

The Spirit of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Permission was granted to extend my remarks immediately after the remarks from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES]. I was greatly privileged to attend the brotherhood dinner and to hear the very fine speech of Mr. Firestone and the splendid statement of the President of the United States, and Secretary Wilson's moving remarks.

The President's statement and the remarks of Hon. Charles E. Wilson follow:

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

To the Brotherhood Dinner, the National Conference of Christians and Jews:

The gold medal brotherhood award which you have given to me is a high honor, indeed. The medal symbolizes a most noble purpose, a rewarding peace among men through a common understanding of their common aspirations. I am deeply touched by your choice of me for this distinction. Most sincerely, I thank you.

The principles on which the Republic is founded, that all men are created equal in dignity and inalienable rights, underscore the brotherhood of man.

Our faith that we can achieve among all peoples a mutual understanding and a mutual recognition of our common brotherhood is fortified by the progress we have made at home by the practice of those principles in the last few generations—a brief span of time compared to the ages in which prejudice and misunderstanding have accumulated.

As we look forward now to the challenges of the atomic age in a world made small by rapid transportation and communication,

we must with our fullest effort put brotherhood into practice by giving to others the rights and respect we want for ourselves.

In our efforts, we must maintain a sense of balance, a sense of perspective and a capacity to listen as well as to speak. We must work for freedom and equality. In the words of President Washington, we must give, "to bigotry, no sanction, to persecution, no assistance," and in the words of President Lincoln, we must act "with malice toward none, with justice toward all."

I congratulate the National Conference of Christians and Jews for its continued educational efforts toward better understanding in all human relationships and again I express my deep appreciation for the brotherhood award.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

REMARKS OF HON. CHARLES E. WILSON, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, AT BROTHERHOOD DINNER, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, FEBRUARY 20, 1956

Mr. Riley, Mr. Firestone, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to be here this evening and have a part in your program in celebration of Brotherhood Week. I am doubly honored to represent our President and accept for him the gold medal brotherhood award. I know he regrets that he could not be here this evening and bring a personal message to you under the inspiration of the occasion and of this wonderful audience.

I did not have in mind to say anything myself but I have a few things in my heart and on my mind that perhaps would be in order for me to say. President Eisenhower is a living example—a symbol of good will and brotherhood. Not only is that recognized in our country but it is recognized throughout the world.

I thought I might tell you about a little incident that happened when he first started to improve on the road to health.

Admiral Radford and I went to Denver to see him for just a few minutes. He had been out on the sun porch. They brought him back in and he was reclining there in bed. The only thing he had on his mind that he wanted to talk about was whether

he was going to recover to the degree that he could carry out the responsibility that he feels he has, not only to our country but in the whole world—perhaps a unique opportunity to personally contribute to peace and good will in the world and all he wanted to talk about was that and whether even if he didn't recover to the point of where he could carry on his duties as President, that he would at least recover to a point where, in some other capacity, he could still fulfill that opportunity, and I'm frank to confess to you, ladies and gentlemen, that had I been a woman I would have broken out in tears and cried.

Of course, I don't know any more than the rest of you do—whether he's going to run again or not. We have an express in the military business of "need to know" and I don't quite "need to know" up to now, but the time is getting a little short.

My particular assignment as Secretary of Defense is to make certain that our country is strong in a military sense and I would like to say that there is a fine group of dedicated men—military and civilian—in what is commonly called the Pentagon that are working diligently at that. We call it the defense team and in spite of what you may read in your papers from time to time we're making some progress with the job.

The purpose of our country in maintaining great military strength is in the hope that thus we will maintain peace in the world. Our military strength is not for aggression. Science, technology, and the mechanical production has been so phenomenally successful in the last few decades that science now has the clear promise of being able to raise the standard of living and the well-being of all the peoples in the world.

The progress in this area has been phenomenal and we all hope and pray that through strength we can maintain peace in the world until men and women of good will—men and women who recognize the responsibility of brotherhood have time to catch up in the sense of establishing better understanding among all human beings throughout the world so that the world will avoid another great catastrophe of war and that's why I'm so pleased and honored to be here this evening and accept for the President this award.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1956

Rev. Howard F. Newman, Th. D., minister of the Lewinsville Presbyterian Church, of McLean, Va., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, on this significant anniversary we would pause to pray for the perspective of history, the spiritual power of Valley Forge, and the persistence to carry through the vision and faith of our Founding Fathers. Balance our gratitude for the heritage of the past with our contribution to the welfare of the future.

May the mounting pressures of the present never push us loose from our ideals. Give to us a clarity of vision and a consecration of purpose that will enable us to rise above the evils of blackness and the temptations of grayness to serve with devotion and honor.

May the benediction of Thy providence guide each decision this day to the good of the Nation and to the glory of God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 21, 1956, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour there be a limitation of 2 minutes on statements.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, prior to the reading of Washington's Farewell Address by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I think a quorum should be present, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the standing order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Farewell Address of George Washington will now be read by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has been heretofore designated to perform that duty.

Mr. HUMPHREY advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the

number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of mani-

festing my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and

insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The north, in an unrestrained intercourse with the south, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The south in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the north, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the north, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The east, in a like intercourse with the west, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The west derives from the east supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyments of indispensable outlets for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as one nation. Any other tenure by which the west can hold

this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal sat-

isfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and

then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of

his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at

no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not

be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both

houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,

17th September, 1796.

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 of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 101. An act for the relief of Fernanda Milani;

S. 117. An act for the relief of Ana P. Costes;

S. 396. An act for the relief of Theresa Pok Lim Kim; and

S. 1212. An act for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing.

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

H. R. 6990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

H. R. 7723. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Phelps County, Mo., to the Chamber of Commerce of Rolla, Mo.;

H. R. 8607. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to David Peters, or to his heirs or assigns, title to land held by the United States in trust for him; and

H. R. 9390. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 206) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H. R. 6990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States to America; and

H. R. 8607. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to David Peters, or to his heirs or assigns, title to land held by the United States in trust for him; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7723. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Phelps County, Mo., to the Chamber of Commerce of Rolla, Mo.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 9390. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 206) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, 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 Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, 1,000 additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings held by said committee during the 84th Congress, 1st session, on the national highway program.

BOARDS OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL AND AIR FORCE ACADEMIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce for him the following appointments:

To the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy, pursuant to title 34, United States Code, section 1084, Mr. McCLELLAN, of Arkansas; Mr. DWORSHAK, of Idaho; and Mr. BUTLER, of Maryland.

To the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1056, Mr. CHAVEZ, of New Mexico; Mr. ALLOTT, of Colorado; and Mrs. SMITH, of Maine.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1955 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplement to his report dated February 9, 1956, relating to changes to be made in the Foreign Petroleum Supply and Contribution of Tanker Capacity Voluntary Agreements (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CLAIM OF OTOE AND MISSOURIA TRIBE OF INDIANS VERSUS UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the proceedings in the claim of the Otoe and Missouri Tribe of Indians v. United States had been concluded (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Third Guam Legislature, 1956 (second) regular session; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution 143

"Resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for a resident commissioner for Guam

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas this legislature has heretofore adopted resolutions respectfully requesting the Congress of the United States to provide for a resident commissioner for Guam

through amendment of the Organic Act of Guam to accomplish this result; and

"Whereas the need for such commissioner-ship is continually growing as the problems of the Territory become more complex and more legislation is considered by the United States Congress affecting Guam: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide a resident commissioner for this Territory; and be it further

"Resolved, That the executive secretary be and she hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and to the House of Representatives of the United States.

"F. B. LEON GUERRERO,

"Speaker.

"A. S. N. DUENAS,

"Legislative Secretary."

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Lemon Cove, Calif., Ditch Co., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the construction and completion of the Terminus flood-control dam on the Kaweah River, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

INCREASED INTEREST RATES ON LOANS TO RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES—RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are now engaged in considering legislation aimed at helping the American farmer gain his rightful share of the general prosperity.

As we work to relieve the farmer of the economic forces now pressing so cruelly on him, I think it appropriate to note that certain other proposals now being made might well achieve the opposite effect. I speak of Hoover Commission recommendations calling for increases in interest rates on loans to REA electric cooperatives. Such increases could be very injurious to the REA system in Texas.

Before REA, less than 5 percent of Texas farms had electricity. Today, 88 percent of Texas farms have electricity. The REA's task now is to expand vertically—to provide more and more electricity for these connected farms. There are grave doubts as to whether this can be done if interest rates are increased.

I call the attention of Senators to a resolution on this subject adopted recently by the Board of Directors of the Deaf Smith County, Tex., Electric Cooperative. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

Resolved, That since the growth of rural electrification program in Texas shows that in 1935, 2.3 percent of the farms had electricity and in 1954, 88.1 percent of the farms had electricity, and that the cooperatives are often compared with the commercial power companies when in reality the comparison is:

	Commercial power companies	Texas co-ops
Members per mile of line.....	33	2.3
Revenue per mile of line.....	\$5,479	\$185

And further that the economic status of the cooperatives in Texas show:

Net operating margin 1954 ¹ (debt to REA ¹ \$157,430,000).....	\$4, 793, 000
Principal payments (assumed $\frac{1}{2}$ of debt).....	4, 500, 000
Margin after debt service....	293, 000

¹ Source: 1954 Statistical Report, REA.

And still further that if 1 percent higher interest rate were put into effect:

Margin 1954 after debt service....	\$293, 000
Cost of 1 percent higher interest rate on \$157,430,000 debt.....	1, 574, 300
Deficit each year.....	1, 281, 300

NOTE.—Interest increase would apply only to future loans. This figure merely demonstrates what would have been effect of higher rate on past loans.

And further the effect of a $\frac{1}{10}$ -mill increase in wholesale power rate would indicate:

Margin, 1954, after debt service....	\$293, 000
Kilowatt-hours purchased 1954, 1,048,176,000, cost of $\frac{1}{10}$ mill increase.....	314, 451
Annual deficit.....	21, 451

The board of directors of the Deaf Smith County Electric Cooperative, Inc., believes that the Hoover Commission report dealing with power, particularly parts 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 would in effect be disastrous to the rural-electrification program. We respectfully ask that our Congressmen and Senators use their influence to prevent acceptance of the Hoover Commission's Report on Water Resources and Power.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress (Rept. No. 1567);

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress (Rept. No. 1568);

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress (Rept. No. 1569); and

H. J. Res. 517. Joint resolution changing the date for the counting of the electoral votes in 1957.

MARY ROYALL BROWN—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 220) to pay a gratuity to Mary Royall Brown, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary Royall Brown, widow of Jonathan H. Brown, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 3254. A bill to authorize the county of Custer, State of Montana, to convey certain lands to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 3255. A bill for the relief of Amin Habib Nabhan;

S. 3256. A bill for the relief of Johannes Suveva; and

S. 3257. A bill for the relief of Georgiana Ching Hsien (Liang) New; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 3258. A bill for the relief of Margaret Kwei Chang (Margaret Hua-Chen Kwei); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 3259. A bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 3260. A bill to assure the accurate labeling and advertising of macaroni and spaghetti products with respect to their durum wheat flour or semolina content; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself and Mr. BARKLEY):

S. 3261. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 3262. A bill relating to the quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mrs. SMITH of Maine when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 3263. A bill for the relief of Chyn-Duog Shiah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3264. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3265. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for filing vessel utilization and performance reports by operators of vessels in the foreign commerce of the United States;

S. 3266. A bill to authorize officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to act as notaries in places outside the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska;

S. 3267. A bill to amend title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for experimental operation and testing of vessels owned by the United States;

S. 3268. A bill to amend section 610 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the imposition of civil penalties in certain additional cases, and for other purposes; and

S. 3269. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3270. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. McNAMARA):

S. 3271. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 in order to promote scientific education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was reported and placed on the calendar:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. Res. 220. Resolution to pay a gratuity to Mary Royall Brown, reported by Mr. GREEN from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. GREEN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

QUALITY REQUIREMENTS FOR IRISH POTATOES

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 1 week to permit any Senator who may so desire, to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The bill (S. 3262) relating to the quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes, introduced by Mrs. SMITH (for herself and Mr. PAYNE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO PROMOTION OF SCIENTIFIC EDUCATION

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 in order to promote scientific education, the purpose of the bill being to provide an incentive for the teaching of science, mathematics, and engineering in the high schools and public schools of our country, and making it a part of the activities under the Vocational Education Act. An appropriation of \$10 million a year would be authorized to finance the program.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may remain on the desk for 48 hours, in order that any Senator who wishes to do so may become a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the

bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill (S. 3271) to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 in order to promote scientific education, introduced by Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. McNAMARA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956— AMENDMENTS

Mr. ANDERSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. HOLLAND) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. SCHOEPP) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I send to the desk three amendments which I intend to propose to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program. I ask that they be printed and lie on the desk until called up for consideration.

The first amendment provides that price support shall not be made available with respect to the products of any one farm of a total value, determined on the basis of support prices, in excess of \$50,000.

The second amendment, would require the Secretary of Agriculture to obtain from processors certification that they had paid producers not less than the support price, or in the case of commodities for which no support price has been established not less than 75 percent of parity, of any agricultural commodity for which price support or surplus removal operation is carried out through purchases from or loans or payments to processors.

The third amendment would—

First. Permit the Secretary of Agriculture to require, as a condition of eligibility for price support under the Agricultural Act of 1949, that farmers participate in the acreage reserve program.

Second. Require farmers to participate in the acreage reserve program in order to be eligible for payments under the Agricultural Conservation Program if they produce basic commodities, except peanuts.

Third. Render any farmer who knowingly harvested any acreage of a basic commodity in excess of the farm acreage allotment for that farm ineligible for payments under the agricultural conservation program, with four minor exceptions.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 4, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

"PRICE SUPPORTS—LIMITATION

"Sec. 107. Title IV of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of such title a new section as follows:

"'Sec. 421. Price support shall not be made available under this act during any calendar year with respect to the products of any one farm of a total value, determined on the basis of support prices, in excess of \$50,000.'"

On page 4, line 24, strike out "107" and insert "108."

On page 4, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

"CERTIFICATION OF RECEIPT OF SUPPORT PRICES BY PRODUCERS

"Sec. 107. Section 401 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) Whenever any price support or surplus removal operation for any agricultural commodity is carried out through purchases from or loans or payments to processors, the Secretary shall obtain certifications from such processors that the producers of the agricultural commodities involved have received not less than the support price therefor or, in the case of commodities for which no support price has been established, such price, not less than 75 per centum of the parity price, as may be determined by the Secretary to be necessary to provide a reasonable return to such producers.'"

On page 4, line 24, strike out "107" and insert "108."

On page 25, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"PARTICIPATION IN ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM AS CONDITION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR PRICE SUP- PORT AND SOIL CONSERVATION BENEFITS

"Sec. 225 (a) Section 401 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'prescribed by the Secretary', the following: 'and participation in the acreage reserve program under subtitle A of the Soil Bank Act.'"

(b) Section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph thereof a new sentence as follows: "Participation in the acreage reserve program under subtitle A of the Soil Bank Act shall be required as a condition of eligibility for payments under this section in the case of producers of the commodities referred to in section 203 of such act."

On page 36, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"COMPLIANCE WITH ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AS A CONDITION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR SOIL CONSERVA- TION BENEFITS

"Sec. 406. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 347 a new section as follows:

"'Sec. 348. (a) Any person who knowingly harvests any acreage of any basic agricultural commodity on his farm which has been

determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such commodity for the farm for such year under this title shall not be eligible for any payment for such year under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended. For the purposes of this section, no person shall be deemed to have harvested any acreage of any basic agricultural commodity in excess of his farm acreage allotment by reason of harvesting corn for ensilage, harvesting wheat in an amount not in excess of 15 acres, harvesting a commodity or a crop with respect to which producers have rejected marketing quotas in a marketing quota referendum, or harvesting peanuts for seed to be used for the raising of peanuts to be hogged off.

"(b) Persons applying for any payment of money under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be required to establish their eligibility for such payment under this section in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit a series of five amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table. I ask unanimous consent that a general statement, prepared by me, in support of the amendments, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement, presented by Mr. LANGER, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

Section 101 of the farm bill (S. 3183), as reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, omits wheat from the mandatory 90 percent of parity provision covering corn, peanuts, and cotton. Amendment of the bill to remove the restrictive language would mean that all wheat would be supported at 90 percent of parity by direction of the Congress of the United States. Wheat would thus stand on the same footing along with the other basic commodities.

Section 102 of the farm bill, as reported by the committee, sets up a special formula for determining the support level for wheat. In 1956, most wheat probably would be supported at 90 percent of parity. But in 1957 and later years, there is no way to tell at what level wheat would be supported. The only mandatory provision is that all wheat price levels must be maintained at 75 percent of parity. The bill provides that some type of wheat should be supported at 90 percent of parity and certain other types at a competitive relationship with the feed value ratio with corn support levels.

The determination of which kinds of wheat and how much shall be supported at 90 percent of parity; and which kinds and how much shall be supported at the corn loan level is left entirely to the tender mercies of the Secretary of Agriculture, whom ever he might be at that future time, as advised by a committee, two-thirds of whose members would not be wheat farmers.

This direct weakening of the wheat price support program is bad enough in and of itself. But as it could operate to destroy the support programs for all basic commodities, it is even more dangerous and invidious.

Section 102, in its entirety, should be removed from the bill. And wheat could be restored to its full status as a basis along with cotton, corn, peanuts, and tobacco by

striking out the exclusion of wheat in section 101.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments, together with a statement, prepared by me, relating to each amendment may be printed in the RECORD.

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

Beginning with line 3, on page 1, strike out over through line 24, on page 4, and insert the following:

"TITLE I—FAMILY FARM INCOME PROTECTION"

"Sec. 101. Title I, title II, and title III of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby repealed.

"Sec. 102. The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) is authorized and directed to make available through loans, purchases, parity payments, production payments, marketing premium payments, purchase agreements and other operations farm income protection programs to cooperators up to the limit of family-farm production for any crop or year's marketings of any agricultural commodity, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas, marketing orders, or prescribed marketing practices for such crop or year's marketings, at a level not less than 100 percent of the parity price of the commodity.

"Sec. 103. The parity price of any commodity shall be the price determined by the Secretary to be required, when multiplied by the average annual marketings of the commodity during the immediately preceding 3 years, to provide the parity income for the commodity, as defined in section 301 (a) (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

"Sec. 104. For purposes of this title the term 'upper limit of family farm production' means the total volume of farm marketings that in terms of 1954 technology and farm prices, will enable a typical single-unit family farm to earn a net family income, after paying all production costs, of not more than \$6,000, except that if the operator can show by attested certification that he has not employed during the year more hours of hired farm labor than was performed by the operator and members of his immediate family, such unit shall be eligible for income protection to the full extent of its farm marketings.

"Sec. 105. Parity payments, production payments, and marketing premium payments shall be the primary method of carrying out family farm income protection programs under this title with such payments used in workable combinations, as may be determined by the Secretary to be applicable to the different commodities, with loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other methods.

"Sec. 106. Section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the words 'corn, wheat, cotton, rice or tobacco' and substituting therefor the words 'any agricultural commodity' and by striking out the words 'parity price' and substituting therefor the words 'parity income'.

"Sec. 107. To carry out the purposes of this title, the Secretary is authorized and directed to make use of any or all price support funds, heretofore or hereafter made available to him. Expenditures made to carry out the purposes of this title by the Commodity Credit Corporation, as directed by the Secretary, shall be reported to the Treasurer of the United States who shall order the cancellation of an equivalent value of Commodity Credit Corporation notes held by the Treasury.

"Sec. 108. The total of parity payments, production payments and marketing premium payments made to any single farm oper-

ator or farm family shall not exceed \$2,500 in any one calendar year.

"Sec. 109. The words 'production payments' means the making of payments directly to producers equal to the extent by which average market price received by farmers augmented by such marketing premium payments and parity payments as may have been made for the commodity is less than the parity price therefor.

"Sec. 110. Marketing premium payments as used in this title mean payments made to producers, where required, in connection with special marketing programs for such commodities as may be designated by the Secretary to encourage the marketing of high quality commodities in a volume better balanced with consumer demand than would be the case in the absence of such marketing premium payments program."

The statement by Senator LANGER, relating to his amendment numbered 1, is as follows:

The amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota would substitute a comprehensive full parity farm-income program for the partial-parity provision of Members of the Senate fully understand that we live in an almost completely legislated economy.

Interest rates are established under authority of Federal law by the United States Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board. This is price or income support for banks and other lending institutions.

Freight and passenger rates are established by the Interstate Commerce Commission under authority of Federal law. This is price or income support for the transportation industry.

Depletion allowances are income supports for the oil and certain other industries.

Accelerated tax amortization privileges extended by the Office of Defense Mobilization are price or income supports for a wide range of business and industry.

Military procurement cost-plus contracts are price or income supports and Government guarantees of minimum levels of profit for that group of manufacturers.

Tax dollars used for the strategic materials stockpile have been used deliberately to support prices and incomes of high cost (or inefficient) producers of many minerals.

Appropriations are made annually to support the merchant marine—this is price or income support for private ship owners.

Industrial tariffs are effective price or income supports for the manufacturing business community.

This is only a small part of the list of direct and indirect subsidies or price and income supports provided by our Government for a major part of our so-called free-enterprise economy.

Minimum-wage laws and protection of collective bargaining are income supports for workingmen.

Every major segment of our economy has specifically designed income support provided by the Federal Government. Why should farmers be picked out as the only important segment required to survive on a go-it-alone, get-yours-in-the-free-market basis.

Yet Secretary Benson and his big-business advertising men have been drumming for 3 years, trying to sell these ideas:

That farm programs are bad.

That subsidies are very bad for farmers.

That supports for farmers are destructive of our free-enterprise system.

That if for political reasons it is necessary to have them at all, they should be very low (at disaster levels) and that the level at which disaster overtakes farmers should be entirely in the discretion of the administration.

That surpluses of food are a very bad thing and not in the public interest.

That the cost of farm programs is an unjustifiable and unneeded burden on the tax-

payers and that such programs are directly responsible for the high cost of food at retail.

And, finally, great effort has been made to convince the public that price supports at any level, higher than desired by the administration, whatever that level is, have only one purpose and effect, namely, to subsidize high-cost or inefficient farmers.

Everybody has been told there is six or seven billion dollars invested in CCC inventories of farm products. But how many people know the amount of money tied up in the strategic materials stockpile? Judging from the appropriation thus far requested, it is probably nine or ten billion dollars. More than a year ago the Wall Street Journal reported our buying policy was to offer prices high enough on all strategic materials to insure a fair margin of profit to the high cost or inefficient producers. And I'm not opposed to that—I'm pointing it out to get this discussion in proper focus.

What is the cost to the Treasury in uncollected taxes of the 27½-percent depletion allowance for the producers of oil and certain other minerals. Who knows? The annual cost to other taxpayers probably exceeds the cost of the farm program.

What is the cost to the Treasury in uncollected taxes of the accelerated tax amortization certificates? The House Appropriations Committee's reports place the figures at more than \$40 billion from 1950-54.

In these unsettled times everyone wants our country to be strong enough to cope with any situation which could conceivably arise. Our military is now reported to have in inventory \$140 billion of military equipment.

Now, military equipment has an acknowledged rate of obsolescence that runs close to 33½ percent annually, with many of the highly expensive items in the inventory like planes, guns, and radar equipment completely out of date by the time they are delivered to the military. This obsolescence amounts to billions of dollars each year and is borne by the taxpayer, not by the manufacturer.

In agriculture, farmers and farm programs are charged with the total cost of carrying inventories and the cost of spoilage.

Wouldn't it then seem reasonable to charge General Motors, Du Pont, Douglas Aircraft, and other producers of military goods with the comparable cost of carrying military inventories and the loss incurred from obsolescence? What is proper for one should be proper for the other. Yet, of course, no intelligent person would seriously make such a suggestion. Let's get this farm debate into perspective.

If we are really concerned with national defense and the public interest, why isn't it just as important to have adequate—yes, more than adequate—stockpiles of food and fiber, as to have stockpiles of military equipment and strategic materials—and why isn't it equally sound to charge the cost of such food inventories not against farmers and their farm program but where they belong in the defense budget?

But let's continue with the record of this big-business administration. And remember its their record—they made it.

According to the Wall Street Journal, business borrowers are paying the highest interest rates in 22 years. Since January 1, 1955, the Treasury Department has tripled interest rates on some issues of Government securities.

These general increases in interest rates were started early in 1953. Farmers are, of course, caught in this interest-rate game as are other users of credit. Farm mortgage debt increased 7 percent in 1954 over 1953 and in 1955 was 10 percent higher than in 1954.

Here are some of the results accruing to big business from Government price and income supports. Comparing with the comparable figures for 1952—

Corporate profits before taxes are up 20 percent.

Corporation profits after taxes are up 34 percent.

The price of corporation stocks is up 71 percent.

During the first 9 months of 1955 General Motors sales were 10 billion and profits after taxes were 1 billion. Kraft cheese (a processor of dairy products) 1952 profit 27 million; 1953, 30.8 million; 1954, 37.4 million and thus far in 1955 their profits are at an annual rate of 40 million.

Railroads have had 13 permanent rate increases since 1946. According to the American Association of Railroads their 1955 profits are expected to be at least 20 percent greater than 1954 or more than \$1 billion.

Government reports show the following increases in profits for 1955 adjusted to an annual basis over the levels of 1954:

Ten textile companies up 78.1 percent.

Twenty-three steel companies up 105.9 percent.

Six rubber companies up 34 percent.

Twenty-one chemical companies up 28 percent.

Seven farm-equipment companies up 24 percent.

Thirty utility companies up 13 percent.

Now how do these figures compare with the situation in which farmers find themselves?

The average price of all farm products for 1955 adjusted to was down 19 percent from the level of 1952. Yet farm income was down 12 percent from 1954 and down 27 percent from 1952.

Copper even during the most critical period of World War II was being price supported and purchased by the Government at 12 cents per pound. I remember the discussions and this figure was determined to be adequate to keep even the high cost producers in business. Now, copper is being price supported and purchased for the strategic materials stockpile at 36 cents per pound, three times as high and a very similar situation is true with respect to lead and zinc.

Farmers and the farm program are deliberately being made the public whipping boy, so as to keep public attention diverted from the great giveaway programs which appear to be a basic policy of this administration. Tidelands oil, Dixon-Yates, Hells Canyon, our \$16 billion investment in atomic energy, our publicly owned grazing lands, large areas of our national forest, and our publicly owned hydroelectric powerplants. Perhaps slogans like regimentation as applied to farm programs, and creeping socialism as applied to TVA and our 50-year-old public-power policy have been carefully designed to blind the public to a new policy of galloping giveaway of our remaining public domain.

These are the essentials of the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment provides for a parity formula which will accomplish these objectives.

1. Establish parity prices that would provide parity income for farmers—that was the goal Congress set in the 1943 Farm Act.

2. Establish a fair relationship between the parity price of the various farm commodities.

3. Result in a level of parity prices on all commodities high enough to enable farmers to operate and maintain their farms and to earn per person incomes equivalent to those that can be earned by people in other walks of life.

My amendment repeals the so-called modernized parity formula, dual parity, and transitional parity because all these formulas will, year after year, create an unpredictable distortion in a fair parity price relationship, among farm commodities.

Existing parity formulas come out with prices on most commodities at levels too low to enable farmers year after year to meet their operating costs and maintenance of their plant and equipment.

The so-called modernized formula insures that had luck 1 year by producer of a commodity becomes bad luck for 10 years.

It has a built-in factor which will mathematically create a lower parity price, year after year, for all commodities whose market prices fall below parity.

There are some requisites that must be taken into account when you speak of controls. Farmers must pay their bills out of gross income. Gross income is derived from bushels times price, or pounds times price, or gallons or whatever they produce times the unit price of that commodity. So when total production is reduced it naturally follows that the unit price must be high enough so that the multiplication will result in sufficient income for the farmer to pay his bills, otherwise bankruptcy will follow quickly. It's just that simple.

It seems a bit silly to take the time of the Senate with this primer grade arithmetic but it is evident that many of the Senators do not understand it. Advocates of the sliding scale of price supports allege that lower price on all nonbasic commodities and to the limit permitted by law, has reduced acreage of basic crops. Total production has not been reduced, it has increased on everything but allotment crops—but, the lowered price on the nonbasic commodities and the sharply reduced production of allotment crops has resulted in a cost-price relationship that closely approaches that of 1933.

The Senators will agree that 1933 was a bad time for the entire Nation? Do the Senators know that using the same parity formula so that the figures are truly comparable—the national average price of wheat was 70 percent of parity in 1933 and only 77 percent on October 21, 1955—

On barley it was 58 in 1933 and only 51 now.

On flaxseed it was 81 in 1933 and only 57 now.

On oats it was 71 in 1933 and only 50 now.

On rye it was 73 in 1933 and only 43 now.

On corn it was 68 in 1933 and is 69 at the present time.

These are national averages. The average price in North Dakota on some of these crops is lower than these national average figures.

It is said, in disregard of the truth, that the sliding scale has not yet had a chance to work—that it started only this year. Let the Senators review the facts known to all who haven't forgotten.

The sliding scale law with its new parity formula became law in 1948. It was amended in 1949—to raise the bottom of the sliding scale from 60 percent to 75 percent of parity; it was further amended so that the sliding scale could not be applied to the six basic crops and so that both parity formulas should be used in calculating the parity price of the 6 basic commodities and that whichever parity price was higher on any of the 6 basic commodities was the one to be used—it was renewed from time to time and finally expired in 1954. Therefore, the new parity formula and the sliding scale of price supports were in effect for the first time on the 1955 crop of the six basic commodities—wheat, corn, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts. All other crops have been under the new parity formula and subject to the sliding scale of price supports since 1949. This administration has used the sliding scale of price supports on a reducing basis as rapidly and drastically as it could on everything except the six basic crops of which only wheat is a principal cash crop in North Dakota. Must the Senator from North Dakota remind anyone of the sliding-scale application to oats, barley, flaxseed, and rye in the past 3 years? Does any Senator need a reminder of the application of the sliding scale to dairy products on April Fool's Day in 1954?

The sliding scale has also been used on cottonseed, soy beans, and grain sorghums.

The present law authorizes price supports, and the money is available for them on hogs, cattle, sheep, lambs, chickens, eggs, and many other additional commodities. Yet, despite this authority, no action was taken by the Eisenhower administration last year when eggs hit a low of 6 cents a dozen. No action was taken 2 years ago when cattlemen by the thousands were bankrupt, and the Senators know the story of hog prices.

The amendment before you makes adequate supports mandatory in law. As a nation we believe in a government of law, administered by men, not a government of men, administering by edict. Second, no industry of the size and complexity of agriculture can afford to have its operations subjected annually to the caprice, the attitude, or the just plain ignorance of an individual who may from time to time be Secretary of Agriculture. As to the level of supports, we want price supports at, as the amendment provides for, 100 percent of parity farm income protection.

Experience has proved that the only time the so-called free market will yield 100 percent of a fair parity to farmers is when there is an actual and serious shortage of a particular commodity. When that happens, most farmers have little or nothing to sell and consumers are required to pay ridiculous prices for that commodity. And, finally, for the reason that if a fair parity price, means what it says: A fair price, a necessary price, in relation to a farmer's cost, then any price less than 100 percent of parity is less than a fair price and less than a necessary price.

There is no ethical, moral, nor economic justification for fractional support prices. The only difference between 90 percent of a fair price and 60 percent of a fair price, is that a farmer can stay in business a little longer with 90 percent of a fair price than he can with 60 percent of a fair price.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota provides for mandatory 100 percent of parity farm income. The parity price formula provided in the pending amendment starts with the parity farm income definition in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, that the average income per person of people on farms should be equivalent to that of nonfarm people. The existing law then defines parity income for each commodity as being its part of parity farm income. The amendment provides that parity price of a commodity shall be the price which if multiplied by the average volume of marketing for that commodity over the preceding 10 years will give the parity income for that commodity.

PARITY PRICE FORMULA

In 1948, the Congress enacted a provision relating to parity farm income. The proposed amendment now on the desk introduced by the Senator from North Dakota would put some teeth into the parity income promise of the successful presidential candidate in 1952 who evidently had read the 1948 farm act. The amendment takes the parity income definition in the 1948 act that has been on the books for 8 years and uses it to calculate parity prices for the different commodities.

Section 301 (a) (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended in 1948, defines parity farm income as that gross income that will enable farm operator families to have a standard of living equivalent to that of people in other gainful occupations.

The standard is the income of non-farm people. The per person income of nonfarm people in 1955 was approximately \$1,960. The average per person family income from farm sources of commercial farm operator families was about \$860; this is exclusive of about \$270 of income per farm person from nonfarm sources. Parity farm income would thus be \$1,690, or \$530 per person higher than was actually the case

in 1955. Actual farm operator family income in 1955 was only 51 percent of parity farm income.

To provide a parity farm income, national farm operators total net income would have had to have been \$21.6 billion instead of the \$11 billion actually attained.

Holding production expenses at the same level, this would mean an increase in farm operators gross income from the 1955 figure of \$33.3 billion to \$43.9 billion and increase of cash receipts from marketings from the 1955 figure of \$29.2 billion to approximately \$39.2 billion.

This \$39.2 billion figure would be established by the Secretary of Agriculture as the parity equivalent cash receipts from farm marketings and the \$43.9 billion figure as the 1955 parity farm gross income.

The parity equivalent cash receipts from farm marketings for 1955 is thus just about one-third greater than the 10-year average of cash receipts from farm marketings from 1945 through 1954. In accordance with section 301 (a) (2) of the Agricultural Adjust-

ment Act of 1938, as amended, the commodity parity income of any commodity would be the same relationship to the 10-year average. Thus the parity income for what in 1955 would be 133 percent of the average annual farm value for the 10-year-base period. The same calculation would be made for any commodity. The following calculations of commodity parity income and parity price are indicated in the attached table for illustrative purposes only. Exact calculations by the Department of Agriculture statisticians might vary a few cents one way or another from the parity prices I have shown in the table. But the table does illustrate quite accurately the effect of the amendment that has been introduced by the Senator from North Dakota.

CALCULATION OF LANGER PARITY PRICES

A. Ten-year average cash receipts from farm marketings, \$30 billion (1945-54 average).

B. Parity equivalent cash receipts from farm marketings, \$39.2 billion.

Commodity	Ratio (B divided by A)		Plus 131 percent		Modernized parity
	1945-54 marketings	Parity income	1945-54 volume sold	Langer parity price	
	Millions	Millions	Millions		
Hogs (hundredweight).....	\$3,751	\$4,914	191	\$25.70	\$21.00
Wheat (bushels).....	2,310	3,026	1,164	2.59	2.38
Rye (bushels).....	32	42	21	2.00	1.66
Barley (bushels).....	331	434	266	1.63	1.33
Cotton (pounds).....	2,114	2,769	6,516	.42	.35
Flaxseed.....	156	204	38	5.38	4.41

The Senator from North Dakota never has seen any justification for limiting price supports to the six basic commodities.

The amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota provides 100 percent of parity farm income protection for all important farm commodities. This would provide, first, equitable treatment of all farmers, whatever they produce. Second, it establishes the only basis upon which it is possible to secure, democratically, the annual reallocation of agricultural resources necessary to meet the Nation's food needs, while yet dealing factually with the problems of weather, soil, climate, and geography, all of which affect a farmer's ability to shift his production emphasis. These are problems peculiar to and inherent in agriculture.

The amendment is designed to protect, preserve, and strengthen the family-type farmer in American agriculture.

In line with this objective we want minimums established of either acreage or marketing allotments as the case may be so that family-type farmers will not be forced out of business.

In line with this same objective the amendment sets a maximum in line with the normal production of an "adequate family farm," above which no farm income protection would be available to any operator. This was recommended by President Eisenhower. His supporters among the Senators will no doubt support the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota authorizes and directs the use of parity payments, production payments, and market premium incentive payments.

Let's see how production payments work out for a commodity the Senators are all interested in—milk.

The price problems in fluid milk areas are more difficult than those for most other farm commodities. The production standards necessary to meet health requirements of milk are exacting. Milk is a highly perishable product and must be moved daily. Dairy men, in most cases, must sell to one

or a few buyers. Price stability is necessary to assure a dependable day-to-day supply of milk in urban markets.

In the interests of both dairy farmers and the general public, the farm income protection program must treat milk as a basic commodity. The dairy farmer must have price assurance which is just as definite and adequate in amount as that provided any other producer.

In order to carry out the program, all the available tools should be used.

Dairy cooperatives enable farmers to do better bargaining, stimulate competition, and provide a maximum of self-help.

Marketing agreements and orders help to maintain orderly marketing and otherwise aid in evening out the peaks and valleys of supply and price.

In particular circumstances and at particular times, the Government purchase method of supporting prices works well. When a surplus situation is likely to last only a short time, and when desirable outlets such as the school lunch program are available, it makes sense to buy and provide a use for milk that might otherwise demoralize markets and go to waste.

The Secretary of Agriculture has been using all these methods, however, and they have done a completely adequate job. In addition, the production-payment method should be used. This method allows producers to go on producing and consumers to go on consuming past the point where surpluses would otherwise begin to cause trouble. It is a simple method. If prices averaged less than the parity-support level, producers would receive a payment for the difference between the market average and the support price. It offers the producer an opportunity to sell more milk at reasonable prices, instead of selling less milk at higher prices. It is a price-support method which keeps the Government out of business channels and gives the consumer the chance to use the abundance that the farmer produces.

Production payments make sense. The rank and file of consumers think so, too. Taxpayers are justifiably alarmed at the

money they are spending to take milk and other commodities off the market. They recognize the need of farm-income protection, but they don't see much point in buying farm commodities for uneconomic uses.

Maybe the opponents of production payments can tell you how the Government can put these commodities to good use—how they can use them under existing legislation to improve the diets of the American people.

In view of the remarkable hue and cry by the Eisenhower administration against the use of production payments, you might be interested in the recommendation of the Dairy Industry Committee over 10 years ago.

This committee, by the way, represented the following: The American Butter Institute, National Cheese Institute, American Dry Milk Institute, Evaporated Milk Association, International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, International Association of Milk Dealers, and the Dairy Industries Supply Association.

In discussing possible methods of price support after the war the committee came out solidly for what it called "compensatory payments to producers" which it described as follows:

"The prices of dairy products, left free to find their level on the basis of supply and demand, coupled with a direct Government payment to the farmer in addition to his return under a free market price, if necessary, to maintain the support."

"This form of support"—still quoting the Dairy Industry Committee—"would tend to promote maximum consumption consistent with demand and supply conditions. * * * The Dairy Industry Committee recommends this method to Government and has committed itself to work for its adoption."

The purchase method discourages consumption by raising prices to consumers.

It takes away from consumers the foods they want and places those foods in Government warehouses.

It puts the Government in business in a big way, buying, storing, and trying to dispose of perishable commodities.

It is expensive and wasteful.

It makes a difficult disposal problem, because the products can seldom be sold back into domestic markets. Instead, they must generally be given away or sold abroad at prices much lower than American consumers are paying.

The amendment provides an alternative support method. Whenever a commodity requires support the national ever-normal storehouse is full and there are no further satisfactory outlets such as the school lunch program, the Government should stop buying and start making production payments directly to producers.

The Senator from North Dakota firmly believes that the only real purpose—the sole and only justification for a farm program of any kind is to assure to farm families an income, adequate to meet annual cost of operation, necessary maintenance, and improvement of plant and equipment, and to maintain a level of consumption and use of goods and services, commensurate with the dependence of the rest of our highly integrated economy upon an adequate level of farm family purchasing power. Any suggested farm program or any suggested part of a farm program which does not meet this test has no value and no justification.

Those who believe the principal consideration in a farm program is "How much does it cost?" would do well to recall the years 1920 through 1929. In those years there were no tax dollars spent for a farm program; there were no difficult administrative problems; and there were no farm programs to affect in any way our so-called free-enterprise economy.

But there were a million and a half farmers who were bankrupt and most of the rest were so deeply in debt that it took the

best part of 20 years for even a part of them to get their heads above water.

Those who disagree as to the need and purpose of a complete farm program should review the period 1930 through 1935. The hundreds of thousands of small-business men who were bankrupt—business executives committing suicide—bank failures the length and breadth of our land; the entire economy almost at a standstill; 16 million men unemployed.

There were difficult administrative problems then. There were tax dollars spent then. Our free-enterprise economy which then was sick unto death was glad to have "Dr. Government" prescribe the medicine and pay for both the doctor and the hospital bill.

Government guaranties of bank deposits, RFC, RACC, NRA, PWA, WPA, propping up insurance companies, bailing out creditors, making work, so as to feed the unemployed. No one cried creeping socialism then. No one shouted about regimentation then. No one objected to the use of tax dollars. No one insisted on a balanced budget then. No one alleged then that Government programs were destroying the free-enterprise system. Everyone then agreed that Government action was imperative to save the free-enterprise system. And all of this, because farmers, in our highly legislated, highly subsidized economy, had found it impossible to keep their price and income in sound relationship to their costs and their loss of purchasing power had the cumulative effects upon the entire economy with which you are all familiar.

The total cost to the Nation, of not having a strong and adequate family farm income protection program during the decade of the twenties and the first part of the thirties was so staggering, and present level of Government subsidies both direct and indirect, which are price and income support programs for big business, is so high that the Senator from North Dakota has no hesitation whatsoever in suggesting an adequate family farm income protection program with the total net cost to be borne by the Government. All of the lessons of history plus the whole body of public experience provide adequate evidence than any lesser alternative will in the end be unthinkably more costly.

The amendment numbered 2, submitted by Mr. LANGER, is as follows:

On page 7, beginning with line 3, strike out over through line 22 on page 11.

On page 11, line 23, strike out "Subtitle B" and insert "Subtitle A."

On page 21, line 12, strike out "Subtitle C" and insert "Subtitle B."

On page 25, beginning with line 15, strike out over through line 17 on page 30, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE III—NATIONAL EVER-NORMAL STOREHOUSE AND CONSERVATION RESERVE"

"Sec. 301. Title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954 is hereby repealed.

"Sec. 302. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall set aside within its inventories at least one year's normal domestic consumption and exports of all storable farm commodities and storable products of perishable and semiperishable farm commodities, as rapidly as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine to be feasible with due regard to not reducing any year's market volume of farm commodities and their products below the quantity that will be taken by consumer demand and exports in a full employment economy at 100 percent of parity prices. Such set-aside commodities and products shall be called the 'national ever-normal storehouse.'

"Sec. 303. The ever-normal storehouse shall be adequately dispersed within the geographic area of the United States in relation to population distribution to serve the needs

of civilian defense, as determined by the Civil Defense Administrator and within the geographic area of friendly free domestic nations as required for collective security as determined by the President upon recommendations of the National Security Council.

"Sec. 304. The national ever-normal storehouse shall not be reduced except (1) by order of the President at any time when in his judgment such reduction is required for purposes of the common defense or to relieve acute shortages of food or fiber in case of widespread national disaster, declared by the President, or (2) in time of war or during a national emergency with respect to the common defense proclaimed by the President, on order of such agency as may be designated by the President.

"Sec. 305. The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to advance not to exceed \$750 million annually, in addition to the authorization in section 209 (c), to expand the scope of the conservation reserve program in a manner that will contribute to establishment of a national conservation safety reserve of soil fertility and improved soil, water, and related resources, and reduce the volume of total agricultural production in any year to the volume that will be marketable in a year of full employment at 100 percent of parity prices. Allocation of these funds to the several commodities will be determined by the extent to which the gross income from the sale of each fails to reach the parity income as defined in section 301 (a) (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

"Sec. 306. The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed through use of funds available to it to extend loans for adequate periods at an interest rate equal to the average net cost of funds to the Federal Government and technical services to farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperatives to build storage, processing, and distributing facilities required to handle the national ever-normal storehouse and to make binding occupancy agreements to utilize at least 75 percent of such storage space for a period of not less than 10 years."

The statement by Senator LANGER, relating to amendment numbered 2, is as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota has submitted an amendment, which, if enacted, would establish a national safety reserve of food and fiber for civilian defense and military security of the free democratic friendly nations of the world.

The amendment would require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish within the Commodity Credit Corporation, a national security ever-normal storehouse of storable farm commodities and storable products of perishable and semiperishable farm commodities equal to 1 full years' domestic consumption and exports. This national security storehouse of commodities would be widely dispersed within the United States in accordance with directions of the Administrator of Civilian Defense and throughout the friendly free democratic nations of the world in accordance with the recommendations of the National Security Council. I realize that the general public has not been informed of the very great danger to our country of hydrogen bombs and cobalt bombs carried by intercontinental bomber planes. And the intercontinental ballistic missile with a hydrogen bomb warhead is just around the research corner. I know the Administrator of Civilian Defense would feel that our urban populations, particularly, would be safer if we had a stockpile of stored food and fiber to meet the emergency that we hope never comes.

The proposed amendment would direct that three-fourths of the ever-normal storehouse in the United States should be processed and stored by farmer-controlled and

farmer-owned processing and marketing cooperatives.

The amendment also provides that subtitle A of the Soil Bank Act would be eliminated from the bill and the money transferred to the conservation reserve so that we can build up a completely adequate reserve of soil fertility without putting an undue hardship on wheat and cotton farmers who have already been forced to take 25 to 50 percent cuts in their cash crop acreages.

The amendment numbered 3, submitted by Mr. LANGER, is as follows:

On page 28, at the end of line 5, add the following: "No expenditure shall be made from this fund except for marketing premium payments or production payments except where the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the purposes of this act and improved national nutrition will be furthered by purchases made from processors or other vendors who certify that the producers of the commodities from which the products are made received payment for the commodities at the support price equivalent specified by the Secretary of Agriculture."

The statement by Senator LANGER, relating to amendment numbered 3, is as follows:

I have submitted an amendment to require use of section 32 funds to help farmers rather than processors.

The Senator from North Dakota examined the authorities which are available for hog price support operations under existing legislation and the committee bills. The only alternatives now open are to purchase either live hogs or finished pork. For obvious reasons, the Government would be in no position to handle live hogs. This leaves purchase of pork and pork products as the only reasonable alternative method under existing authorizations which are not enforced by the committee bill.

There are several serious disadvantages in supporting hog prices by purchase of pork and pork products:

1. It is virtually impossible to assure support levels for products. There is no assurance that the purchase program will maintain prices of hogs at support levels for all producers. Certainly the purchase program now in operation has done nothing to maintain adequate levels to producers throughout the entire country. Hogs are sold by farmers at hundreds of points, away from central public markets, and the differentials between prices in different areas are constantly changing. This has to be taken into consideration in directing the purchase program. Even so, the program is supporting prices received by packers, while producers are not getting any established hog price-support level. Furthermore, Government purchases of pork necessarily are made only from federally inspected slaughterers; otherwise, the pork could not be moved across State lines or into foreign shipment. In addition, there frequently are temporary gluts at markets and no amount of Government buying of pork or pork products will maintain prices at support levels during those periods.

2. It is difficult and costly to handle, store, and dispose of the pork products acquired. The question of disposal of products acquired by a purchasing program would become very serious if the Secretary really tried to use them to raise hog producers income. After the products are acquired they must be held in cold storage, with the resulting high handling costs and spoilage risks. In a purchase program of sufficient size to help farmers, eventual disposal would have to be arranged primarily outside of the United States, since return of these products to the domestic market would at most times weaken the price—the very thing we would be trying

to prevent by our purchases. Exports, however, could only be arranged at greatly reduced prices, and in some cases probably almost on a fight basis. The net result would be very little return on the disposal of the pork stockpiles. The money used in such price support could be very nearly a total loss.

3. Complex administrative machinery is required. The difficulties involved in handling large quantities of fresh and cured pork are quite apparent. There is the problem of setting up an adequate staff of experts in meat procurement to carry out the buying, storing, and selling operations required by a purchase program. The Department does not now have a large enough staff to man an effective program and would face considerable difficulty in recruiting one.

4. Maintaining more nearly adequate pork prices would discourage increased domestic consumption. The other disadvantage of a purchase program—lack of incentive for expansion of consumer purchases—is extremely significant. Under the purchase method, operations should be geared to holding or raising market prices to the support levels. This undoubtedly would result in an increase, or at least a maintenance, of retail prices for pork products with the resulting discouragement to increased consumption. The Senators could not overemphasize this point. A large part of the thinking back of the production-payment idea is to make possible greater domestic consumption of the perishable products that come off our farms.

In contrast to the difficulties of purchasing operations, a marketing premium payment plan for hog supports would be relatively simple in operation. It would also avoid the chief weaknesses of a purchase program.

Definite support can be given to all hog producers throughout the country if hog prices are supported by market premiums payments. Whenever the market price for a certain period averaged below the announced support, the difference between the average market price and the support level would establish the rate of payment to producers who sold hogs for slaughter during that period. All producers who sold hogs for slaughter within the period would receive the same rate of payment per 100 pounds liveweight if he marketed his hogs at less than a specified rate. And under this plan, each individual hog producer would have full incentive to get the highest possible price for his hogs on the market.

The problems of disposal would be eliminated as to all hogs moving directly into market.

No highly technical staff would be required under the marketing premium payment program. The work would be handled by the field force to ASC farmer committees, and the administrative expense to the Government for making premium payments would be relatively small.

Under the premium payment method, prices of pork and pork products would seek the level determined by domestic and export demand, without governmental action. As a result, the entire output from the slaughter of hogs would move into domestic consumption channels at lower weights and into such export markets as would be available. Retail prices would be at levels which would increase consumer purchasing, broadening the demand for hogs.

If the Secretary determines, however, to use Government purchases from section 32 funds as a means to protect the income of hog raisers or other farmers, the pending amendment would require him to specify the exact support-level price to producers and require him to obtain a certification from the packer or other vendor that such support prices have in fact been paid to the farmers.

The amendment numbered 4, submitted by Mr. LANGER, is as follows:

On page 36, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"Sec. 406. Title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 394. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, whenever he finds that the total supply of any farm commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year exceeds the reserve supply thereof, to proclaim the amount of the total supply, and beginning on the first day of the marketing year next following and continuing throughout such year a national marketing quota shall be in effect for that commodity marketed during such marketing year: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall cause to be held a referendum by secret ballot of the producers of that commodity and if more than one-third of the producers of that commodity voting in such referendum oppose the quota, as proclaimed by the Secretary, the quota shall be ineffective from the date of the proclamation: *Provided further*, That subsequent to the proclamation of the total supply but prior to the date of the referendum the Secretary of Agriculture shall apportion the national marketing quota among the several States, counties, and individual producers in relation to the volume of farm marketings of the commodity by each in the immediately preceding 3 years: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law the marketing quota of any producer shall not be reduced below that required for an adequate family living from the production of that commodity in combination with other commodities produced on the farm and the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish an appropriate schedule of marketing quota percentage reductions from the 3-year base for individual producers such that larger producers will be required to take appropriately larger percentage cuts than smaller producers: *And provided further*, That the Secretary shall make known to every producer his individual marketing quota at least 10 days prior to the date of the referendum. In administration of programs initiated to carry out this section the Secretary shall utilize the services of the farmer committees established pursuant to section 8 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended."

The statement by Senator LANGER, relating to amendment No. 4, is as follows:

I have submitted an amendment to S. 3183, which would require the Secretary of Agriculture to set farm marketing quotas, when they are in effect, on a specific bushelage or poundage base for each farmer instead of on an acreage base, for crops other than tobacco and peanuts. This quota would govern the volume a grower could sell without penalty in a given year, regardless of how many or how few acres he used to produce it. For tobacco and peanuts the acreage-allotment procedure appears to have worked fairly satisfactorily, and therefore should not be changed.

However, in high-risk wheat and cotton areas the producer never knows when he plants his acreage allotment what his production and sales might be. If his marketing quota is established as the production from allotted acres there is no basis, either nationally or on the individual farm, to know how much volume of sales will move into the commercial market.

A wheat farmer in North Dakota never knows when he plants whether his yield will be nothing, 2 bushels per acre, 15 bushels, or 22 or 30. With a 200-acre allotment, his marketing quota might thus vary from as little as 0 or 200 bushels to as much as 6,000

bushels from year to year. This is a most unstabilizing and completely unnecessary result of existing marketing quota laws for wheat, cotton, and rice.

The purpose of marketing quotas is to regulate the volume of sales of a commodity by charging a heavy penalty on sales over quota. A national determination is made as to what volume of the commodity will be needed for domestic and export needs in the year ahead. This is expressed in bushelage or poundage terms. This national marketing quota should not be translated into a national acreage allotment but should be distributed to States and counties and individual farmers as a specific marketing quota. If no producer exceeded his marketing quota the volume actually marketed would equal the national marketing quota.

Under existing law, the volume actually marketed from allotment acres may be substantially below or substantially above the national marketing quota, depending upon acreage yields. In crops and areas where yields do not vary greatly from year to year this poses no great difficulty. But as droughts in recent years, reaching even into Georgia and Virginia, have indicated, the acreage allotment device is a blunt and clumsy method at best, even in humid areas.

For the individual producer, except for tobacco and peanuts, basing marketing quotas on acreage allotment simply does not make much sense, nor does it allow him to fit the program effectively into his farm-management plan. If the individual wheat producer, for example, knew before planting time that his quota was 4,000 bushels, he would be able to choose the acres on which he wants to try to produce it. One year he might choose to use 200 acres of his most fertile land and another year to use 400 acres of his less fertile soil. If growing conditions looked especially promising, he might wish to plant 500 acres of his land into wheat, knowing full well that at average yields his total production that year would greatly exceed his marketing quota. He would market his quota volume and would store on the farm the excess production for sale in a later year when due to weather, disease, or pests his yields might be greatly reduced.

A determination is made as to the volume of the commodity which is marketed will fill export needs, if any, preserve an adequate national stockpile of safety reserve of the commodity, and fill the expressed needs of domestic United States consumers at a price that will be consistent with the continued production of a sustained abundance of the commodity, and consequently will prevent farm bankruptcy, reduced farm-family living standards, and the development of a condition of chronic poverty on American farms.

Under a farm-marketing quota system each farmer is appraised, well before planting or breeding time, of the amount of the commodity he is authorized to market at the higher or parity price, determined by legislation or agreement as being a price that is fair to both producers and consumers. If the farmer sells only this volume of the commodity he can do so at support price. If he wants to produce and sell more than the determined volume he may do so, but only by selling all of his marketings of that commodity at a much lower average price. The lower average price in this case results from two factors: first, any sales above the marketing quota must be made subject to the payment of a fee, or penalty, for the privilege of selling above quota. This fee or penalty is deducted from whatever price the farmer receives. Moreover, the entire marketings of that commodity by the farmer who exceeds his marketing quota must be sold at the market price, which may be lower than determined support price owing to the operation of production payments as a method of support or because market price has fallen below the announced support price available through

Government loans, purchase agreements, or purchases.

Marketing quotas, with or without acreage allotments, are not a system of federally imposed farm production controls. Any farmer can produce and sell any amount of the commodity that he wishes. But to do so he must be willing to accept a lower return per unit than that made available to the farmer who holds his annual marketing within his agreed upon quota. First, somebody must decide under the law the total national quota that fits the circumstances of the particular year. Second, somebody must make known to each farm family the information as to its share of the national quota. Third, somebody must hold a referendum or vote to determine whether the producers of that commodity wish to impose marketing quotas upon themselves that year. Fourth, if quotas are approved by producers, somebody must administer the machinery that makes provisions effective with respect to the marketings of each producer. Fifth, maintenance of the higher or support price or return requires the operation of a Federal farm price-support program. Sixth, enforcement of the lower of the two prices requires both withholding of support-program eligibility and the imposition and collection of fees or penalties on over-quota marketings of individual producers.

It is entirely possible that all of these needed functions could be performed by an organization of producers to which certain governmental powers were granted by the Federal Government. However, experience, logic, and commonsense all indicate that the first three functions listed above can most efficiently be performed by the United States Department of Agriculture and that the latter three involve the exercise of the spending and police powers of government, which probably should not be transferred by the Government to any private group. Moreover, since the effective operation of marketing quotas contribute to the national welfare by maintaining farm income at a level where farmers can make their pro rata contribution to an expanding full-employment economy, can conserve and improve their soil and water resources and farm equipment and thus insure a continuing ability to produce a sustained abundance of food and fiber, the administrative cost of the marketing-quota program is a just charge upon the general Federal revenues and not upon the producers of a single farm commodity.

Representative BURNICK and the Senator from North Dakota have been trying for many long years to bring about enactment of legislation that would substitute bushelage and poundage marketing quotas for acreage allotments. We were gratified, though surprised, when our President joined us after all these years in this recommendation. I urge my colleagues in our party to join with our President on this. When the Senator from North Dakota and Secretary Benson agree on something as improvement in the farm program, you certainly should not oppose it. Here you can demonstrate the broadest kind of party unity. I urge you and welcome you to join President Eisenhower and me in giving to farmers the kind of marketing-quota program they want and which makes the most sense from a national standpoint, too.

The amendment, No. 5, submitted by Mr. LANGER, is as follows:

On page 4, after line 24, add the following: "Sec. 108. The Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 421. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the maximum value of price-support loans that may be extended to any one farm-operator family in any year shall not exceed \$35,000."

CII—195

The statement by Senator LANGER, relating to amendment No. 5, is as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota hopes to have the attention of the Senators of his own party. The head of our party, the President of the United States, has urged us to put a dollar limitation on price support loans. Our own campaign committees have put advertisements, carrying the President's picture, in all the farm magazines in the Middle West. All these full page advertisements reiterate the President's recommendation that a dollar limit be placed on price support loans.

The pending amendment, introduced by the Senator from North Dakota, would set \$35,000 as the maximum amount of support loan for any one operator in 1 year. Less than 1 percent of the farm units in the Nation would be affected by this limitation.

Yet establishing this limitation would stop using the power of the Federal Government to subsidize competition of our largest factories-in-the-field against family farmers. I urge my colleagues on this side of the aisle to follow our President and enact this limitation on eligibility for price support loans of \$35,000 as incorporated in the pending amendment.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 3091, TO AMEND THE RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held by the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency on the bill (S. 3091) to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act so as to permit the sale or lease of the alcohol butadiene plant at Louisville, Ky. The hearing will be held on February 28, 1956, in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearing are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, Chief Clerk, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 303 Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., telephone, National 8-3120, extension 865, as soon as possible, and, in any event, before the close of business on Monday, February 27, 1956.

CENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF WOODROW WILSON — ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR CONNALLY BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a remarkably fine speech made by former Senator Tom Connally, of Texas, before a joint session of the General Assembly of Virginia, in the hall of the house of delegates at Richmond, in commemoration of the centennial year of the birth of Woodrow Wilson.

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

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

House Joint Resolution 12

Joint resolution inviting former Senator Tom Connally to address a joint session of the General Assembly

Whereas the year 1956 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, the Virginia-born President of the United

States during the time of the First World War, and it is fitting that this centennial should be observed by the General Assembly of Virginia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring), That the Honorable Tom Connally, of Texas, for many years an illustrious representative of that State in the Senate of the United States, is hereby cordially invited by the Senate and the House of Delegates of Virginia to address a joint session of the general assembly to be held in the hall of the house of delegates at the capitol on February 21, 1956, at 2 p. m., in commemoration of the centennial year of Woodrow Wilson; and

Resolved, further, That the Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD, senior Senator from Virginia in the Congress of the United States, is hereby invited to accompany former Senator Connally on this occasion and to introduce him to the joint session of the General Assembly of Virginia; and

Resolved, further, That the clerk of the house of delegates is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to former Senator Connally and Senator BYRD.

Agreed to by the house of delegates, January 19, 1956.

E. GRIFFITH DODSON,

Clerk of the House of Delegates.

Agreed to by the senate, January 20, 1956.

E. R. COMBES,

Clerk of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR TOM CONNALLY, OF TEXAS, BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF THE VIRGINIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Congress of the United States by Joint Resolution 147 established a Commission to be known as the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission.

The General Assembly of Virginia also established a commission to plan a centennial celebration of the birth of Woodrow Wilson and to invite all the people of the United States to join therein.

I feel greatly honored to appear before the General Assembly of the State of Virginia and to address this distinguished body in its observance of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson in Staunton, Va., and to remind the people of the United States and of the world of the sublime achievements and the great life and service of Woodrow Wilson.

I first saw Woodrow Wilson in the fall of 1911 at Dallas, Tex., where he delivered an address. This was before his nomination for the Presidency while he was on a tour through the country. I came from Texas to attend his first inauguration and heard his magnificent address at his installation. I saw him again on March 4, 1917, at his second inauguration. I also, of course, saw him in 1917 when he addressed Congress advocating United States entrance into the World War. In Paris in 1919 during the Peace Conference, I, along with a number of other Congressmen, saw him where he received us at his residence and freely and widely conversed with us regarding the progress of the conference. I saw him again when he returned to Washington from Paris for a short time, and conferred with members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Of course, I saw him on a number of occasions at state dinners and other functions.

Woodrow Wilson was the son of a Presbyterian minister, his mother was the daughter of a Presbyterian minister in England. His undergraduate education was in Davidson College, North Carolina, and Princeton, New Jersey. Later, at the University of Virginia, he studied law, and at Johns Hopkins University he studied jurisprudence and politics. Most of his college career was in Southern States. He attained a reputation for clear and definite interest in and knowledge of government and public affairs. When 29

years of age his career as a college student came to an end. For 1 year he practiced law in Atlanta, Ga. He then began the profession of teaching American youth politics and government at Bryn Mawr College, Wesleyan College, Johns Hopkins University, and Princeton University. He became a profound and distinguished student of history and government and a renowned author in those fields.

He became the author of seven books on political and historical subjects. The first was his outstanding volume on Congressional Government. His literary productions attracted the admiration of scholars and students and received wide popularity among the public. As a boy it is said that his ambition was to become a Senator from the State of Virginia. He became the president of Princeton. His widened prestige embraced all the fields of university life and institutions of liberal culture. As president of Princeton he stood for democracy and tolerance, against snobbery, and for liberalism.

Woodrow Wilson's political career began in 1910 when he left Princeton and accepted the Democratic nomination for Governor of New Jersey. In the campaign he announced that he opposed political machines and championed a rededication to the liberties of the American people. He announced that those who sought high office must assume responsibility for leadership. Upon that platform he was elected Governor of New Jersey. Upon his record in that high office he became in 1912 the nominee of the Democratic Party for President. At the Baltimore convention the Texas delegation supported him and fought valiantly for his nomination from beginning to end. He was elected and became President of the United States on March 4, 1913. In 1916 he was renominated and reelected. In that campaign his opponent was Charles Evans Hughes, who resigned from the Supreme Court to become a candidate. I heard Hughes speak in San Diego, Calif., in his campaign. He was aggressive and vigorous. For the first day after the election the Republicans claimed that Hughes had been elected. However, the California vote when finally counted gave California to Wilson and made his election secure. It was a tense and exciting period in our public life.

As President, Wilson demonstrated outstanding leadership. A splendid program of liberalism and reform distinguished legislation under his guidance. Many of the reforms inaugurated by him are upon the statute books today. Among the important measures were the establishment of the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Reserve banking system, and other outstanding policies.

The European war burst upon the world in 1914 with tremendous shock and carnage. The reckless and barbarous submarine warfare of Germany upon the shipping of neutral nations as well as its enemy resulted in the murder of American citizens and was a supreme challenge to the doctrine of the freedom of the seas as championed by the United States over the years. It was a war upon peaceful nations and their citizens while engaged in lawful pursuits on the high seas. More than that, it was a supreme challenge to free peoples and free nations by autocracy and tyranny.

President Wilson, fortified by his sublime convictions and sustained by the united sentiments of the people of the United States, on April 2, 1917, stood in the House of Representatives and addressed a joint session of the Congress. He spoke inspired words. He marshaled the opinion not only of his countrymen but of freemen everywhere. He led our Republic into war and laid before the public opinion of Europe and America the tremendous issues which our Nation championed. He thrilled the hearts of our Allies. He was heard round the world. As a new Member of Congress I sat in the House Chamber and witnessed his calm cour-

age and firmness and heard his challenging words. Wilson, a liberal statesman and guardian of his country's honor, was urging the American people to take up the sword against arrogant tyranny and the violation of American rights on the seas and on the land. He was speaking for the righting of wrongs, he was pleading for the reconsecration and the rededication of the liberties of the American people. He was declaring for the rights of nations and free people. He was conscious of the responsibility resting upon the United States. He had always been an advocate of peace with justice and honor but when the infamous violations of the liberties and safety of the people of the United States were thrust upon us he spoke in clarion tones.

When the outrageous and malignant submarine warfare convinced him that it must be resisted by military might, that resistance alone could preserve the peace and safety of the free world, he declared that America must retaliate with all of its strength and power. He asked the Congress to adopt a declaration of war against Germany.

I was a new member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to which was referred the resolution to declare war. My membership imposed upon me a terrible responsibility. To me it was a solemn and overwhelming decision. On my knees I sought guidance and direction. A few days later the committee voted for reporting a declaration of war and I was among the members who supported the resolution. It was adopted. It later was adopted by the House of Representatives and the Senate. The United States was at war.

The President at once sent an armed force under the command of Gen. John J. Pershing to France to join our Allies.

In early 1918 President Wilson appeared before Congress and submitted his famous "14 points of peace." This great state paper deserved a place among the historic charters that have advanced the liberties of mankind through the ages. His speeches and state papers inspired our soldiers at the front and advanced our battlelines. His voice became the voice of free peoples. His words impressed the world with the grandeur of his aims and high purposes.

The progress of the war and Wilson's superb leadership guaranteed that kings and emperors would abdicate and under allied triumph the war would come to an end. An armistice was declared followed by a peace conference. Under the President's leadership, and the unity of our people, and the courage and bravery of its armies, victory had come to the cause of the United States and its allies.

In December 1918 President Wilson landed on French shores and took part in a conference assembled to chart and guarantee the peace following the war. It seemed to Wilson that it was his duty to go to Europe, heedless of the dangers which might face him. High was his hope for the establishment of a council among free and democratic nations which might result in a parliament of nations.

At Paris he fought for his ideals and hopes. He wanted to see brute force disenthroned as the rule among nations and peoples. He labored bravely for these noble sentiments and principles. He wanted the League of Nations to administer the principles of international justice. Wilson was faced by the leaders, not only of our allies, but of the enemy. Tremendous problems stared him in the face. Not alone a peace treaty to end the war, but future problems in international affairs challenged him at every step that he took. He secured all that was possible. The liberal features of the Versailles Treaty had his support and championship. His great spirit was revealed in those aspects of the treaty. The American people wanted the treaty to embrace some kind of project to guarantee

the peace in future years. There was latent a small group who opposed any sort of international treaty with regard thereto. Wilson returned to the United States with wide acclaim. He returned to America offering his country's leadership in the noble cause of peace.

During the pendency of the Peace Conference President Wilson returned to the United States for a short time to attend to Presidential duties. He had a conference at the White House. He invited the members of the Committees on Foreign Relations of the Senate and Foreign Affairs of the House. As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs I attended that Conference. The President related to those assembled the matters with which the Conference was struggling. He outlined his own views and purposes. He was clear and firm. He was highly hopeful. He was frank and gave a detailed report of the progress of the Conference. He then returned to Paris to engage again in the labors of the Conference.

While he was in Europe he visited several countries. He was enthusiastically and widely acclaimed in Italy, France, and in other areas wherever he went. The people of Europe in tremendous numbers welcomed him as their deliverer from tyranny and aggressive war. They looked upon him as the champion of a new order that would guarantee their safety and the peace of the world.

Upon the adjournment of the Conference and the signing of the peace treaty he returned to Washington. He was faced with enemies bent upon his defeat. The treaty of peace as finally signed was appropriately submitted to the Senate of the United States. Here a battle was to be fought in committee and later on the floor. Here the opponents of the treaty, organized and militant, were to begin an attack particularly upon the clauses regarding the League of Nations. Opponents submitted involved and confusing reservations to the League's provisions to weaken and destroy it. They were designed to alarm the people and to arouse their prejudices and to inflame their fears and passions. Political agitation and bewildering debate were broadcast throughout the land.

The League was never proposed as a partisan or Democratic political maneuver. It was an appeal to all of the American people. But all the wiles and devices of partisanship were brought forward to condemn it and to denounce Wilson. The miners and sappers were at work overtime. Some of his most bitter opponents were prominent public figures who theretofore had advocated a "league to enforce peace." Some of them had toured the country in support of such an international agency. The public records will today reveal their support and promotion of such a project. But their overpowering political and personal hatred of Wilson drove them into the camp of his enemies and the League which he had helped to write.

The President soon was aware of the tremendous and bitter forces that were marshaled against the treaty and against him. He believed that the people of the United States wanted a League of Nations. He believed they hungered for world peace. He believed that they wanted international treaties binding the nations to resort to the League to settle quarrels and to prevent war. He felt it his duty to lay before the American people the issues involved and to secure their approval of his conduct at the peace conference. There followed a long and bitter debate in the United States Senate over the treaty and particularly those clauses relating to the League.

In September 1919 he undertook a western tour seeking approval of his work in Europe. Woodrow Wilson was stricken as though in battle at Pueblo, Colo., on September 25, 1919. The United States Senate on March 20, 1920, rejected the treaty. Without the United States as a member the League was fore-

doomed to failure. After a few years of ineffective and spasmodic effort it ceased to exist. It was superseded not directly but in fact by the United Nations.

Though it was widely asserted that Wilson failed in his efforts for an international organization to preserve peace, it must be remembered that finally in 1945 the United Nations Charter, which embraced the ideal that was in his heart, was adopted at San Francisco and later formally ratified by the United States Senate. In 1945 I was the ranking delegate next to the Secretary of State to the International Conference at San Francisco for the consideration of the Charter of the United Nations. It was generally and definitely recognized that the organization created there was a reflection of the high purposes of Woodrow Wilson. Though in detail it differed from his conception it may be stated that his inspiration prompted its adoption by the United States Senate and the American people. Though his cold and pulseless form rested in the Washington Cathedral his spirit, his noble purpose, his high concept of an agency for world peace marched on and revived in anxious hearts the desire for a world organization. Today, notwithstanding its weakness in some respects and its shortcomings in others, the United Nations is the best hope of the world to prevent wars and to safeguard and guarantee peace. It may be amended and strengthened. It embodies in essence the concept of Woodrow Wilson for the establishment and preservation of international peace.

Woodrow Wilson was devoted to democracy. He believed in the rights of the weak and underprivileged. He was against autocracy in industry and business. He was against monopoly and financial tyranny. He believed that the common man had rights that must be protected. He had a towering intellect. He had indomitable courage and energy.

He was a superb leader. His ambition to serve his country was gigantic and compelling.

Woodrow Wilson was a colossal world figure. Had he lived in 1776 he would have stood by Thomas Jefferson when he wrote the Declaration of Independence. Had he lived in 1787 he would have supported George Washington as president of the convention which adopted the Constitution of the United States. Had he lived in 1815 he would have applauded Andrew Jackson as he triumphed in the Battle of New Orleans.

The 4 closing years of the life of Woodrow Wilson were saddened by his affliction. He endured his sufferings in patience and quietude. In those dark hours he adhered to the noble principles for which he had stood. His enemies did not hesitate to assail him and denounce him but his great heart did not respond to calumny and vituperation. The courageous warrior had to lay down his arms and suffer in silence and quiet.

On February 3, 1924, all that was mortal of Woodrow Wilson passed into the shadows. His cold and inert form was entombed in the Washington Cathedral. The people of America were plunged into grief and sorrow. The lovers of peace all over the world were saddened and moved to tears.

Woodrow Wilson was a gigantic figure among men. He was a titanic captain in the battle for international action for the establishment of agencies to preserve the peace. He was a superb leader in government. He was a devoted patriot and a leader of a free world. In the field of statesmanship in the United States he stood like a blazing star. In international affairs he was a towering figure. His memory forever will survive. It is emblazoned upon the pages of the history of the world's great events.

How great is the poverty of phrase and the feebleness of tongue to bring to you a message of the majesty of his life. Where is bronze stout enough; where is granite firm enough; where is marble white enough in chiseled figure of molded form to portray the grandeur of his life. Where can literature find a pen powerful enough; where can oratory find a tongue eloquent enough; where can the poet find lines lofty enough; where can history find a page bright enough to tell the story of the heroic life, the sublime patriotism and the commanding purposes of the great man, Woodrow Wilson.

EDITORIAL COMMENT FROM ALASKA ON SPEECH BY SENATOR LANGER RELATIVE TO CONFISCATION OF PROPERTY OF GERMAN AND JAPANESE NATIONALS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last week I delivered a speech dealing with the subject of confiscation of private property of German and Japanese nationals, and of American nationals in this country. Very few Senators were in the Chamber at that time.

I have before me an editorial entitled "Langer's Talk Full of Meat," published in the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily News of February 14, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

LANGER'S TALK FULL OF MEAT

The press has noted with casual amusement that Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, sat in the Senate Chamber in solitary state for more than 2 hours the other day listening to his own speech which was read by the Chief Clerk, because of the Senator's visual difficulties.

But the press failed to tell us what was in the speech, making it as derelict in duty as the Senators who could have learned much, had they cared to listen. What they all missed was one of the best-documented, most complete histories yet presented on the communistic influence exerted on the Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower administrations. It related, step by step, how both parties were hoodwinked by Soviet agents and led blindfolded to confiscation of alien property as part of the conspiracy to destroy property rights throughout the world.

Senator LANGER named former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau and his aids, Harry Dexter White and Laughlin Currie, as those who foisted the Moscow-written doctrine of confiscation on this country. He quoted two secret orders of Secretary Morgenthau that gave White the purse-strings—and hence control—over the State Department and the Army and Navy in all foreign operations.

"As early as 1951," Senator LANGER reminded us, "I charged that Harry Dexter White . . . was a Communist agent." He went on to point out that this was "almost 3 years before the Attorney General . . . repeated what I said."

The Senator blamed both parties for the legislation permanently confiscating the property of German and Japanese nationals, but said, "White, Glasser, Coe, and Hiss, with the help of the Office of Alien Property, got that done by trickery and deceit."

Of the confiscation of Swiss property in the United States, he declared: "I say it was not the United States but Communist spies and agents in our Government who gave us a sordid reputation with a nation whose honor and integrity we have always admired. I say it is time to reverse these policies by return-

ing all confiscated private property. Only in that way can we purge ourselves of the terrible implications."

More specifically, Senator LANGER's recipe for removing the tarnish from our national honor calls for immediate passage of the Dirksen-Kilgore bill, plus two bills of his own that would remove the Office of Alien Property from control of the obstructionist Justice Department and place it under the State Department.

The least we can hope for is that his fellow solons will regard Senator LANGER's speech—which came to them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—as important homework . . . and that when action is taken on the Langer recommendations the Capitol press corps will be paying attention.

NATIONAL ART CONTEST FOR HANDICAPPED AMATEUR PAINTERS

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, during the fall of 1955, I was asked to serve as one of the honorary sponsors for the national art contest for handicapped amateur painters. Chairman of our committee is the Chief Justice of the United States, Earl G. Warren, who is chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art. Other honorary sponsors include Mrs. Eisenhower, Congressman AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, and, in all, 13 top persons from private industry and from Government.

The purpose of this contest, the first of its kind anywhere, is to further and encourage the careers of talented amateur artists who are handicapped, to dramatically illustrate the employment and rehabilitation potential of the handicapped, and to increase public awareness of the contribution to be made to our society by the handicapped.

I am pleased to report that this contest has met with fine public acceptance and is now progressing at a most satisfactory rate toward the May 1, 1956, contest closing deadline. Information on the joint sponsors, contest judges, and contest rules is contained in the following two news stories: The first is from the New York Times for November 6, 1955, announcing the opening of the contest, and the next is from the Washington Evening Star for January 22, 1956, announcing the judges.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times of November 6, 1955]

HANDICAPPED VIE IN ART CONTEST—FIRST OF ITS KIND IN NATION—MRS. EISENHOWER IS AMONG THE SPONSORS—TWENTY-TWO PRIZES TO BE GIVEN—COMPETITION TO END NEXT MAY—PAINTINGS BY WINNERS TO HANG IN MUSEUMS

WASHINGTON, November 6.—A national art contest for the handicapped, first of its kind, was opened here today.

Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, one of the sponsors, said in a message that she and the President supported any effort "to foster the employment of the handicapped and an understanding of their problems."

She said the President also shared her views on the need for dramatically illustrating the employment and rehabilitation potential of the handicapped.

Jointly sponsoring the 6-month contest are the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Veterans' Administration, and the Morris Morgenthau Foundation of New York City, a philanthropic organization, which is financing it.

THREE THOUSAND AND FIFTY DOLLARS IN PRIZES SET

Twenty-two prizes, totaling \$3,050, will be awarded in the contest closing May 1, 1956. They range from a first prize of \$1,000 to 10 consolation prizes of \$50 United States savings bonds. The winners, who will be announced July 31, will have their paintings hung in museums across the country.

The first entry came today at a luncheon from Mrs. Alverda L. Kae, a housewife from Shenandoah, Pa., an arthritis victim confined to a wheelchair.

In accepting the entry, Melvin J. Maas, chairman of the President's committee, said the contest gives handicapped artists "the chance to prove again, that with the handicapped it is ability that counts, not disability."

Mr. Maas, former Republican Representative from Minnesota and a retired Marine Corps major general, is blind. He noted a purpose of the contest was to point out the possibilities for future rehabilitation of handicapped given the proper opportunity. The contest is open to all handicapped amateur artists in the territorial United States.

Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, told the luncheon meeting that "art has assumed the status of a full-fledged rehabilitation agent in veterans' hospitals throughout the country."

FIFTY GUESTS AT LUNCHEON

"In many cases, it is actually being prescribed for patients by our doctors," he added. "It is expected that scores of handicapped veterans in Veterans' Administration hospitals as well as additional thousands of the handicapped in private life will compete."

Arthur Larson, Under Secretary of Labor, said his Department long had believed that employment of persons with physical handicaps was essential to the national interest. The teaching of art to the handicapped, he added, is sometimes a steppingstone to a productive career in the fields of commercial art or related fields.

The 50 guests at the luncheon, held in the National Art Gallery here, also heard Bradshaw Mintener, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Mary Switzer, Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation; Thomas M. Beggs, director of the National Collection of Fine Arts; and Morris Morgenthau, 73-year-old New York philanthropist who heads the foundation that bears his name.

Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, accepted the chairmanship of the honorary sponsors' committee.

Contest details may be obtained from the Morris Morgenthau Foundation, 119 West 57th Street, New York City.

[From the Washington Star of January 22, 1956]

FIVE EXPERTS TO JUDGE HANDICAPPED ART ENTRIES

Five artists will judge entries in the National Art Contest for handicapped amateur artists, the first of its kind to be held in this country.

Twenty-two prizes totaling \$3,050 will be awarded winners in the event which began November 6 and continues until May 1. It is open to all handicapped amateur artists in the territorial United States.

The contest is sponsored jointly by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped; the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Veterans' Administration, and the Morris Morgenthau Foundation of New York.

THE JUDGES LISTED

Ernest W. Watson, particularly distinguished for print making and editor-in-chief of American Artist, is chairman of judges.

Others are Miss Isabel Bishop, painter, etcher, and art teacher; Frank J. Reilly, mural painter and illustrator; E. Franklin Wittmack, commercial illustrator, and Andrew Newell Wyeth, painter, whose father was the artist, N. C. Wyeth.

Application blanks for the event are available at the offices of State vocational rehabilitation agencies and at Veterans' Administration hospitals. They also may be obtained by writing to the Morgenthau Foundation, 119 West 57th Street, New York.

To be eligible, an entrant must not earn the major portion of his income as an artist, and must be handicapped, his ability to function in everyday activity substantially impaired by disease, congenital condition, or injury.

Only original entries in oil, water color, gouache or tempore, on canvas or paper, will be accepted, each not larger than 50 inches on any side. Heavy and bulky frames should be avoided and glass frames are not acceptable.

Prepaid entries, which will be returned on completion of the contest, should be sent to the foundation in New York.

The sponsors so far have received letters from some 1,000 handicapped amateur painters asking for entry blanks. Paintings already have commenced arriving in New York.

MANY ORGANIZATIONS AIDING

Cooperating with the President's Committee are many large organizations, and veterans, union, employer, fraternal, and service organizations are helping to distribute entry blanks and are supporting the event in trade papers and house organs.

Chief Justice Warren is chairman of a group of 12 honorary sponsors. Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower is a sponsor. Others are George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO; Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Folsom; Veterans' Administrator Harvey V. Higley; Secretary of Labor Mitchell; A. Boyd Campbell, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce; William Farley, president of the Association of American Railroads; Harold E. Fellows, president of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters; Earl Gammons, consultant; Representative Kelley, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; Senator Potter, Republican, of Michigan, and Adm. DeWitt Ramsey, president of the Air Transport Association.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY, ESSAY BY JAN HOGENDORN

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, this week marks the culmination of the annual I Speak for Democracy contest. This year students from 47 States, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii entered the contests. There were over a million and a half entries. From that field four winners were selected.

I am privileged to note that 1 of these 4 winners is a fine boy from Iowa, Jan Hogendorn, of Oskaloosa, Iowa. The Oskaloosa High School has distinguished itself by producing a national Voice of Democracy winner for the second straight year. During the 1954-55 con-

test, Dwight David Walker, of Oskaloosa, was one of the national winners.

Iowa is very proud of its most important asset—its young people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the prize-winning script of Jan Hogendorn be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY, 1956

(By Jan Hogendorn, Oskaloosa, Iowa)

It stands on a solid granite foundation, its long white shaft rising into the peaceful Virginia countryside. It is continually guarded by a uniformed sentry, whose rifle is carried at the military salute. Yes, it is a tomb. But it is not the tomb of a President, nor of a great general. And yet it holds the greatest martyr to the spirit of democracy that this world will ever know. For in that tomb lies the body of the Unknown Soldier.

He lived, he slept, he loved just as all of us. He may have come from a sprawling eastern city, or a quiet tree-shaded southern town, or a midwestern farm. But from whence he came, or how well he lived, he knew democracy, and he loved it. He loved it so much that he gave more than his own life. He gave his whole identity.

What is there in a word that drove this man to the supreme sacrifice? Just beyond the tomb of the Unknown Soldier stands a red brick building. It stands apart from other buildings because of four words cut deep into the stone above the doorway. Fairfax County High School. In its halls walk the youth of America. Youth free to study and work as it chooses. There is no fear here. No fear of political crimes or regimented instruction.

This is what he fought for. This is what he died for. This is democracy. He died that no totalitarian creed would be taught in that school.

About a mile down the road stands another building, not so much different from the schoolhouse. This building is the Fairfax County Court House. Here is transacted the business of America, the administration of civil matters and of justice itself. A government of the people.

Here each day go scores of officials, elected to their positions by an intelligent citizenry. Certainly, a government by the people.

And here is centered that indispensable code of human behavior, law. Laws to protect, laws to insure, and laws to maintain our high standard of decency. Irrefutable government for the people.

This, too, is what we fought for, and died for. This, too, is democracy.

But look again. Look past the pacing sentry and the garlands of flowers, past the high gate and the valley, until you see the top of the next hill. A weatherbeaten white frame building stands there, exposed to nature. Surmounting it is a small white cross, a sort of symbol to this mechanized day and age that we are a God-loving and a God-fearing people.

But no one is forced to attend that church, and no one is forced to stay away. A solid, indisputable freedom of religion that nothing may challenge.

If he could but speak, his cold lips might tell with the eloquence of eternity the unending principles and ideas for which he fought.

He would tell of our God-given rights of freedom of speech, which gives us the privilege to criticize, to express our conscientious opinion on any question, without being harshly silenced by a secret police.

He would say that freedom and democracy are great gifts, which can be maintained and continued only through the unending vigi-

lance of us all, who are the guardians of this great heritage.

He would say that we, who keep the precepts of democracy, are all unknown heroes.

It is not necessary that we all die as he did in the defense of our rights and liberties, but it is very important that we don the hero's mantle by daily practice of the principles which have made our democracy the hope of the world. He would plead with us to keep our democracy a living thing.

We must work for it, speak for it, fight for it, and even die for it, so that democracy will exist long after the tomb of the unknown soldier has crumbled.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION TO FACILITATE THE IMPORTATION OF COMMERCIAL SAMPLES AND ADVERTISING MATERIAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive Q, 83d Congress, 1st session, which appears on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention Executive Q (83d Cong., 1st sess.), an International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material, dated at Geneva, November 7, 1952.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce that I understand the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GEORGE] has a brief statement to make about the convention. I want all Senators to know, however, that before a yea-and-nay vote on the convention is taken, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention will be read.

The convention was read the second time, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION TO FACILITATE THE IMPORTATION OF COMMERCIAL SAMPLES AND ADVERTISING MATERIAL

The Governments signatories to the present Convention,

Believing that the adoption of uniform regulations regarding the importation of samples of goods of all kinds (whether natural products or manufactured articles) and of advertising matter will promote the expansion of international trade,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I Definitions

For the purposes of the present Convention:

(a) The term "import duties" means Customs duties and all other duties and taxes payable on or in connexion with importation, and shall include all internal taxes and excise duties chargeable on imported goods, but shall not include fees and charges which are limited in amount to the approximate cost of services rendered and do not represent an indirect protection to domestic products or a taxation of imports for fiscal purposes; and

(b) The term "persons" means both natural and legal persons; and

(c) References to the territory of a Contracting Party include its metropolitan territory and any territory for whose international relations it is responsible and to which the Convention extends in accordance with article XIII.

ARTICLE II

Exemption from import duties for samples of negligible value

1. Each Contracting Party shall exempt from import duties samples of goods of all kinds imported into its territory, provided such samples are of negligible value and are only to be used for soliciting orders for goods of the kind represented by the samples with a view to their importation. In determining whether samples are of negligible value, the Customs authorities of the territory of importation may consider the values of individual samples or the aggregate value of all the samples in one consignment. The values of consignments sent by a consignor to different consignees shall not be aggregated for the purpose of this paragraph even though the consignments are imported at the same time.

2. The Customs authorities of the territory of importation may require that, as a condition of their being exempted from import duties in accordance with paragraph 1 of this article, samples shall be made useless as merchandise by marking, tearing, perforation or other treatment, but not, however, so as to destroy their usefulness as samples.

ARTICLE III

Temporary duty-free admission of other samples

1. For the purpose of this article, the term "samples" means articles which are representative of a particular category of goods already produced or are examples of goods the production of which is contemplated, on condition that they:

(a) are owned abroad and are imported solely for the purpose of being shown or demonstrated in the territory of importation for the soliciting of orders for goods to be supplied from abroad; and

(b) are not sold or put to normal use except for purposes of demonstration or used in any way for hire or reward while in the territory of importation; and

(c) are intended to be reexported in due course; and

(d) are capable of identification on reexportation;

but does not include identical articles brought in by the same individual, or sent to a single consignee, in such quantity that, taken as a whole, they no longer constitute samples under ordinary commercial usage.

2. Samples which are chargeable with import duties shall, when imported from the territory of another contracting party, with or without the intervention of a commercial traveler, by persons established in the territory of any contracting party, be temporarily admitted into the territory of any of the contracting parties free of import duties, subject to the amount of the import duties

and any other amount that may be payable being deposited or security being given for payment if necessary. Any deposits taken (other than those required in virtue of article VI of this Convention) shall not, however, exceed the amount of the import duties by more than 10 percent.

3. To obtain the facilities provided for in this article, the persons concerned must comply with the relevant laws and regulations prescribed by the authorities of the territory of importation and the customs formalities in force in that territory. As regards vehicles and industrial and agricultural machinery or equipment of a value for customs purposes exceeding 1,000 United States dollars (or the equivalent in other currencies), importers may be required to declare the place of destination of such machinery, equipment, or vehicles; they may also be required by the customs authorities of the country of importation to establish, at any time, that the machinery, equipment, or vehicles are at the declared places. The customs authorities of the country of importation may seal such machinery, equipment, or vehicles or otherwise preclude their operation during the time in which temporary duty-free admission is allowed and limit the places where these goods may be operated for demonstration purposes.

4. The customs authorities of the territory of importation shall, as a general rule, recognize as sufficient for the future identification of samples the marks which have been affixed by the customs authorities of a contracting party, provided that the said samples are accompanied by a descriptive list certified by the customs authorities of the latter contracting party. Additional marks may be affixed to the samples by the customs authorities of the territory into which they are imported only if they are necessary, in the opinion of those authorities, to ensure the identification of the samples on reexportation. Any mark affixed to samples shall not be such as to destroy their usefulness.

5. The period allowed for reexportation of samples which qualify for exemption from import duties under this article shall be not less than 6 months. When the period allowed for reexportation has expired, the amount of the import duties and any other amount due may be charged on samples which have not been reexported. These amounts may also be charged, before the expiry of the period, on samples which cease to satisfy the conditions of paragraph 1 of this article.

6. On the reexportation within the permitted time of samples imported under this article, the refund of any amount deposited or the release of any security given on importation in accordance with paragraph 2 of this article shall be effected without delay at any of the customs offices situated at the frontier or in the interior of the territory which possesses the necessary authority, subject to the deduction of the duties and any other amount payable on samples not produced for reexportation. When special circumstances exist deposits may, however, be returned by other means, provided the return is effected promptly. Each contracting party shall publish a list of the customs offices on which the said authority has been conferred.

ARTICLE IV

Duty-free admission of advertising material

1. Each contracting party shall exempt from import duties catalogs, pricelists, and trade notices relating to

(a) goods offered for sale or hire, or
(b) transport of commercial insurance services offered,

by a person established in the territory of another contracting party, when such documents are imported from the territory of any

contracting party, provided that each consignment imported either:

(i) Consists of not more than one document, or

(ii) if it consists of more than 1 document, does not include more than 1 copy of any 1 document, or

(iii) irrespective of the number of documents or copies, does not exceed 1 kilogram in gross weight.

Simultaneous dispatch of a number of consignments to different addresses in the territory of importation shall not debar such consignments from this exemption, provided that not more than 1 consignment is sent to any 1 consignee.

2. Notwithstanding paragraph 1 of this article, a contracting party shall not be obliged to exempt from import duties on importation into its territory:

(a) Catalogs, pricelists, and trade notices which do not clearly indicate the name of the foreign concern producing, selling or renting the goods, or offering the transport or commercial insurance services, to which such catalogs, pricelists or trade notices relate; or

(b) Catalogs, pricelists, and trade notices which are entered to customs in the territory of importation in packets grouped together for subsequent dispatch to separate addresses in that territory.

ARTICLE V

Temporary duty-free admission of advertising films

Each contracting party shall accord the facilities provided by article III of the present Convention, subject to the conditions laid down in that article, to positive cinematograph advertising films of a width not exceeding 16 millimeters shown to the satisfaction of its customs authorities to consist essentially of photographs (with or without sound track) showing the nature or operation of products or equipment whose qualities cannot be adequately demonstrated by samples or catalogs, provided that the films:

(a) relate to products or equipment offered for sale or for hire by a person established in the territory of another contracting party; and

(b) are of a kind suitable for exhibition to prospective customers but not for general exhibition to the public; and

(c) are imported in a packet which contains not more than one copy of each film and which does not form part of a larger consignment of films.

ARTICLE VI

Temporary waiver of import prohibitions and restrictions

1. No contracting party shall apply import prohibitions or restrictions (other than import duties), whether made effective through quotas, import licenses, or other measures, on the importation from the territory of another contracting party of goods:

(a) which qualify (or would qualify if they were dutiable) for exemption from import duties by virtue of the provisions of article II or article IV of this Convention; or

(b) which qualify (or would qualify if they were dutiable) for temporary duty-free admission by virtue of the provisions of article III or article V of this Convention; provided that the importation of such goods does not give rise to any payment other than for freight or insurance or for services provided in the territory of importation by a person established in that territory.

2. In the case of goods which qualify (or would qualify if they were dutiable) for temporary duty-free admission by virtue of the provisions of article III or article V, this waiver of import prohibitions or restrictions shall extend only to the period for which temporary duty-free admission is allowed (or

would be allowed if the goods were dutiable). In the case of non-re-exportation of such goods within the period during which the application of any import prohibitions or restrictions has been waived under paragraph 1 of this article, the authorities of the importing country may apply such measures as would have been applicable if the import prohibitions or restrictions had not been so waived. To this end, the authorities of the territory of importation may require appropriate guarantees, such as the deposit of a special security over and above any security deposited against payment of import duties.

3. The provisions of this Convention shall not prevent a contracting party from applying import prohibitions or restrictions:

(a) Necessary to protect public morals or essential security interests;

(b) Necessary to protect human, animal, or plant life or health;

(c) Relating to the importation of gold or silver;

(d) Necessary to secure compliance with laws or regulations relating to customs enforcement, the enforcement of state monopolies, the protection of patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

(e) Necessary to prevent deceptive practices;

(f) Relating to the products of prison labor;

(g) Necessary to the application of standards or regulations for the classification, grading, or marketing of commodities in international trade.

ARTICLE VII

Simplification of formalities

1. Each contracting party shall keep to a minimum the formalities required in connection with the facilities accorded by the present Convention.

2. Each contracting party shall publish promptly all regulations introduced in this respect in such a manner as to enable persons concerned to become acquainted with them and to avoid the prejudice which might result from the application of formalities of which they are unaware.

ARTICLE VIII

Settlement of disputes

1. Any dispute between any two or more contracting parties concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention shall so far as possible be settled by negotiation between them.

2. Any dispute which is not settled by negotiation shall be referred to a person or body agreed between the contracting parties in dispute, provided that if they are unable to reach agreement, any of these contracting parties may request the president of the International Court of Justice to nominate an arbitrator.

3. The decision of any person or body appointed under paragraph 2 of this article shall be binding on the contracting parties concerned.

ARTICLE IX

Signature and ratification

1. The present Convention shall be open for signature until June 30, 1953 by the Governments contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, by the Governments of all States Members of the United Nations and by the Government of any other State to which the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall have communicated a copy of the Convention for this purpose.

2. The Convention shall be subject to ratification or acceptance by the signatory Governments in accordance with their constitutional procedures, and the instruments of ratification or acceptance shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE X

Accession

1. The present Convention shall be open for accession by the Governments of any of the States referred to in paragraph 1 of article IX.

2. Accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XI

Entry into force

When 15 of the Governments referred to in article IX have deposited their instruments of ratification, acceptance or accession, the present Convention shall come into force between them on the thirtieth day after the date of the deposit of the fifteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession. It shall come into force for each other government on the thirtieth day after the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession.

ARTICLE XII

Denunciation

1. After the present convention has been in force for 3 years, any contracting party may denounce it by notification of denunciation to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

2. Denunciation shall take effect 6 months after the date of receipt by the Secretary General of the United Nations of the notification of denunciation.

ARTICLE XIII

Territorial application

1. Any government may at the time of the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession or at any time thereafter by notification addressed to the Secretary General of the United Nations declare that the present convention shall extend to all or any of the territories for the international relations of which it is responsible, and the convention shall extend to the territories named in the notification as from the 30th day after the date of receipt of the notification by the Secretary General of the United Nations or on the date on which the convention comes into force under article XI, whichever is the later.

2. Any government which has made a declaration under paragraph 1 of this article extending the present convention to any territory for whose international relations it is responsible may denounce the convention separately in respect of that territory in accordance with the provisions of article XII.

ARTICLE XIV

Reservations

1. Any State may at the time of its signature or of the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, or accession declare that it shall not be bound by specified provisions of this Convention.

2. Any State may at the time of making a notification under article XIII that the present Convention shall extend to any of the territories for the international relations of which it is responsible make a separate declaration in accordance with paragraph 1 of this article in respect of all or any of the territories to which the notification applies.

3. If any State submits a reservation to any of the articles of this Convention at the time of signature, ratification, acceptance, or accession, or at the time of making a notification under article XIII, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall communicate the text of such reservation to all States which are or may become parties to this Convention. Any State which has signed, ratified, accepted, or acceded before the reservation is made (or, if the Convention has not entered into force, which has signed, ratified, accepted, or acceded by the date of its entry

into force), shall have the right to object to any reservation. If no objection is received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations from any State entitled to object by the ninetieth day from the day of his communication (or from the date of entry into force of the Convention, whichever is the later), the reservation shall be deemed to be accepted.

4. In the event of an objection being received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations from any State entitled to object, he shall notify the State making the reservation of such objection, and request it to inform him whether it is prepared to withdraw the reservation or whether it prefers to abstain from ratification, acceptance, or accession or from extending the Convention to the territory or territories to which the reservation applies, as the case may be.

5. A State which has made a reservation in regard to which an objection has been presented in accordance with paragraph 3 of this article shall not become a party to this Convention unless the objection has been withdrawn or has ceased to have effect as provided in paragraph 6; neither shall a State have the right to claim the benefits of this Convention in respect of any territory for the international relations of which it is responsible and in respect of which it has made a reservation if any objection has been made to the reservation in accordance with paragraph 3 of this article, unless the objection has been withdrawn or has ceased to have effect as provided in paragraph 6.

6. An objection by a State which has signed but not ratified or accepted the Convention shall cease to have effect if, within a period of 12 months from the date of making its objection, the objecting state has not ratified or accepted the Convention.

ARTICLE XV

Notification of signatures, ratifications, acceptance and accessions

The Secretary General of the United Nations shall notify all signatory and acceding States, and all other states which so request, of all signatures, ratifications, acceptances and accessions of the present Convention and of the date on which the Convention comes into force and of every notification received by him under article XII or XIII.

In witness whereof the undersigned plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

Done at Geneva, this 7th day of November 1952, in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authentic, in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the United Nations. The Secretary General of the United Nations shall transmit certified copies thereof to all signatory and acceding states.

Certified true copy.

For the Secretary General:

C. S. STAVROPOULOS,
Principal Director in Charge of the
Legal Department.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the samples convention now before us is a relatively simple treaty of primary interest to the business community. Its purpose is to simplify regulations governing the admission of samples and advertising materials into the territory of the parties thereto.

In general, samples and advertising material of negligible value are to be admitted duty free, if they conform to certain standards. Samples of more than negligible value and advertising films are to be admitted duty free for a minimum period of 6 months provided,

however, that the importer deposits the necessary security which will be forfeited if these materials are not reexported within the stated period. Certain other import restrictions are to be waived in the case of samples and advertising materials, and the parties agree to keep to a minimum the customs formalities in connection with such items. The provisions of the convention are summarized in the committee's report.

For some years, international trade has suffered great inconvenience because of widely varying practices with respect to the treatment of samples sent abroad to promote sales. The suggestion that a convention be negotiated to alleviate such difficulties came from the International Chamber of Commerce. In consultation with interested private organizations and citizens in the United States, the pending convention was negotiated.

The committee has heard of no objections to the treaty. It has received numerous letters from chambers of commerce and similar organizations urging its approval.

The treaty is already in force for 17 nations that have ratified it. As one of the major trading nations in the world, it is clearly in the interest of the United States to make it possible for our citizens to share the advantages offered by this treaty. For this reason, the Committee on Foreign Relations voted to report the treaty favorably to the Senate, and urge the Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification thereof.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to concur in the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. This matter was gone into very thoroughly in the committee. Certain questions were raised. The committee was fully satisfied with the replies it received in response to those questions.

I urge an affirmative vote on the treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). If there is no objection, the convention will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages, up to the point of agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive Q, 83d Congress, 1st session, an International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material, dated at Geneva, November 7, 1952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the question of agreeing to the resolution of ratification, have they not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. CASE and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. CASE and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 76; nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—76

Alken	George	Monroney
Allott	Goldwater	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Mundt
Barkley	Hennings	Murray
Bender	Hill	Neely
Bennett	Holland	Neuberger
Bible	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Humphrey	Pastore
Bridges	Ives	Payne
Butler	Jackson	Potter
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Carlson	Kennedy	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Saltonstall
Clements	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Curtis	Langer	Stennis
Daniel	Lehman	Symington
Duff	Long	Thurmond
Dworshak	Magnuson	Thye
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Mansfield	Weiker
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young
Frear	McClellan	
Fulbright	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—20

Barrett	Gore	Millikin
Beall	Green	Schoeppel
Bush	Hickenlooper	Scott
Case, N. J.	Jenner	Smathers
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kilgore	Wiley
Douglas	McCarthy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas are 76, the nays none. Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, by request of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the ratification of the convention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will return to legislative session.

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of Senate Resolution 219, to investigate campaign expenditures and other activities, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 3183, better known as the farm bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, LOBBYING, AND CERTAIN OTHER ACTIVITIES AFFECTING THE SENATE OR ANY MEMBER THEREOF

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that there be laid before

the Senate the resolution coming over from the previous day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the resolution (S. Res. 219) to investigate campaign expenditures, lobbying, and certain other activities affecting the Senate or any Member thereof.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the resolution, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the minority leader, there has been called up the resolution to establish a special committee which will have broad authority to investigate any improper or illegal influence that may bear upon the Senate. The resolution represents the combined thinking of the leadership on both sides of the aisle. It comes to the Senate with the unanimous approval of both the majority and the minority policy committees. It has been carefully checked with the distinguished chairman of the present select committee and with other distinguished chairmen involved in the jurisdictional question. It is our hope that the investigation will have the active support and the full approval of the entire United States Senate.

Mr. President, the subject matter affects the Senate as a whole, and it is the Senate as a whole that must finally determine the response.

The form of the investigation can be stated simply. It would be conducted by an 8-member special committee, with membership equally divided between the 2 parties. The committee would have every power needed to investigate campaign contributions, lobbying, or any and all other activities or practices designed to influence the Senate improperly.

Mr. President, this is not intended to require a predetermination of impropriety or illegality before the committee can proceed to investigate any given matter. Such a determination might or might not follow the examination, in the judgment of the committee.

At the present time we are proposing that \$350,000 be provided to finance the work which is to be done. It was our understanding that the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections—and his subcommittee—agreed that the initial budget for the subcommittee alone should be \$300,000.

In view of the fact that the proposed special committee will consider matters under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and perhaps other committees, it was felt, after consultation, that \$350,000 should be provided.

Mr. President, it is our purpose to be unstinting in our efforts to guarantee to the Nation that every relevant fact is exposed to the broadest and brightest light of day.

The origin of the resolution, of course, lies in the incident which related to the Senate by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] on February

3. I should like to refresh the memory of my colleagues on the events which took place on that day.

On Friday evening, February 3, just before the debate was to close on the gas bill, the junior Senator from South Dakota told the Senate of an incident in which a man interested in the gas bill had proffered \$2,500 to his campaign fund.

The distinguished minority leader and the senior Senator from Texas recognized immediately the possible implications of that statement. We met within the hour with the junior Senator from South Dakota. Early Saturday morning we met again, and continued to meet most of that morning. We met again on Sunday.

We came to the conclusion, after consultation with many of our colleagues, including the Senator from South Dakota, that the incident was such as to warrant the creation of a select committee. This committee, we believed, should be divided equally between the members of the two parties and between the opponents and supporters of the bill, if that were possible. It seemed to us that these were the most rigid standards of fair play which we could apply to an incident that concerned the entire membership of the Senate.

At the very earliest opportunity on Monday, the majority leader asked the unanimous consent of the Senate for immediate consideration of the resolution creating the select committee. At the time the senior Senator from Texas stated that "if there are any other instances, involving any other Senators, and they will rise in their places and call attention to them, I shall be glad to have the episodes they relate included within the scope of this resolution."

At the time, however, there was only one set of allegations before the Senate, and it was my belief that they should be investigated as thoroughly, as expeditiously, as fairly, and as judiciously as might be possible.

At that time the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] arose and proposed an investigation of "campaign contributions by persons connected directly or indirectly with any interest opposing or favoring the passage of legislation touching on or involving the oil and gas industry of the United States."

That is a portion of an amendment which he offered to the resolution.

At that time, Mr. President, I stated to the Senator from Missouri and to the Senate that I had no objection to his request. I went further than that, Mr. President, and said:

I would be very glad to have the Senate consider the resolution of the Senator from Missouri, and I hope the Senate will grant the authority he seeks.

To my knowledge, this has never been published, and I repeat it only that those who seek the truth may have it. I asked only that the Senate first consider my resolution, because I felt it was the responsibility of the majority leader of this great deliberative body to see to it that the incidents related by the junior Senator from South Dakota were considered as soon, as quickly, and as fairly

as might be possible. Allegations had been made, and even though they were not criminal allegations, they had to be settled.

An objection prevented the immediate consideration of our resolution and the resolution offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

On the following day, as soon as the parliamentary situation permitted, and as I had announced I would on the previous day, I called up the resolution which bore my name and the name of the distinguished minority leader. The yeas and nays were requested, and the resolution was adopted by a vote of 90 to 0, which I interpreted as a clear and satisfactory expression of the opinion of the Senate.

The senior Senator from Missouri then asked unanimous consent himself that his resolution lie on the table. Consent was granted, and his resolution is on the table before us today.

Mr. President, in recommending the appointment of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who served for many years on the highest court of his State and for many years was chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and is the senior Member of this body, and in recommending the former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, now the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, it was the viewpoint of the senior Senator from Texas that he had selected from his side of the aisle men of maturity and seniority, who had the public interest at heart and had great concern, as demonstrated by their public acts, for the people of this Nation.

The investigation is still proceeding, but I believe authority was extended to it yesterday that it file its report by March 10.

It is the opinion of the majority leader that the committee has developed sufficient facts to indicate that a much broader inquiry should be undertaken.

Mr. President, those who are sponsoring the resolution which we have called up today are aware that there are two problems involved in the inquiry. The first is that we are going into an investigation of the rules which govern the selection and the conduct of the people's representatives in the greatest deliberative body in the world. Since this is a two-party Nation, it means that each party has an equal stake in the outcome.

The second is that investigation alone is not enough. It is one thing to expose any evil or wrongdoing which may exist; it is another, and a far more important thing, to write legislative safeguards against any evil or wrongdoing which may be found. It is essential to expose misconduct from any source, but our actions will be satisfying only if we move to correct any abuses that may exist.

Mr. President, I returned from my State this past weekend. On Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, I conferred with the minority leader. The legislative draftsmen had worked into the evening searching the precedents and examining the jurisdiction of some 5 or 6 committees of this body, and I think it is fair

to say that so far as the majority leader and the minority leader are concerned, they are trying to meet both of the problems head on. An investigation of Democrats by Republicans, or of Republicans by Democrats, would not serve the interests of this Nation.

The usual type of investigation is quite rightly conducted by committees which are divided according to the partisan division of the Senate, but when the rules of political life are under scrutiny, a bipartisan investigation is strongly indicated.

The subject matter of this investigation is necessarily broad. The genesis of the inquiry is an incident which intermingled both lobbying practices and campaign contributions. We cannot investigate one, Mr. President, without investigating all. For this reason the minority leader and I are in complete agreement that the legislative committees which may have jurisdiction over these subject matters should be represented on the special committee.

Historically the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections have jurisdiction over campaign contributions. The Government Operations Committee has jurisdiction over the Lobby Act. The Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over the Corrupt Practices Act. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has jurisdiction over the Taft-Hartley Act. The Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections has jurisdiction over election practices. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may have jurisdiction concerning other related laws. We must either request each committee to conduct independent investigations, or we must seek to combine the interests of each of the committees into one investigation. The dictates of efficiency and thoroughness, in my opinion, call for the latter course. On the basis of the facts that are revealed, such an investigating committee could make recommendations for legislation that should govern this Nation for many years to come.

Mr. President, I have complete confidence in my colleagues. I have served with most of them for many years, and I believe the integrity of the United States Senate is still intact. I think the overwhelming sentiment favors a truly searching and truly objective investigation of the circumstances which surround the Senate's activities, and I should like to appeal to my colleagues for their complete and positive support of this proposal.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join in complete concurrence with the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Texas, the majority leader, and to affirm and testify to the facts as he stated them on the floor as to the steps which were taken with regard to the existing select committee and the steps which have been taken since that committee was created.

I believe the resolution is necessary. I hope it will have the unanimous approval of the Senate. Certainly every Member of this body, on either side of the aisle, will want to know if anything

has been done improperly or illegally to affect the vote of any Member of the Senate. Certainly we want to know if there have been improper activities on the part of any lobbies, and of the necessity, if any, for changes in the so-called Lobbying Act.

We are not unmindful that under the Constitution the people retain the right to petition their Government. We are not unmindful that throughout the Nation there are fine organizations of citizens. They may be school boards; they may represent educational institutions; they may represent farm groups; they may represent labor organizations; they may represent business organizations; all of them having a proper job to do in bringing their views before Congress. No one would wish in any way to interfere with the right of petition and the right of the people to submit their legitimate views to the Senate and House of Representatives. Indeed, I doubt if constitutionally one could do so, even if he desired. But that, of course, is an entirely different consideration from that of improper or illegal activities.

It may well be that certain additional changes will be made in the election laws and several of the other statutes which have been cited by the majority leader. If that be so, the special committee will be free to make recommendations to the Senate.

I believe that in a matter of this kind, which vitally affects the Senate as an institution, it is fitting and proper that both parties in the Senate should be equally represented. Therefore, I hope there will be an overwhelming vote of approval of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the distinguished minority leader, because I desire to make a brief modification of the resolution.

In line 4, after the word "thereof", it is proposed to insert "or any candidate therefor."

To explain the modification very briefly, the minority leader and I think the resolution is clear as it is now drawn, but some Senators have raised the question that the committee would be authorized to investigate the subject of attempts improperly to influence Members of the Senate, but not of their opponents in a campaign.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My personal belief is that the term "political activities" is broad enough to cover the point raised by the Senator from Texas; but I would have no objection to clarifying the matter, as I understand it is the desire of a number of Senators to do, by having the words "or any candidate therefor" included.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I share the viewpoint of the distinguished minority leader, as does our counsel; but no harm can be done by including in the amendment, and it would satisfy some of our colleagues to have it embodied in the resolution. I think it should be made clear beyond the peradventure of a doubt that the special committee not only has

the authority to investigate any improper or illegal influencing of any Member of the Senate, but of any improper or illegal influencing of any candidate for election to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution is modified as indicated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, first, I wish to commend the Senator from Texas upon the way in which he has handled this matter. I support him strongly in the effort to establish a bipartisan committee.

I recall that when the matter involving the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] was before the Senate, a select committee, bipartisan in nature, was proposed. At that time I had a grave reservation about it; in fact, I did not favor it. It appeared on the surface that perhaps the creation of such a committee would result in delay; and for that and other reasons I was not in favor of it. But, contrary to my expectations, that committee functioned, under the able leadership of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], in an extremely fair manner. Its work was so well done that the entire Senate and the country accepted its decisions in good faith and with complete confidence. I consider that the result achieved by that committee is a good illustration of the effectiveness and wisdom of the suggestion now made by the Senator from Texas. I hope the Senate will support the pending resolution.

The matter which is proposed to be investigated is one that has plagued our Government for a long time. It is not new. Some years ago—in 1950, I believe it was—I introduced a joint resolution. Substantially the same resolution was reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on October 9, 1951. From the report I wish to read a sentence or two:

If the Congress should act by concurrent resolution, not only would full executive participation not be invited, but such action would lead to the inference that the executive branch is not willing to participate, a conclusion which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are unwilling to accept.

So I wish to suggest an amendment to the pending resolution in the same spirit in which this statement in the report was made. My resolution was in pursuance of my effort to have established a Commission on Ethics to study every type of activity the one which has now resulted in the new investigation, and in the demand made for it, in effect, by the President's veto message.

I think this is a very necessary undertaking. I believe the procedure which the Senator from Texas has followed is the only real, effective way to get at the situation so that it will not be considered as a partisan matter.

The same report to which I have referred had this to say:

The commission must deal with the basic dilemmas, pressures, and moral conflicts of present day life, that is, with causes and with fundamentals.

If the investigation is to be of any benefit, it must deal with the fundamentals. We all know there are many

rather hypocritical provisions in the election laws, and that we are placed in the position of having to accept assistance in running our campaigns, and then be subject to criticism for having accepted the assistance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the body of the report which accompanied Senate Joint Resolution 107 of the 82d Congress.

There being no objection, the report (No. 933, 82d Cong. 1st sess.) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) to establish a commission on ethics in the Federal Government for the purpose of "assisting in the establishment of higher moral standards in the official conduct of the executive and legislative branches of the Government," and the substitute joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) for substantially the same purpose, having held hearings and considered the same, report favorably the substitute resolution (S. J. Res. 107) printed below and recommend that the resolution do pass.

The purpose of the resolution is to establish a commission (1) to make a thorough study of the problem of morals and ethics in Government, (2) to recommend constructive measures which will assist in establishing and maintaining high moral standards, and (3) to report its findings and recommendations to the 83d Congress during the 1st session.

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE COMMITTEE

In hearings covering a period of 3 weeks, extensive testimony was taken from a broadly representative group of witnesses. The list of those who appeared is as follows:

"Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, United States Senator, Arkansas.

"Hon. William Benton, United States Senator, Connecticut.

"Hon. Robert Jackson, Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

"Hon. Learned Hand, United States Court of Appeals, Second Judicial Circuit.

"Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States.

"Hon. Harold L. Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior.

"Hon. Frederick J. Lawton, Director, Bureau of the Budget.

"Hon. CARL ALBERT, United States Representative, Oklahoma.

"Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT, United States Representative, Florida.

"Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING, United States Representative, New York.

"Hon. Robert Ramspeck, Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission.

"Hon. Wayne Coy, Federal Communications Commission.

"David Lillenthal, former Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

"Benjamin V. Cohen, attorney, former counsel in various Federal agencies.

"Joseph O'Connell, former Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.

"Jerry Voorhis, Director, Cooperative League of United States; former United States Representative, California.

"Edwin D. Canham, editor, Christian Science Monitor.

"Eugene Meyer, chairman, board of directors, Washington Post.

"Marquis Childs, journalist.

"Drew Pearson, journalist.

"Dr. Theodore M. Greene, professor of philosophy, Yale University.

"Rev. Wilfrid Parsons, S. J., professor of political science, Catholic University.

"Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, professor of applied Christianity, Union Theological Seminary.

"Rabbi Philip J. Bernstein, president, Central Conference of American Rabbis.

"Thurman Arnold, attorney, former Justice, United States Court of Appeals.

"Morris Ernst, attorney.

"D. A. Hulcy, president, United States Chamber of Commerce.

"Louis Brownlow, former director, Public Administration Clearing House.

"Dr. Paul Appleby, dean, Maxwell Graduate School, Syracuse University.

"Walter White, executive secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

"Dr. Jasper Shannon, University of Kentucky.

"Anna Lord Strauss, former president, National League of Women Voters.

"Benton J. Stong, National Farmers' Union.

"Frank H. Weltzel, Assistant to the Comptroller General of the United States.

"Michael Straight, publisher; national chairman, American Veterans' Committee."

Thus it may be seen that representatives of all three branches of Government were heard, as well as leaders in religion, political science, journalism, public affairs, and industry. In addition to the oral testimony, significant written statements were submitted to the subcommittee by Cabinet members, agency heads, and representatives of a wide variety of interested groups.

The heavy preponderance of the opinions expressed to the subcommittee was in favor of the proposal for a commission on ethics. Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, the author of Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, which was the basic proposal before the committee, and the sponsor also of the substitute joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107), in testifying said:

"I believe a commission of eminent citizens, free from prejudices and influences which surround public life, can make a real contribution to the task of improving the ethical standards of our national life and particularly our Government."

In his address to the Senate upon introduction of the resolution, Senator FULBRIGHT had stated:

"The Commission would evaluate the conditions which have been exposed, and drawing upon its combined wisdom would restate again, or formulate anew, principles which, it is to be hoped, would strengthen the faith of all decent men in our democratic society. * * *

"Further investigations, as instructive as they may be, are not nearly as important as an understanding of what has already been exposed and action to remedy the situation."

Many others supported this view.

The Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller of the United States, supported the creation of a commission on ethics in the following language:

"I believe consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 21 can do much to focus the attention of leaders in and out of Government on the problem. Important disclosures already have been made through public-spirited efforts of the Committees on Expenditures under Chairmen McCLELLAN and Dawson, the Hoey investigating committee, the Fulbright Subcommittee on the RFC, and the Kefauver Crime Committee, and through the Bonner hearings on surplus property and the Hardy investigation of the Maritime Commission. These non-partisan probes have informed and aroused our citizens. Constructive measures for strengthening the moral fiber of our Government must receive wholehearted public support."

The Honorable Frederick J. Lawton, Director of the Budget, lent his support to the creation of a commission in saying:

"I do not believe that any right-thinking citizen, particularly any person who has been in Government for any length of time, can

do anything but applaud the objectives of the resolution. * * *

"The purpose of this resolution is the reexamination and reevaluation of those standards which in part have been enacted into law, and in part have become a question of custom and practice in order to determine what is the best method of evaluating the moral standards and the ethical conduct of Government in its three branches. This technique of reexamination and reevaluation is a tried and proven one. It is the reason we have had a Hoover Commission in the field of Government organization. It is the reason that we have established a National Science Foundation in the field of physical research. It can serve the same useful purpose in the field of public morality."

Mr. Eugene Meyer, chairman of the board of directors of the Washington Post, was among the others who endorsed the Fulbright proposal for the creation of a Commission. He testified that:

"Obviously, it has always been important to have higher moral standards in the official conduct of the executive and legislative branches of the Government. But now that we have become in many ways the most powerful country in the world from a material point of view, it is more important than ever, in my opinion, that our strength in natural resources, in well educated manpower, in technological progress, and in production, should be matched by correspondingly high standards in the conduct of public affairs. Our very strength and leadership in the free world—and our responsibility, I may add—causes us to be examined with reference to our character as a Nation. If we do not match our material strength by our moral strength, our material strength will not alone be sufficient to win the battle of freedom."

Reactions of department and agency heads to the proposed Commission were somewhat varied. Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall wrote:

"I can see no objection to establishment of such a commission on ethics in the Federal Government, along the general lines proposed in Senate Concurrent Resolution 21. I should like to suggest that the success of the work of such Commission would depend very largely on the attitude taken by the Commission and by the witnesses who are called before it. A commission which develops a broad and helpful attitude toward the investigation would inspire considerable confidence and frankness on the part of the witnesses. Such a commission could do much to develop and consolidate the basic facts with respect to the proper conduct of Government officials and permit the development of a code of conduct which could be used as a yardstick for all officials of the Government."

"As now drafted, the resolution provides for the appointment of all members of the Commission from private life. It seems to me that it would be helpful to have on any such Commission representation from both private and public sources."

On the other hand, Secretary of Commerce, Charles Sawyer, in his letter to the subcommittee chairman, stated:

"I do not favor the establishment of any more commissions or agencies in the Federal Government. I am not one of those who believe that the solution of every problem lies in the organization of another alphabetical agency. I have opposed the establishment of new commissions and agencies in the executive branch and recently testified to the same effect with reference to a commission to be established by the Congress dealing with foreign aid."

A few others expressed similar doubts.

The committee agrees with the views expressed by most witnesses, that the establishment of such a commission is highly desirable.

WHY A BROADLY REPRESENTATIVE COMMISSION IS NEEDED

The ethical standards which govern public officials are of basic importance to the strength and unity of the Nation. A thorough study of the problem is needed at this time to recommend constructive measures, to increase public understanding of the problem, and to avoid the exaggeration and distortion which tend to occur in the absence of an impartial and authoritative appraisal. In these views the committee, as noted above, is supported by the great weight of testimony received from informed persons.

There is no doubt of public concern and responsibility for the problem. Satisfactory standards of conduct in public affairs are the products of much more than the official behavior of men in public office. The morals of the public are involved as well as the morals of public officials, and the moral tone of society at least partially determines the moral tone of government.

Since the public is so directly involved, and has become so interested, it should be strongly represented on the investigating commission. The resolution recommended for adoption provides for a commission of 15, with 9 members who are private citizens and 6 who are in public office or employment, including 2 Members of the Senate, 2 Members of the House of Representatives, and 2 administrators. All members should, of course, be persons of recognized integrity, judgment, and experience in public or civic affairs.

In addition to what is being done or may be done by committees of Congress, investigation by such a Commission is desirable because of the essential nature of the inquiry which is required. Practices and standards of the public, executive officials, and the Congress will be subject to criticism. A Commission representing all three groups will have a broader perspective, will be less subject to a charge of bias than a legislative committee, and can be forthright in pointing out improper standards, wherever found. Interpretation is needed, perhaps more than additional fact finding, and for this, the more broadly representative Commission is better qualified. The Commission will also have time to make a thorough study and to mature its recommendations (2 years if necessary), whereas committees of the Congress tend to work under great pressure.

The problem can be dealt with in part by legislation, and in part by Executive or administrative orders, but only in part. An important phase of the Commission's function is educational. Findings must commend themselves to the public as well as to the President and Congress. The broadly representative character of the Commission is intended to further this educational objective.

Although Senator FULBRIGHT's original proposal (S. Con. Res. 21) would have limited the Commission membership to persons not now in the Government, the committee believes that the principal objective of that aspect of the proposal can be attained by keeping the private citizens in a majority, as the recommended resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 107, provides. It is also clear that members with current Government experience can contribute important insights to the Commission's study.

WHY THE ACTION SHOULD BE BY JOINT RESOLUTION

The committee recommends that the Commission on Ethics in Government be established by joint resolution rather than by concurrent resolution. The standards of conduct of administrators as well as legislators and private citizens will be subject to review and criticism. The inquiry should be a joint inquiry, and the action recommended should be followed up on as wide a front as possible. If the Congress should

act by concurrent resolution, not only would full executive participation not be invited, but such action would lead to the inference that the executive branch is not willing to participate, a conclusion which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are unwilling to accept.

THE GOVERNMENT'S GOOD NAME AND THE PUBLIC'S GOOD NAME

The Government's good name and the public's good name are already at issue. They have been challenged, not by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, whose subcommittee directed their inquiry toward corrective measures, but by the findings of numerous committees of the Senate and House of Representatives in the course of specific investigations over a period of several years, by the normal processes of criminal prosecution, by the basketball and football "scandals," by increasingly unfavorable public comment on legislative as well as administrative conduct, and by charges in the press. Nothing less than a thorough investigation and appraisal of the situation can clear the air, and put substandard conduct, which already has been disclosed, in its proper perspective. The report of a wise and objective commission can be most helpful to the public and to officials alike. Failure to clear the air by such an inquiry would be most unfortunate. Rumor is more dangerous than reality.

A feature of American politics which has amazed foreign observers is willingness to indulge in open self-criticism. Although the intemperance of political controversy is frequently to be regretted, and there is disregard for the facts all too often in the heat of domestic disputes, there is no doubt that the vitality of critical faculties and traditions is a source (and also evidence) of strength in American life. People are not perfect, and institutions are not perfect, but imperfection is to be feared most in political institutions when governments lay claim to perfection and dare not permit public criticism. An official and objective inquiry into the ethical standards of public life is something which only a strong and free nation may undertake. The committee have no hesitation in recommending such an inquiry.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION AND ITS FUNCTION

The President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House, according to the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 107, will each appoint five members to the Commission on Ethics in Government. The President will appoint 3 from private life and 2 from within the administration. The Vice President will appoint 3 from private life and 2 from the Senate. The Speaker will appoint 3 from private life and 2 from the House of Representatives. Appointments from the Congress are required to be divided equally between the Democratic and Republican Parties. Some consultation among the appointing authorities to secure a representative selection of persons from private life is probably desirable. The members should be chosen for their personal ability to contribute to the work of the Commission, however, and should not serve as representatives of organized groups. The Commission should not be partisan in its inquiry; and the committee believe that this requirement should be and will be considered in making appointments.

The Commission is directed to report to the President and to Congress during the first session of the 83d Congress, but has 2 years from the date of its establishment in which to complete its work. This schedule will allow sufficient time for a thoroughness in inquiry and for reaching a considered judgment as to recommendations. It will also avoid entanglements in the 1952 elections.

The Commission is directed:

(1) To make a thorough and complete study and investigation of the moral standards of official conduct of officers and employees of the United States; the effect thereon of the moral standards in business and political activity of persons and groups doing business with the Government or seeking to influence public policy and administration; and, in relation thereto, the moral standards generally prevailing in society which condition the conduct of public affairs or which affect the strength and unity of the Nation.

(2) To make recommendations for the improvement and maintenance at a high level of the moral standards of official conduct of officers and employees of the United States and of all persons who participate in or are responsible for the conduct of public affairs.

In the testimony taken by the committee there was strong emphasis upon the need for a broad, rather than narrow, assignment for the Commission. It was insisted that the Commission must consider public morals broadly defined, insofar as they affect public affairs, as the ethical standards of officialdom. The Commission must deal with the basic dilemmas, pressures, and moral conflicts of present-day life, that is, with causes and with fundamentals. This should be its emphasis rather than individual failures, large or small, if it is to be successful in recommending corrective and preventive action.

The subcommittee which conducted the hearings on this resolution has prepared a much fuller report on Senator FULBRIGHT's proposal of an ethics commission and on many other related questions for the use of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee and for the information of the Senate. The fundamental character and the very number of the proposals submitted to the subcommittee and summarized in its report indicate that a significant agenda is ready for the study and action of the Commission on Ethics.

UNTAPPED MORAL RESOURCES

The fact that a study of ethics in government is needed is not grounds for pessimism or cynicism. The very healthy trait of self-criticism which we have noted as characteristic of American life, must be salted with objectivity and fairness. The tendency to assume that because some men are moved chiefly by thought of personal advantage and nearly all are strongly influenced by economic motives, therefore, no other forces are effective, is as dangerous as naive confidence in automatic progress. The committee are convinced that among the greatest assets of American life are its moral resources which, if understood, conserved, and developed, can give the Nation unprecedented moral force and vitality, not only for its own benefit but for the benefit of the world.

The full text of the recommended resolution is as follows:

"[S. J. Res. 107, 82d Cong., 1st sess.]

"Joint resolution to establish a Commission on ethics in Government

"Resolved, etc.—

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to strengthen the faith and confidence of the American people in their Government by assisting in the establishment and maintenance of high moral standards in the official conduct of officers and employees of the Government.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT

"SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1, there is hereby established a Commission to be known as the Commission on Ethics in Government (hereinafter referred to as the Commission).

"MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of 15 members as follows:

"(1) Five appointed by the President of the United States, of whom one shall be an employee of the United States holding a position not above grade GS-16, or equivalent grade, and one shall be an officer or employee of the United States holding a position above such grade;

"(2) Five appointed by the President of the Senate, of whom two shall be Members of the Senate; and

"(3) Five appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, of whom two shall be Members of the House.

"(b) Of the Members of the Senate appointed under subsection (a) (2) and the Members of the House appointed under subsection (a) (3), not more than one such Member in each instance shall be from the same political party. Except as provided in subsection (a), all members of the Commission shall be appointed from private life.

"(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(d) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

"(e) A quorum of the Commission shall consist of eight members, except that the Commission may establish a lower number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

"DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission—

"(1) To make a thorough and complete study and investigation of the moral standards of official conduct of officers and employees of the United States; the effect thereon of the moral standards in business and political activity of persons and groups doing business with the Government or seeking to influence public policy and administration; and, in relation thereto, the moral standards generally prevailing in society which condition the conduct of public affairs or which affect the strength and unity of the Nation.

"(2) To make recommendations for the improvement and maintenance at a high level, of the moral standards of official conduct of officers and employees of the United States and of all persons who participate in or are responsible for the conduct of public affairs.

"(b) The Commission shall, from time to time during the 1st session of the 83d Congress, report the results of its study and investigation and submit its recommendation to the President and the Congress and shall submit a final report not later than 2 years after the appointment of all members of the Commission.

"POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 5. (a) The Commission may, in carrying out this joint resolution, sit and act at such times and places, hold such hearings, take such testimony, require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, administer such oaths, have such printing and binding done, and make such expenditures as the Commission deems advisable. Subpoenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman or any member of the Commission designated by him and shall be served by any person designated by the Chairman or any such member. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission.

"(b) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems necessary, but

the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation for comparable duties prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 6. (a) The members of the Commission who are Members of the Congress shall serve without additional compensation. The members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without additional compensation, but shall continue to receive the salary of their regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. All other members of the Commission shall receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(b) All members of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution.

"EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 8. The Commission shall cease to exist 30 days after the submission of its final report."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished and very able chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency showed the majority leader his proposed amendment before the resolution was laid before the Senate. I have conferred with the coauthor of the resolution, the distinguished minority leader, and we both think the suggestion made by the Senator from Arkansas is a constructive one. We are delighted to have the resolution amended accordingly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Texas. With that change, I think the resolution should be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Arkansas send his amendment to the desk, so that it may be stated?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The CHIEF CLERK. Following the modification of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, it is proposed to insert: "or any officer or employee of the executive branch of the Government."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no doubt that the resolution will be agreed to. As it has been written, it has the full support of the leadership, both of the majority party and the minority party. I believe also that the resolution has been passed upon by the policy committees of the two parties. So I am not deluding myself thinking that the resolution can be defeated. I am certain that when the vote is taken, there will be very few neg-

ative votes, because the other Members of the Senate, like myself, understand the necessity for and are desirous of having a thorough, exhaustive investigation of the charges of corruption, both to establish whatever instances of corruption have taken place, and also to obtain information which will result in the consideration and enactment of more adequate election laws.

But the Senate now has a readymade subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration, a subcommittee in which every Senator has always had and today has full confidence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator if he desires additional time. Since the hour of 2 o'clock has arrived, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour be extended until the conclusion of consideration of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

So far as the enactment of other legislation is concerned, whatever bills are submitted, whether they be submitted by the proposed special committee or by any Member of the Senate, would still have to go to the appropriate standing committees for their consideration and report, and then to the Senate. The proposed special committee would not be called upon to report until January 31, 1957. Mr. President, this is an urgent matter. We cannot wait until January 31, 1957.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The legislative record of this matter is very clear. As shown by the discussion of the distinguished majority leader of yesterday, the special committee would have full authority to make reports to the Senate from time to time. The date of January 31, 1957, is merely the terminal date of the special committee.

I want to say to the distinguished Senator from New York that he is no less interested in having a complete and full investigation than is the senior Senator from California, who happens to be the minority leader, or the senior Senator from Texas, who is the majority leader of this body. There is going to be a full and complete investigation of all phases of this problem, which is confronting the Senate of the United States and the country.

I hope the Senator's implication is not that there is any desire or any interest on the part of any Senator, certainly not of the authors of the resolution, to postpone any action to January of next year, beyond the election date. To the contrary, I want the special committee to get all the facts. In the judgment of the committee, when it feels it has facts which should be reported to the Senate of the United States, its reports to this body will be welcome.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from California that

section 3 of the resolution reads as follows:

The special committee shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1957.

I know full well, as every other Member of the Senate knows, that a committee may report at any time, when it considers it to be in the interest of the Senate to file a report; but there is no mandate in the resolution that the committee shall report until January 31, 1957, and that is what I was referring to.

Mr. President, this whole matter was injected into the deliberations of the Senate by reason of the statements made by the action of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] when he related certain facts which had come to his attention, and which to some extent involved him. At the time the natural-gas bill was under consideration, I urged that the bill be not passed at that time, because I felt that the measure itself and also the Senate of the United States were under a cloud—a cloud that should be dissipated before final action was taken.

I brought that argument up at the time the motion to recommit was before the Senate. I brought it up during the final consideration of the bill.

Mr. President, the President of the United States, in his message vetoing the natural-gas bill, H. R. 6645, after expressing regret that he could not sign the bill, although he was in accord with its basic objectives, said the following:

Since the passage of this bill, a body of evidence has accumulated indicating that private persons, apparently representing only a very small segment of a great and vital industry, have been seeking to further their own interests by highly questionable activities. These include efforts that I deem to be so arrogant and so much in defiance of acceptable standards of propriety as to risk creating doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes.

Mr. President, that is not my language; that is the language of the President of the United States. I think we are justified in, and are under the necessity of, giving careful consideration to that statement in the veto message.

The creation of a new special committee will raise new doubts and questions, at least, in my opinion, and in the minds of the people. It will not in any way allay the suspicions or doubts which have been created by the present situation. The situation should be resolved. I am talking now about the oil lobby, which was so much in evidence and so clearly referred to in the President's message. It should be investigated and considered before any other aspect of this whole subject is brought up.

In my opinion, the creation of a new committee—and I know one will be created by the Senate this afternoon, and I shall vote for it, because I am not willing to vote against any proposal to investigate the acts of any Member of the Senate or of any private citizen who may wish to bring pressure to bear on the Senate—is unwise; it is bad government, in my opinion. It will not satisfy the people, and I believe it will only intensify doubts.

Mr. President, I wonder if I may address a question to the distinguished majority leader on this subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may address a question to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have already described the situation which was created in connection with alleged pressures, possibly alleged bribes, possibly other alleged illegal acts, in connection with the natural-gas bill. That is the matter which has brought up this whole discussion.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Texas whether he will agree to write into the resolution a direction to the Special Committee, if created, that the very first order of business before that committee shall be to investigate the subject of attempts in the case of the natural-gas bill to influence improperly or illegally the Senate or any Member thereof, through campaign contributions, political activities, lobbying, and other activities and practices of the oil lobby.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have great confidence in the membership of this body and the committee that will be set up. I do not seek, Mr. President, to direct that committee as to the organizations or individuals or subjects it shall consider at its initial meeting. I believe the membership of the committee will be composed of Senators of the highest integrity who are highly trusted by their colleagues.

I have no objection whatever to the Senator from New York himself offering any amendment he may care to offer; but the resolution appears as it is after days and nights of draftsmanship, after discussing it with the minority—and there are some 40 members on their policy committee—with the majority, with the nine members of our policy committee, and after reviewing the resolution carefully word by word, line by line, after considering every comma, semicolon, and period, after discussing it with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections [Mr. GORE], after going over it yesterday morning for an hour or so with the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], and we all felt we had a resolution under which a committee could do the job the Senate wanted done.

If the resolution is unacceptable to the Senator from New York, he is perfectly within his rights if he offers an amendment. Although it is becoming popular here, of late, to accept amendments. I do not think the Senator from Texas wants to start a practice of accepting such an amendment as this one, containing directions to a committee which has not yet been named.

I believe that the chairman of the committee and the membership of the committee will be glad to hear any evidence the Senator from New York may produce; and they can determine what they should consider first and what they should consider last. As a matter of fact, I think they will be an honest and

as honorable as any other Members of this body.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Texas that certainly I have no question regarding the members of the committee, when they are appointed—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then why cannot we trust them to proceed with their deliberations?

Mr. LEHMAN. Any more than I have regarding the other Members of the Senate. But I hope the Senator from Texas will not take offense when I say the committee will be a hand-selected committee, and will displace a legally constituted subcommittee of a standing committee. I do not believe that will satisfy the people of the United States; I believe that the doubts and suspicions regarding what has happened will continue.

I have made the suggestion to the distinguished Senator from Texas. Of course, obviously there is no object at all—

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have the floor; and when the Senator from New York reaches the end of the sentence he has begun, I wish to express my resentment at his implication.

Mr. LEHMAN. There is no object at all in offering an amendment of the character of the one I have suggested that the Senator from Texas accept, because I know, of course, what the outcome of the consideration by the Senate of that amendment would be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in reply to what the Senator from New York has said, I wish to say that apparently he has an amendment which he wishes some other Senator to offer for him. The Senator from New York has a right to offer the amendment. If he chooses to offer it, it can be acted on promptly by the Senate.

Every committee of this body is, in a measure, a hand-picked committee; the committees are selected by the chairman of the Steering Committees, who happen to be the majority leader, for one side, and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], for the other side. The tradition of this body has always been that the committees are selected upon the nominations of the respective leaders.

When the present Congress was organized under the present Vice President, I said to him that if he chose to ask the then minority leader for recommendations from this side of the aisle, I would be glad to submit them, after consultation with my colleagues on the Democratic side, and if he did not desire to follow those recommendations, the first one he failed to follow would be the last one I would make. I must say, in paying my respects to the Vice President, that every recommendation the Democratic leader has made has been followed since the Vice President took office.

Let me say to the Senator from New York that I have no doubt that the oil lobby will be thoroughly investigated. I do not know whether the investigation of it will begin on the first Monday when

the committee meets or on the following Tuesday.

I can also assure the Senator from New York that many Senators want other lobbies investigated. I believe that the Members selected for the committee will do their jobs in their own way, according to their best judgment; and I am hopeful that the job they do will meet with the approval of all fair-minded, patriotic, nonpolitical Senators.

Mr. LEHMAN. I want all lobbies investigated, but I think the oil lobby should be the first one to be investigated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am perfectly willing to have the oil lobby investigated, or I would not be submitting the resolution; and the other day I was perfectly willing to have the oil lobby investigated.

When the resolution to investigate the oil industry was submitted, the Senator from Texas said, "I will not object. I hope the Senate will accept the resolution."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from New York, if the Senator from Texas will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the Senator from New York this question: Does he, himself, have any knowledge or any information regarding any lobby or any unfair advantage which anyone took or attempted to take in connection with the vote on the natural gas bill?

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Indiana that I have no knowledge of the offering of any bribe. I have submitted to the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration certain facts which developed in the State of New York and came to my attention. Whether they constitute corruption, I do not know; and I made no charges.

Mr. CAPEHART. My question was whether the Senator from New York of his own knowledge knows of any corruption or any bribe offering or any illegal activities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, that is the purpose of the committee. So I wish to ask for the regular order, if the Senator from Indiana will indulge me.

Mr. CAPEHART. I merely wondered whether the Senator from New York had any knowledge of his own about such matters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from New York has said he will support the resolution, and has made his statement. So I should like to ask for the regular order.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from New York said he wanted the oil lobby investigated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is going to be investigated.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wanted to know whether the Senator from New York had any knowledge on his own part.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to answer the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thought the Senator from New York had answered.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think I have. I simply refer the Senator from Indiana to the message of the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is before the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the distinguished majority leader: While the resolution, of course, covers a much greater area than did the one involved in the recent controversy, I find no objection to that. But it occurs to me that the resolution itself should perhaps include words which would justify or even require the filing of temporary reports prior to this year's elections, in the event that any such reports should prove to be needed to take care of situations and charges which might arise.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has asked a very pertinent question. It has been considered and discussed. The counsel of the Legislative Drafting Service has prepared the resolution; and the question has been raised here by the Senator from New York, and it was raised yesterday.

On yesterday the majority leader said, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 3030.

I should like to say only a few words at this time. The question has been asked whether or not the January 31, 1957, date means that will be the earliest date of any report.

I may say that I talked with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections; and we had discussed the same question, too.

I read further from yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The date on which the committee will expire, unless extended, will be January 31, 1957.

It is anticipated, contemplated, and hoped that the committee can organize as soon as the present select committee makes its report—

That is, March the 10th—

and proceed diligently, on a full-time basis, to make its investigation and studies, and from time to time, and certainly during this session, file interim reports and make recommendations, and perhaps cause to be introduced for consideration proposed legislation.

That is the intention. I ask the majority leader whether he will confirm it, if it is his opinion. But that is the intention of the majority leader and the minority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, who reviewed it, when the question was raised; and that opinion is supported by the counsel who prepared the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will permit me to say a word at this point—

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say that I fully concur in the statement the ma-

jority leader has made. I believe that January 31, 1957, is the termination date of the committee, unless otherwise extended; and I believe that the committee will have ample authority to make reports in its discretion at such times as it may determine, starting after its organization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to say that the same question was brought up when the select committee on the McCarthy matter was created. I think the distinguished Senator from Minnesota discussed at some length the question of when the reports would be made, and the circumstances.

I merely wish to emphasize, so that the legislative history may be clear, that the January 1957 date is a termination date, unless extended by the Senate. It is hoped by the authors of the resolution—and I trust by every other Member of the Senate who supports or opposes it—that the committee will proceed expeditiously and diligently, and that when it is prepared to file a report with the Senate on any subject or person, or any piece of legislation, it will do so in the form of an interim report. It was necessary that there be a cutoff date. The cutoff date with respect to the select committee was March 1. The cutoff date for this committee is January 31, 1957, because we felt that after the election there might be some matters upon which the committee might wish to report.

Mr. HOLLAND. I very much appreciate the reassuring statements made by the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader.

It occurs to me—and I am sure it has occurred to every other Senator—that this may prove to be a handmade vehicle for possible misuse by those who would seek to besmirch a Senator who is necessarily running, because of the expiration of his term, in this year's primaries and elections.

So long as the actual legislative record shows clearly that not only would the committee not be volunteering something that was not intended, but that instead, it is the opinion of the Senate at the time it is considering this resolution that in such a case the committee would and should go as quickly as possible to the bottom of any such charges, the situation becomes clear. If the charges are false, the committee can issue a statement to that effect, without being placed in the position of having volunteered something ahead of time. If the charges are not false, the committee can regretfully and clearly state what the facts are. I think the legislative record should clearly show—and I believe it will now show clearly—that no limitation is to be placed upon the duty of this committee to act speedily and effectively upon charges which are brought before it; and that that duty applies with particular strength in the case of charges brought against Senators who may be candidates for reelection this year. I believe that such charges should be handled as speedily as may be consonant with obtaining and announcing the facts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the majority leader entirely agrees

with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized no one except the Senator from Florida.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am seeking recognition so that I may yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the distinguished Senator from Washington wish me to yield to him?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wish to express agreement with what the Senator from Florida has said. If what he says were not true, and if the appropriate legislative record were not made at this point, surely availability for membership on this committee would be limited to 66 Members of the Senate instead of 96.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. For that reason, when the resolution was presented yesterday, particular attention was called to this specific point, so that it would be a part of the legislative history.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my question to the majority leader concerning this resolution is one which involves the basic matter of jurisdiction. In order that the RECORD may be entirely clear, it is my understanding that during the coming election the responsibilities of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration will not be superseded by those of the special committee. In other words, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections will still have the right to review election practices and procedures which are being followed, will it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that is a fair interpretation. I have discussed the question with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections; and it is the opinion of the Senator from Texas that if the Senate were to approve this resolution it would perhaps expect the special committee to take precedence and proceed diligently. If there were a conflict between the two committees on a certain day or at a certain hour, it would be hoped that the committees could resolve the conflict.

We are not seeking by this resolution—and we did not seek in two similar resolutions in the previous Congress—to abolish or circumvent the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration, or the Committee on Rules and Administration itself. All of them have jurisdiction of a kind. We hope that on this general subject representatives from this body who have interests and knowledge in this particular field will diligently apply themselves and make recommendations to the Senate, which, in turn, can implement such recommendations with remedial legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is equally true, is it not, that the special committee will

not possess what we call legislative jurisdiction? It will have powers of recommendation, advice, and counsel; but when it comes to the question of modernizing Federal election laws or improving and strengthening the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, the Federal Lobby Regulation Act, the Taft-Hartley law, or whatever other law may be involved, the responsibility will still rest with the duly established committees under the Reorganization Act of 1946—namely, the Subcommittee on Reorganization with relation to the Lobbying Act; the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as related to the Taft-Hartley Act; the Committee on the Judiciary, as related to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and so forth. Am I correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the opinion of the majority leader, and that is the opinion he has expressed to the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the chairman of the subcommittee under the Lobbying Act, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and other Senators with whom he has discussed this subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am asking these questions so that whatever private conversations may have been held with responsible leaders of the committees and subcommittee chairmen will now become a matter of public record.

I ask these questions because I do not think it is fair to infer that as a result of the approval of this resolution any committee is to be bypassed or any subject covered up. I think we would be doing a disservice to this body if we so indicated.

The majority leader and the minority leader are to be complimented for drafting this particular proposal. The first I heard of it was yesterday. The first time I held a copy of it in my hand was within the past 2 hours. I have read its language. I point out that section 3 is just about as all-encompassing and comprehensive a provision as we could hope to draft. If anyone could suggest a larger structure in which to house an investigation, he would indeed be an amazing architect and engineer.

Under the provisions of the resolution, any lobby can be investigated. Amendments could be considered with respect to any law which pertains to Federal elections, and revisions could be perfected and suggested. I am sure it will be clearly understood that there is to be no restriction in terms of investigation of lobbying activities. I, for one, want the oil lobby investigated. I can hear someone else say he wants the labor lobby investigated. I think we should be very frank. There is no doubt as to what will happen. Every activity will be subject to an airing. There will be an opportunity to ventilate the activities of everyone. Anyone or any organization engaged in lobbying or contributing to candidates or political parties may be investigated. There is general and specific authority in this resolution for a thorough inquiry, study, and examination of election practices and lobbying.

We should be perfectly clear as to what we are doing. We are authorizing a special or select committee to go into a very difficult, sensitive, and all-important subject; and the Members who are to serve on this committee will have a responsibility second to none. It is the same kind of responsibility which other men have had to assume, under equally controversial conditions and during equally difficult times in the past. I only hope that the job will be done judiciously, temperately, thoroughly, carefully, and objectively.

Let me say to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] that this committee will undertake a great responsibility, in particular with respect to the coming elections. No committee of this Congress should be used to besmirch friend or foe, candidate or incumbent; but any committee of the Congress should be required to dig out the facts. If charges are made, they should receive priority treatment before the select committee or any subcommittee. The committee should go to the bottom of such charges, and not leave them dangling in mid-air.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the concurrence of the Senator from Minnesota in the thought I had previously expressed. As I listened to the debate a while ago, there came to my mind the fact that in my State, entries for the primary began to be made yesterday. I understand that my distinguished colleague entered his name for reelection. I believe he is as "clean as a hound's tooth," and can stand investigation from any and every source and quarter.

However, early in May will come the first primary, and if he has opposition and has to have a second primary, that likewise will come in May.

It is very clear in that case—and I am sure in other States as well—that it will be essential that the committee give priority and preferential handling to matters that arise which have such early time limits as the ones I have described.

I believe the RECORD now shows very clearly that the Senate intends that the special committee should give such priority and preferential treatment, from the point of time, as may be necessary to explore thoroughly but quickly any charge that may be made against one who is a candidate at this time, so that announcement of the findings may come, not at the last moment, when it might be too late to correct a false impression that had been given, but at such time as to do justice, not only to the man now running for reelection, but to his opponents as well.

I believe that the RECORD will now show that we intend—and certainly the Senator from Florida in voting for this measure and in giving it his support intends to make it thoroughly clear—that we expect the special committee to give priority and preferential treatment to charges that involve Senators standing for reelection whose primary or election comes at a very short period in the future, so that the matter can be determined and publicly announced in time to get full circulation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that he reassures me by his statement and that his observations give me great strength. I am sure his statements are also deeply appreciated by the minority leader, as they are by me.

I have no doubt that the committee that will be appointed under the terms of the resolution, if the resolution is adopted, will reflect great credit on the Senate and will conduct itself in a manner that will be thoroughly approved by the Senate.

I now yield again to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I had not intended to speak on this subject at all, but I have been very much disturbed by the cloud of uncertainty and distrust which has been thrown over the Senate.

I should like to observe that I do not believe either political party is without sin, or that either political party is a repository of all virtue or wisdom.

The Senator from Texas and the minority leader have acted with dispatch, vigor, and determination. I wish to commend them for moving into this situation and coming forth with an effective program. The only way we can objectively, wholeheartedly, enthusiastically, and determinedly investigate lobbying and corrupt practices, indiscretions, evil doing, and violations of law in an election year—and that is what we are faced with—is a bipartisan committee such as this. Let us face the fact and not try to kid ourselves. Otherwise we will be confronted with confusion compounded and a political madhouse.

We have an obligation to the citizens of this country. We must remember that the election laws are inadequate, antiquated, and very much need revision. That is true of all cognate laws. Everyone who has ever campaigned knows that those laws need complete revision. Every Senator knows of the very powerful lobbies which are at work, and many of us are becoming sick and tired of them. They ought to be investigated. Outmoded election and lobbying laws should be rewritten, so that there will be greater responsibility in Congress and greater respect by the people for Congress. I submit the only way it can be done is in the way in which we are proceeding today. No authority is denied to any standing committee, but new authority is added to the Senate to get this job done like gentlemen and men, and not like partisans. That is the way we ought to do it. The Senate will by this resolution give a mandate—a directive—to proceed forthwith.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana. Then I shall yield to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota asked some questions which I had expected to propound. I express the hope that the special committee will in no way supersede the regularly appointed Privileges and Elections Subcommittee of the Rules Committee. It was my privilege to serve

on an elections subcommittee, and that subcommittee performed some valuable work.

Are we to understand that it is not the intention of the Senate that the special committee shall supersede the regularly appointed Elections Subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I reaffirm the Senator's understanding in that regard.

I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the distinguished majority leader. Last week, a political newspaper which calls itself the Non-Partisan Leader, published at Bismarck, N. Dak., carried this headline concerning the junior Senator from North Dakota, "Young Sells Out Again."

The subheadline reads, "CASE Bribe Recalls \$5,000 MILTON YOUNG Got From Dutchman."

I should like to ask whether the special committee will have authority to investigate a matter of this kind. If it will have such authority, I should like to have this vicious charge made the first item of business before the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not wish to set myself up as an authority on what the committee will do. However, I believe if the Senator will make available to the committee that matter, or any other question he may have, that under the political activities phrase of the resolution perhaps the committee in its wisdom would take up such a matter.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to get a promise at this time that as soon as the committee organizes the matter to which I have referred will be the first one this committee will investigate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] suggested an item that the committee should undertake first. I believe the question of precedence is one the committee would have to determine itself. Neither the minority leader nor the majority leader would endeavor to prevent the committee from taking any course it might desire to take.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Texas a question, although I do not wish to keep him on his feet too long.

For 20 years, beginning about 1926, until 1946, when the Congressional Reorganization Act was passed; every 2 years in a congressional and senatorial election year, the Senate appointed a special committee to investigate campaign practices and contributions or anything of that kind pertaining to the right of a Senator to take his seat.

After the Reorganization Act of 1946 was passed, no such special committee was appointed. However, the Committee on Rules and Administration took over jurisdiction which had theretofore been exercised by the special committees.

In this instance the special committee will have the mandate of the whole Senate behind it for whatever it sees fit to do, not only from a nonpartisan standpoint, but from the standpoint of the authority of the Senate, in looking into such matters.

I congratulate the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California and all other Senators who have had anything to do with the formulation of this program.

I suppose it is not impossible to anticipate that anything developed in an investigation which might involve the right of a Senator-elect, when he comes here, after the election in November, to claim his seat, might bring in question his right to the seat.

My question is whether the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections would still have jurisdiction to determine and report to the Senate whether such man had a right to take his seat.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the opinion of the majority leader, which he believes is strengthened by the observations of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who has had such wide experience. I might say I believe that to be also the opinion of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], because I have previously discussed this matter with him.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May the Record show that the Senator from Tennessee agrees?

Mr. GORE. That is my interpretation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am no match for the Senator from Kentucky when it comes to anything, particularly humor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator will not confine my ability to humor. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not. But the incident I am about to relate refers to humor. Let me say that I have made no commitments to any Senator. I think it is generally known that several Senators have been unusually diligent in this field and have manifested an interest and have exercised some authority. We might conceivably be confronted with a situation where the chairman of one committee would be writing a member of another committee, and be writing memorandums to himself. In other words, the Senator from Tennessee is chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, and if I can prevail upon him, he will be assigned to the special committee, and he could be writing a memorandum to himself. But I do not think there will be any great conflict. We have at least understood that the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, or any other committee which may be involved, are giving up none of their authority in their particular fields, but the special committee will proceed, as a result of the so-called CASE incident, in the general public interest, to try to avoid conflicts with the other committees, and not go in different directions.

Mr. BARKLEY. If anything should develop from this particular investigation which would cast some reflection upon the right of any Senator who may

come to the Senate as the result of the next election, the standing committee having jurisdiction of the subject would not be deprived of its jurisdiction.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the feeling of the majority leader and of the minority leader.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield in order that I may ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from New York for the purpose of his asking a question of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before the Senator from New York asks his question, I should like to point out that the Senate has approved the normal \$50,000, which year in and year out the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee has had, to enable it to conduct its normal operations relative to the elections in 1956.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall read to the Senate the first paragraph of Senate Resolution 219:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a Special Committee which is authorized and directed to investigate the subject of attempts to influence improperly or illegally the Senate or any Member thereof, through campaign contributions, political activities, lobbying, or any and all other activities or practices.

I ask the Senator from Tennessee if there is any function provided for in that paragraph, which is the one which establishes the special committee and prescribes its authority, that could not be carried out by the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the original statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas as to the extent of the investigative authority which would be conferred upon the special committee created as a result of this resolution. Whether that authority is on all fours with all the powers and jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections is a different matter. The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections is spelled out in the rules of the Senate. It refers to presidential elections and to some matters not covered in this particular resolution, in my opinion; but I concur in the statement of the senior Senator from Texas that the language of the resolution is sufficiently broad to permit the committee to examine into political activities, into campaign contributions, into lobbying for the purpose of influencing votes in the Senate, or improperly or illegally to influence legislation. The Senator from Texas has gone further and said it was not intended to require a predetermination on the part of the special committee that the activities to be investigated are improper or illegal. He has said that it is presumed that, after the committee makes its examination, it may or may not, in its wisdom, deter-

mine that such activity as has been investigated is improper or illegal.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the Senator from Tennessee has misunderstood my question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, in my prepared statement, with which the Senator is familiar, after receiving the opinions of the Parliamentarian, the Legislative Counsel, and the Democratic policy committee counsel, I made this statement:

For this reason, the minority leader and I are in complete agreement that the legislative committees which have jurisdiction over these subjects should be represented.

Historically, the Senate Rules Committee, and its Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, has jurisdiction over campaign contributions. The Government Operations Committee has jurisdiction over the Lobby Act. The Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

We must either request each committee to conduct independent investigations or we must seek to combine the interests of each of the committees into one investigation. The dictates of efficiency and thoroughness, in my opinion, call for the latter course.

I assume that is the question which the Senator from New York is asking.

Mr. LEHMAN. No. Let me propound my question, because I am afraid the Senator from Tennessee may have misunderstood my inquiry. My question is whether there are any investigatory powers given to the special committee—and I emphasize the words “investigatory powers”—which are not inherent in the powers of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee.

Mr. GORE. I believe so. I believe the investigatory powers which would be conveyed to the special committee by the pending resolution are considerably broader than is the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. For instance, the subject of lobbying would come clearly under the jurisdiction of the Government Operations Committee. The subject of elections and corrupt practices would come clearly under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. As I understand the terms of the resolution, they cover a merging of those authorities, and give a mandate to the special committee to make a thorough investigation.

I had not intended to take part in the debate, but since I have been called upon, I may say that it is my earnest hope that the principal purpose and aim of the study will be corrective rather than punitive. The future is more important than is the past. As I envision the procedure, the disclosure of existing conditions is a necessary foundation for corrective action. When we understand the problem we face, and when the American people understand what those of us who seek to make a career of public service must contend with, I believe there will be sympathetic understanding and a basis for corrective action. I think the special committee will have greater jurisdiction and authority than has the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may

yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the able Senator from Tennessee agree with me that it will be far more difficult for anyone under investigation on any phase of the resolution to raise a question about the jurisdiction of the special committee than to raise such a question as to his subcommittee?

Mr. GORE. I think it would be far more difficult, in view of the record as to the legislative intent which has been made on the floor by the statements of both of the coauthors of the resolution. I think it would be almost impossible for a witness to raise a question of jurisdiction.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Whereas, if the Senator's Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, alone, were undertaking to cover the entire field, is it not true that the subcommittee most likely would meet with many challenges to its jurisdiction?

Mr. GORE. That is very probable.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to congratulate the majority leader and the minority leader on the resolution. I shall vote for it.

But I am a candidate for reelection. I welcome contributions. I hope my friends will not forget me.

I wish to say also that if any of my friends otherwise offer me any contributions by means of which they try to bribe me or to get me to vote for any specific legislation, they and I will settle the matter; we will not bother the Senate with it. I will take care of the matter myself.

I welcome also the help and assistance of all lobbyists. I welcome the assistance of anyone who can help me to make up my mind on the merits of any proposed legislation. I want people to write to me. I want them to come to see me whenever they are in Washington. That goes for the labor organizations, the farm organizations, the gas organizations, the sugar organizations, and all the rest of them, because they have been very, very helpful to me, as I know they have been to other Senators.

I hope what the Senate does today will not discourage the American people from contributing to their favorite candidates for Senator, Representatives, and Governor; and that it will not discourage the American people from coming to Washington and expressing their thoughts and ideas to their Senators and Representatives, because we in Congress today deal with every phase of everyone's life.

The Government is spending about \$65 billion a year. The Government has both hands in the pockets of the people. The Government is running just about everything that has to do with the lives of the American people.

So the people have to come to Washington to talk with us. They have to do it in order to protect themselves. If they do not, only the Lord knows what

the Government in Washington might do to them in the way of taxation and otherwise. So we as their representatives in Congress must know their views in order to protect them from their own Government.

I am about to sit down. But before I do, I express the hope that my friends will not forget me. I assure that fellow who may try to bribe me that he and I will settle the matter ourselves.

I welcome all lobbyists, I welcome everyone in the United States who thinks he might like to talk to me, either for or against any piece of proposed legislation, to come and see me, or write, or wire me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire the floor in my own right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, is the Senate operating under the 2-minute rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is not operating under the 2-minute rule.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not like the resolution we are discussing. Time and again upon the Senate floor I have made a plea for the direct election of the President and Vice President by the people of the United States, in the same way in which Senators, Representatives, governors, and mayors are elected. Why should not the people vote for them directly? Why not trust the people instead of the politicians?

What is taking place today is not at all new; it is as old as the hills. There is not upon the floor a Senator of mature years who does not know about the bribery of 3 delegates at the Republican National Convention in which the nominations of Frank Lowden and Gen. Leonard Wood were contested and \$102,000 changed hands.

There is not upon the floor a Senator of mature years who has not read the book by Mr. Sparks, in which he related the incident at the Republican convention in which the delegation from Arizona was offered \$75,000, merely to give the right to the delegation of another State to vote in its place, and not to have Arizona vote when its name was called.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that Arizona is not first alphabetically.

Mr. LANGER. This incident occurred some years ago, before the junior Senator from Arizona was in politics. I am casting no aspersions upon my friend from Arizona.

A SENATOR. Vote!

Mr. LANGER. I had not intended to speak at length; but now I shall speak a little longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Consider the last Republican convention. The Dewey forces were claiming delegations in various States had been purchased. Charges and countercharges were made throughout that convention. The Senators knew

about it. They have let 3 long years go by.

Then along came the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] with his bill. It was placed on the calendar on June 22, 1955. Congress did not adjourn until August 3.

It is true that the distinguished majority leader became ill and left Washington; but the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] ably represented him, acting in his place. There need not have been any compunctions about Congress going home in August or September, because we had just raised our salaries to \$22,500 a year. For \$22,500, Senators should be willing to work all year. Nevertheless, Congress went home.

We met again in January. Nothing has been done about the Hennings bill. I agree with the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who yesterday afternoon said there was not a thing in the pending resolution which necessitated any phase of the subject going to the Committee on the Judiciary, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or to any other committee.

The Hennings bill has been reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. Hearings have been held on the bill; all the testimony has been received. When debated, it can be amended to include lobbying, the Corrupt Practices Act, or any other germane subject dealing with elections. Why cannot the Senate act on the Hennings bill and debate it on the floor, without the necessity of spending \$350,000 to get more evidence, when hearings already have been held?

So far as the pending resolution is concerned, a report does not have to be made under the resolution until January 31, 1957. In other words, the next presidential election will have been held. As the New York Times said last Sunday, the national election might be bought and paid for by that time, and that includes the two national conventions. And the New York Times said \$80 million was spent in the last national election.

So it is proposed that we shall start in again after the next election, Congress will go home this year, no matter what the special committee does. It will make its report and probably will recommend legislation. But we very likely will be going home about July 31 this year. So nothing will be done by the Senate on the resolution in August, September, October, November, or December—nothing at all.

We will then return next January. At that time the election will have taken place. Whatever report the special committee makes will be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration of proposed legislation. That committee then will make a report to the Senate, and the entire matter will be debated all over again, and very likely will be referred to all the committees the majority leader has mentioned for more and more hearings. I want action now before the next national election, as alleged by the New York Times, is bought and paid for.

I want the people of North Dakota and the country to know my attitude on this subject, because I shall vote against the resolution. I cannot in good conscience vote for it. I want the people of North Dakota and the country to know that I am as much opposed to corrupt practices and lobbying and bribery as any Senator upon this floor, but I believe the Hennings bill covers everything which is contained in the pending resolution and if not it can be amended so as to include it. I agree with the statement made yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that there is absolutely no reason why the Hennings bill cannot be taken up and considered at this time.

Perhaps the Senate will want to wait until after the farm bill is disposed of by March 15, and take the matter up right after that. I think proper legislation should be proposed so that it may be enacted before the next presidential election and the conventions take place.

If the resolution is agreed to today, what are the people all over the country going to say? They are going to think that the month of next January was selected because the next presidential election and the elections of the Representatives and Senators will be over then, as the New York Times pointed out last Sunday.

Mr. President, as I have stated before, this is nothing new. The fact that \$2,500 was placed in an envelope in South Dakota has been thoroughly investigated by the appropriate committee. I voted for that resolution. The committee will make a report by March 10 and that matter will be disposed of. There is no reason for the delay in promptly taking up the Hennings resolution that the senior Senator from North Dakota can possibly see unless it is to avoid legislation to affect the coming election of President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives. I believe in prompt action to protect the people, Mr. President. There will be sufficient time to act after the farm bill is disposed of, and to enact proper laws to take care of lobbying the Corrupt Practices Act and kindred matters before the next presidential election.

I might add, Mr. President, that so far as the Corrupt Practices Act and the Lobbying Act are concerned, the Judiciary Committee has full jurisdiction over questions arising under those acts. The committee can make any recommendation it cares to and amend the Hennings bill now pending on the calendar and where it has been since last June 1955. I repeat, sooner or later, whatever the recommendations are, the proposal has to come to the floor and be adopted. We might as well do it now and not in 1957, after, as the New York Times said last Sunday, the elections have been bought and paid for and another \$80 million spent by the big boys to fool the people.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, because the Senator from Massachusetts is chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization, which has jurisdiction over the Lobbying Act, I should like to clarify the position of the subcommittee with respect to that act.

The present lobbying law is completely unsatisfactory, ambiguous, and contradictory. It has been held so by the court in its decision in the Harris case. The minority or Republican members of the committee agree and concur with the report of the committee. The Subcommittee on Reorganization had a bill before it last summer. The amount of money reported as spent by lobbyists last year was only half what was reported in 1950, and less than what was reported in 1946. That is indicative that the law as it exists today is being evaded and is completely unsatisfactory.

Therefore, unless the Senate objects, it is the intention of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization to continue to consider the matter, in an attempt to bring forth some proposed legislation designed to improve the present law before the end of the present session, unless it meets the opposition of the special committee. I shall support the special committee, since there is involved a jurisdictional question involving four committees, but I think the appropriate standing committee has responsibility in this field.

If the Senate or the special committee does not disagree when the proposal is submitted, I hope it will be possible for our subcommittee to take affirmative action in this field, and perhaps, when the special committee reports in January, further action can be taken.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am a member of the Senator's subcommittee. We discussed this question somewhat as members of the subcommittee. Am I to understand that what the Senator is asking for in this instance is cooperation of the special committee in offering any material to the subcommittee with legislative jurisdiction, so that the subcommittee of which the Senator from Massachusetts is chairman, for instance, can proceed with proposals which he has before his subcommittee, and some proposals of which he himself is author? Is that what I am to understand?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes; it is. I think the Subcommittee on Reorganization will have to consider the program of the special committee, but it is my hope the subcommittee will prepare some tentative recommendations to submit on the matters now before it, so that they will not be put over for 1 year. It is my understanding that program is not in conflict with the statement of the majority leader of yesterday or with his statement of today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is not in conflict, but in accord with everything I said to the Senate several times, and I concur.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the views of the Senator from Massachusetts. Those are the views I take. I assure him of my wholehearted cooperation in his legislative program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from Massachusetts has made the statement, we have just heard, and that the majority leader has concurred in his remarks. It

has been my understanding all along that so far as regular committees and subcommittees are concerned, their prerogatives will in no way be abolished or eliminated, and it will be perfectly satisfactory for the regular committees and subcommittees to proceed with their work. That includes measures relating to lobbying, as the Senator from Massachusetts has indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is absent by leave of the Senate, because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. CASE and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. CASE and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—79

Alken	Duff	Ives
Allott	Dworshak	Jackson
Anderson	Eastland	Johnson, Tex.
Barkley	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Beall	Ervin	Kennedy
Bender	Flanders	Kerr
Bennett	Frear	Knowland
Bible	Fulbright	Kuchel
Bricker	George	Lehman
Bridges	Goldwater	Long
Butler	Gore	Magnuson
Byrd	Green	Malone
Capehart	Hayden	Mansfield
Carlson	Hennings	Martin, Iowa
Case, S. Dak.	Hickenlooper	Martin, Pa.
Clements	Hill	McClellan
Cotton	Holland	McNamara
Curtis	Hruska	Monroney
Daniel	Humphrey	Morse

Mundt	Purtell	Thurmond
Murray	Robertson	Thye
Neely	Russell	Watkins
Neuberger	Saltonstall	Welker
O'Mahoney	Schoeppel	Williams
Pastore	Smith, Maine	Young
Payne	Sparkman	
Potter	Stennis	

NAYS—1

Langer

NOT VOTING—16

Barrett	Jenner	Smathers
Bush	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Case, N. J.	Kilgore	Symington
Chavez	McCarthy	Wiley
Dirken	Millikin	
Douglas	Scott	

So the resolution (S. Res. 219), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a special committee which is authorized and directed to investigate the subject of attempts to influence improperly or illegally the Senate or any Member thereof, or any candidate therefor, or any officer or employee of the executive branch of the Government, through campaign contributions, political activities, lobbying, or any and all other activities or practices.

SEC. 2. (a) The special committee shall consist of 8 members to be appointed by the Vice President, 4 each from the majority and minority Members of the Senate, and shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the Vice President, select a chairman and vice chairman.

(b) Any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

SEC. 3. (a) The special committee shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1957, and shall include in its report specific recommendations (1) to improve and modernize the Federal election laws; (2) to improve and strengthen the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, and the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, and related laws; and (3) to insure appropriate administrative action in connection with all persons, organizations, associations, or corporations believed to be guilty of wrongdoing punishable by law.

(b) Upon the filing of its report the special committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the special committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable.

(b) For the purpose of taking testimony the special committee may provide that fewer than 5 but not less than 2 members shall constitute a quorum, providing that both the majority and minority are represented.

SEC. 5. The expenditures authorized by this resolution shall not exceed \$350,000 and shall be paid upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the special committee.

NATURE'S INTERNATIONAL FOOD BANK—A PERPETUAL INSURANCE AGAINST HUNGER

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, before the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of

the Agriculture Committee of the Senate, proceeds with his profound debate on the agricultural bill, let me say to the Senate that in a few days, at a convenient time, when the issue is timely, I shall address the Senate on the subject of what can be done in the Antarctic to establish nature's food bank. In my opinion, there will be presented an interesting and unique proposal which I think might very well do away with our farm surplus problem, be of tremendous financial saving to our taxpayers and do away with the basic cause of the depressed farm income.

I shall have something to say with respect to the very fine article written by Adm. Richard E. Byrd, who wrote favorably on this subject under date of January 29, 1956. He is the brother of our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is present in the Senate at this minute.

Prior to addressing the Senate on that subject, I ask my distinguished colleague from Louisiana to study the remarks made by Admiral Byrd, and to help me, if he can, upon the all-important problem of farm surpluses. I have already had the benefit of the experience and wisdom of Admiral Byrd, who is now on his fifth mission to the Antarctic. The senior Senator from Virginia informs me that Admiral Byrd is on his return to Washington, and that I can renew my acquaintance with him and further learn of the suggested plan to use nature's Antarctic as a perpetual deep freeze for our Nation's farm surplus.

As I said in the beginning, this is a revolutionary plan. I ask all Senators to await my presentation of this plan.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Admiral Byrd, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star magazine for January 29, 1956, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADMIRAL BYRD SAYS THE SOUTH POLE CAN BE THE WORLD'S ICEBOX

(By Adm. Richard E. Byrd, as told to A. E. Hotchner)

Question. Mr. Richard B. Shoemaker, of Los Angeles, writes: "Dear Admiral Byrd, I realize that the Antarctic has scientific and perhaps strategic value, but can it ever have any really practical significance for us?"

Answer. The fact that the Antarctic is of importance scientifically, automatically means that it has practical significance. The comprehensive scientific program to be carried out during world science's international geophysical year (1957-58) will, I am confident, yield information of incalculable value.

Just how much it would be worth to agriculture, to aviation, to radio communications, and other phases of the overall world economy if, as a result of our studies, we are able to predict weather with, let us say, a 20 percent greater accuracy.

The Antarctic has economic significance, too, because we have found coal there and indications of other minerals. In my opinion, it is an untouched reservoir of natural resources.

But apart from these considerations, and perhaps more immediately, there is one very practical use to which we could put the Antarctic. In my opinion it would be entirely feasible to employ the Antarctic as a vast freezer where we could store the enormous

food surpluses we now have in this country. I offer this plan for discussion, knowing that it presents legal and practical problems which have to be solved. It, of course, reflects my personal views and does not necessarily represent the views of the Department of Defense or any other Government agency.

FIRST AID FOR FAMINE

Today our storage facilities are adequate—but barely adequate. And quite possibly there may come a day when the Government will decide to stockpile much more food against the possibility of military or natural disasters.

Also such a stockpile could be made available through the years to any other country hit by famine or disaster.

Actually the solution of the problem of what to do with surplus food is important to our economy and to the world's general welfare. In the fiscal year of 1955, the United States Government spent \$332,929,579 to store surplus foods in warehouses in this country. Many more millions are spent annually to hold down the rate of food production. Our warehousing facilities, especially for food requiring refrigeration, are taxed to capacity, and we may soon be faced with the necessity of spending more millions to build new storage plants.

This may be a needless waste because Antarctica is an uncomplicated, unlimited freezer, as scientifically perfect as you could ask. In 1934, on my second expedition, we dug down to a Little America hut where we found some food that had been left on the table when the first expedition departed in early 1930. The food had been there for almost 5 years. There was part of a roast beef, potatoes, bread, butter, and other foods. We unfroze them and had a fine meal. The roast beef was probably as good as the day it was cooked.

In 1947, on our fourth expedition, we again had an adequate meal of food we took to Little America in December 1928. On the same expedition a group of men came upon a cache of kippered herrings and biscuits which had been left at Shackleton's old base on his 1914 expedition, and the men who ate that 33-year-old food reported it was in perfectly good condition.

Food deterioration and bacteriological activity go hand-in-hand. Dr. Paul A. Siple, who has been with me on all my expeditions to the Antarctic, made a study of the amount of bacterial life present in the snow. He came up with the startling result that, on an average, there is only one bacterium per pint of snow. In its frozen state these bacteria would have been completely inactive. When you consider that there are millions, perhaps billions of bacteria in a pint of the water which we use in our refrigeration warehouses, you can see why the Antarctic is a vastly superior icebox.

SNOWBALLS ARE OUT

Below the snow line, as far south as Little America, temperatures never get above freezing. Contrary to popular belief, the temperature within the Antarctic Circle averages about 40 degrees colder than in the areas within the Arctic Circle. During my solitary winter vigil at Advance Base in 1934, I succeeded in recording a temperature of 83 degrees below zero.

It is this consistently cold climate, plus the presence of névé, that makes the Antarctic so ideal for food storage. Névé, which covers Antarctica, is partly ice, partly snow, a granular substance that crumbles in your hand and doesn't pack into a snowball. It is an ideal cover for foodstuffs, for it does not pack down and become a crushing force.

As far as the physical process of storing the food is concerned, the Navy has a piece of equipment which would be ideal for the job. It is a machine that digs a continuous trench in snow. In 1 day it can dig a trench 12 feet wide, a half-mile long and 6 feet or

more in depth. Equipment for unloading and loading the food is also available or could easily be adopted from existing devices. The Navy's Flying Fox is a mechanically driven loop of rope that could automatically haul the food along the trenches and deposit it wherever desired. Wheat and other grains could be blown into the trenches through air tubes. Winds would take care of covering the trenches with névé.

As you can see, the cost of storing the foods would be negligible. The only big expense in connection with the project would be the transportation of the food from the United States to the Antarctic Continent. Some of the food could possibly be hauled by Navy transports, some of it could be let out to private shipping concerns. But let's just see how expensive an operation this would be.

We have now, for example, approximately 280 million pounds of surplus butter in storage, with an estimated value of \$175 million. The Government paid \$8,500,000 for the storage of this butter in 1955. The United Fruit Co. estimates it could haul all this butter in 35 refrigerated ships, at a cost of something like \$250,000 a ship. This adds up to \$8,750,000 which is slightly more than the Government spends in 1 year to store that butter in this country. When you consider that once the butter is put underground at Antarctica there are no charges on it for the 5 or 10 or 15 years it may remain there, you will appreciate why I feel that the Antarctica freezer proposal at least warrants serious consideration. The cost of transporting other foodstuffs, as compared to the cost of storing them in the United States, follows the butter example.

ONE-HUNDRED-YEAR EXPERIMENT

Last year it cost the Government \$185 million to store wheat, \$54 million to store corn, \$6 million to store cheese, \$13 million to store barley. Altogether, we have almost \$6 billion worth of surplus crops in storage in the United States, and we are paying a whopping annual fee for their upkeep.

I have already discussed this proposal with some Congressmen and Government officials, and they have all shown interest in its possibilities. I intend to recommend to the National Security Council that we undertake the necessary scientific and economic investigations preliminary to such a program. During my current expedition to Antarctica, my associates and I will continue our research on the subject. Among other things, we plan to bury a cache of 100 loaves of bread; every year over the next 100 years, 1 loaf will be dug up and examined for flavor, nutrient, vitamin content, and other factors. We won't be here to finish the experiment, but our great-grandchildren will.

It is my strong conviction that if we could create a permanent icebox for our food surpluses in Antarctica, it would not only save us much money and take pressure off the entire problem of surpluses, but it would also turn out to be a great act of international good will.

This is one of several reasons why I believe the Antarctica is important to our national future and to the whole of mankind.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the special order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3183, to provide an improved farm program.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which has been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hesitate to start the debate on the important measure now pending so late in the afternoon, and on Washington's Birthday. However, I think it is of such importance that we conclude the debate on the bill at an early date that I am willing to start this afternoon.

Mr. President, I express the hope that the Senate will continue to debate this measure without too much interruption. It is incumbent upon us to have a farm bill on the President's desk by March 5, or at least by March 10. I may be overly optimistic, but if the bill is to bring any benefits to our farm economy during the 1956 crop year, it should be enacted into law and signed by the President not later than March 15. All farmers are now waiting on the Congress to act before determining what they should do in order to comply with the requirements of the 1956 Farm Act.

Mr. President, first I wish to present to the Senate a general statement on the bill. I shall reserve a section-by-section analysis of the bill until after I have completed my general statement. I wish to state that I shall welcome interruptions at any time, and I also wish to inform my colleagues that I shall be available at my desk at all times during the debate on this measure, so that I may answer any questions which Senators desire to propound to me, whether or not I have the floor.

The bill before the Senate for consideration today represents months of detailed study, lengthy hearings, and much midnight-oil-burning by individual members of the Senate Agriculture Committee, as well as its staff. This is, truly speaking, a bipartisan bill. It represents the best judgment of a majority of the members of the committee.

I wish I could tell Senators that the bill under consideration has the unanimous and unqualified support of every one of the 15 members of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Unfortunately, that is not the case. On many of the proposals contained in the bill, the committee members voted unanimously in support of them. On the other hand, there are other items within the bill that are highly controversial and on which the committee membership split widely, some of the sections of the bill having been retained by the narrow margin of one vote. I am glad to state, however, that partisan politics played no part in the voting on any issue. A primary example of the nonpartisan nature of the voting is the 8 to 7 committee approval of the provision calling for 90 percent of parity price supports on the basic commodities for the years 1956 and 1957. On this highly controversial issue, 5 Democratic members voted for a return to rigid price supports, with 3 Democratic members voting against them; while 3 Republican members of the committee voted for the 90 percent provision, with 4 Republican members voting against it.

As Members of the Senate will recall, the House of Representatives last year passed a bill reinstating mandatory 90 percent price supports on the basic commodities—that is, on corn, wheat, rice, cotton, and peanuts. Tobacco is now supported at 90 percent of parity. When

the bill came to the Senate, it was considered carefully by the Senate Agriculture Committee, and after thorough discussion and debate among the members of the committee, we decided—by a vote of 8 to 7—to not report the bill favorably to the Senate, but, instead, to hold extensive hearings in the fall of 1955 after the Congress had adjourned, with a view toward drafting a new farm program for submission to the Congress early in 1956. I was one of the members of the committee who voted for holding hearings in the fall, and against reporting to the Senate for consideration in 1955, H. R. 12, the 90 percent price support bill.

Mr. President, last October the Senate Agriculture Committee hit the road. We traveled throughout the length and breadth of this great land of ours, holding hearings in all of the important agricultural centers of the country. We met in 17 cities and we heard testimony from approximately 1,000 witnesses, with all States of the Union but 4 represented. We encouraged and received an abundance of testimony from grassroots farmers. As chairman of the committee, I tried to keep the hearings on a strictly nonpartisan and nonpolitical basis and to hear representatives and witnesses from all sections of the country and all segments of agriculture, regardless of their political or farm organization affiliations.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MUNDT. As a minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I should like to say that our chairman not only tried to keep the hearings on a strictly nonpartisan basis, but that he succeeded 100 percent in keeping politics completely out of the hearings, not only as he conducted them throughout the length and breadth of the country during the summer and fall, but throughout the deliberations we had during the many long weeks of the current session before we finally voted, at the mystic hour of midnight, approval of the present pending farm bill.

I believe it should be recorded in the record for all to know that there was not a single straight party line vote on any of the many issues involved in the consideration of the farm bill at any time during the current deliberations, and that although the result sometimes was a vote of 8 to 7, sometimes 9 to 6, sometimes 10 to 5, there never was a straight party line vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank my good friend from South Dakota.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should not like to have this opportunity pass without expressing my commendation and appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and to the other members of the committee who were kind enough to hold a meeting in Hutchinson, Kans. I can say very sincerely that the distinguished chairman [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator

from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], not only conducted the hearings in a fine manner, but the chairman was extremely patient. There were more than a hundred witnesses, and he continued the session until 8 o'clock. I wish to commend him and the other members of the committee for the fine way in which the hearings were handled.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say to my good friend from Kansas that it was a pleasure for me to do that. On one occasion witnesses had come as far as 800 miles to be heard, and I, for one, would have remained all night in order to hear them, if that had been necessary.

There is one other thing I wish to say to my good friend, namely, that the hearings pointed up, through the testimony of many of the witnesses who appeared before us, the many facets of the difficulties which confront us, and which have made it impossible to report a bill that would please everyone. I hope the work of the committee will meet with the approval of the majority of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I feel rather proud of the record which we made. The first hearing was held in St. Paul, Minn., on October 24, and the last one took place in Utica, in the State of New York, on November 19.

The schedule which our committee undertook was a rugged one; it was back-breaking, to say the least, yet, all the members of the committee cooperated wonderfully, and, as a result, I feel safe in saying that the hearings which we conducted were some of the most successful and most informative that have been held on farm legislation during my tenure of over 19 years on the committee.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that never in my experience in the Senate has a committee spent so much time to inquire into any subject as has the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in this instance. Long hearings were held in the West, and hearings were also held in Washington, which ran until late in the afternoons. I know of no chairman of any committee at any time who has been more diligent in pursuing his duty than has the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I marveled oftentimes at the ruggedness of the Senator from Louisiana which enabled him to stand such long hours.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to thank my good friend from North Dakota.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Coming from a far distant part of the Nation, as does the Senator from North Dakota, I wish to echo his sentiments fully by saying that I have never seen such a devoted job done by any one Senator in the many years I have been a Member of the Senate, as was performed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the course

of the hearings, not only last year and this year in Washington, but also throughout the country.

I am proud to be associated with him and the committee. I felt the work done was so clearly nonpartisan and bipartisan as to command the confidence of the agricultural public wherever the hearings were held. I wish to say for the record that in my judgment the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana has rendered outstanding service to the Senate and to the people of the United States in connection with the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I know it must be very satisfying to the chairman to hear the testimonials given to him, particularly in a year when he is not even up for reelection so they must come straight from the heart.

I should like to add my testimonial to those of the other members of the committee. I know how anxious the Senator is to have the proposed legislation come to a successful conclusion. I simply wish to say that I share with him the very earnest hope that we shall be successful in getting really constructive legislation through the Congress in time to have it effective at an early date.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank my colleague.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I submit an amendment consisting of several items, so that it may be printed and lie on the table in order that every Senator may have a chance to study it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the amendment relate to corn?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It relates to corn. There may be other Senators who desire to join in sponsoring the amendment, and I should like to afford an opportunity for any Senator who wishes to cosponsor it to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I can testify to the heroic work and the heroic efforts of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. ELLENDER]. I have never known a chairman of any committee who has worked harder or has devoted more time and greater effort to bring together divergent views on the very troublesome farm problem. I say that without any disrespect to other chairmen. I sincerely honor his efforts in this regard. While there are one or two little matters on which the chairman of the committee and I do not completely agree, I should like to say that he has approached his duties not only with the utmost sincerity, but with the utmost thoroughness. I appreciate the opportunity of serving with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I now send to the desk the amendment to which I have referred, containing several items which I hope may eventually be considered en bloc, because they go to the same situation, namely, that affecting corn. My amendment I believe will correct what I think are the deficiencies in the bill as reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and it will give the diversified agriculture of the Midwest an opportunity to participate on an equality with other sections of the country in the so-called soil bank and conservation reserve.

I wish to say, also, that there are other Members of the Senate who have asked to join in the amendment. I have not had time to submit the amendment to them, but I ask that those who care to join in the amendment may be permitted to add their names as soon as they have had an opportunity to examine it in final form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Speaking in behalf of some of the witnesses who appeared at the hearings in Montpelier and other places in New England, I wish to testify that they are most appreciative of the manner in which the hearings were conducted.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, with whom I have the privilege of serving on the committee, that in arranging the schedule for hearings on the bill, I think, in his good judgment, he chose the sections of the United States which more nearly typified the problems involved. As the Senator has indicated, the committee held a great many hearings. It was a pleasant experience for me to participate in those hearings, conducted as they were in a fine manner and in a most impartial way. The printed record of the hearings, which is available to all Senators, will reflect the source of information which we received. Many, many views were expressed. I am sure that there was not a witness who appeared at any of the hearings who did not recognize the painstaking effort of the chairman of the committee to hear all the witnesses, even though the hearings ran into the early and sometimes the late hours of the night.

I wish to associate myself with the other members of the committee, and on behalf of those who appeared in my own State and who had the opportunity to testify, in expressing my appreciation for the manner in which the hearings were held.

I know that the chairman and the majority of the committee, in their wisdom and judgment, hold certain views, as to many of which some Senators might

have some shades of difference in our initial approaches to the bill.

I am at present giving consideration to 3 or 4 amendments I may wish to offer, by request, for printing and for consideration, because I feel that as to certain of the amendments offered there should be an opportunity afforded the Senate to pass upon them one way or the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Speaking not as the Presiding Officer of the Senate, but speaking as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Chair knows that our chairman must have a feeling of satisfaction after hearing all the commendations which have been bestowed upon him today, which were well deserved.

At one time during the hearings it seemed to me that the chairman was almost a slave driver, because he kept us at work many hours each day and worked us overtime so much. We did not work merely a 40-hour week. Not only did we work until midnight on one occasion but on some of the other nights we worked until 9 or 10 o'clock, trying to solve the problems presented to us in order to report the bill promptly. The Senator from Louisiana is highly to be commended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hope all the fine statements which have been made about me will result in the passage of the bill as it was reported.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators who are not members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I wish to express very deep appreciation for the splendid work of the chairman. I join in every word of tribute which has been uttered about him.

Also I desire to pay tribute to and to thank every individual member of this very important, hard-working committee. I do not know of any parallel to the work which has been done on the farm problem, especially during the last year.

I wish the people of the United States, who are so vitally dependent on agriculture, could fully realize, as we do in the Senate, the committee's deep concern and anxiety about and their unstinting devotion to the problems of agriculture. I wish the people could know of the sincere efforts of Senators to understand fully those problems and of their attempts to solve them. This is true of the entire membership of the committee. I commend and thank them.

At the same time, I wish to pay tribute to the chairman of the committee for his persistence and his willingness to work. He is one of the most valuable Members of the Senate, not only in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but also as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. Because of his unselfishness and his capacity for work, he is a great asset wherever he serves.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi, provided the Senator from Louisiana did not interpret them as a commitment on the part of the Senator to vote as the Senator from Louisiana will vote on every amendment.

Even if he did so interpret them, I would still want to express my genuine appreciation for the diligent work the chairman has done, and also to say that I hold him in the highest admiration. I have never heard any of his colleagues, upon discussion or mention of the Senator from Louisiana, fail to do likewise.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank my good friend. These compliments are very encouraging. I hope that when I present myself for reelection in 1960, I will be able to use all these tributes in my campaign.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, although I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I wish to express my commendation of the chairman of the committee. I have consulted with him quite often recently in respect to proposed farm legislation and other farm matters, and he certainly has been most cooperative. I appreciate it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Louisiana will be a candidate for reelection not only in 1960, but also in 1966, 1972, 1978, and 1984.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, the committee received a wealth of information, recommendations, and criticisms. One thing stood out clearly as a result of the hearings: There was an urgent need for immediate and effective action to restore to the American farmer a reasonable share of the consumer dollar, and to increase his income. The grass-roots farmers told us in no uncertain terms that they were worried and, in some cases, frantic because of the predicament they found themselves in. They were worried because they were caught in a squeeze, Mr. President, in a price squeeze, and were helpless, on their own, to combat it. They complained to us that the prices of the things they have to buy have gone up steadily in recent years, while, on the other hand, the prices of the things they have to sell, and on which their livelihood is dependent, have gone down substantially. Farm profits, they told us, have decreased in recent years to the vanishing point, and, in too many cases, operating losses were sustained. Faced with a drastic decline in their gross and net income, our farmers have, of course, been forced to tighten up in their purchases of farm equipment, household goods, and other consumer items. Thus, there has been not only a decline in the prosperity of the farmers, themselves, but the impact is being felt right on down the line amongst the merchants, the laboring people, the service trades, and other segments of our population.

As I have stated, Mr. President, the field hearings that the Senate Agriculture Committee conducted were concluded late in November of last year. After our hearings I wrote letters to the leading farm organizations, asking for their help and suggesting that they try to agree on some of the programs outlined by the committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a form letter which the committee sent to various organizations.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
AND FORESTRY,
November 21, 1955.

DEAR —: The Agriculture and Forestry Committee of the Senate, of which I am chairman, has just concluded extensive hearings on the farm situation at the grassroots, and I am happy to say that these hearings were very fruitful and conducted, I believe, in a manner that was more or less satisfactory to all parties concerned. All witnesses who asked to be heard were given attention, and an opportunity to present either a written or verbal statement. A mass of evidence was gathered, and it is my hope that the committee will be in a position by early January to present a bill to the Senate for its consideration.

As you may recall, the House of Representatives enacted H. R. 12, providing for reinstatement of 90-percent price supports, the details of which I am sure you are familiar with. The Senate committee postponed action and instead proceeded to order the hearings to which I have just referred. Many suggestions were made as to how best to solve the problems confronting agriculture. The preponderance of evidence points to the necessity of finding some ways and means of disposing of some of our surplus commodities to the point where they will not be a drag on the market. Many witnesses have indicated that our agricultural production plant has grown too large, and that some method should be found to reduce its capacity by way of acreage reductions. Others have proposed a soil-bank program to conserve and preserve the fertility of the soil, whereas others expounded on a two-price system, and many have suggested a continuation of price supports in some form or other. It is my belief that the preponderance of evidence would indicate that neither flexible nor rigid supports in themselves would do the job, and that some kind of program in addition to either of those methods is necessary.

May I earnestly suggest that the major farm organizations of our country put their heads together in the hope that agreement can be attained on some of the plans or solutions suggested to meet the present challenge to agriculture. There is no question but that many farmers are in a precarious financial situation, particularly those who have embarked in farming in recent years as a means of livelihood. The evidence disclosed that many veterans started out and have incurred many debts they are now unable to pay because of the sagging income that farmers now receive. Much evidence has been given us indicating that the small farmer is gradually being eliminated and is having to seek work in industry. The chief complaint, I find, has been the price squeeze wherein the farmer obtains less and less for what he produces and pays higher and higher prices for what he requires in his operations. He is not satisfied with the reduction of his share in the consumer dollar which is at an almost all-time low. As you may be aware, the farmers' share of the consumer dollar was, as of August 1955, only 40 cents, in contrast to 52 cents in 1946.

A similar letter is being addressed to the farm organizations which I have indicated at the bottom of this letter, and may I suggest that as many leaders of your respective organizations as possible get together in the hope of at least getting unanimity on a program touching some or all of the following topics:

1. Surplus disposal: We have had for some time a program to dispose of some of our surpluses. There are laws now on the statute books providing for ways and means

of selling, disposing and bartering our surplus commodities. An effort should be made to give us a plan whereby we can obtain a fair return on what we sell.

2. Soil fertility bank: Some of the proposals submitted favor control of diverted acres, with or without rental payments or payments for conservation practices on diverted acres; while others favor a soil bank or conservation acreage reserve plan, under which the total agricultural plant would be reduced by the total number of acres in excess of that required to meet the demand for all crops. It is my belief that the consensus of opinion among the witnesses who testified is that some incentive should be provided to the farmers for setting aside a certain percentage of their acreage which would constitute the so-called soil bank. Suggestions have been made for graduated payments depending on the size of the farm and its location as well as the commodities that can be produced thereon.

3. Two-price plans: Suggestions were made that two-price plans be enacted for wheat, rice, and cotton, with the accent on rice. It is my belief that the vast majority of the rice growers desire a two-price system. There was much divided opinion as to wheat as well as cotton. The Northwest, where practically all of the soft wheat for the production of flour for baking and cracker making is produced, has strongly suggested a two-price system. Your views as to whether or not it will be feasible to work out a plan whereby a two-price system could be provided for the Northwest wheat growers, with some provision to prevent the extra wheat being used for feed in any other place than in the Northwest, will be appreciated. Many suggested that a two-price system could be attempted on one crop so as to determine whether such a plan would work.

4. Price supports: It is my belief that the majority of the witnesses who testified desire rigid price support of, say 90 percent of parity on the basics, with emphasis on quality products as a basis for payment; in other words, on commodities such as cotton, rice, wheat, tobacco, corn, and peanuts that are readily salable and merchantable. In that connection may I suggest the feasibility of, say, rigid price support so as to encourage the production of desirable and salable basic commodities, and flexible supports on such of the basic commodities as do not meet the standard that may be proposed as herein suggested.

Another suggestion made as to price supports is that they should be on a graduated basis; that is, take care of the smaller farmers so as to encourage them to remain on the farm.

5. Quality commodities: As suggested in No. 4—a plan to encourage the development of quality and readily merchantable basic commodities, I realize the difficulties in drafting legislation to accomplish this purpose. In order to assist you, I am sending a copy of this letter to organizations representing grain dealers, millers, cotton ginner and manufacturers, canners and other processors in an effort to assist in drafting language to place in the bill.

6. Marketing quotas: Recommendations were made that allotments be put on a bushel, bale, or pound basis; that they be put on a producer instead of an acreage basis; that allotments be given to cover all field crops instead of individual crops; and that moderate marketing penalties on a graduated basis be imposed on the first 25 percent of excess acreage, the proceeds of those penalties to be used for research.

7. Marketing orders: Extension of marketing order authority to fruits and vegetables for canning was requested. Authority to permit deductions for promotional programs under milk orders also was recommended.

8. Dairy products: Various and sundry programs were offered to assist milk pro-

ducers. Very few witnesses outside of the Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Dakota area proposed price supports for dairy products above the present level. Most agreed that the marketing agreement and order provisions of the law should remain as they are. There was some support in the area just described, and in other sections of the country, for the so-called self-help program now pending before Congress.

I hesitate to write you such a lengthy letter, but I thought it was advisable to acquaint you with the thinking and the views of the witnesses who appeared before us. I am sure that I speak for the committee as a whole when I say that if you men can get together and agree on some of the proposals that I have suggested above, it would be much appreciated and would, of course, be of great benefit to the committee.

It is my hope that the problem will be studied on a nonpartisan, nonpolitical basis, and that the leaders of the various organizations will do their best to reach agreement on one or more of the proposals above stated, particularly with respect to surplus disposal (No. 1), a soil-fertility bank (No. 2), and two-price plans (No. 3). Time is of the essence, and I urge you to contact each other at your earliest possible convenience so that you can get together and try to reach accord so that we can have the benefit of your views in the early part of January when Congress convenes.

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

(Similar letters to Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. Herschel Newsom, master, National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Mr. R. S. Waltz, president, National Milk Producers Federation, 635 Elliott Avenue West, Seattle, Wash.; Mr. John G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; Mr. Homer L. Brinkley, executive vice president, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, between the time when this communication was dated and the convening of Congress on January 3, the committee had its staff members working around the clock to digest and analyze the recommendations that were obtained during our field hearings, and as a result of these letters referred to.

I do not believe there is in the Senate a committee which has a more devoted staff than has the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Our staff worked night and day, and they are certainly to be commended to the same extent, and perhaps more so, than the chairman of the committee has been commended this afternoon.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to my good friend from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I wish to join in the remarks of commendation of the staff of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There has never been a time when I have called upon the staff for assistance when I have not had an immediate response, or a response as soon as the information could be obtained. They have always given factual information. They have been a great help to me. I am glad I was in the Chamber to hear the Senator's words of commendation of the staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Thus, when the Congress convened last month, the committee was ready to consider specific legislation for the relief of agriculture. We had all of the background information that we needed on which to formulate some kind of plan to help bail the farmers out of the serious condition in which we found them.

Then on January 9, the President submitted his agricultural message to the Congress. It contained specific recommendations for the relief of the farm economy; most of the recommendations, I may state, had been suggested to the committee, in varying forms, during the course of our field hearings.

It has been my fervent hope, Mr. President, for the past several months, that somehow and in some way, the Senate Agriculture Committee could prevail upon the leaders of the Nation's major farm organizations to put their heads together and agree upon some sound program that we could present to the Congress this session and obtain enactment of it without too much controversy and delay.

With that in mind, soon after I got back to Washington on January 1, I again urged the leaders of the major farm organizations to hold one or several meetings amongst themselves and try to work out some kind of plan that was agreeable to them and which they could support, if not wholeheartedly, at least in its essentials.

I am informed that, in line with my recommendations, two meetings were held, but, unfortunately, it was not possible to get all of the representatives of the major farm organizations to attend. Nor was there any substantial area of agreement among the representatives of the farm organizations who did attend the two meetings. The sad and sorry truth, Mr. President, is that among our major farm organizations today there is no agreement as to what should be done to restore our farmers' purchasing power. They stand divided, and seem to be vying with each other as to the best approach to meet the challenge.

Confronted with such a divergence of views among farm leaders, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held a series of open hearings in Washington in early January, at which we received the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture and other representatives of the Department of Agriculture; we also heard testimony from the leaders of the major farm organizations, and from other representatives of agriculture. Once again, it was apparent that there was no substantial agreement amongst the farm leaders as to the kind of farm program we should report to the Senate.

The committee staff prepared a bill based on suggestions that were received from the farmers. The administration submitted its own version of what should be done. The committee then sat for days, and finally came out with the bill now before the Senate for consideration.

It was no easy task, Mr. President, as is eloquently shown by the divided votes within the committee on the various sections of the pending farm bill.

The problem we had to solve was, of course, how to put more dollars into the farmers' pockets without delay. We were faced with the stark fact that an agricultural crisis was on our hands. Net farm income has dropped \$5 billion since 1951, and is still falling; the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar has fallen from 52 cents in 1946 to about 38 cents today; and there is no indication that the downward trend has been spent. In spite of the fact that total farm production in 1955 was 12 percent greater than it was in 1947, gross farm income in 1955 was 9.4 percent below that of 1947, and net farm income was down 38 percent. Measured another way, the parity ratio, which indicates the relationship between prices received by farmers and prices paid by farmers, dropped from 123 in October of 1946 to 80 in January of this year, a loss of 43 points.

It is significant, too, that during the same period, when the farmer was watching his share of the consumer dollar being whittled away and his operating profit wiped off the books, the national income from nonagricultural sources had increased about 68 percent. In other words, while the rest of our economy has been prospering, the farmer has gradually been going broke.

In spite of the rosy predictions by the Secretary of Agriculture for the past 2 years, our committee could not escape the melancholy fact that farm prices and farm income are still on the way down. We were faced, too, with the stark reality that there was nothing in the farm program submitted by President Eisenhower which held out any hope of increased income to the farmers in 1956, except a possible stiffening of the prices of some farm commodities due to less production on acres that may be placed in the soil-bank program. We were all in agreement that something had to be done immediately—early in 1956—to improve the plight of the farmer.

I can state, Mr. President, that the President's farm program received very careful and sympathetic study by the entire membership of the committee. As all of my colleagues know, it called primarily for a continuation of the so-called flexible price supports, plus the inauguration of a soil bank, and the continuation and enlargement of some of the existing programs. As I have just stated, and as I shall point out in more detail a little later, there is nothing in the President's farm program that offers the farmers additional revenue in the immediate future for 1956. Under the program called for by the President, and in support of which the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, is presently beating the bushes around the country, flexible price supports will be the order of the day in 1956 and thereafter.

Let us consider for a moment the full impact of Mr. Benson's recommendations.

The price of wheat, which was supported in 1954 at 90 percent of parity, and in 1955 at 82½ percent of parity, would be supported in 1956 at 76 percent of parity. In other words, in the space

of 2 years, the price supports on wheat, under Mr. Benson's plan, would be dropped 14 points. This means that wheat, which was supported at an average of \$2.24 a bushel in 1954, would be, under Mr. Benson's program, supported at an average of \$1.81 a bushel in 1956.

Cotton, under Mr. Benson's plan, would be supported in 1956 at somewhere between 75 and 90 percent—the exact level of support has not yet been determined, but undoubtedly it will be not greater than 80 percent of parity, and probably as low as 75 percent—compared with 90 percent support levels in 1954, and 90 percent support levels in 1955.

Mr. Benson's program calls for supporting the price of corn in 1956 at 81 percent of parity, or \$1.40 a bushel, compared with a support level in 1954 of 90 percent of parity, or \$1.62 a bushel, and 87 percent of parity, or \$1.58 a bushel in 1955.

Support prices on rice in 1956 would drop to 75 percent of parity, or \$4.04 a hundredweight, compared with 90 percent of parity, or \$4.92 a hundredweight, in 1956, and 86 percent of parity, or \$4.66 a hundredweight, in 1955.

The support level for peanuts in 1956 has not yet been announced, but in 1954, peanuts were supported at 90 percent of parity, or 12.2 cents per pound, and in 1955, at the same rate. Under the sliding scale formula, they may be supported in 1956 at levels ranging between 75 percent and 90 percent of parity.

It is only with respect to tobacco, among the basics, that the support level for 1956 will be continued at the same levels as in 1954 and in 1955. As Senators will recall, this special advantage to tobacco producers occurs because the Congress, in 1954, in passing the so-called flexible price-support program, continued the exception for tobacco and directed that price supports for this commodity be maintained at 90 percent of parity, the same as had prevailed for all basic commodities prior to the enactment of the administration's flexible price-support program.

Mr. President, it does not take a mathematical genius to figure out that under the Benson program for 1956 the general level of farm income is bound to drop further. Mr. Benson can predict and prophesy all he pleases, and he can prate with all his might about what his program will do for the farmers, but he cannot talk away the startling fact that all the while he is promising to raise the income of the farmer his departmental policies are lowering still further the price the farmer receives for his products. I doubt that many farmers will be taken in by the blandishments of this great soothsayer who promises increased farm income while he hacks away at the very foundation of farm income—the prices of farm products. No, Mr. President, the farmers of America who produce our basic crops understand and realize that a continuation of the flexible-price-support program into 1956 and 1957 means only one thing to them—lower prices for what they produce.

The Secretary of Agriculture argues that high price supports will create big surpluses, while lower price supports

will make the surpluses disappear. I submit, Mr. President, that this argument does not hold true. Those who put forth this argument overlook the fact that the basic commodities are under strict acreage controls and marketing allotments, and, as to the allotted acres that are made available to a farmer for planting, the level of price supports will not affect in the least the quantities of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, or tobacco that are produced from those allotted acres. The facts and figures that are on record in the files of the Department of Agriculture prove conclusively that lower price supports do not bring about a reduction in the number of bales of cotton or bushels of wheat that will be produced from allotted acres. And, conversely, high price supports will not increase the total production from allotted acres. The reason is simple: When a farmer's money crop is cut back by reason of acreage allotments, he has to plant every acre that is allotted to him, because he has to get enough gross return in order to make interest payments on his mortgage, meet the installments due on farm-equipment purchases, pay the cost of living expenses of himself and his family, and other items of fixed costs.

Let us look at the record in this respect. Let us take a look at what has occurred among the basics immediately before and after the enactment of the sliding-scale formula.

The rice industry provides an interesting study. In 1954, with 90 percent price supports, the acreage planted to rice totaled 2,600,000 acres. With 1955 came acreage allotments and marketing quotas, and the national acreage allotment for rice was established at 1,859,000 acres—a cut of almost 30 percent below 1954. Along with it, the price support for rice, under the Benson formula, was dropped from 90 percent, as in 1954, to 85 percent. In money, this gave the rice farmers a price support of \$4.66 per hundred pounds in 1955, compared with \$4.92 in 1954—or 26 cents less. Did the drop in price supports discourage the rice farmers and persuade some of them to drop out of the picture, thereby alleviating to some extent the carryover problem? The answer is "no." The rice farmers in 1955 planted 1,842,000 acres, or 99 percent of their total national acreage allotment. Plainly, Mr. Benson's theory that lower price supports bring less production does not hold true, at least where one of the basic crops—one of the farmer's major money crops—is involved.

For 1956, the Secretary has established a national acreage allotment for rice of 1,639,000 acres, with a support price of 75 percent of parity—a further drop in price supports from the \$4.92 in 1954 and the \$4.66 in 1955, to \$4.04 in 1956. Here is a very substantial drop in price—a drop of 88 cents per hundred pounds over a 2-year period. Yet I cannot find in the Department of Agriculture anyone who will predict that anything less than 99 percent of the national acreage allotment will be planted to rice in 1956.

Let us take a look at another one of the basic crops—wheat. In 1954 the national acreage allotment for wheat

amounted to 62 million acres, with a support level of 90 percent. The total acres planted to wheat in 1954 amounted to 62,569,000 acres—or 101 percent of the acreage allotment.

In 1955, the national acreage allotment for wheat was dropped back to 55 million acres, and the support price was lowered to 82½ percent of parity—a drop from \$2.24 per bushel in 1954 to \$2.08 in 1955. Did this drop in the support price discourage the wheat farmers from producing wheat in 1955? No, it did not. The records of the Department of Agriculture reflect that in 1955 the wheat farmers of America planted a total of 58,284,000 acres to wheat—or 106 percent of the national acreage allotment. In other words, with a support price for 1955 that was 16 cents per bushel less than the support price for 1954, the nation's wheat farmers planted, not only right up to their national acreage allotment, but 6 percent beyond it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair.) Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the extra 6 percent cover the acreage planted in the winter-wheat area for cover crops which later are plowed under?

Mr. ELLENDER. It might well have done so. Also, as the Senator from North Dakota will recall, some durum wheat was planted during that period.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

But it is a fact, is it not, that the wheat farmers have abided by their quotas?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, certainly; there is no doubt about that. I did not mean to insinuate, I say to my good friend, the Senator from North Dakota, that the wheat farmers did not abide by their quotas. As he knows, under the law, as I understand it, if there is overplanting of the allotment, the farmer can put the amount of overproduction under lock and key, and can keep it until the following year, if he desires; and it is probable that in many cases that was done.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I am in thorough accord with the view of the Senator from Louisiana that flexible parity does not result in a reduction of production. The surpluses nationally were not decreased by the flexible parity, but would have been increased much greater if there had not been the crop failure which occurred as a result of the drought. The drought was severe; in fact, in my State we produced the second smallest wheat crop in our history, whereas we would have increased the surplus by between 80 million and 100 million bushels, if we had had a normal crop. That is true also of the neighboring States of Oklahoma and Texas, and probably Nebraska.

Even with the acreage allotments, which we follow very closely, as a matter of fact, my State has reduced the area devoted to wheat production from 18 mil-

lion acres in 1953 to less than 11 million acres—in fact, approximately 10,800,000 acres—this year; and because of the drought which occurred last year, we had a wheat crop of only 128 million bushels, in the face of a normal crop of 240 million bushels, and a record crop of 304 million bushels. So a drop in the price support simply does not bring about a reduction in production.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that the wheat producer is subject to a severe penalty if he does not observe his allotment, whereas that is not true in the case of the producers of corn?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. Furthermore, as the Senator from Vermont knows, there is another difference in the case of corn allotments: They are simply promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture, under certain rules and regulations that he follows, without submitting the allotments to the corn producers in a referendum. That is another difference which I wish to point out, as compared with the allotments for the wheat farmers.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice that the Senator implies that the flexible parity formula is responsible for the large drop in income suffered by our farmers this year. Is it not a fact that practically all basic commodities, with the exception of wheat, have been supported at or near 90 percent, for the crop year 1955? Wheat, of course, was supported at 82½ percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I was about to suggest to my friend.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that while corn is supported at 87 percent, on January 15 the average farm price received was only 67 percent?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is because the corn producers did not take advantage of the price-support program. They planted all they could and took their chances as to price. I believe that only 38 or 39 percent of the farmers complied with acreage allotments.

Mr. AIKEN. Thirty-six percent, counting all corn producers in the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. Thirty-six percent of them complied with acreage allotments. They were the only ones who were able to go to the Commodity Credit Corporation and get loans at the support level previously fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that the commercial corn grower has been planting about the same acreage year after year, which is, roughly, 56 million acres, but that this year he found some new competition in the form of feed grains produced on several million acres which had been taken out of wheat production, and some out of cotton production, but largely wheat production? I refer to such items as sorghum, barley, oats, and possibly some lesser commodities in certain places.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe that situation was peculiar to 1955. I think it was true many years before that.

Mr. AIKEN. No; because under the rigid support program, the wheat growers and the cotton growers were required to cut back severely in their acreage. Naturally they did not want the diverted lands to lie idle; they needed the additional income, so they produced about 800 million bushels of feed grains, which came into direct competition with corn. The corn producers had been going along on a more or less even plane, planting 56 million acres a year. Consequently, when 800 million bushels of feed grain are dumped on the market, such a circumstance is bound to depress the price of something. In this case it happened to be hogs, and to a lesser extent beef cattle. Under the law the corn grower could observe his allotment or not. He chose not to do so, because he markets most of his corn in the form of animals. I do not believe that the corn grower, who had been producing the same sized crop running from 3 billion to 3,100,000,000 bushels a year, should be penalized because producers of other basic commodities saw fit to plant diverted acres to crops which came into direct competition with the corn grower.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think we should keep in mind that the 56 million acres of which we speak do not represent all the acres planted in corn. That figure represents only the quota acres. I think the total acreage runs up to 87 million.

Mr. AIKEN. The national acreage allotment for corn was 49 million acres last year, but the corn grower in the commercial area has been planting, usually, about 56 million acres a year. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina. There has been some increase in corn production outside the commercial area. However, I believe it is small in comparison with the tremendous amount of feed grains produced on diverted acres which came into the picture.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I intend to discuss this subject a little later when I speak on my amendment. However, to keep the record straight, it is true that the producers on approximately 36 percent of the acreage in the commercial corn area originally indicated an intention to conform to the allotment of 49 million acres out of 56 million. A very much smaller percentage actually went ahead and sealed their corn. In my State, with respect to the 1954 crop, the percentage was about 23. Originally approximately 40 percent had agreed to conform. They were not necessarily violating any obligations when they did not, but many of them later decided that they would not go to seal; they would not take advantage of the sealing operation. Of course, at least 85 percent of the corn in this country is fed. It goes into animals. By the very nature of diversified farming, 56 million acres in the commercial corn area is about the acreage which diversification in that area will permit.

I do not think it is quite an accurate statement to say that a corn farmer or one in the commercial corn area will plant all the corn he can. The nature of the situation is such that he will plant only about so much corn on his farm. He conducts a diversified operation. Corn production is a feeding operation. He will have a certain amount of corn, a certain amount of beans, some alfalfa, perhaps some oats, and other crops. He diversifies from year to year. It all adds up, year in and year out—and the statistics prove it—to approximately 56 million acres, whether there are allocations or not. We have had allocations with respect to corn only in 1954 and 1955. They are proposed for 1956. We had them in the late 1930's, but they never really proved satisfactory and they were abandoned.

So, regardless of whether we have acreage allocation with respect to corn or not, we shall have about 56 million acres in the commercial area. Those seem to be the facts of nature in the diversified area. There are some problems with respect to the increase in corn production outside the commercial area, upon land which has been diverted, but we can discuss that subject a little later.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Is it not true that if we had had the soil bank, or a provision comparable to the soil bank, so that we could have had a place to put the diverted acres, and some just compensation had been allowed the producer for placing his acres in the soil bank, the situation would have been different?

No young man who is paying cash rent for an acre of land can afford to allow that acre to lie idle. He must crop it. Also, an owner is subjected to taxes, and he has an investment in that particular acre. He must crop it. However, for the first time the soil bank offers a realistic approach to the problem of reducing agricultural surpluses. Never in history have reduced prices reduced the total overall production of the land. Such a result has not been brought about in connection with milk; and milk has taken the full flex, from 90 down to 75. Production is increasing, and it will continue to increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. I plan to discuss that question a little later.

Mr. THYE. For that reason the soil bank, for the first time, offers a realistic approach to the problem of reducing agricultural surpluses. The question I should like to ask is this. If a farmer reduces his acreage allotments on wheat or cotton or corn, he must put that acreage into some idle operation, such as a soil bank.

Mr. ELLENDER. An acreage reserve; that is correct.

Mr. THYE. Yes; an acreage reserve. He must do that before he is qualified to obtain an acreage reserve payment. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. That provision is contained in the bill.

Mr. THYE. There is a question involved here, however. He is not man-

datorily bound to put the acreage into idle acreage. In order to qualify, I would say that a great percentage of the farmers would put their land, diverted from cotton, wheat, or corn, into a soil bank. That applies as well to the arid acres of the Southwest, so far as the soil bank or soil conservation practice is concerned. Therefore we would not have what we had in the past 2 years, namely, a shift from cotton to corn, particularly near the Corn Belt, and a shift from wheat to sorghums in the Southwest. Sorghums are almost the equivalent of corn in feed value. In that way there has been in the past a nullification of everything which was done in the commercial corn area. For example, a farmer producing wheat in the Northwest would go into the production of barley or some other feed grain.

What we have done in the past is to shift the surpluses from one crop to another, and from one geographical area to another. However, this time we come forth with a soil bank provision, which promises the producer an opportunity to reduce his plantings and at the same time not go bankrupt while he is doing it. We are also developing a program which will reduce surpluses.

We know it will take a year and a half to get the soil bank into full operation. The farmers in the South are already going into their planting season, and therefore it is only in the northern part of the country where we will be able to get the full application of the soil bank provision. It seems to me that the 90 percent of parity provision is almost a necessity in order to prevent a slump in agriculture until we get into the soil bank operation fully and thereby reduce our surpluses.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has expressed my views and my hopes for the soil bank. I believe, if properly administered, the soil bank can be a very effective instrument in bringing about a reduction of the commodities and thereby alleviating the surplus problem.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. This is the first realistic approach to a solution of the problem. It is unfortunate indeed for the Nation's economy, particularly for agriculture, that we did not write such a soil-bank provision into the 1954 revision of the Agricultural Act.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to put some figures into the RECORD to show what has happened to the planting of corn and other feed grains during the past 2 years.

The total planting of corn for 1955 was 81,600,000 acres. That includes both commercial and noncommercial plantings.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much of that total was planted in the commercial corn area?

Mr. AIKEN. About 56 million acres of it is in the commercial area.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I thought.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the lowest acreage planted since 1937. It is 100,000 acres lower than the next lowest year of 1953, when 81,700,000 acres were planted.

During the time, from 1953 to 1955, when the acreage of corn was decreasing, the acreage of oats increased from 43,900,000 acres to 48 million, or by 4,100,000 acres. The acreage of barley increased from 9,700,000 acres to 16,100,000 acres, or by 6,400,000 acres.

The acreage of sorghums increased from 6,200,000 acres to 12,400,000 acres, or an increase of 6,200,000 acres.

While corn was decreasing its acreage—and of course it is true that it was increasing its yield—the feed grains coming in competition with corn were being planted on 16,900,000 more acres. I believe that corresponds very well to the acreage which was required to be taken out of the production of wheat. For the moment I forget how much was taken out of wheat planting, but—

Mr. ELLENDER. For what year was that?

Mr. AIKEN. From 1953 to 1955. I am taking 1953 plantings and 1955 plantings, to show what happened during that time. At the same time perhaps 17 million acres of new feed grain came into competition with the Corn Belt, which had been holding its production fairly stable, because from 80 to 85 percent of the crop was used on the farms.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield so that I may make a brief comment on the figures put in the RECORD by the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will be glad to yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has put his finger on the exact problem with which agriculture has been faced. In 1954 some of us endeavored to have a soil-bank provision written into the act. Anyone who has had any experience with agriculture knows very well that a young man who is paying \$10 or \$12 or \$15 an acre cash rent cannot allow an acre of land to lie idle and still be able to pay his cash rent.

For that reason we said a program must be initiated for an orderly diversion of such acreage. We said if that were not done we would merely shift the surplus from one commodity to another, and we would merely divert the headache, so to speak, from the Southwest into the Central West, for example, so far as the production of feed grain is concerned.

I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture in January 1954, in which I informed him that he would not resolve the surplus problem, but would only head for additional trouble, because, I said, neither the Secretary nor I would advise a young man to increase his pork production, for it was inevitable that pork would be produced far beyond the consumptive needs of the country.

Within the course of the next 18 months, my predictions proved to be accurate, in the light of what happened

in 1955 in connection with pork production.

Therefore I wish again to say that we are approaching the surplus problem now for the first time in a realistic manner, by providing a soil bank, into which to draw surplus acreage, and thereby reduce the total overall harvest in the coming year.

That will not be accomplished in the calendar year 1956. The educational program connected with it will require many months before it will be possible to have the program completely understood, and it will be well into the calendar year 1957 before we shall have established an administrative practice which will materially reduce the overall productive capacity of the Nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is why I suggested that the farmers of the country need not expect any bonanza from the soil bank during the first year, because it will take time for the benefits to reach the producers. Some results may flow from it this year only if there are sufficient acres diverted to bring about less production of some of the grain crops and other crops. However, that remains to be seen. As my good friend from Minnesota has just said, unless we provide for an increase in price supports this year, farmers cannot expect to get any benefits out of the bill in 1956.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Recently, I found it necessary, in order to convince myself of what has happened in the dairy industry, to go back and check the price of fluid milk in the Central West. When I checked the figures I found that the price paid in 1952 for fluid milk was, on an average, just about \$1 higher than the price which was paid for the same butter-fat-content milk in the month of January 1956.

Has the production been decreased? No. Positively, the figures show that there is a 4-billion pound increase in total milk production for the calendar year. The same thing applies to wheat.

Let us picture what is going to happen next August when the farmers begin to make applications for a commodity loan. They are going to take the difference between \$2.08 and \$1.81. They are going down 18 cents on corn.

Let us try to place ourselves in the position of the farmer taking such a reduction on corn and wheat, when every index figure on cost is rising, and at every turn he is faced with a greater expense in operation, including taxes, insurance, and interest. I cannot go back to the Midwest and tell the farmers to accept this program and work it out for another 2 years until the soil bank has effectively reduced the overall production. I know that some of them will not be there to enjoy it when prosperity returns to agriculture.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to concur in the statement just made by the Senator from Minnesota. He has described the situation exactly as I see it in the entire farm picture. We are confronted with a soil-bank program which I think

is a very good program, but if anyone believes we shall be able to get any of the money out into the winter-wheat belt this year, he is looking forward farther than I can. I am a wheat farmer in my own right, and I think I know my own farm. If the price is not such as will give the farmers some increase in income, they will be no better off this year than they were last year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think we all recognize the situation of the farmers. Their net income has been reduced from \$17.2 billion to \$10.2 billion. So we all realize that we cannot permit it to be further reduced. That is why we come in with a soil-bank proposal. We are going to pay the farmers something for taking acres out of production. We know that in the past they have cut down the acreage of corn and have planted wheat or rye or barley, or some other crop, so that the only way to prevent building up surpluses in other fields is to follow the proposal made in the bill. I am one who believes that if we do not keep the prices up on the small amount of acreage the farmers are going to have, the farmers will be doomed.

Mr. President, I have a table which shows the farmer's net income from 1952 through 1955. During most of this period the farmer's income has been going down. I should like to have the table printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[In billions]	
1952:	
1st quarter.....	13.4
2d quarter.....	14.1
3d quarter.....	15.9
4th quarter.....	12.8
1953:	
1st quarter.....	13.6
2d quarter.....	13.6
3d quarter.....	13.2
4th quarter.....	13.2
1954:	
1st quarter.....	13.2
2d quarter.....	11.3
3d quarter.....	11.4
4th quarter.....	11.3
1955:	
1st quarter.....	11.2
2d quarter.....	10.7
3d quarter.....	10.2
4th quarter.....	10.2

Source: USDA Farm Income Situation, Dec. 16, 1955.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to pursue the subject a bit further.

The modernized parity formula contained in the act of 1949, which has been permitted to go into effect, reduces the parity price for wheat approximately 13 cents a bushel a year, until it reaches approximately \$2.19 a bushel, and support at 75 percent of this parity price would be only \$1.65 a bushel.

In addition to that, there is deducted from the price-support loan an addi-

tional 10 cents a bushel, so that when the full program is effective we shall get down to approximately \$1.55 a bushel. Obviously a wheat farmer cannot live under that kind of a program. There has also been a cut of one-third in acreage.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think there is some misunderstanding about the benefits of the soil-bank plan not being made available this year, because it is provided in the bill that when it has been determined that a producer of a certain commodity has not planted his full allotment this year, under the acreage reserve he will be entitled to receive the payment which would be due him for not planting that acreage immediately, as soon as it has been determined that he has not planted it. So he will be eligible for payment this year if the bill is passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think there was another suggestion made by the Secretary of Agriculture to the effect that if the bill is passed early enough it would be possible for some wheat farmers who had already planted their wheat to plow up some of their acreage if they wished to do that. Whether they would do so remains to be seen.

Mr. AIKEN. They would be eligible. If they prefer to carry through their crop of winter wheat thinking they will get more than that, they can do so, and if they wish to come under the soil bank early enough they will be eligible to do so. I do not know exactly what they would be paid, but we were talking in terms of around 90 cents or \$1 a bushel for the crop which they might reasonably expect to raise. I hope that wheat farmers will take advantage of it generously. We have provided \$750 million. I do not think the entire \$750 million could be used this year. If we use two-thirds of it we shall probably be doing pretty well. We have to consider that surpluses do not apply alone to the United States. It is a worldwide situation at this time.

The prospects for wheat on the world market are dim enough so that the United Kingdom has refused to consider going into the wheat program, evidently anticipating the purchase of wheat for less than the minimum of \$1.55 a bushel. That is getting down pretty low. We subsidized wheat last year to the extent of approximately 75 cents a bushel. So it strikes me that speed is of the essence in order that the wheatgrower and the cotton and cornrower may come under the program this year, and not only receive the benefit of payments, but the benefit that may accrue from a strengthened market.

Mr. ELLENDER. Along that line, it is my hope that we can get the majority leader and the minority leader to try to reach an agreement to vote on this bill not later than next Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know when we can get a vote on it. I know there are some amendments in process of preparation. I would say, not later than the first of March.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be too late.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the Senator from Louisiana tell us what the level of payment will be for acres coming within the soil-bank provision?

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill does not provide any particular amount. It is left entirely to the Secretary of Agriculture to fix the levels of the payments. As the Senator will note from the committee report on the bill, preliminary estimates have been made as to what can be expected per acre for various commodities. The estimates were made by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the bill provide any maximums and minimums?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; except in funds. The bill provides for a maximum of \$750 million for the so-called acreage reserve program, and \$350 million for the conservation reserve.

Mr. CURTIS. But from the standpoint of the individual farmer, will he be paid as much as he could ordinarily cause those acres to earn, or will he be paid a lesser amount?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the plan.

Mr. CURTIS. Which? As much as he could earn, or less?

Mr. ELLENDER. The plan is to pay enough to induce him to divert his acres, and not to plant the allocated acres.

Mr. THYE. I wish to concur in the remarks of the distinguished chairman, because the Secretary of Agriculture, in appearing before the committee, made the statement that he thought we should err on the liberal side, so as to get compliance in the soil-bank program.

When the Secretary was further asked to explain his position, he stated that a farmer, in harvesting a crop, had had the expense of seeding and harvesting, and would have the expense of delivery of the grain to the bins or to the market. On the other hand, under the soil-bank program, the farmer would, first, have the privilege of building the fertility of his land, of being compensated, and then of having no expensive harvest. So what the farmer would have would be the equivalent of the net crop plus a little on the liberal side. That was the way the Secretary explained the plan to the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. How will the payment be divided between the landlord and the tenant, where they operate on a share basis?

Mr. ELLENDER. We have written into the bill a provision whereby it will be the duty of the Secretary to provide rules and regulations which will treat tenants fairly, not with the idea of putting them off the farms, but of giving them a just share of whatever payments will be made.

On page 15 of the report is an estimate, which is purely tentative, made by the Secretary of Agriculture. As to cotton, let us say, assuming that the national average yield per acre is 303 pounds, 50 percent of the loan level

would make the payment to a cotton farmer \$50 an acre.

Assuming that the national average yield per acre for wheat is 15.8 bushels, the approximate payment per acre would be \$17.

The Secretary has the right, under the bill, to go above that amount if he wishes to do so.

Mr. CURTIS. He can go below it, too?

Mr. ELLENDER. He can also go below it—either above or below. But the idea is that if he wants to get acres out of cultivation, particularly allotted acres, he would have to make the proposal attractive enough and the incentive big enough so that the farmers would be willing to cooperate.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Louisiana has been in the Senate for a long time and has played a very definite part in the shaping of agricultural legislation for many years. I wish he would tell me what, basically, is the difference between this plan of paying the farmer not to produce and previous plans which have been tried.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are tremendous surpluses at present. Marketing quotas cause farmers to divert their acreage from one crop to another.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that. I refer to the operation of the plan so far as the individual farmers are concerned.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman yield to me momentarily with reference to the question which has been asked?

Mr. CURTIS. My question is, What does this program propose which has not been tried heretofore?

Mr. THYE. My question is, To what years does the distinguished Senator from Nebraska refer?

Mr. CURTIS. To all of them.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator refer to 1955 or to 1954? Those were the only years since the Korean crisis in which there were quotas on corn.

Mr. CURTIS. No; I am referring to all the years since 1933. What is the basic difference between this plan and other plans of paying farmers? I do not ask my question argumentatively; I am seeking information. What is the basic difference between this plan and some of the other plans which have been tried at times?

Mr. ELLENDER. The basic difference is simply that in the past farmers have been given support prices at a given percentage of parity so long as they complied with their acreage allotments.

Mr. CURTIS. I am aware of that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Farmers were able to plant all of their allotted acres, and they were able to obtain loans through whatever agency offered them.

Mr. CURTIS. I am aware of that. I am referring to the original AAA Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator refer to the soil bank?

Mr. CURTIS. It was not called a soil bank. I am talking about the system of paying farmers not to produce. How does this plan differ from other plans which have been tried throughout the years Congress has been engaged in considering agricultural legislation?

Mr. ELLENDER. We have never had this type of plan before. Under the Ag-

ricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, farmers entered into contracts to reduce acreage in specified surplus crops in return for benefit payments financed chiefly by processing taxes on the commodity concerned. The processing tax was declared void in 1936.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it that this plan probably is constitutional, while the other plan, which involved processing taxes, was declared to be unconstitutional?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is one of the differences. The situation is somewhat different now, too, since acreage is already controlled by marketing quotas and allotments. The purpose of the bill is to obtain a further reduction.

Mr. THYE. I believe this is the first realistic approach to reducing farm planting. The individual farmer cannot be induced to reduce his farm planting at his own expense, when he does not know what the producer in the next county will do. Excellent cooperation in the reduction of planting might be achieved in a given area, while in another area the planting will be expanded. Therefore, the soil-bank program affords an orderly Federal program which proposes to bring into the soil bank the surplus acres of land which have added to the feed supply, which, in turn, has overproduced livestock, dairy products, and poultry.

It is also proposed now that when a farmer diverts his land from wheat planting, instead of putting the land into some sort of feed crop, the land will go into the soil bank. Instead of reducing the cotton acreage and planting the diverted acres with corn or soy beans, as the hearings last fall disclosed was the case throughout the northern region of the Cotton Belt, that land will be placed in the soil bank.

Mr. CURTIS. I am aware of all of that, and I am not arguing about it. What I am trying to find out is, What is the basic difference between the proposed system and the system which existed under the original AAA Act, admitting that that act was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court because of financing and other factors concerned with paying farmers not to produce?

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest that one basic difference is that the old program to which the Senator from Nebraska refers had to do with reimbursing for acreage which was cut out before the allotted acreage was determined. This particular program of acreage reserve is an effort to cut out from the allotted acres some of the very best acreage that a farmer has.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, what the Senator is saying is that throughout the years the farmer has had to cut down his acreage, and now it is proposed to pay him to have additional acres lie idle. In the beginning, we merely offered him some reimbursement for letting the acres lie idle, even though there were no quotas or acreage restrictions.

Mr. HOLLAND. There are two different programs contained in this one program.

The first program, that of the acreage reserve, seeks to retire from production some of the most highly productive

acreage the farmers have, by inducing them, through special payments, to cut out some of their allotted acreage no matter how low the allotments get. That, of course, will require a real inducement. When the reduction takes place, it will be very real; and because it will be very real, and in some instances will hurt, it is important that the producer be able to turn to the surpluses to be reimbursed in kind, instead of in funds, for instance, for feed on his farm, if that is what he has to have.

One part of the program, the conservation reserve, is much more like what has been called, up to now, the ACP program. It is designed to take out of cultivated acreage—not out of allotted acreage, but out of cultivated acreage—that acreage which can be best spared by the grower. That will not be his best acreage at all, but more frequently will be his marginal acreage, that acreage which will profit most from a storing up of fertility through the practicing of conservation methods with reference to it.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not have the floor.

Mr. THYE. I merely wanted to commend the distinguished Senator from Florida for pointing out the importance of the two phases of the soil bank and soil fertility program. The so-called less productive land can go into trees. Land could be definitely retired over a period of many years. That could be done under contract for possibly 10 or more years. So, for example, in the western part of Nebraska, there may be some land in crops which should go back into grass. A contract can be entered into covering 3 or 4 or 10 years, not only that the land will go to grass, but into trees, in that area, if it is so desired.

It is the first positive realistic approach to resolving the problem of surpluses.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend from Nebraska that he anticipated me far in advance. I expect to speak about the difference between the methods of the operation of the soil bank.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator has been very kind. Will he yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator anticipate it will be necessary to continue the soil bank for a number of years in the immediate future? I refer to both parts of the proposal.

Mr. ELLENDER. The proposal deals with acreage reserves. It may be possible to end that in 2 years. In most cases, it may be possible later to balance our production with our consumption requirements, but that phase of the bank program cannot go beyond 4 years.

Mr. CURTIS. Without further legislation. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the proposed legislation now being considered by the Senate.

In regard to the conservation reserve, that program provides for contracts covering not less than 3 and not more than 10 years, unless trees are planted, in which case the contract may cover as much as 15 years. Contracts could be

entered into through 1960, and would have to expire by December 31, 1974, at the latest.

Those are the limitations we have written in the bill with respect to that. I hope to discuss that fully during the course of my presentation.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I apologize to the able Senator from Louisiana, because I am sure he treats these matters better in the course of his argument than I am able to deal with them here; but if I may address the Senator from Nebraska, in order to complete my answer to him, I thought he was worried a moment ago, as shown by his questions, about the amount.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not worried; I merely have an inquiring mind.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say that if he is anxious about the amount involved, the amounts shown in the chart printed on page 15 of the report are the average amounts for each of the commodities; but the bill and the report both make it very clear that the land and its productivity and the value of the production from the land stand on their own bottom. For instance, if cotton-producing land from one State which was marginal land—and always had been, or had been for years—were put under the acreage reserve, and at the same time some land in the Mississippi delta were placed under the acreage reserve, it would not mean that the same amount would go to each, but the value of the productivity and the value produced by each would be reflected by the actual payments and allowed to those who retired their acreage.

I am of the firm belief that instead of having the payments postponed until the second year, there would be very sizeable payments the first year because of the inducements to be offered. The whole program would fall flat unless inducements were offered to retire acreage in this year we are about to enter. The whole purpose would be ineffective as to this year unless such reduction could be made in this year. There are some crops already planted, but there are others which have not been planted. There are others which have been planted and which might be replanted to grass or the like.

If the Senator will look at the plat, he will see that even when the payments in effect are 50 percent of the gross profit of the soil, in most instances they will be well above the net profit of the soil. It would be profitable, and it is designed to be profitable, to the growers who operate under the acreage reserve, to retire to it, from their allotments for this year and for subsequent years, some of their precious allotted acreage. The inducement offered would be that to do so would be to their advantage and would be money in their pockets—either money in their pockets or payments in kind which would give them a profit above what they could make ordinarily.

It is intended to be a quick method of balancing our present surpluses and production against the consumers needs.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, so that I

may reply to some of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Florida has said that he supposed we will get compliance this year. I point out that the winter wheat in the States of Washington and Oregon is planted. Winter wheat in Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, and Wyoming is planted. Therefore there would have to be a tremendous inducement to have a plowing down of grain which is in some areas already 7 or 8 inches high. The same thing is true with respect to some of the summer crops.

No matter how speedily the Senate may act, there still has to be action taken by the House, and then there must be a conference between the two Houses, and then the administrative functions in the States must take place, in order to get the county committees as well as the State committees acquainted with the program.

If we get from 30 to 40 percent of the soil-bank program in operation the first year, we will be exceedingly lucky. That is not going to reduce the surpluses much. There must be a positive reduction in surpluses before we will start getting any benefits from the soil bank, except the cash rental which will be obtained from diverted acreage. But, psychologically, legislation will not firm up the market; it is going to be evidence of the disappearance of surpluses which will strengthen the market.

I fear we will well into the calendar year 1957 before the full effects of the surplus disappearance, through the operation of the soil bank, will be reflected in a firm national market of the various grains involved in the acreage which will go into the soil bank. That is my only argument on the question of the 90 percent versus reduced or lower supports on commodities.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is thoroughly correct when he states that there will not be maximum employment of acreage reserves in the first year. No one could seriously contend otherwise. No one can say what percentage of the maximum will be in effect. It is our belief that if the bill is passed quickly, a very large percentage of it will be in effect.

I call attention to the point the Senator makes so well. He refers to winter wheat. If he will look at the plat on page 15, he will see the whole wheat program involves only one-third, \$250 million, of the annual program of \$750 million, which is planned for the first year.

Then let me say to my distinguished friend that, from my experience in something like this, but not exactly like this—because I do not believe there has been anything exactly like this—in my State we have found that the minute there is in effect a firm plan to retire surpluses from circulation, and to take that overhanging cloud out of the way, the very fact that the trade knows there is such a program, and that it is underway, has

a very stimulating effect and greatly builds up morale.

One year we had in the State of Florida a great surplus of grapefruit; and we asked the Government to inaugurate a purchase program—I believe it was for the school-lunch program or for a similar program. That was announced, and it strengthened and stiffened the market to such an extent that it was not necessary to purchase a single grapefruit. So the result hoped to be achieved from that program was achieved without making a single purchase.

Therefore, I wish to make the point that immediate good will come from having our agricultural population embark upon a program which will not continue the heartless, year-by-year overstimulation and piling up of more and more surpluses—which is what we have been doing—but, instead, finally will have their efforts addressed to a reduction of the surpluses.

Although, of course, later I shall speak in my own time, if my throat permits me to do so, about the 90 percent of parity situation, the reason why I so strongly oppose a return to the concept of 90 percent price supports is that I think it would cause us to try to move in opposite directions at the same time. The cart would be in one place, and one powerful horse would be trying to run to the north, and another powerful horse would be trying to run to the south at the same time—if we were to have price supports reinstituted at a fixed 90 percent level, and if at the same time the soil-bank plan were in effect.

I realize that this matter may be controversial. However, since I must leave the Chamber at this time, I wished to refer briefly to that point.

I also wish to say that I have been most interested in what my able friend, the Senator from Louisiana, has said. His remarks have been most ably presented. At the same time, however, I wish to state that I do not agree with the concept of running in both directions at the same time.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Florida leaves the Chamber, I wish to say that he is answering his own argument in regard to 90 percent price supports. He feels very strongly that the psychological effect will be such that the national markets will reflect full parity, which is what all of us are endeavoring to achieve. If that happens, Mr. President, the entire matter of supports will be forgotten, and supports will no longer be needed—any more than a man would continue to need crutches if his feet and legs were in sound condition. So if prices of 100 percent of parity are reached, price supports can be thrown out immediately.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say that, judging from our experience over a long period, nothing that I can see indicates in the slightest measure that a return to 90 percent price supports will mean that we shall no longer have surpluses and that the market will build up to 100 percent. As a matter of fact, to the extent that we have had 90 percent price supports, we have mined our soil and

have built up the enormous supplies in the storehouses.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, during my presentation of the bill, I hope to show that the so-called Steagall amendment and related emergency legislation, with which I am sure my friend, the Senator from Florida, is familiar, were placed on the statute books, not to offer increased full incentive in order to increase production, but to do the very things we are now attempting to do, namely, to bolster farm income, and to protect farmers against having to sell in bottomless markets at the end of the war. Those amendments were placed on the statute books during World War II. I have some data regarding that matter, and in due course I shall present them.

As I said in my opening remarks, the only provision of the pending bill that gives the farmer hope for an immediate increase in his income is the provision increasing price-support levels; that is all. Otherwise, nothing substantial will come through until possibly next year. Of course, it is possible that some slight effect on farm income may be registered this year if the soil bank can be put into effect soon. In other words, by decreasing the acreage to be planted to wheat and to other grain crops, the result may be a slight increase in the prices of those commodities. But aside from that, no immediate relief is to be expected under the soil bank.

I believe that another part of the bill, which I shall discuss later, will assist the farmers in getting a little better price, particularly for perishables and for livestock. As my good friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], knows we provide in the bill for an increase in the amount of money which can be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase perishable commodities. Those purchases can be made in the same manner as section 32 funds are now used. For that purpose, in the bill we have provided an authorization of a quarter of a billion dollars. If that amount of money, together with the \$462 million which we now have on hand in section 32 funds, is administered with the hands of an angel, and in the manner which we intend, we can get somewhere. But we must have someone administering the law who is in sympathy with it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as I understand, the majority and minority leaders desire to have a quorum call. I wonder how long the remainder of the address by the Senator from Louisiana will require.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not quite completed half of my prepared statement, and there are other matters which I should like to place into the RECORD, in connection with my presentation.

If Senators will bear with me, if I can proceed for perhaps 10 more minutes, I shall reach a point where I can suspend, if that is agreeable; we can then resume on tomorrow—provided, however, that I can obtain unanimous consent to have the floor when the Senate convenes on tomorrow.

So, Mr. President, in anticipation of the Senate recessing before I conclude my presentation, I ask unanimous con-

sent that when the Senate meets tomorrow, I may be permitted to have the floor, at the conclusion of the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, I simply wish to take this opportunity to invite the other Members of the Senate to be present tomorrow to listen to the presentation of this interesting report by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I note that with the single exception of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], every Member now present on the floor of the Senate is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. So I extend this invitation, in behalf of the chairman of the committee, because he is too modest to do so himself.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to my good friend that I express the hope that on tomorrow more Senators will be present. However, I am not surprised or disappointed at the attendance at this time, because today is a legal holiday. We simply wished to start the ball rolling and begin the presentation of the bill today.

However, I have not yet reached the meat of the bill. On tomorrow we shall have an opportunity to do that.

Mr. MUNDT. I simply wish to have all Senators know that they are welcome, and that we hope they will be present to hear the discussion of the farm bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course.

I also hope that on tomorrow we shall have at least as many members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry present as we have had today, because I am sure the chairman of the committee will not be able to answer all the questions which will be asked. He will be very glad to have all members of the committee present. Whenever the chairman of the committee gets bogged down, he hopes the other members of the committee will speak up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the senior Senator from Louisiana that when the Senate convenes tomorrow he shall be entitled to the floor at the conclusion of the morning business? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. To continue with my prepared statement, I was discussing wheat, and I shall continue on that subject.

For 1956 the Secretary has retained the same 55 million acre national allotment for wheat as prevailed in 1955, but he has permitted the price support of wheat to flex downward to 76 percent of parity, or \$1.81 a bushel—43 cents a bushel less than it was in 1954, and 27 cents a bushel less than it was in 1955. Does anyone here in the Senate, or in the Department of Agriculture, for that matter, expect that the total plantings to wheat in 1956 will be less than the national acreage allotment of 55 million acres? I doubt that there will be any to predict that this will occur. The record already shows that the 1956 plantings of

winter wheat—which comprises 75 percent of the total wheat crop—will amount to 45,203,000 acres compared to 44,393,000 in 1955—an increase in 1956 of almost 1 million acres over 1955. And yet, according to Mr. Benson's reasoning, and on which he bases his opposition to 90 percent parity price supports, lower price supports will bring about a shrinkage in production. Obviously, Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture is either woefully ignorant of what is going on today in American agriculture, or he is talking through his hat.

Mr. President, I know of no better example to rebut the Secretary's argument that lower price supports will bring about reduced production, than what has happened in the dairy industry over the past several years. Now here is a nonbasic commodity—a highly perishable commodity—over which there are no production controls whatsoever. The laws of supply and demand, upon which our Secretary seems to rely so heavily, should surely operate in this industry, so that with a lower price to the producer, total production should drop in direct relation to the amount of the price reduction.

In 1953, Mr. President, we had 90 percent price supports for milk products—a continuation of the 90 percent support level that had prevailed under the prior administration. Total milk production on all farms for the year 1953 amounted to 121,149,000,000 pounds.

Then came 1954. Mr. Benson dropped the support level for milk to 75 percent of parity, and what happened? Total production on all farms, instead of dropping off sharply due to the impact of lower prices, climbed up instead to a new record high of 123,502,000,000 pounds.

In 1955 there was a further opportunity to prove the accuracy of our Secretary's premise that lower prices mean lowered production. Mr. Benson established 1955 price supports on butterfat at 76 percent of parity, and on manufacturing milk he fixed price supports at 80 percent of parity. Was there any dropping off of total milk production last year? Not only was there no reduction in total milk production, but once more the opposite trend set in, with milk production for the United States stepped up to another new record of 124,500,000,000 pounds. So, Mr. President, under 2 years of experimentation by the Secretary of Agriculture with flexible price supports, during which he dropped price supports on milk products from 90 percent of parity to a range of 76 to 80 percent of parity, we find that dairy farmers produced 3½ billion additional pounds of milk over the 1953 figure. And this, mind you, is with respect to a nonbasic, noncontrolled perishable commodity.

The estimates for 1956 milk production are at an all-time high.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator that the figures show that when the

support price of milk was dropped from 90 to 75 percent of parity, the following year production went up 3½ billion pounds. However, I point out that while production was going up 3½ billion pounds, consumption went up 10 billion pounds. I, for one, do not claim any great reduction in production when the parity level is changed. The difference comes in consumption.

Mr. THYE rose.

Mr. AIKEN. I see the Senator from Minnesota on his feet. I know that we cannot mention the word "milk" without bringing him to his feet. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. AIKEN. I point out that although there was a reduction in the income of the dairy farmer for the first year which was 1954, last year in 1955 there was an increase of about \$200 million in the income of the dairy farmer over the previous year. Unfortunately the State of Minnesota did not share in that increase, and I presume that is the reason why the Senator from Minnesota is now on his feet.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Vermont may recall that another reason was offered by the Secretary of Agriculture in support of lower support levels, namely, that lower price supports would mean lower milk prices, and that lower prices would have the tendency of causing consumers of fluid milk to use more of it. It is true that they used more milk, but the average cost to the consumer went up. The Senator knows that.

Mr. AIKEN. The consumption of milk has increased.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The consumption went up, notwithstanding the fact that it cost the consumer more.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In order that the RECORD may be informative, if the Senator from Vermont, who gave the figures with respect to the increased consumption, could place in the RECORD the information as to how much of the disappearance of dairy products went into feed mixes, and what percentage went into human per capita consumption, our RECORD would be crystal clear. However, the 10 billion pound disappearance, in itself, is not crystal clear, because there was a disappearance of powdered milk into feed mixes, which accounted for a great deal of that milk. There is not the increase in consumption by humans which the figures might lead one to believe.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at that point—

Mr. ELLENDER. I am familiar with what the Senator from Minnesota has said. As a matter of fact, a great deal of the powdered milk that was left over from prior years was disposed of for little or nothing. Butter was sold by the CCC in some instances, I am told, at 3 cents a pound.

Mr. AIKEN. No; that was disposed of in the year 1954. The increase of 10 bil-

lion pounds from 1953 took place in 1955, and it is largely accounted for by the fact that in about 18 months the dairy organizations of the country got busy and sold the milk in greater quantities. The other increase was accounted for largely by the increase in population.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. What I wanted to ask the Senator from Vermont was to make that statement in the RECORD, because in 1954 much of the product went into feed mixes. Another reason was that in 1955 we had one of the hottest summers in the history of our country. In that time there was the greatest fluid-milk and ice-cream consumption that ever occurred. It was not due to the price factor, because that was not reflected to the consumer. The price of fluid milk remained the same, or about the same. The fact was that the producers assessed themselves so much a pound for their production and went into a campaign to sell the milk. They engaged in an advertising campaign, not only in the magazines and the newspapers but also over the radio and on television. That is what brought about an increase in consumption. It was not due to any drop in the price of milk.

The RECORD must be absolutely clear in that regard, because the farmer in the Midwest, who is in a surplus-producing area, did not get any benefit from the increased consumption of milk. His price has been dropping consistently, and he has been getting about 8 cents less than in 1955.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator has stated, during the hearings it was pointed out that the method of advertising milk was changed. The milk producers had hired Bob Hope to advertise the sale of milk. Bob Hope might be a good salesman of women's lingerie, but that does not mean that he is a good salesman of milk. The milk producers soon realized this, and they hired Hopalong Cassidy and other cowboys, and they were able to get the children of America to drink more milk. They changed their method of advertising, and they got results. I hope they will continue to do so, and I hope that more and more of the milk which is being produced in unprecedented quantities will be disposed of in the raw state.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The producers had lost 14 percent of their per capita milk sales in the few years when they were depending on the Government to buy their milk. When the Government ceased to buy the milk at a high price, the producers started to sell more milk. They have so far recovered nowhere near what they lost during the high-support years, but a good share of it has been recovered. What they have done by way of advertising has been good business practice, and they are continuing that practice. As the Senator from Minnesota has stated, the reason more people are using more milk is that the dairy

people have been putting it up in more attractive packages and making it in more attractive flavors. It is possible to buy almost any flavor of cheese, and it is possible to have any kind made to order.

Through their advertising campaign they have recovered a great deal of what they lost, although they have not quite caught up yet. They have recovered sufficiently so that the total received from dairy products in 1955 was about \$200 million more than in 1954.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to state to my good friend from Vermont that I cited these figures merely to show that lower farm prices for milk did not bring about a lowering of production, as has been contended by Mr. Benson. That has been the basis of his argument. He also stated, as I remember, that a lower price support would mean cheaper merchandise, and that it would be bought in greater quantities by the consuming public because of the cheaper price.

So far as the price of milk is concerned, I believe we have evidence in the RECORD to show that where milk-marketing agreements were in effect the price to the consumer did not diminish. On the contrary, in most cases, the prices went up.

Mr. AIKEN. That was unfortunately true.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is diametrically opposed to the contentions of the Secretary of Agriculture. Let us not forget this fact, too. As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has pointed out, the milk people have in a measure benefited by the Government's disposing of a great deal of accumulated butter and cheese and powdered milk, which had been in storage.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct; butter and powdered milk.

Mr. ELLENDER. The loss which has been sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation since 1954 in disposing of surplus dairy products amounts to about \$700 million. The record shows that.

Mr. AIKEN. We will be fortunate if it does not amount to a billion dollars before we get through with it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not complaining about it. I am merely pointing to these figures to show how this factor has influenced the change in the milk consumption.

Mr. AIKEN. At the present time there are fewer dairy products in storage, both in Commodity Credit Corporation storage and in private storage.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is because the products have been frequently given away.

Mr. AIKEN. There is less in storage than in many years. The Commodity Credit Corporation has sold most of its butter. I believe 30 million pounds are left. Most of what is left is in powdered milk, and there is a considerable quantity of cheese left also.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has pointed out, millions of pounds of powdered milk went into feed for hogs.

Mr. AIKEN. It is unfortunate that when the price to the farmer goes down, the consuming public does not get the benefit of it, and somebody else always steps in to take the difference in the price. However, when the price to the farmer goes up the price to the consumer also goes up.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I shall take the time of the Senate to cite just one more example of the confused thinking of our Secretary of Agriculture on the subject of what makes the American farm economy tick. In 1954, the national acreage allotment for corn, in the commercial corn-producing area, amounted to 46,996,000 acres. The support level was established at 90 percent of parity. As Senators know, the corn price-support program works somewhat differently from the support program for the other basics, in that marketing quotas are not invoked in the Corn Belt. Thus, a farmer may elect to either comply with his individual acreage allotment and thereby become eligible to participate in the price-support loan and purchase features of the program, or he can disregard his acreage allotment, plant all the corn he wishes, and dispose of it on the market at whatever price he can get, and without any penalty whatever. Under this type of program, in 1954, corn farmers in the commercial area planted 57,173,000 acres of corn. The average price received by the farmer on the market for corn in 1954 was \$1.43, compared with a support price of \$1.62.

Now, in 1955, the Secretary established the national acreage allotment for corn at 49,843,000 acres, with a support price of 87 percent of parity, or \$1.58 per bushel. Faced with the prospect of even less Government assistance in maintaining a price at or around parity, did the corn farmers of the commercial belt reduce their acreage, as should occur if the philosophy of the Secretary of Agriculture is sound? No, they did not. In 1955, they planted 57,209,000 acres to corn—just slightly over the amount they planted in 1954. Bear in mind that in 1955, the corn farmers of the United States received an average of \$1.31 per bushel, compared with the announced support price of \$1.58.

Again, in 1956, what will the corn farmers of the commercial area do, when the Secretary has lowered the national acreage allotment to 43,281,000 acres, and flexed the support price downward a full 6 points, to 81 percent of parity, or \$1.40 per bushel? If the Secretary's reasoning is correct, corn acreage in the commercial belt should drop, in direct relation to the anticipated price the commodity will bring on the market. Yet we find Department of Agriculture officials, in testifying before the Senate Agriculture Committee just a short while ago, predicting that unless something is done, over and beyond the incentives contained in the pending bill, to encourage corn farmers to participate in the soil-bank program, we can expect another huge planting in the commercial Corn Belt—at least 56 million acres.

I repeat, Mr. President—either our Secretary of Agriculture is woefully

ignorant of what is going on today in American agriculture, or he continues to whistle in the dark in the hope that lightning will strike.

Mr. President, I should like to place in the RECORD at this point several statements made by the Secretary of Agriculture in some of the reports which emanated from the Department since he took office. For instance, in his report in 1953 Mr. Benson said:

As for price and income, the outlook indicates that most of the price adjustments have been made and the situation has now become fairly stabilized. Farm prices in 1954 may decline slightly, but costs are also expected to dip downward. Of course, we are not satisfied with the present level of farm income. It is not enough that prices be stable if they do not give farmers their rightful share of the national income. Our goal is a farm program that will enable farmers to obtain their rightful share.

The Secretary stated that the retreat of farm prices and farm income had been stopped. Remember, that was a statement made in 1953. But prices and income have gone down further and further.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. At what time in 1953 was that statement made?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1953. I cannot find the exact time, but, evidently, it was made in the early part of 1954, because it is the Secretary's annual report for 1953.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. At that time the national net income of farmers was \$13.2 billion, according to the Secretary's own report. For the fourth quarter of 1955 it was \$10 billion. It did not remain stabilized; it dropped quite a bit. So that report is incorrect.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is incorrect. But it is my hope that things will really get better in the months ahead. The Secretary of Agriculture, in my humble opinion, has been not very sympathetic to the price-support program. It is my hope that if the bill is passed, as we are presenting it, he will be either more sympathetic to it or that the President will get someone in his place who will be sympathetic in administering the program.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take too much of the time of the Senate, but I have other such statements by Mr. Benson which I should like to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point, and I ask unanimous consent that they be so incorporated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matters referred to are as follows:

STATEMENTS OF SECRETARY BENSON

January 1954, before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"In the year ahead, the realized net income of farm operators is likely to hold near the 1953 level of \$12.5 billion."

Comment: Net farm income in 1955 was \$10.6 billion.

April 21, 1954, before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"I say categorically that the farmers' share of the consumer's dollar has not declined un-

der this administration nor have retail food prices moved upward."

Comment: Farmers' share of consumers' dollar in April of 1954 was 44 cents. By December of 1955, it had dropped to 38 cents.

Other statements:

Date	Benson said:	Parity ratio	Date reported ¹
Feb. 11, 1953	"... analysis leads us to expect no major changes (in farm price) during the next several months."	94	Feb. 15
Apr. 7, 1953	"Our analysts ... anticipate that prices of farm products during the spring and summer will be steady."	92	Apr. 15
Oct. 21, 1953	"It's my belief that the major price declines are behind us."	90	Nov. 15
June 30, 1954	"It (last month's 4 percent farm price decline) does not indicate a general weakening in the farm price structure."	88	July 15
Jan. 7, 1955	"I am convinced that for agriculture the road ahead will be smoother than the one we have been traveling."	86	Jan. 15
June 15, 1955	"I am confident that we have seen the worst of the transition which agriculture goes through following every major war."	84	July 15

¹ The parity ratio is reported as of the 15th of each month.

Comment: The parity ratio on January 16, 1956, was 80.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, my good friend from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] asked a moment ago whether I wished to complete my statement tonight. It is now quarter of six, and I know I cannot complete it tonight. I am a little over halfway through. It is my hope that tomorrow there will be more Senators present. I express the hope that as many members of the committee as we have had present this afternoon will be on the floor tomorrow, so we can engage in a debate to make crystal clear, if possible, what the bill proposes to do, in the hope that we can vote on the measure not later than Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. I am sure my good friend from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] will assist us in trying to attain that aim.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I will say to my good friend from Louisiana that his suggestion that we may get a vote on the bill in the early part of next week is encouraging. I certainly recognize the fact that it is a measure of such importance that it should be discussed fully and completely, in every detail, on the floor. I should think that Tuesday or Wednesday of next week would probably afford the time needed on this place of proposed legislation. I ask my distinguished friend from Louisiana if he believes that much time will be required to bring the bill to a vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. From the conversations I have had with Senators who are desirous of offering amendments, I would say it would hardly be possible to vote on the bill before Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. I express the hope that some working arrangement can be made between the majority leader and the minority leader toward trying to get a limitation of debate after this week so that we can fix a day certain on which to vote, and have the Senators who desire to express themselves in the meantime take the floor. By fixing a date certain, I am sure we can make a good deal of progress toward completing the consideration of the bill and having it in conference by the middle of next week.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it the chairman's view that no request is likely to be made for a limitation of time until Monday of next week?

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope we can fix a date before that time.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Even if it is fixed before that time, am I to understand the Senator's view to be that he would not want the vote to be taken before Tuesday?

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to see the bill voted on by Friday, but I am a realist and I doubt, with the many amendments that are being proposed, that I can be so optimistic as to suggest we can get through the bill tomorrow or next day.

Mr. CLEMENTS. There will be no session on Saturday.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has already indicated that. It strikes me that if we debate the bill through Friday afternoon, and if Senators remain and ask such questions as they may desire to propound, we can get through with a discussion of the bill this week. It is not very complicated, so far as the matters at issue, including the 90 percent price support, are concerned. I do not suppose that many Senators can be prevailed upon to change their minds on any of the basic issues embodied in the bill. I think many of them have already changed their minds, and I hope they will remain that way.

I want to be realistic. I realize that many Senators may have to leave Washington over the weekend. Therefore, they wish to be assured that no serious business will be transacted on Friday. I hope Senators can be given assurance that there will be a vote on the bill on, let us say, next Tuesday, or on Wednesday at the latest. It should be possible to complete action on the bill by that time and then to proceed with other matters.

I urge my good friend from Kentucky not to let anything interfere with the debate on the farm bill. Let us continue with its consideration until we have finished with it. Let us try to get Senators to talk about the farm bill, and to forget about everything else for the time being. Since last October I have devoted the major portion of my attention to this legislation. Since I returned to Washington on January 1, I have left nothing undone in an all-out effort to have it on the President's desk sometime in the early part of March—not later than the 15th. If we set that date

as the goal, I am certain we can achieve it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator is unusually modest when he speaks about this measure having occupied his time since last October. If my memory serves me correctly, a vote was taken in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last May which charted the way for the bill to be taken up at this time rather than to be considered at the close of the last session. It has been my understanding, and certainly my observation, that the Senator from Louisiana has been very active in working on the proposed legislation from that time until now.

Mr. ELLENDER. I made a slight error of about 5 months.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I felt certain the RECORD ought to be cleared to that extent.

I appreciate what the Senator from Louisiana has said. There is no way whereby assurance can be given as to when a measure will be voted on, unless a time certain has been set to do so. I was very much interested in having the Senator's views as to whether he thought it was possible to have an agreement to limit debate considered prior to Monday. From what the Senator has said, with only 2 days remaining of this week, with the great interest there is in the Senate and throughout the country in the bill, and important as the bill is to the people of the country, I am taking it for granted that probably the limitation of debate will not be asked for until Monday.

I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if that is not probably in line with his thinking.

Mr. AIKEN. That is generally in line with my thinking. We know that several amendments, probably important amendments, are in process of preparation now. I hope Senators who intend to submit amendments will have them printed this week at the latest, so that the committee will have a chance to study them.

We realize, also, that there are always some Senators who are out of town, and who should have notice of when an important vote is to take place. It is my thought that probably by Monday it would be possible to secure a unanimous-consent agreement, thus giving the absent Senators time in which to return to Washington, even if it be necessary to shorten the debate after the voting starts on the various amendments.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I could not agree more with the Senator from Vermont, and I, too, urge Senators who have had an opportunity to study the bill to submit the amendments they intend to propose and to have them printed at the earliest possible date. I am certain that any Senator who intends to offer an amendment to the bill will also come to the Senate prepared with what seems to him to be a good, sound argument for it.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know why the Senate should spend much time in debating 90-percent rigid supports or dual parity, or possibly 1 or 2 other amendments. But there are some amendments in which all Senators are interested, one way or the other, and which should be

explained and debated fully on the floor. I hope those amendments will make their appearance promptly, and that their sponsors will make their arguments for the amendments as soon as they have them prepared.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator mentioned a very important segment of the bill when he spoke of the 90-percent supports. I trust the Senator from Louisiana was referring to that part of the bill a while ago when he said he thought there had been some change in sentiment among the Members.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope so, too.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was not wishful thinking, either.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from Louisiana heartens me, for I now believe that a sufficient number of Senators realize the great hurt that came to agriculture through the passage of the legislation which is now on the statute books.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me assure my friend from Kentucky that my remarks were not intended to hearten him in that respect.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I can assure my friend from Vermont that I wanted to be heartened, and this is the only way I know of in which I can get any encouragement for the farmer in the days that lie ahead.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 23, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who wert the God of our fathers, we thank Thee for this day in the calendar of our national history, commemorating the birth of one whom we affectionately call the Father of Our Country.

We are seeking to pay honor and tribute to the memory of that noble patriot who stood like a giant among his contemporaries and made an indelible impression upon his own and succeeding generations.

Grant that the memory of his illustrious qualities of character, his lofty idealism, his sturdy commonsense, his skill in statesmanship and diplomacy, his fidelity to the principles of righteousness and justice, and his faith in divine providence may never become eclipsed or pass into oblivion.

May this not only be a day of commemoration but of consecration when we are resolving to give wholehearted devotion to those ideals which were

resident and regnant in the soul of George Washington.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8101. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to give 25 World War II paintings to the Government of New Zealand.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 8320) entitled "an act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1135. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes."

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 7, 1956, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution

of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations

in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Intervened as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion

of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves,

which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such

they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext.

One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown.* In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the govern-

ment itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting in a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that

morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against par-

ticular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. *The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But

that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or pref-

erences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly on one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the bel-

ligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1135. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes,"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 23, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1566. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting a letter requesting the case of Min-Sun Chen, A-6848005, be returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1567. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting nine copies of recent publications for the information of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8675. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; without amendment (Rept. No. 1804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9429. A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9428. A bill to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 9473. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 9474. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 9475. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 9476. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 9477. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 9478. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 9479. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 9480. A bill to amend title II of Public Law 480 (83d Cong.) so as to increase the amount of surplus commodities available thereunder and permit payment under certain circumstances of ocean freight; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 9481. A bill declaring the inundation of property because of, or aggravated by, wind, waves, or tidal effects on the Great Lakes to be property within the flood-control activities of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 9482. A bill to increase the amount authorized for the erection of adequate facilities for use of National Institute of Dental Research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 9483. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H. R. 9484. A bill relating to the quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of, Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 9485. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Construction Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to extend the benefits of such act to certain individuals by change of the date limitation on the citizenship requirement contained in such act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9486. A bill to provide equitable compensation for Saturday, Sunday, holiday, and overtime duty in the Federal Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9487. A bill—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9488. A bill to provide for Federal contribution to the election campaigns of major political parties, to reduce the importance of campaign contributions in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 9489. A bill to recognize and confirm the authority of arid and semiarid States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their geographic boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9490. A bill to provide a 10-year program for the construction and improvement of roads, trails, buildings, and utilities in national park and monument areas and other areas administered by the National Park Service and for the construction and improvement of parkways authorized by acts of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 9491. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 9492. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 9493. A bill for the relief of John Koussoumbri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 9494. A bill for the relief of Joseph David (Jerry) Malamud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9495. A bill for the relief of Gerald Augustine Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 9496. A bill for the relief of Kiki Monoyioudis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 9497. A bill for the relief of Antonio Quijano, Lilia Quijano, and Aurora Quijano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. Res. 402. Resolution providing for sending the bill H. R. 5918 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; 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:

562. By Mr. RIEHLMAN: Petition signed by Mr. Ivan M. Cash and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the enactment of H. R. 4827; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

563. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the executive secretary, American Mosquito Control Association, Inc., Selma, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their support of S. 2870 with certain amendments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1956

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who dost overarch our fleeting years with Thine eternity and dost undergird our weakness with Thy strength, in the midst of the pressures of another day, as we face its vast concerns, we pause with bowed heads and hearts at this shrine of our spirits. Without Thee even our wistful hopes for humanity are like winter's withered leaves, once verdant and bright—now

brown and crumpled ruins blown upon a bitter wind.

Above all else we pray Thee save us from succumbing to the terrible temptation to become cynical and to be men of lost faith. Join us in kinship to those who in other times that tried men's souls went on believing in beauty and love and God in the midst of ugliness, hatred, and horror. For as with deep craving for reality we turn now to Thee we remember that we date this day's deliberation from the lowly cradle of One who died on the gallows of his day—mocked, reviled, insulted, outraged—yet that torturing cross of defeat sways the future. By its crimson sign which towers o'er the wrecks of time may we conquer. In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 22, 1956, 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, informed the Senate that Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker pro tempore, during the absence of the Speaker.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li), Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor);

H. R. 2430. An act to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, South Carolina, by the United States of America; and

H. R. 8101. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to give 25 World War II paintings to the Government of New Zealand.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for action on the nomination on the Executive Calendar, under the heading "New Report."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the Presi-