investigation and study of the procedures and practices under the Trading With the Enemy Act during the period from December 18, 1941, to the present; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. R. 10191. A bill for the relief of Antonio Silva de Oliveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 10192. A bill for the relief of Michele Constantino Pastore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1133. By Mr. FORRESTER: Petition of Mrs. Linda C. Ewing and sundry other citizens of Ashburn, Ga., calling for passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1134. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the board of aldermen, city of Somerville, Mass., favoring a hydroelectric plant for New England; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Details of World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, for 3 years I have been trying to alert the people of the United States to the sinister clouds of desolation now forming to destroy this great Government. I have had to weave together bits of evidence coming to light here and there which in my judgment clearly spelled out the purposes of those citizens of the United States who desire and strive to substitute for our Government a world government by placing over it a world organization which would destroy our sovereignty and make this Government subservient to it.

The excuse which these misguided citizens make for this treasonable program is that it is being done in the name of peace. Peace would be the easiest thing in this world to accomplish if we were to surrender our means of protection and kneel down before the altar of peace and surrender our freedom and liberties. People behind the Iron Curtain have this kind of peace, but where is their freedom and liberty? I am just as much an advocate of peace as anyone can be, but the peace I want is not a slave's peace, but a peace with freedom and liberty. I do not want to be driven into slavery in the name of peace.

Just what is intended by the one-worlders is now definitely outlined. The people no longer have to go over the facts we have gathered here and there to prove this treasonable act, for now directly before us is the written plan with the specifications of this sinister world government.

The American Public Relations Forum, Inc., of Burbank, Calif., in its bulletin No. 31 of June 1954, outlines the whole scheme to destroy the sovereign power of the United States.

In 1955 it is planned to amend the Charter of the United Nations, with the design, it is said, "to produce a genuine, and, as we believe, a workable scheme of world government."

Membership: Membership should be open to all states, and all must be urged to join. Once membership has been accepted, continued membership must be compulsory. There must be no right of secession.

If the United States can be lured into this snare by these sirens of world government, we cannot get out except by revolution. Do the free citizens of the United States want any such contrivance merely because misguided peace advocates tell us this is what we want?

Disarmament: The charter will provide for the complete, simultaneous, universal, en-

forceable disarmament, enforceable by the United Nation's police.

In other words, if this great Nation thinks it is best to keep prepared to defend our institutions of freedom, we are to be forced into a position of no protection and are to be subjugated by the police force of the United Nations. Do these weakminded disciples of world government believe for a single moment that here, in the cradle of liberty, where we have maintained the greatest government on earth for nearly 170 years, we are going to meekly surrender and turn our affairs over to a bastard child of the United Nations? Instead of this scheme's bringing peace it will bring war—war right here in the United States.

Judiciary: The International Court of Justice should be given jurisdiction to:

(a) Decide disputes between states.

(b) Disputes between a state and citizens of another state.

(c) Disputes involving members of the UNO and in particular its police.

(d) Any matter concerning the interpretation of the U. N. Charter, including the validity of laws passed by the world legislature.

This provision makes certain that the Supreme Court of the United States will not be permitted to pass upon the Charter of the United Nations. If this court decides that the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations supersedes the Constitution of the United States, then our courts have no power to decide the matter, and we must accept the world court's decisions.

The world legislature:

A. Shall consist of two chambers, the lower chamber shall be represented by the selection by states of the members according to population.

B. Have power to raise revenue for U. N. purposes.

Here we at once notice that Russia, Red China, and their satellites will control the lower chamber. Just where would we be in this organization with Red forces controlling the world congress? Anyone who thinks this is not a Communist-inspired scheme certainly is completely dumb or at least weakminded.

The executive:

The two chambers shall select an executive committee to run the business, so here again the Communists would control. There is to be no veto power over the legislature in any way.

World citizenship:

Every person in the world should be a citizen of the United Nations, and the charter and laws should bind each individual.

Bill of rights:

A new bill of rights is to be set up under the terms of the Charter of the United Nations. This means a new definition of free speech, a free press and free religion.

Power shall be given by the Charter of the United Nations to legislate in order that states shall be governed by international law.

Here we have the direct challenge that the United States shall henceforth be governed by this world government legislature, no matter what a citizen of this country may think of it.

The following suggestion as to how Russia will come into this organization is enlightening:

America must disarm to show we are proving democracy means what it says.

It is implied "that then Russia will be so ashamed that she will lay down her own arms and come in and be good." Did you ever hear such asinine nonsense? When has Russia ever been ashamed? If the United States disarmed as here recommended, Russia would not be ashamed, but delighted that we were naive enough to believe her, and her word would be as worthless as it has proven to be in all our dealings with the Soviet.

This is a plan of government hatched up by a band of world peace advocates who are willing to sell out their own country, lock, stock and barrel, if these peace-lovers can have peace. "Peace, peace," is their cry, and the certainty of the loss of freedom and liberty under that kind of peace has never dawned on their incompetent brains.

I want the people of this country to know just what kind of people are fomenting the sale of our sovereignty. They are intentionally trying to do it—or they are to ignorant to understand freedom and liberty.

Many good people in the United States have been captivated by this cry of peace, but here in this speech are the facts that demonstrate how demented some people can get. They are either absolutely demented or they are traitors to the Republic of the United States. In either case they should be halted in their perfidy before they can complete the sale of the free institutions of the United States of America.

These conspirators propose to have the atomic and the H-bomb, and all stockpiles of completed bombs, turned over to the United Nations. While they do not in this outline of world government say so, it can logically be inferred that the purpose of having these bombs is to awe the various states into submission.

It may well be that the taxes assessed by the world legislature would not suit the people of the United States, whose Representatives in Congress were not consulted about this tax. In that event the police force of the world government will go into action and forcibly collect the tax—that is, any tax the world government may assess. Should that police force be unable to forceably collect the tax, the possession of the atomic bombs by this police force might conceivably be used against the United States or any other state in the world government.

Thus, we see that while these skim-milk-brained advocates of world peace want peace, and peace at any price, at the same time they want weapons enough to force the people of the world into submission. They want the United States to disarm, but insist upon arming themselves. Nothing could be more cowardly than this.

I do not believe these world-peace advocates should be arrested for treason, but they should be taken before the nearest sanity court, and if as demented as they appear to be in backing this plan of world government, they should be locked up as a protection to the public.

As soon as the people of the United States fully understand what the world government plan is, the fighting spirit of the patriots who started this Government will be aroused.

My oath of office reads that "I will protect the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic," and while serving into this Congress, or living in this Republic, I propose to carry out to the letter the provisions of that oath.

Crumpacker Plans Official Tour of 22 Communities in Third Indiana District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, following a practice established in 1950 of making the services of my office directly available to constituents at least once each year, I am planning an official business tour of 22 cities and towns in the Third Indiana District soon after the adjournment of Congress.

My 1954 grass-roots tour—the fourth in as many years—has been scheduled for August 30 through September 3 and will include visits to 7 communities in Elkhart County, 6 in La Porte County, 6 in Marshall County, and 3 in St. Joseph County.

A temporary office will be established at a central location in each community and local citizens will be afforded an opportunity to confer informally with their representative in Congress.

No formal appointment will be necessary, and I will welcome the chance to be of any possible service to any and all callers. As in past years, I will be accompanied and assisted by a member of my Washington office staff.

I have learned from experience, Mr. Speaker, that these tours are of value for many reasons. Not only do they afford me an opportunity to bring the services of my office directly to the people in their home towns, but they serve another useful purpose.

As a supplement to the opinion polls I conduct annually by mail, they enable me, through personal contact, to keep informed of the views and attitudes of my constituents on legislative issues. With this in mind I am looking forward with eagerness to my 1954 Third District tour.

The complete tour schedule follows:

MONDAY, AUGUST 30

Osceola, fire station, 9 a. m.
Elkhart, courthouse, 10 a. m.
Middlebury, First State Bank, 2 p. m.
Bristol, town hall, 3:30 p. m.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 31

Wakarusa, Exchange State Bank, 9 a. m.
Goshen, courthouse, 10 a. m.
New Paris, State Bank, 2 p. m.
Nappanee, city hall, 3 p. m.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1

Lakeville, town hall, 9:30 a. m.
La Paz, Farmer's State Bank, 10:30 a. m.
Bremen, town hall, 11:30 a. m.

Bourbon, News-Mirror office, 1:30 p. m.
Argos, town hall, 3 p. m.
Culver, Citizen office, 4 p. m.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2

Plymouth, courthouse, 10 a. m.
Walkerton, town hall, 1:30 p. m.
Kingsford Heights, fire station, 3 p. m.
Wanatah, H. W. Welkie office, 4 p. m.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 3

Westville, public library, 9 a. m.
Michigan City, courthouse, 10 a. m.
La Porte, courthouse, 2 p. m.
Union Mills, fire station, 4 p. m.

Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 30, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] attempted to show the American farmer that he was doing pretty well under the present administration—and if he was not doing very well it all came about because the Democrats had been running the country a couple of years ago, when the farmer was doing pretty well.

I can sympathize with the gentleman from Illinois in his attempts to make the American farmer think he is doing well under the present administration. It was an almost impossible task the gentleman undertook to accomplish.

Let me relate the experience of Mr. L. W. Boley, a cattle farmer in Nicholas County, W. Va., who also happens to be the current sheriff.

In the spring of 1952, Mr. Boley sold 31 yearling steers at $230 a head.

In the spring of 1953, Mr. Boley sold 24 yearling steers at $145 a head.

In the spring of 1954, Mr. Boley sold 24 yearling steers—bigger and fatter than the 31 sold in 1952—at $114 a head.

The man to whom Mr. Boley sold 31 yearling steers at $230 a head in 1952 still has some of those animals. He recently offered to sell them back to Mr. Boley at much less than he had paid for them, even though he has fed them for 2 years.

Mr. Boley recently wanted to buy some steaks. He went to a chain store, where the price was $1.14 per pound, a price the butcher said was the equivalent to the all-time war-period high.

The sheriff said that farmers in Nicholas County, W. Va., are paying higher-than-ever prices for fertilizer, seed, feed, and farm machinery.

This administration can explain and explain and sloganize and sloganize until its spokesmen are blue in the face, but neither Mr. Boley, nor any other farmer, looking at these realities eye to eye, will be convinced his lot is better now than it was under the Democratic regime.

H. R. 8193

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, approximately a year and a half ago the President urged the Congress to enact emergency legislation to admit 120,000 refugees, escapees, and distressed persons in friendly European countries to the United States. The President pointed out that it is imperative that we join with other nations in helping to find a solution to the grave problem of homeless and distressed persons and population pressures. He stated:

> These refugees, escapees, and distressed peoples now constitute an economic and political threat of constantly growing magnitude. They look to traditional American humanitarian concern for the oppressed. International political considerations are also factors which are involved. We should take reasonable steps to help these people to the extent that we share the obligation of the free world.

The Congress promptly enacted such emergency legislation and on August 7, 1953, the President signed into law the Emergency Migration Act of 1953. We read in the newspapers daily of families arriving in the United States from various European countries as a result of this special legislation.

In Italy an unusual and unexpected situation has developed. The Emergency Migration Act of 1953—also referred to as the Refugee Relief Act—provided for the issuance of 15,000 special nonquota visas to Italian nationals who have immediate relatives in the United States—sisters, brothers, and adult children of American citizens. It also provided for the issuance of 45,000 special nonquota visas to Italian nationals who could qualify as refugees or escapees. I believe that the drafters of this emergency legislation now realize that the special nonquota allocations for Italian nationals should have been reversed. In other words, the 45,000 visas should have gone to the relatives of American citizens and the 15,000 to those who qualify as refugees or escapees. It has turned out that comparatively few Italian nationals qualify in the latter category as very few individuals who fled their homelands to escape political persecution resettled in Italy. On the other hand, many, many more relatives of American citizens have applied for nonquota visas under provisions of the Refugee Relief Act than can possibly be accommodated with the meager allotment of 15,000 visas. To date the American consular officers in Italy have on file approximately 44,000 approved petitions filed by American citizens for their relatives in Italy. Latest information from the visa office of the State Department is that only approximately 1,000 Italian nationals have applied for admission to the United States under the refugee-escapee provisions of the Refugee Relief Act.

The Senate Chamber has an opportunity to correct this situation and I sincerely hope that this will be done before the 83d Congress adjourns in the next week or so. H. R. 8193 which was approved by the House of Representatives on March 15, 1954, and reported to the Senate by the Senate Judiciary Committee on August 2, contains a provision for permitting the issuance of nonquota visas to Italian nationals who are immediate relatives of American citizens but do not qualify as refugees or escapees. In other words, it throws open to Italians with approved visa petitions on file in their behalf any portion of the 45,000 nonquota visas which are not utilized by Italian nationals qualifying as refugees or escapees.

The excerpt quoted previously from President Eisenhower's letter of April 22, 1953, gives strong evidence of the importance of opening our doors to the oppressed and needy of friendly countries.

Our Government has pledged itself time and again to aid friendly countries who are in need. We have learned that outright appropriation of funds alone cannot totally relieve economic distress and the threat of communism. One of the friendliest and most helpful gestures we can make to Italy is to ease her burden of overpopulation and arranging for the reuniting of loved ones in the United States. Italy's major problem—unemployment—is caused by overpopulation.

Of a total population of 47 million, Italy's unemployed consistently exceeds 2 million. The United States and other countries of the Western Hemisphere could absorb most of these people without disrupting their economies. In fact, they would have everything to gain by taking in these people who are renown for their special skills in arts, science, industry, culture, and spirit. The role of Italians in the heroic drama of the building of our own Nation is written across the land and in the pages of our history books.

I hope other Members here today will also urge the Senate leaders to schedule H. R. 8193 for consideration within a day or two in order to ensure enactment before the 83d Congress adjourns.

Just a Minute, What Is Costing How Much?—Or, People Who Live in Glass Houses Should Not Throw Stones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, there are in the United States today certain groups and individuals who are severely criticizing the reclamation program on the assumption that it is costing the taxpayer a lot of money, and becomes an everlasting burden upon them.

Naturally, in these times of high cost of living anyone who talks about cost to the taxpayers finds a receptive audience whether the presentation is misleading or whether it is representative of the true situation. It has been pointed out time and time again that reclamation projects when studied in their true perspective yield benefits to the nation that are national in scope as well as local, and that the projects pay for themselves many times over in the form of newly created income and of tax revenues made possible by the reclamation project, and that these and many other benefits continue indefinitely into the future.

Critics of the Federal reclamation program, on the ground that it will constitute a burden on the Federal taxpayers, should take a good look at H. R. 9859, the omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill. Here is a bill that, under the arguments advanced by opponents of reclamation projects constitutes a real giveaway. The cost to the Federal Government is entirely nonreimbursable, and no interest is charged the beneficiaries on the original cost either.

In the case of Federal reclamation projects, interest is paid on the investment in power and municipal water features, including interest accruing during the construction period. This part of the cost of the project is, then, returned to the Federal Treasury with interest in 50 years. Interest is not charged on the costs allocated to irrigation features in accordance with reclamation law. The capital investment in irrigation features is, however, returned to the Federal Treasury in 50 years partially from the irrigation farmer, partially from taxes levied by the required conservancy-type districts, and the remainder from power revenues. After full pay out there will flow into the Federal Treasury millions of dollars per year for the life of the project, from power revenues, which may be for hundreds of years or longer.

One of the arguments currently being employed by opponents of reclamation projects in general, and of the Colorado River storage project in particular is to point an accusing finger at the interest on the amount assigned to irrigation features, the principal of which is returned from power revenues. For instance, Mr. Leslie Miller, one of the severest of critics of H. R. 4449 points out that the Nation's taxpayers will be called upon to pay interest for 44 years at 2½ percent on $231,041,900, the estimated amount assigned to irrigation and to be repaid from power sales. He further points out that this amount at interest compounded annually would grow to $780 million, and that interest on unpaid balances over the 6-year period would amount to $23 million; the total cost then being $803 million from which the principal is subtracted, because it is repaid, leaves $540 million to be paid in interest by the taxpayers.

Now, let us take a look at the cost of those projects in the omnibus rivers, harbors, and flood control bill. Remember, the figures quoted are costs to the Federal Government. They are nonreimbursable gifts. No interest is paid by the beneficiaries on the capital investment. No part of the principal is returned.

In the current omnibus bill under titles I and II, we note the following. There are:

1. 85 rivers and harbors projects at a cost to the Federal Government of	$212,915,100
2. 22 beach erosion projects	14,003,664
3. 39 flood-control projects	663,352,750
Total cost to the Federal Government	890,271,514

This $890 million is not the total cost of all rivers, harbors, and flood-control projects. It represents only the cost of projects for which authorization is sought in H. R. 9859 for this session of Congress.

To illustrate the ridiculousness of the argument of those opposed to reclamation projects on the grounds of the interest argument illustrated above, let us now apply that same argument, that someone, the taxpayer, has to stand the cost of the interest charges paid by the Federal Government on borrowed money, to the cost of those items sought for authorization in the omnibus bill. First, we should note that it is very significant that those opposed to the Colorado River storage project figured their interest for a 50-year period. This is significant because at the end of the 50-year period all of the principal is repaid and power revenues continue into perpetuity to pour $20 million per year into the Federal Treasury. In the case of the projects in the omnibus bill the interest need not be computed for only 50 years. It could be figured for any period into perpetuity—50 years, 100 years, 200 years, 1,000 years—infinity.

For the sake of this illustration it is sufficient to point out that in 50 years at 2½ percent interest compounded annually the $890 million will add $3.06 billion; in 100 years $10.5 billion; and in 200 years $124.2 billion to the current national debt.

For the city of Los Angeles, Calif., there is a flood-control plan now underway that is estimated to cost the United States taxpayers $363,265,500. By this project alone at 2½ percent interest compounded annually in 50 years there will be added to the national debt $1.25 billion; in 100 years $4.3 billion; and in 200 years $50.7 billion.

For the city of Los Angeles, Calif., and environs, there are also planned three harbor improvement programs with a total estimated cost to the Federal taxpayers of $14,071,500. At the same rate of interest in 50 years the total cost will be $48.4 million; in 100 years $166.2 million; and in 200 years $1.96 billion.

Current plans for the city of Los Angeles and environs for flood control and harbor improvements will cost the Nation's taxpayers in 50 years $1.3 billion; in 100 years $4.5 billion; and in 200 years $52.7 billion. These figures do not take into consideration the immense expenditures that have been made in these categories for the city of Los Angeles in past years, nor the fantastic nonreimbursable expenditures undoubtedly expected in the future from the Federal Treasury.

In House Report No. 2247 to accompany H. R. 9859, the omnibus bill, we note in title I that—

Cost of completed navigation program	$856,000,000
Cost of projects now underway not completed	1,409,000,000
Cost of projects authorized but not yet started	911,000,000
Total cost of active navigation programs (does not include multiple-purpose projects)	3,176,000,000
Cost of completed flood-control projects	545,000,000
Cost of projects now underway	2,945,000,000
Cost of projects authorized but not started	1,371,000,000
Total cost of active flood control projects	4,861,000,000
Total cost of active rivers, harbors, flood-control projects	8,037,000,000

To further illustrate how ridiculous this argument about interest can become at 2½ percent interest compounded annually the total cost of the active rivers, harbors, and flood-control program in 50 years would grow to $27.6 billion; in 100 years to $94.9 billion; and in 200 years would add $1,121.6 billion—over a trillion dollars—to our national debt.

In spite of the stupendous figures that can be derived by this method of considering interest we all realize the benefits to be gained from the programs in question. We realize that both the principal invested and the interest that could be computed thereon are expendable items from which benefits are derived into perpetuity and ad infinitum. We as Americans cannot condone the attitude of the man who starved himself to death because he realized that if he did not eat at the rate of $1,500 per year at the end of 50 years his $1,500 would grow to $5,155; in 100 years to $17,721; and in 200 years to $209,340.

A Basic Program for the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker during the year a great deal has been spoken, and written, in support of the American merchant marine, and of the shipbuilding industry. Competent observers, imbued with the desire to promote the national interest, have urged that the Federal Government take such steps as are necessary to insure the preservation of these two allied industries.

Since the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, such a course has

been the policy of Congress. It was clearly recognized then, just as it is now, that both the economic prosperity and the security of the United States are inextricably united with our merchant marine and shipbuilding enterprises. Part of our national strength lies in these activities.

For the purpose of insuring an adequate merchant marine and the maintenance of a nucleus of shipbuilding, there has been suggested a basic program which the Federal Government should adopt. I wish to go on record as earnestly supporting this basic program.

Some of the elements of the program have already been enacted into law. These include three separate requests by President Eisenhower totaling just over $100 million. The first is for funds to construct 10 fast tankers. The second is for funds for national defense features and construction parity for four passenger ships.

Third is the request for funds to conduct experimental work on ships in the reserve fleet. The purpose of such experiments is to determine if the slower, less efficient vessels can be modernized and speeded up to the point where they would be of use to the Nation during a national emergency. If it proves feasible to modernize these vessels, I recommend that we establish a program to extend the work to all vessels in the fleet for which such work would be practicable.

These parts of the basic program remain to be adopted: First, the Department of Commerce should be authorized to sell Government ship mortgages to provide funds for ship construction.

Second, the revolving fund authorized in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 should be made available for use in connection with ship construction. It is expected that under such an arrangement the Maritime Board would have funds available to encourage the construction of new vessels.

Third, legislation should be enacted which would provide for accelerated rates of depreciation for new vessels.

Fourth, S. 3233 should be enacted into law. The bill, introduced by Senator BUTLER, of Maryland, requires that 50 percent of material shipped abroad under aid programs move in ships of American registry. Likewise, half of the material procured abroad for the Government's account must be carried in American merchant ships.

Finally, there should be enacted legislation which would clarify the existing language with respect to the determination of construction subsidy. Clear and specific responsibility for determining the amount of construction subsidy should be given to the Board. This would have the effect of removing the uncertainty which overshadows contract making at the present time.

These proposals have the support of Mr. Robert B. Murray, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. In the interest of an adequate merchant marine and shipbuilding industry, in the interest of our national economy and national security I wholeheartedly endorse and support these proposals.

Foreign Assistance Through Export-Import Bank To Enable Foreign Producers To Compete With American Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, when will we as a nation awaken to the fact that American industry and our own workers must be protected against foreign production and the low standard of wages paid to workers in foreign countries?

For years we have been pouring American taxpayers' money into countries all over the world to enable such countries to rehabilitate their broken-down economies In some countries the result has been to increase their production even beyond what it was before the war, but, we still keep on giving. Today, our situation is such that Congress will be asked to increase our debt limit. It seems to me it would have been more sensible to have cut down our expenditure at home and abroad and thereby eliminated the necessity at this time of increasing our debt limit to accommodate our spending program.

The foreign-aid program has added greatly to our present indebtedness of $270 billion, but even that program of spending is not all that we are doing in the line of spending. The Export-Import Bank is now expected to do its part in spreading American dollars around the world. The latest request for a loan comes from the Brazilian National Steel Company, which I understand, is controlled by the Brazilian Government.

It is my understanding that this Brazilian company is attempting to obtain a loan of $40 million from the Export-Import Bank to increase its capacity. This company was originally financed by a loan of $70 million from the Export-Import Bank. The proposed new loan would serve to make a substantial increase in the capacity of that company.

I am sure that I need not tell you that the steel industry in our own country is now operating at a rate which is considerably below its capacity; in fact, it is operating at less than 70 percent of capacity; with resultant large-scale unemployment and much part-time employment.

South America is a natural export market for the United States steel industry. The encouragement of the production of steel by South American countries in order to make those countries self-sufficient will result in serious disadvantage to the American steel industry. It is recognized that if those countries are able to obtain capital elsewhere, there is nothing we can or should do about it. However, I believe that the expenditure of American tax moneys to build up competition for American industry in foreign countries for a commodity which is already in oversupply in the world markets is not justifiable and is grossly unfair to American producers and American labor.

It is the duty of Members of Congress to use whatever influence they can exert on the Export-Import Bank to prevent the proposed loan to the Brazilian National Steel Co., and all other loans of a similar character. We owe it to American industry and our own workers to oppose all loans that enable foreign producers to compete with us on a low-wage basis.

Statement Condemning the Diversion of Veterans' Employment Funds Under the Labor Department Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the action of the Senate in changing the language in the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955—Public Law 472, 83d Congress, approved July 2, 1954—so as to make it possible to divert the funds appropriated for the Veterans' Employment Service, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, to other uses within the Bureau of Employment Security. I cannot but condemn this action; particularly as I am informed that there are now some 75,000 unemployed veterans in California. After their patriotic service to their country the least that can be done for them is to refrain from cutting down on the possibilities of employment help whereby these deserving men and women might support themselves and their families.

The specific matter in H. R. 9447, the bill which became Public Law 472, to which I refer appears in the first paragraph under the heading "Bureau of Employment Security." It provided, as reported by the House committee:

> Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not to exceed $10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); $4,650,000, of which $1,100,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except sec. 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

The appropriations for this purpose for 1954 had been $5,300,000, later adjusted to $5,273,400, with $1,100,000 thereof for the Veterans Employment Service under title IV, supra. The budget, fiscal year 1955, page 840, recommended that these figures be cut to $4,760,000 for the Bureau of which $700,000 was to be for the Veterans Employment Service. As indicated by the quotation, supra, the House committee cut the appropriation for whole Bureau

to $4,650,000 but kept the amount required to be used for the Veterans Employment Service at $1,100,000 stating in its report—House Report No. 1756, 83d Congress, page 3—that—

The bill includes $4,650,000, a reduction of $110,000 from the request, and $650,000 from the appropriation for 1954. The amount recommended includes $1,110,000 for the Veterans Employment Service which is the same amount appropriated for 1954, but $400,000 above the amount recommended in the budget. It is the committee's opinion that the amount recommended is about the minimum necessary for an effective VES program. When the time comes that the program is not needed, it should be eliminated entirely, but to appropriate for the abbreviated and ineffective program proposed by the budget would have been a waste of funds.

The House passed the bill with the amounts recommended by the committee.

The Senate committee reported out the bill with the amounts as passed by the House but recommended that the word "shall", after the figures $1,100,000, be changed to "may." The Senate committee's report—Senate Report No. 1623, 83d Congress—does not comment upon this proposed change. The Senate accepted the word "may" and passed the bill with the total amount for the Bureau increased to $4,760,000.

The conference committee set the amount for the whole Bureau at $4,705,000 and retained the discretionary provision respecting the amount which might be used for the Veterans Employment Service—House Report No. 1988, 83d Congress, page 5—stating:

Strikes language proposed by the House and inserts language proposed by the Senate to give the Department discretion in determining the total amount to be set aside for the Veterans Employment Service.

The result of all this is that the bill enacted as Public Law 472 appropriates $4,705,000 for the Bureau of Employment Security of which any amount up to $1,100,000 may be used for the Veterans Employment Service in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor.

Let me emphasize again my absolute opposition to this device whereby the funds needed to help make veterans self-supporting can be diverted to make up and modify cuts made in the funds for other nonveteran services of the Bureau of Employment Security.

Accomplishments of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as you may remember, it has always been my policy to tell of what I thought were the major accomplishments of each Congress since I was first elected to serve in the House of Representatives in 1942. This year, I am quite proud of our accomplishments.

Friends, during my 6 terms in Congress, I have followed the policy of sending you a report of its accomplishments and giving you an account of my stewardship as your representative. I wish I could write each of you individually, but that would be impossible. However, I do hope you will take the few minutes necessary to read this; and if you have any comments or questions, I would appreciate your writing me either at Kimball, Nebr., or 1025 House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

This is not a political report, but rather an objective review of the accomplishments of the 83d Congress and the Republican administration. As the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska, it is my responsibility to represent the views of both Republicans and Democrats, realizing that what is best for Nebraska is best for both political parties and the Nation.

First off, I will tell you of a few of the actions which are of direct and primary interest to you—the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska.

SARGENT PROJECT APPROVED

The Sargent irrigation project was approved by my Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and, at my insistence, a supplemental appropriation bill was passed containing $1 million to start actual construction of the project. This project has been hanging fire for many years and to many it is a dream come true.

Western Nebraska irrigators and REA groups are quite familiar with my efforts to get money appropriated for the Glendo multipurpose dam which would firm up the water supply in the North Platte Valley and provide critically needed hydroelectric power for the entire area.

Legislation placing the Niobrara irrigation project under the Missouri Basin plan passed my committee and the House. It is now pending before the Senate.

In another closely related field, when REA groups became uneasy about the new power marketing criteria for Federal power, I called a special meeting of my committee to study it and insure that your interest would be protected. These hearings brought out some very interesting and startling facts. Testimony pointed out that, in many instances during the past administration, public power was being sold to private power groups with complete disregard for the preference clause, and at a price below the cost of production.

Upon my recommendation, the criteria were clarified to insure that the REA's and other preference customers' position would be retained. In fact, I believe the amended criteria place them in a much better position.

ON FORT ROBINSON

When the General Services Administration announced it was selling the buildings at Fort Robinson for scrap, I introduced legislation and stopped the sale. The bill would authorize transfer of the Fort to the State. Now, the next move is up to the State—if the legislature finds a use for it (many recommendations have been made), and if the necessary funds are appropriated, I am quite confident "Fort Bob" will be transferred to Nebraska.

Now for a look at the national scene. I want to point out that on national and international questions, I have always acted in what I thought was your best interests. In order to maintain your fresh outlook, I conducted two polls on the major questions facing Congress, and held Government clinics in the county seat towns of the district. Your views guided my vote, and that is why I could not go along with the administration's foreign-aid program or its opposition to the Bricker amendment.

As for my contribution to the President's program, I introduced a bill to govern the use of new chemical additives in pesticides. The bill, recently signed into law by the President, has been hailed as one of the finest public health measures of recent years.

Another major bill which I introduced is the small projects bill which provides for Federal participation in non-Federal irrigation projects. I have been working on this bill for several years, and it has acquired national importance in the field of irrigation and reclamation. It would place more control and responsibility with the local people.

Naturally, I introduced several other so-called minor bills. One which attracted national interest was the drug addict bill. Now on the statutes, it serves as model legislation, and many States are considering it for their use.

RESULTS, 83D CONGRESS

Many of you have often asked, "Doctor, what did the 83d Congress do?" Well, I am quite proud of its accomplishments, because much far-reaching, realistic legislation has been enacted.

It stopped the war in Korea. At this writing, August 5, no war is going on any place in the world—the first time in 17 years.

Under President Ike and the Republican Congress the Nation has a much stronger economy. There has been no depression, as has been so often forecast by the prophets of gloom and doom.

More than 62 million are gainfully employed—employed in national production which amounts to more than a billion dollars a day.

The 83d Congress saved over $14 billion during the first 17 months out of the monies that Truman had planned to spend.

There was a big tax cut, the biggest in our history, amounting to nearly $7½ billion.

The tax laws, for the first time in 78 years, were given a general overhauling and revamping to remove the inequalities.

We established a new Hoover Commission, as we did during the 80th Congress, to study reorganization and the overlapping functions of State, County, and Federal Governments. I am confident this, as the first Commission did, will save billions of dollars.

Then, another thing, this business of communism has been kicked around a lot by the 83d Congress. It has already

passed some laws that make it possible to deal with communism and subversion here at home. I have been asked about Senator McCarthy. In a nutshell, while I think his methods have not always been good, I would rather have someone investigating and kicking the Communists out the McCarthy way than not to have it done at all.

More than 2,200 security risks have been removed from their Federal jobs, and many, many prosecutions and deportations which had been hanging fire for too long a time were carried out. New charges and prosecutions were also quickly disposed of.

The President supported, and the Congress passed, a broadened social-security law.

A far-reaching Federal-aid program has been enacted.

Over 180,000 unnecessary Federal jobs were abolished.

It has moved to get Government out of competition with private business.

Veterans' benefits have been increased and improved.

It provided for an adequate national defense. The armed services and the national defense have been streamlined and strengthened with much waste eliminated.

The President has insisted that outstanding men head up Cabinet posts.

Yes, it appears President Eisenhower will meet about 75 percent of his program during the first 2 years, and that is quite an accomplishment. He has an excellent program—one that is building a stronger America.

He does not want to remake America into a socialistic state with everyone dependent upon the Government. That is why the leftwing group is not supporting him—this group tied up legislation with filibusters in the Senate.

President Eisenhower realizes that no one can repeal the 20th century, yet expansion of Government in business must be halted. He is making a determined effort to get the Government out of business that private enterprise can and will do more efficiently and, at the same time, takes a realistic approach to the fundamental responsibilities which the Government cannot escape in maintaining basic programs for the general good.

WASHINGTON'S NEW ATMOSPHERE

There is truly a new atmosphere in Washington—new in recent years but old among American traditions. There has been cooperation with the President—he has not tried to jam legislation down the throat of Congress. Both parties join in passing many measures.

Yes; there is a Christian atmosphere in Washington. You know, there has not been anyone in Washington who has received a mink coat or deep freezer since the Republican 83d Congress came into being. All I can say is thank goodness we have a President who stands four square on the proposition that anyone having a Government job must give full service for the dollar received.

With the record we have compiled it will be most difficult for grafters to label this as a "do-nothing" Congress. They will try, for they do not like the investigations which are uncovering graft, corruption, and communism. They know if this Congress succumbs to those charges, it will mean they will return to power.

NO DEPRESSION IN SIGHT

On the national scene everything seems to be in pretty good shape. There was no depression as many antiadministration people almost hopefully predicted. Actually business is good, unemployment is low, and inflation has been stopped—and it did not take a war to pick up the slack.

And on the same subject, in 1950, just before Truman sent troops to Korea without the consent of Congress, about 5 million were unemployed and we were in the midst of a very strong recession, one that had all the markings of the beginning of a depression.

AGRICULTURE

On the agricultural scene at that same time prices were down 17 percent, and, to make matters worse, the slide was not being stopped. The new administration, fully realizing all new wealth comes from the soil, took positive action to stop the rapidly descending prices. And it was done without the false supports of a war economy. The bloodshed was an outrageous price, especially since nothing was gained in that stalemated war.

Contrary to the thinking in some quarters, the Republican administration is convinced that it can make the transition from an economy based on war to a lasting one based on peace without a depression. It will be difficult, but under the leadership of President Eisenhower and the enactment of his program, I feel confident this transition will be made without any financial setbacks. For this reason, the President needs a working majority in Congress.

As long as we continue to work toward a basic farm program, with a foundation of rock rather than sand on which to build our Nation's economy, I feed confident we will have real prosperity. Toward that end, I recommended that allotments be based on bushels rather than acres. We all know it is not the number of acres planted, but rather the number of bushels harvested that count.

HOME VISITS

As I have said, I am quite proud of the accomplishments of the Republican 83d Congress. When Congress adjourns, I will be out home attending county fairs and visiting with civic and church groups. I will continue my question-and-answer periods, for I feel this is the best way to learn your views.

I will want to discuss with you, in an honest, forthright manner, just what has been accomplished by the 83d Congress, and you have the right to know my views on all these subjects. The views I state and the votes I have made represent my honest thinking on what was best for the Nation and the people I represent. The only rollcalls I have missed were those which occurred when I attended the funerals of several of my colleagues, including Senators Butler and Griswold.

I regret that I have not been able to be in Nebraska more often, but I felt the legislative schedule here in Washington demanded that I be on the job. Also, as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, 1 of 19 committees, I had to be on the job guiding legislation through Congress.

It will be good to be back home. I am looking forward to seeing as many of you as possible. My schedule will be announced in all the local newspapers and by the radio stations of the district.

SENATE

Friday, August 6, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, August 5, 1954)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, in Thy surety we find our courage and unto Thee would we lift up our hearts. In times that test men's souls, we would quake with fear but for the fact that, as we look unto the hills from whence our help comes, we know Thou wilt keep us and wilt not suffer us to slip or fall.

This day we would renew our trust in Thee, asking only the consciousness of Thy presence to strengthen us in our tasks. Help us ever to serve Thee that Thy will for mankind might be our first desire and all else shall be added unto us. Hear this our prayer, we beseech Thee, in the name of Him who said, *Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end.* Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Knowland, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 5, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2887. An act for the relief of Hilario Camino Moncado and Diana Toy Moncado; and

H. R. 7745. An act to amend certain provisions of the act of August 2, 1939, commonly known as the Hatch Act, relating to employees of State or local agencies whose activities are financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from the United States.