foundation world as consciously and intentionally as did the Communists.

It was incontrovertibly established that the American Communists were directed by Moscow to infiltrate American foundations and to use their funds to promote communism in the United States.

We know that they succeeded to some extent, but we may never know the full extent, as their methods are devious. Two well-known foundations had their tax-exempt status lifted by the Treasury because of Communist subversion. And I understand the Fund for the Republic is now under investigation.

But in the case of the infiltration of collectivists or Socialists into the foundations, we know a great deal about it. They have virtually taken over the operating phases of the major foundations, and through them or in conjunction with them have taken over a vast part of the direction of thought and teaching in our educational system.

We have called this use of the foundations for the promotion of socialism by the name "subversion."

For this our enemies have bitterly criticized us.

The Socialist in the United States prefers to have the term "subversion" confined to Communist penetration.

But the term "subversion" denotes an undermining, a chipping away. In this sense the promotion of socialism is clearly subversive of our institutions.

Moreover, it is my opinion, and I am far from alone, that subversion through socialism offers us a far greater internal danger than the threat of communism.

There is no doubt that socialism and communism go hand in hand. The Socialist may hate the Communist, but the Communist loves the Socialist.

The Communist knows that if the Socialist is able to get the upper hand and to destroy a capitalistic system, the Communist can quickly take over.

There is much misconception about the relationship of socialism and communism.

They are the same and identical thing except for one single difference—the Communist believes in establishing the Socialist order by force, while the Socialist is generally content to achieve it through subversive methods—by perverting a democracy.

I wish I had time to give you case after case of socialist propaganda financed by the Carnegie Corp., the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and others, each without repudiation afterward, each without any effort being made to counteract the impact of what had appeared.

XII

As I intimated previously, one can perhaps exonerate the trustees who did not understand what was being done with the money they allocated to such projects—exonerate them for having been uninformed; yes.

But one cannot exonerate them for having abdicated their trust functions by relying upon professional employees and advisers and intermediary organizations to do their thinking for them.

Nor can one forgive them for either not having studied the products of their negligence or else having failed to repudiate or counter the evil which reading must have disclosed.

We must congratulate Mr. Henry Ford II for having finally had the courage to repudiate (in somewhat gentler language than one might have hoped for) the irresponsible and dangerous antics of the Fund for the Republic.

But does this belated and qualified disavowal excuse Mr. Ford and his fellow trustees of the Ford Foundation for having created this Fund for the Republic and placed $15 million in the administrative hands of Mr. Paul Hoffman and Dr. Hutchins knowing from their own experience with them, that they could use it for purposes conforming to their own radical political predilections?

I do not say that foundations should avoid the social sciences. They need support, just as do the true sciences, medicine, public health, the humanities, etc.

But I do say that the social sciences form a dangerous area for foundation activity unless they are approached with the greatest objectivity and realism.

There are perhaps dangers even in direct grants to institutions, such as universities, when these themselves are to select the areas of research and its administrators.

But there are natural protections within most such institutions.

The dangers are limited by its traditions, its academic organizations, its inter-conflicting opinion, and other factors which keep such an institution reasonably on the track of objectivity.

It might be better if foundations which wish to support social science research did so solely through undirected and unselected grants to universities and colleges.

But if they, with the help of their intermediary organizations, decide to design and control such research themselves, they must do so in conformance with their duty to the public to whose service they are, and by law must be, dedicated.

This dedication requires objectivity, which in itself is not easy. There are many excuses for avoiding this responsibility.

XIII

For example, professional foundation managers frequently talk about the desirability of using foundation funds as risk capital, in ventures where the chances of success are too remote to attract normal financing.

This is an intriguing concept, and has great validity when you are talking about medical research, and other basically non-controversial areas.

If, however, risks are to be taken with the form of our society, or with the form of our Government, or with public opinion in fields which affect our morals, ethics, and political theory, then I, for one, do not believe this to be a proper use of public trust funds.

When funds as huge and powerful as those of the Ford Foundation can be focused upon the proliferation of unscientific science, the risks to society are so great that I do not believe we can tolerate such risk-taking.

My time is too short to give you more. I must close with a plea to you and other like you to become alert to what has happened in the foundation world—and what is currently happening.

I close, as well, with a plea to the trustees of the great foundations themselves to give closer attention to their own organizations.

As matters now stand, the tremendous amount of good performed by these foundations is being jeopardized by their delinquencies.

It is possible pressure for legislative control of foundations may increase. I would deplore it if such legislation became necessary.

There is an easier cure, one which would permit these huge organizations to continue independently. They have done so much for the benefit of humanity and should be allowed to continue.

In your field of medicine, for instance, so many great accomplishments have been foundation financed.

But the great aggregate of good they have done cannot excuse the evil for which they have been responsible; and the day may come when society is unwilling to permit them full freedom unless they reform from within.

That is what I hope for, that their trustees will come to understand that they must restore these foundations to the full respect which careful management would entitle them, and to the very useful place in our society which foundations should occupy.

Such reform from within would entail jettisoning, once and for all, the political influences to which they have been subjected. It would demand a general housecleaning, both as to their academic advisers, their professional staffs, and the intermediary organizations which they support financially and use as retailers.

A foundation, by its very public character, must be wholly objective and wholly free from any political influence.

This is particularly true, obviously enough, when the political forces which seek to influence it are those which are seeking to propel us toward a state which they see as ideal but which must inevitably pitch us into slavery of socialism.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, April 9, 1956)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, who knowest our necessity before we ask, and our ignorance, limitations, and fallibility in asking, have compassion, we beseech Thee, upon our infirmity, strengthen us in all noble impulses, and daily increase in us the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and knowledge, and true godliness.

Dowered with privileges and with the stewardship of power as no other nation, may our high estate be to us Thy call to protect the weak and exploited, that through the potent ministry of this republic of freemen, all peoples of the earth may be blessed.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 9, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On April 6, 1956:

S. 1240. An act for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky;

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;

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; and

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.

On April 10, 1956:

S. 101. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens;

S. 117. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens;

S. 315. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 396. An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

S. 663. An act for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis);

S. 963. An act for the relief of certain aliens; and

S. 1242. An act for the relief of certain aliens.

On April 11, 1956:

S. 213. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens and to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of certain aliens;

S. 500. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; and

S. 1289. An act to establish a Domestic Relations Branch in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Canada, vice R. Douglas Stuart, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary;

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations;

The Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs of the Committee on the District of Columbia; and

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Armed Services Committee was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

On request of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet tomorrow afternoon during the session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

CHAIRMAN OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SENATE RECEPTION ROOM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce for him the appointment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] as a member and as chairman of the Special Committee on the Senate Reception Room, vice the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PERSONNEL SITUATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

A communication from the President of the United States, relating to the personnel situation in the Armed Forces (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
WASHINGTON, *April 9, 1956.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The attached letter, addressed to me by the Secretary of Defense, reviews the serious nature of the personnel situation in the Armed Forces. It also outlines the major legislative proposals which the administration has presented to the Congress as a means of improving military career incentives.

I urge that this legislation be enacted. Only when we have created a career military service which can compete with the attractive opportunities available in civilian pursuits will we be able to stop the wasteful losses from our Armed Forces and attract individuals to those services. We cannot move too soon in our efforts to increase the number and quality of volunteers for long-term career military service in both enlisted and officer ranks.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, AND DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE AND POST OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 112)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1956, in the amount of $20 million for the Small Business Administration, $500,000 for the Department of Agriculture, and $16 million for the Post Office Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE FOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of amendments to the Rules of Criminal Procedure for the United States District Courts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTECTION AGAINST DISSEMINATION OF DISEASES OF LIVESTOCK OR POULTRY

A letter from the Acting Secertary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide further protection against the dissemination of diseases of livestock or poultry, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of January 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated March 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the United States Coast Guard, Department of the Treasury, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Civil Aeronautics Board, dated October 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution urging removal of certain Federal restrictions on the raising of crops for the feeding of livestock

"Whereas the right to own and till our soil is one of the basic conceptions of our American way of life; and

"Whereas this is construed to mean the right to raise any crop we wish in order to feed ourselves, our cattle and poultry; and

"Whereas, since 1938, a provision of the Federal crop control law has restricted and denied this right to farmers; and

"Whereas there is every justification that a farmer should be free to grow on his farm whatever crops he deems proper and necessary to feed his own livestock and poultry; and

"Whereas the margin of profit, if any, under present prices for milk depends, to a large extent on the amount of feed grown on the farms: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved (if the senate concur)*, That the legislature of this State on behalf of all its people go on record as favoring the modification or removal of these restrictions; and be it further

"*Resolved (if the senate concur)*, That the legislature of this State does hereby respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to alleviate situation above set forth and to modify or remove the crop control laws which created it; and be it further

"*Resolved (if the senate concur)*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to each Member of the Congress duly elected from the State of New York."

Five concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 128

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to the States the right to regulate health, morals, education, marriage, peace, and good order

"*Be it resolved by the Mississippi State Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby requested to propose the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'SECTION 1. No branch or department of the Federal Government shall limit, abridge or interfere in any manner with the right and power of the States to regulate health, morals, education, marriage, peace, and good order in the States, and exclusive jurisdiction thereof is reserved to the States.

" 'The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, a part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate March 21, 1956.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 30, 1956.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 130

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements

"*Be it resolved by the Mississippi State Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States of American be and it is hereby requested to propose the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution, or which is not made in pursuance thereof, shall not be the supreme law of the land nor be of any force or effect.

" 'SEC. 2. A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation valid in the absence of international agreement.

" 'SEC. 3. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty, the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the journal of the senate.

" 'SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall be ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, a part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate March 21, 1956.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 30, 1956.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 131

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the election of President and Vice President

"*Be it resolved by the Mississippi State Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby requested to propose the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'SECTION 1. Each State shall choose a number of electors of the President and Vice President, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress, in the same manner in which its Senators and Representatives are nominated and elected. But no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States shall be chosen elector.

" 'SEC. 2. The electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for President and Vice President, one of whom, at least shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice President; and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate; the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and the House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted; the person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be the President and the person having the greatest number of votes for Vice President shall be the Vice President, if such numbers be majorities of the whole number of electors chosen.

" 'SEC. 3. If no persons voted for as President of Vice President have a majority of the whole number of electors chosen, then from the person having the highest numbers, not exceeding three, on the lists of those voted for as President and Vice President, the Senate and the House of Representatives, assembled and voting as one body, shall choose immediately from the respective lists the President, and then the Vice President, or either, as the case may be; a quorum for these purposes shall consist of three-fourths of the whole number of the Senators and Representatives, and the persons receiving the greatest number of votes for President and for Vice President on the respective roll calls shall be the President and the Vice President. But no person ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to the office of Vice President'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, a part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate March 21, 1956.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 30, 1956.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 132

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the procedure for amending the Constitution

"*Be it resolved by the Mississsippi State Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby requested to propose the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'SECTION 1. The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments; or the legislature of any State, whenever two-thirds of each house shall deem it necessary, may propose amendments to this Constitution by transmitting to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the secretary of state of each of the several States a certified copy of the resolution proposing the amendment, which shall be deemed submitted to the several States for ratification when certified copies of resolutions of the legislatures of any 12 of the several States by two-thirds of each house shall have been so transmitted concurring in the proposal of such amendment; which, in any case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: Provided, that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

" 'SEC. 2. A proposal of an amendment by a State shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so concurred in within 7 years from the date of the proposal. A proposed amendment shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so ratified within 7 years from the date of its submission, or shorter period as may be prescribed in the resolution proposing the amendment.

" 'SEC. 3. Controversies respecting the validity of an amendment shall be justifiable and shall be determined by the exercise of the judicial power of the United States.

" 'SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an

amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission'; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, a part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate March 21, 1956.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 30, 1956.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 133

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget

"Be it resolved by the Mississippi State Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby requested to propose the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'SECTION 1. On or before the 15th day after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the President shall transmit to the Congress a budget which shall set forth his estimates of the receipts of the Government, other than trust funds, during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws then existing and his recommendations with respect to expenditures to be made from funds other than trust funds during such ensuing fiscal year, which shall not exceed such estimate of receipts. If the Congress shall authorize expenditures to be made during such ensuing fiscal year in excess of such estimated receipts, it shall not recess or adjourn for more than 3 days at a time until action has been taken necessary to balance the budget for such ensuing fiscal year: *Provided, however,* That in case of war or other grave national emergency, if the President shall so recommend, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all the Members of each House may suspend the foregoing provisions for balancing the budget for periods, either successive or otherwise, not exceeding 1 year each.

" 'SEC. 2. This article shall take effect on the 1st day of the fiscal year next following the ratification of this article.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, a part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate March 21, 1956.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 30, 1956.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A current resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relating to the evaluation of the Federal fiscal policy and taxing power as it affects the three levels of government, and so forth; to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on April 9, 1956, p. 5894, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

UTILITY RELOCATION — RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., endorsing section 11 of the Fallon bill, relating to utility relocation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution relating to the utility relocation-cost section of the Fallon bill (H. R. 8836, section 11)

Whereas the Fallon bill (H. R. 8836, section 11) provides for the inclusion of the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal highway systems, whenever a State makes provision for paying such costs; and

Whereas the city of Minneapolis has had mutually satisfactory arrangements with the State of Minnesota on the inclusion of such utility costs on projects heretofore carried out in the city: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That the city council endorse the said section 11 of the Fallon bill providing for financing the cost of relocating utility facilities; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the members of the Minnesota delegation in the House and Senate of the United States Congress and to the chairman of the House Committee on Public Works.

Passed March 29, 1956.

EUGENE E. STOKOWSKI,
President of the Council.

Approved April 2, 1956.

ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor.

Attest:

LEONARD A. JOHNSON,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the National Board of the United States Section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom held a meeting in Philadelphia, Pa., February 3 to 5, 1956, and the following resolution was adopted. I want to bring this to the attention of my colleagues and therefore ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION RE THE SENATE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

The national board of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, meeting in Philadelphia, Pa., February 3–5, 1956, commends the establishment of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Disarmament, chaired by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and welcomes the expressed intention of the committee to study all phases of the problem.

In the findings we hope that the committee will make recommendations based on testimony of nongovernmental organizations with a concern in the field, as well as that of experts. We hope that the committee will be able to extend the opportunity for this expression of citizen opinion by holding hearings throughout the United States.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CO-OP SERVICES, INC., OF NEW YORK MILLS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolutions adopted by the members of the Co-op Services, Inc. of New York Mills, Minn., relating to parity prices, and so forth.

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

Whereas farmers everywhere are going broke due to falling farm prices and rising costs of production; and

Whereas profiteers and speculators in our economy are inflating prices of food and other goods until consumers cannot afford these items; and

Whereas taxes are sky high due mostly to defense spending from which the common people get little benefit, but which is creating millionaries by the thousands; and

Whereas our shaky economy is being propped up with borrowed money in the form of mortgages, installment buying and loans from high interest-charging loan sharks: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we wake up to the fact that drastic measures are needed to prevent a complete depression; measures such as the Brannon plan with 100 percent of parity for farmers, Federal aid to schools and roads, and also other programs to increase the consuming power of the people. This means greater efforts toward world peace and disarmament and repeal of universal military training with corresponding cuts in spending of tax money for war purposes; this means getting back to real freedom of speech so people can discuss remedies such as the Brannon plan: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Co-op Services, Inc. assert leadership in the fight for peace and parity; and a real fight for peaceful use of atomic energy, especially for REA powerplants, immediate action on new farm legislation enabling the family-size farm family to survive. Any farmers with over $15,000 yearly gross income should not be protected with 100 percent parity but left to sell on the open market: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Co-op Services, Inc. of New York Mills, Minn., representing 1,880 members and patrons, feeling that the situation among farmers is getting desperate, urge our representatives in Congress to take immediate action to alleviate matters by measures as outlined herein.

VERNER A. ANDERSON,
Secretary, Co-op Services, Inc.

EXPANDED FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution proposed by streets and traffic committee of the League of Minnesota Municipalities, Minneapolis, Minn., supporting an expanded Federal highway program.

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

RESOLUTION ON EXPANDED FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Whereas Minnesota and the Nation's highway systems fall steadily behind accelerating traffic needs, and bold construction programs involving all levels of government are an urgent necessity; and

Whereas pending congressional legislation for an expanded Federal-aid highway program properly recognizes national interest in an adequate system of interstate highways for reasons of defense and economic progress; and

Whereas until the interstate highway routes and their rate of development are decided, it is frequently impossible for municipalities in many cases to determine access roads, connecting streets, and highway rights-of-way in and near cities, and delays will cost money, particularly in added right-of-way costs; and

Whereas adoption of the pending expanded Federal highway program along with ratification next fall of Minnesota's proposed amendment No. 2 will provide admirably for the three-way governmental partnership essential to a solution of Minnesota's highway problems, both rural and urban; and

Whereas the need for immediate action may make impossible an official legislative expression by the League of Minnesota Municipalities at its June legislative conference: Be it

Resolved, That the streets and traffic committee of the League of Minnesota Municipalities endorse adoption of the pending expanded Federal highway program in a form which would—

1. Achieve the earliest possible completion of the 40,000-mile interstate highway system along with the highest possible level of construction on the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems, having due regard for inflationary pressures resulting from too rapid a construction program;

2. Provide for the assumption of 90 percent of the cost of the interstate system, including urban extensions, with a continuation of present matching formulas for other parts of the Federal-aid program;

3. Properly recognize the needs of rural and urban highways;

4. Provide for getting the expanded highway program adopted and in high gear at the earliest possible time, recognizing that to achieve prompt passage of the expanded program a review of many controversial details of the program can be provided periodically in the course of its execution over the next 15 years; further

Resolved, That if such action will still be timely, the League of Minnesota Municipalities at its legislative conference in Detroit Lakes on June 15, 1956, be asked to adopt this resolution as the official statement of the league and that in the meantime, copies of this resolution as the expression of the league streets and traffic committee be sent to Members of the Minnesota congressional delegation.

RESOLUTIONS AND REPORT OF NORTH CAROLINA ACADEMY OF SCIENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at the annual meeting of the North Carolina Academy of Science on March 23, 1956, several resolutions were adopted, two of which I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues. I should also like to bring to their attention the report of the conservation and legislative committee of the North Carolina Academy of Science. I ask unanimous consent to have these printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NORTH CAROLINA ACADEMY OF SCIENCE

Whereas the land now constituting the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge was set aside in 1905 by President Theodore Roosevelt to preserve for future generations this tract as a national forest, and because of the importance of this tract as a wildlife refuge and recreational area it was transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service in 1935; and

Whereas the reduction in the size of the refuge as requested by the Army and proposed by legislation now in Congress will seriously impair, if not destroy, the value of this wildlife refuge which protects one of the largest herds of bison and Texas longhorns on the North American continent; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has firmly opposed suggestions that a portion of the Wichita Refuge be transferred to the Army; and

Whereas, testimony before the Congress by the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, calls attention to the fact that all prominent conservation groups of the State of Oklahoma and every major national conservation group are on record as opposing this transfer which is not essential to the national defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Carolina Academy of Science, meeting in Chapel Hill on March 23, 1956, vigorously opposes H. R. 9665 by Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM, and S. 3360, by Senators A. S. MIKE MONRONEY and ROBERT S. KERR, which would transfer to the Army certain lands from the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of the academy's views be sent to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to all Members of Congress from North Carolina.

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System is essential to the protection of many endangered species of native birds and mammals and also serves to insure protection for migratory species in critical parts of their range; and

Whereas these refuges were established for the purpose of protecting the remnants of this Nation's once vast wildlife heritage which belongs to all the people; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has the authority to dispose of this Nation's wildlife refuges by signing an administrative order without public hearing, without advance notice, or without discussion with the sportsmen and other conservationists whose funds and support were responsible for the establishment of the refuge system for the benefit of the present and future generations; and

Whereas legislation (S. 2101, H. R. 5306, and H. R. 6723) is now being considered which, if passed, will require the Secretary of the Interior to obtain prior approval of the Congress before the Secretary can dispose of or relinquish any of the national wildlife refuges, or parts thereof: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the North Carolina Academy of Science, meeting in Chapel Hill on March 23, 1956, supports in principle S. 2101, introduced by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, H. R. 5306, introduced by Congressman LEE METCALF, and H. R. 6723, introduced by Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, and urges the immediate passage of legislation to require the Secretary of the Interior to obtain approval of the Congress before he can dispose of, relinquish, or permit incompatible uses of a national wildlife refuge or parts thereof: And be it further

Resolved, That copies of the academy's views be sent to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and a copy of this resolution be transmitted to all Members of Congress from North Carolina.

REPORT OF THE CONSERVATION AND LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, NORTH CAROLINA ACADEMY OF SCIENCE, MARCH 23, 1956

The past several months have been marked by a considerable increase in activity on the part of numerous individuals and groups who wish to exploit or to develop our natural resources. In the opinion of your committee, some of these activities have not been in the public interest.

On November 29, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay announced that the Department was abandoning plans for the controversial Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. This withdrawal by the Secretary represents a major victory by the conservationists in their fight to protect the integrity of the national park system.

The almost successful raid on the public lands by certain grazing interests were finally defeated in conference committee where North Carolina's Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, supported by other conservation-minded Congressmen and Senators, struck out the amendment which had been tied to the totally unrelated farm subsidy bill in the Senate. The amendment was vigorously opposed in the Senate by Senator SAMUEL J. ERVIN and several other Senators.

The Al Sarena case, in which Al Sarena Mines, Inc., of Trails, Oreg., became owner of 300 acres of fine Oregon timber worth more than $600,000, by getting the Department of the Interior to approve some questionable mining claims, is being investigated by North Carolina's Senator KERR SCOTT.

What amounts to a lifting of restrictions on the exploration for oil on wildlife refuges by the Secretary of the Interior has created considerable apprehension among wildlife biologists throughout the Nation. It is felt that the manner in which the Lacassine Waterfowl Refuge was opened to Frankfort Oil Co., a subsidiary of Seagrams' Distillers, should be the subject of a thorough congressional investigation.

The attempt by the Army to appropriate a portion of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge as a target area for atomic cannon is of grave concern to conservationists, particularly in view of the fact that public testimony shows that the area is not essential for national defense. If this tract of 10,700 acres is turned over to the Army, it would be possible under current law and practice for it to become a hunting preserve for a select group of Fort Sill and other Army personnel and their guests in addition to its use as an impact area for artillery practice. Fire resulting from shell bursts would be almost impossible to control during certain seasons and would spread to the remainder of the Wichita Refuge. The efforts of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in opposing this transfer is most gratifying to conservationists.

Another resolution for the academy's action deals with the danger to the national wildlife refuge system by the power now vested in the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of any or all of these refuges by signing an administrative order without reference to the Congress or to the public.

The continuation and strengthening of the Water Pollution Control Act (Public Law 845, 80th Cong.), which expires on June 30, 1956, is recommended by your committee. A resolution is submitted for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted.

HARRY LEGRAND,
WANDA S. HUNTER,
T. E. MAKI,
F. S. BARKALOW, Jr.,
Chairman.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 10004. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1725).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 5566. An act to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1727).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, from that committee, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 3481) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1726) thereon.

Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION, RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed my individual views on the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements, Calendar No. 1649, as part 2 of Senate Report No. 1716.

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

Subsequently, Mr. HENNINGS submitted his individual views, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 1716.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

James Durfee, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, vice Ross Rizley, resigned; and

Herman H. Druebert, and James C. Sainsbury, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably from that committee the following nominations, which will be placed on the Executive Calendar:

James W. Barco, of Virginia, to be a deputy representative in the Security Council of the United Nations; and

Lowell C. Pinkerton, of Missouri, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Sudan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Also from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably the following conventions, and I submit a report (Ex. Rept. No. 5) thereon:

Executive A, 84th Congress, 2d session: A Convention Concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, signed at New York on June 4, 1954; and

Executive B, 84th Congress, 2d session: A Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, signed at New York on June 4, 1954.

Without objection, the report will be received and the conventions will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 3582. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 17, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the Employees' Compensation Fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. KERR:

S. 3583. A bill for the relief of Mathilde Gombard-Liatzky;

S. 3584. A bill for the relief of Helga Binder; and

S. 3585. A bill for the relief of Paz Tupas Meeker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3586. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army to the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

S. 3587. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. FREAR):

S. 3588. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. BYRD) (by request):

S. 3589. A bill to carry out the International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Matter; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 3590. A bill for the relief of Oather S. Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3591. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Campo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3592. A bill to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service; and

S. 3593. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 3594. A bill to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 3595. A bill for the relief of Irma B. Poellmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES (by request):

S. 3596. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Kenrick W. Hackett; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 3597. A bill for the relief of Duk Chang Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3598. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 3599. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to compensate certain civilian employees of the Corps of Engineers who suffered loss of annual leave as the result of being engaged in emergency flood relief work; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 3600. A bill for the relief of certain dependents of the late Darwin Philo Taylor; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3601. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in Lemhi County, Idaho, to the State of Idaho for the use and benefit of the department of fish and game; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 3602. A bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3603. A bill to amend section 3231, title 18, United States Code, to reaffirm the jurisdiction of State courts to enforce State statutes prohibiting subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. DUFF, Mr. LANGER, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. THYE, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 3604. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Attorney General; and

S. 3605. A bill to establish a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3606. A bill to amend section 4 (a) (11) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 so as to permit the issuance of visas to certain refugees residing in the Far East; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 3607. A bill to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 3608. A bill establishing the Joint Congressional Commission on Fundamental Farm Policy; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3609. A bill to exempt fine arts programs from the admissions tax; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 3610. A bill to prohibit the importation of manufactured articles from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and other Communist-dominated countries; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3611. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Conicacelaya Cenarruzabeitia; and

S. 3612. A bill for the relief of Gust Madias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 3613. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3614. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide increased payments, eliminate certain inequities and restrictions, and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3615. A bill to recognize and facilitate the administration of the multiple uses of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 3616. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, special disability determinations for railroad employees, and for other purposes; and to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the Special Committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. THYE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution to establish the Crazy Horse Memorial Foundation to provide for the construction of a permanent national memorial to the North American Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and other Senators):

S. Res. 236. Resolution directing the Tariff Commission to investigate whether imports of textiles or textile products are affecting injuriously the domestic industry; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. PAYNE when he submitted the above resolution, which appeared under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT RELATING TO REIMBURSEMENT FOR CERTAIN EXPENDITURES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on March 4, 1955, I introduced, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] the bill (S. 1309) to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the Employees' Compensation Fund by Federal employing agencies.

For some time we have been greatly interested in promoting greater occupational safety within the various agencies of the Federal Government and have been backed up fully in this interest by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, over the past few months, a review has been made of the provisions of S. 1309, and as a result it has been found that certain changes in that bill would be desirable in order to provide for easier and more economical administration of this program.

Therefore, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], I am today introducing a new, substitute bill, which will accomplish the same results as S. 1309, but at considerably less expense, and I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and an explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 3582) to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 17, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the employees' compensation fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 35 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 785), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 35. (a) There is established in the Treasury a separate fund to be known as the employees' compensation fund which shall consist of such sums as the Congress may from time to time appropriate therefor or transfer thereto, and amounts otherwise accruing thereto under this section. Such fund, including all additions that may be made to it by appropriation or otherwise, shall be available without time limit for the payment of the compensation, medical benefits, sums advanced as costs for enforcement of liability in third party cases as approved or required or as undertaken by the Secretary pursuant to section 26 of this act, and such other benefits and payments as are provided for by this act or any extension or application thereof, except as may be provided by this act or other acts. The Secretary shall submit annually to the Bureau of the Budget estimates of the appropriations necessary for the maintenance of the fund.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in this section, or as exempted by the Secretary as he may find necessary or proper in the public interest or to avoid serious impairment of the conduct of Government business, each executive department and each agency or instrumentality of the United States, or other establishment, having employees who are or may be entitled to compensation under this act or any extension or application thereof (hereinafter called 'agency'), shall contribute to the maintenance of the employees' compensation fund in the manner herein provided. At the end of each quarter the Secretary shall determine for each agency the total cost of benefits and other payments made in that quarter from the employees' compensation fund on account of cases arising from injury, or death from injury, occurring after July 1, 1956, in such agency under this act or any extension or application thereof. The Secretary shall bill each agency for the amount of the payments made as determined under this section giving such information as may be required to enable the agency to make payments under subsection (d) hereof. If an agency or part thereof or its functions shall be transferred to another agency, the receiving agency shall be billed for undischarged liability to the Employees' Compensation Fund on the same basis as if such liability had been originally incurred by the receiving agency.

"(c) Within 45 days after receipt of the Secretary's bill, the head of each agency shall cause the charges billed to his agency pursuant to this section to be obligated against and paid from the appropriations and funds of the agency and its constituent units, such payments to be placed to the credit of the employees' compensation fund.

"(d) Payments to the employees' compensation fund under this section shall be made from the respective appropriations or funds which are used for payment of salaries, wages, or other compensation of the employees of the several agencies: *Provided*, That the head of each agency may make transfers between such appropriations up to the amounts needed for this purpose.

"(e) Charges billed by the Secretary to each agency for payments made from the fund shall be subject to such readjustment

and correction as may be found necessary: *Provided,* That such readjustment or correction must be made within 120 days after the receipt of the Secretary's bill specified in subsection (c).

"(f) The provisions of this section with respect to contributing to the maintenance of the employees' compensation fund shall not apply in cases of persons to whom the benefits under this act or any extension or application thereof are payable from sources other than the employees' compensation fund. Losses or payments arising out of war risk hazard (as defined by the Secretary of Labor) shall not be included in such contributions."

SEC. 2. In addition to the contributions for the maintenance of the employees' compensation fund required by section 1 of this act, any mixed ownership corporation as defined in section 201 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 856), or any corporation or agency (or activity thereof) which is required by law to submit an annual budget pursuant to, or as provided by, the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841–849), shall pay an additional amount for its fair share of the cost of administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act as determined by the Secretary of Iabor. With respect to said agencies, the charges billed by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 1 of this act shall include an additional amount for such costs, which shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts from the sources authorized, and in the manner otherwise provided in section 1 of this act.

SEC. 3. All provisions of law, other than those included in this act, which require contribution or payment by any agency to the employees' compensation fund are hereby superseded.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect July 1, 1956.

The explanation presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL AMENDING THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT TO PROVIDE FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF COMPENSATION COSTS BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

As the largest single employer in the Nation, the Federal Government should utilize every means to reduce accidents among its employees. If the various departments and agencies are made more conscious of both the incidence and costs of accidents in employments within their responsibility, more effective safety measures would be adopted and the number of accidents accordingly reduced. The shifting of costs to the employing agencies is consistent with sound business practice. It will allow the Congress, on a cumulative basis, to evaluate the progress of the agencies toward safer practices.

In furtherance of this objective, the President's 1955 budget message recommended that the financing of benefit payments in employment injury cases be shifted from a single appropriation to the appropriations of the employing agencies. A bill (S. 1309 and H. R. 5751) was introduced during the first session of this Congress to accomplish that result. Further study by the Department of Labor has shown that certain changes in the form and substance of the prior bill are desirable. These changes, while retaining the principle expressed in the budget message, would accomplish the result at less administrative expense than under the prior bills.

The most fundamental of these changes concerns the method by which Federal agencies will reimburse the employees' compensation fund established by this bill. Under the provisions of S. 1309 and H. R. 5751, the agencies would contribute to the maintenance of the fund by payment of a premium charge determined in accordance with commercial workmen's compensation insurance practice. This method, however, would be expensive from an administrative point of view. Therefore, the premium charging method has been replaced by a less complex system under which each agency will be charged only for actual payments made from the fund on its account for injuries occurring after July 1, 1956. This would considerably reduce administrative expenses. Under the premium charging method proposed by S. 1309 and H. R. 5751, it was estimated that $1,500,000 in additional administrative costs would result annually. Additional administrative costs under the revised bill are estimated at $50,000 annually. Under the revised bill, administrative costs would not be charged back to the employing agencies, with the exception of corporations or agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act.

The coverage of the revised bill is broader than that of S. 1309 and H. R. 5751. The new bill includes the employees of all agencies, regardless of size (the prior bill excluded those having less than 5,000 employees), and includes military reservists (who were excluded under the prior bill).

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army to the State of Oklahoma.

The Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board operates the recreational facilities at Greenleaf Lake and it is now designated as Greenleaf State Park.

A portion of the Gruber Military Reservation, which has been declared surplus, is needed to round out this park.

My bill proposes to give the State of Oklahoma this land for park purposes.

It appears that the State is operating the Greenleaf State Park under a 5-year lease. The leased land consists of 575 acres plus the 900 acres in the lake itself. They desire to secure an additional 1,960 acres adjacent to the property they now operate in order to have adequate land for control of the area and future expansion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3586) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army to the State of Oklahoma, introduced by Mr. KERR, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

ADMISSION, DUTY FREE, OF ARTICLES IMPORTED FOR EXHIBITION AT AMERICAS' NEW FRONTIERS EXPOSITION

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The bill has for its purpose to permit articles imported from foreign countries for exhibition purposes in the Americas' New Frontier Exposition at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be free of duty and tax, as long as they are used for exposition purposes.

Americas' New Frontier Exposition is the name used for the exposition to celebrate the 50th anniversary of statehood for Oklahoma.

This procedure is not unusual. It is done regularly in order to attract exhibitions that have outstanding appeal to be used.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3587) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KERR, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

COMPULSORY INSPECTION BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE OF POULTRY AND POULTRY PRODUCTS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senators from Maine [Mrs. SMITH and Mr. PAYNE], and the Senators from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. FREAR], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products. I may want to add 1 or 2 additional cosponsors of the bill before the end of the session today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3588) to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to carry out the International Convention To Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Matter. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to the Vice President by Herbert Hoover, Jr., Acting Secretary of State, relating to the bill.

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

The bill (S. 3589) to carry out the International Convention To Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Matter, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. BYRD) (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The letter presented by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 17, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There are transmitted herewith for your consideration and action copies of a draft of a proposed bill to implement the International Convention To Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material. The Convention was dated at Geneva, November 7, 1952, and was signed on behalf of the United States on May 28, 1953.

The Convention has been approved by the Senate and will be submitted to the President for ratification at such time as implementing legislation has been enacted. The Convention establishes simpler standards and uniform regulations for customs treatment of imported commercial samples and advertising for the purpose of facilitating their importation with a view to promoting the expansion of international trade.

The following is a summary of the attached draft bill:

Section 1 amends the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide duty-free treatment for advertising material as defined in the Convention.

Section 2 amends the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide duty-free treatment for samples of negligible value. This section also limits the quantity of samples of alcoholic beverages and tobacco products that each consignee may receive.

Section 3 amends the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide temporary duty-free treatment for advertising films.

Section 4 provides for this legislation to become effective when the Convention enters into force for the United States.

In regard to temporary duty-free treatment for samples of more than negligible value provided for in the Convention, it is considered that present United States legislation is sufficient to implement that provision.

Sincerely yours,
HERBERT HOOVER, Jr.,
Acting Secretary.

EXEMPTION OF FINE ARTS PROGRAMS FROM TAX ON ADMISSIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide relief from the 10-percent nuisance excise tax on the legitimate theater and on fine arts performances, including concerts, operas, ballet, lectures and the like; and I send to the desk a statement I have prepared on the bill.

The bill is a counterpart to H. R. 7109, which has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, and to H. R. 7851, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement on the subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3609) to exempt fine arts programs from the admissions tax, introduced by Mr. Wiley, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

On March 29, I was pleased to introduce a bill on behalf of myself and my able colleague from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for the purpose of providing a National Charter to the National Music Council.

I emphasized at that time the crucial role played by the living theater and by fine arts in American life and, indeed, in the life of all peoples.

As one phase of this field, I had earlier reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an open letter sent to me urging relief from the nuisance excise tax on the stage and fine arts performances. The text of this letter from a group of distinguished leaders (representing the National Association of the Legitimate Theatre and the National Association of Concert Managers) may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23 on page 5441.

TREASURY LOSS OF REVENUE WOULD BE MINOR

The purpose of my action today is to follow through on both the specific and the generalized approach which I have already outlined.

I do not ask for specific tax relief without an appreciation of the Federal Government's revenue problem. Every American realizes that the budget situation of the United States is such that we cannot, willy nilly, slash taxes right and left, particularly if they produce important revenue.

But the fact of the matter is, in this instance, that the net loss to the Treasury of the bill which I am proposing today is approximately $7 million per year. This, while a substantial sum, is modest indeed in relation to our $65 billion budget.

Moreover, even if the present tax produced larger revenue, it is intrinsically objectionable as a crippling burden on the legitimate theater and on fine arts. (After all, they are already hard-pressed from a competitive standpoint by the medium of television.)

As pointed out, in connection with the earlier letter which I had reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the United States is probably the only major power in the world which discriminates against its own fine arts by taxation of this nature. Other countries not only do not tax their theater, their concerts and similar productions, but they provide direct financial support.

DON'T PENALIZE THE SMALL-BUSINESS MAN

Surely the very least we can do is to help facilitate cultural development in our country.

Recognizing the role of fine arts, Congress had previously completely removed the tax on performances, conducted by nonprofit groups—municipal groups, foundations and the like (a fine category in which my own State, I am glad to say, really abounds).

While I welcome such tax exemption, I do not feel that profit-making bureaus, that is, unsubsidized small-business men, managing these fine arts performances should at the same time be penalized. As everyone is aware who works in this field, it is hardly very lucrative. Men and women engaged in it do so almost exclusively out of love for cultural media, and not out of a desire to become a millionaire.

HOUSE MUST ORIGINATE ACTION

I urge, therefore, prompt action on this legislation this year. I do not believe that the United States Treasury is so poor that it need carry on only on the basis of taxing its fine arts.

I hope that the House of Representatives, whose Ways and Means Committee must initiate action of this nature, will give the Thompson-Celler bill its sympathetic attention and I hope the Senate Finance Committee will at the appropriate time do likewise.

LET'S SEE MORE, NOT FEWER THEATERS

Let's expand the theater and increase the frequency of fine arts performances. All over America, the living stage has, for example, been hard hit by skyrocketing costs. In New York City, fountainhead of the living theater, there is at last an indication that, thanks to far-thinking leadership, a new, modern theater may be constructed. It may be a partial replacement of the many theaters which have unfortunately closed (and/or which have been taken over by TV). Let us see more live theaters open and let Congress help by wiping out this nuisance excise.

I shall incidentally at a later day take up another phase of the entertainment problem—the problem of U. S. motion picture theaters, as such. My commitments today have been addressed to the problem of the legitimate theater.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the ever-growing problem of providing real social security for the people of my country has long been of great concern to me.

Not until the devastating depression of the 1930's did the social conscience of our country stir sufficiently to realize that unless society as a whole was guaranteed some form of security—then no member of society could attain and be sure of keeping any measure of security.

Because hardship, hunger and deprivation descended, not just on a few, but on the majority of our people in those horrible years, an acute social conscience was demanded from our Government.

As a result, our Social Security Act was passed by Congress in 1935.

It was a good beginning. It still is a good beginning. But, anyone who faces the facts knows that it is only a beginning.

Unfortunately, with the advent of prosperity for the majority—social conscience has had conspicuously little or no influence on legislation.

Yet there is today a large segment—a most worthy segment—of our population living under conditions which are in many instances far worse than depression standards. I refer here particularly to the needy aged, blind, physically handicapped and dependent children who come under the Public Assistance Section of the Federal Social Security Act.

These are the forgotten citizens.

I maintain that it is my duty—and it is the duty of each and every Member of

Congress—to be forever seeking to better the social welfare of our country. Only by doing so can we hope to fulfill the trust placed in us by the people we serve.

While improvements have been made from time to time in the Social Security Act pertaining to old-age and survivors insurance benefits, the public assistance section has been almost wholly ignored.

For several months now I have been doing research to find out how we could help these forgotten citizens; where the trouble spots lay, and how the public assistance section could be amended to correct many of the injustices now endured by the needy aged, blind, the physically handicapped, and helpless children.

I have personally talked with many recipents of this aid to determine what the most needed improvements are, and I have received correspondence from aid recipients in every State of the Union telling of their miserable plight.

Of course, the greatest need is for more money. This fact is evident when we take a look at the Social Security Bulletin issued in January 1956 by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and study the amounts paid during the month of October to those on public assistance.

This bulletin reveals that the more than two and a half million recipents of old-age assistance received a nationwide average of only $53.28 per month.

No one in his right mind can say that $53.28 per month is enough to keep body and soul together with the cost of living at its present high.

I think statistics will show that the cost of living varies little in any of the 48 States, but the amount of assistance varies much. Aid to the blind, physically handicapped, and dependent children showed the same wide difference of payments between indivdual States and approximately the same low average monthly payment.

The root of the whole trouble and its correction—if you please—lays in the Social Security Act.

Under our present formula, the Federal Government has a ceiling of $55 a month on the matching of Federal funds to the States. This means that the Federal Government will not pay more than a total of $35 toward a recipent to whom the State is paying $55 a month or more.

I say that such a ceiling is most unrealistic. I propose to raise that ceiling to $100. Under present law, where a State pays an aged, blind, or physically handicapped recipent $55 per month or more, the Federal Government pays four-fifths of the first $25 plus one-half of the next $30.

In other words, of the first $55 paid, the Federal share is $35 and the State's share is $20. But the Federal Government contributes not one red penny of any amount granted by the State over and above the $55. Quite obviously, only the more wealthy States can pay over and above the ceiling and some of the poorer States cannot even afford to match up to the present ceiling. So, we end up with a jigsaw puzzle of payments. And in no State are they adequate.

This should make it quite evident that we must also revise parts of our formula. I have worked out an amendment to the Social Security Act which would, I believe, solve this problem to everyone's satisfaction. My formula would peg the Federal grants-in-aid to the States, on a per capita income basis.

For instance, a State whose per capita income is equal to or greater than the per capita income of the continental United States would still be required to match 50–50 with the Federal Government over the first $25, and under the $100 ceiling. This would greatly assist the more wealthy States who are now paying relatively high pensions and carrying the whole burden over $55.

Under my plan, the poorer States would also be able to up their pension payments considerably. This would be possible because the Federal share in no case would be lower than 50 percent and would graduate up to 75 percent, according to the per capita income of the individual State.

For example, the State of Georgia's per capita income in 1954 was only 70 percent as compared to 100 percent for the continental United States. Therefore, Georgia's share of the grant over $25 and under $100 would be 35 percent, with the Federal Government contributing 65 percent.

To take the extreme example, Mississippi, whose per capita income was lowest in the Nation with 49 percent in 1954, would receive the maximum of 75 percent Federal contribution, or three Federal dollars to every State dollar expended on these programs.

Needless to say, this additional Federal money would immeasurably help these poorer States who are from necessity now paying such starvation-level assistance, and would at the same time help to equalize and make more uniform assistance payments throughout the country.

As I said before, the biggest problem these people have to meet is the lack of enough money to keep body and soul together.

Their serious problems, however, only just begin there. I think that probably the other element—the loss of human dignity that a recipient of aid must undergo in order to qualify for assistance—places just as great a moral obligation upon Congress to correct.

I think this has been done because Congress has never established a humane single standard of qualifications for the applicants and recipients of aid, below which no State would go and still receive Federal grants-in-aid.

This accounts for the fact that the public-assistance laws are different in each of the 48 States. It also accounts for the desperately low morale of the poor people who come under these laws, a condition quite evident by the letters I have received asking respite from the harsh restrictions.

For instance, in some States an applicant or recipient of aid must first sign over his home to the State before aid shall be granted.

This practice violates a cardinal principle on which the Social Security Act is based:

That needy persons should not be differentiated by reason of their need and that recipients of assistance have the same right of self-determination by reason of their need in the use of their resources as others in the community.

I propose that Congress spell out in the law that our old pioneers can own a home and that there be no imposition of a lien on such a home as a condition of receiving aid.

Another disgraceful practice is the publishing of the recipients names in an effort to shame them off the assistance rolls. This not only violates cardinal principles of the Social Security Act, but I say it violates our very decency itself. I recommend that this be prohibited.

One of the provisions now in the Social Security Act which desperately needs revision is the clause stating that all "outside income and resources must be deducted from the amount of aid granted." This prohibits recipients from earning even the smallest amount to supplement their pitiful grants.

The standard of living for many who are able to do a little work here and there would most assuredly be improved. And of perhaps as much benefit would be the better mental health of the aged and handicapped—now sentenced to a life of idleness—if these people were allowed to earn up to $50 per month without threat of deduction from their grants. This privilege has already been granted by Congress to the blind.

I also urge that needy children be permitted to earn up to $30 per month. Most assuredly children, especially of school age, should not be sentenced to a life of idleness simply because their parent or guardian, through some circumstance, has had to seek aid to feed the child. It seems to me that such children need more than ever to be encouraged to learn self-reliance and certainly should not be discouraged from seeking part-time employment.

Many are the harsh provisions imposed by the various States, but none so unfair, nor un-American, as the State residence requirement. Under the Social Security Act, this can be and often is a maximum of 5 years' duration.

It is hard to reconcile how such a provision ever became part of the law of this land. Under any other circumstance, the United States is considered to be the legal residence of all of us. We are not citizens of 48 different States. We are all citizens of these United States. No tariffs may be imposed between States. In time of war, no one escapes military duty because of State boundaries.

I propose that the maximum State residence requirement allowable be reduced to 1 year and certainly not more than 3 years; and I further propose that where an otherwise qualified person does not meet State residence requirements, the Federal Government pay its share direct to the person until they have met the residence requirement of the State.

This would at least give some help to these citizens without a State—and under present conidtions—without a country.

Much has been said about lowering the age for women applicants and recipients from 65 to 62 years. I say that this is

not only right, but it is absolutely necessary considering the present pattern of employment and retirement.

Studies show that almost two-thirds of the caseload on public assistance is women and that the dependency rate for women is 1½ times greater than that of men.

The substantially higher dependency rates for women derive from many factors. Among the most important are the following:

First. Women have traditionally assumed a more dependent economic role in our society, concentrating on home management rather than outside employments.

Second. Because of limited employability, they require public assistance at an earlier age. This is confirmed by the fact that there is a larger concentration of women at the younger age levels of 65 years.

Lastly, I would add a few features which may seem minor but which are of the greatest importance to those involved:

First. That the needy not be penalized because of marriage.

Second. No person receiving such public aid shall be deemed a pauper, and no warrant drawn in payment shall contain any reference to indigency or pauperism.

Third. The program is to be administered by each State so as to insure uniform treatment of the needy in all its political subdivisions.

The public assistance section of our Social Security Act has been too long neglected. During the last 20 years when we should have been slowly building here, firming there, steadily improving the act, we have instead either lost or ignored our sense of social conscience and all but ignored these unfortunate citizens.

I am not seeking new laws; I am seeking to amend existing laws so as to assure those on public assistance the right to retain their self-respect and, as human beings, their right to human dignity.

The intent of the Social Security Act is to help the American people when they need it. It most assuredly was never meant to act as a form of harassment to people already plagued with distress.

I say it is our duty to God and to our country to provide a decent level of social security for the people of these United States.

MULTIPLE-USE ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN NATIONAL FOREST AND OTHER LANDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide statutory authority for the multiple-use administration of the one hundred and eighty-odd million acres of national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Our national forest lands are presently administered under a system which provides many benefits to a diverse group of users—including timber, grazing, mining, water, wildlife, and recreational interests. However, these various groups need a medium through which they may maintain formal, advisory relationships with the Secretary of Agriculture in the formulation of policy covering these forest lands.

This bill if enacted would write into law the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make the fullest possible use of the rich and varied range, timber, water, mineral, wildlife, and recreational resources of these public lands under a multiple-use system of management. It would also provide for the establishment by the Secretary of multiple-use regional and national citizens' advisory councils, representing the many diverse groups of users of the forest areas, from those interested in timber to those interested in the recreational resources—including wildlife and wilderness.

These multiple-use councils would be of tremendous value in aiding the Department of Agriculture in promoting the maximum appropriate utilization of these valuable lands. The proposed legislation insures adequate consideration of the incalculably valuable recreational assets of our national forests. Recreation is the third major use of these lands, ranking in importance with timber production and watershed protection. Recreational interests and wildlife conservationists would have important representation on the proposed advisory councils.

In the interest of preserving these basic plant, soil, water, and wildlife resources, this bill leaves the Secretary of Agriculture with full authority to control the management practices that are applied by the various individual users of the forest areas. However, it would provide a badly needed means for the democratic expression of the viewpoints of these forest area users, so that these viewpoints can be fully weighed by Department Administrators. While these Administrators will retain final control and authority, the recommendations of the proposed citizens multiple-use councils would aid immeasurably in the formulation of policies designed to serve the best interests of the American people, to whom the forest lands belong.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3615) to recognize and facilitate the administration of the multiple uses of the national forests and others lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

INVESTIGATION OF EFFECT OF IMPORTATION OF TEXTILES ON DOMESTIC INDUSTRY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last February I had the privilege of discussing on the Senate floor the problem of increasing textile imports and their effect on the domestic textile industry. At that time I urged that continued consideration be given to all possible alternatives for dealing with this problem of increasing imports. As I pointed out at that time, the Tariff Commission was directed by Senate Resolution 121, 84th Congress, to keep fully informed regarding the importation of textiles and textile manufactures. This resolution, which was adopted by the Senate during the last session, did not direct the Tariff Commission to make an immediate investigation because the effects of last September's tariff reductions were not known at that time.

It is now evident that imports of cotton manufactures and cotton cloth are continuing to increase. In January 1956 the value of cotton-cloth imports was up 46 percent, and the value of cotton manufactures was up 14 percent over December 1955. A comparison of January 1956 imports with the average monthly imports in 1955 is extremely alarming. It is apparent that the continuing increase of textile imports will result in further injury to the domestic textile industry and the people it employs.

Because of this continued textile import increase, I am submitting a resolution on behalf of myself, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and Senators BRIDGES, COTTON, GREEN, FLANDERS, KENNEDY, PASTORE, PURTELL, SALTONSTALL, GEORGE, WOFFORD, and BUSH, directing the United States Tariff Commission to make an immediate and thoroughgoing investigation to determine what textiles and textile products are being imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic textile industry. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and that the resolution may lie on the desk until Monday, April 16, to afford other interested Senators an opportunity to join in sponsoring this resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received, appropriately referred, and under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The resolution (S. Res. 236) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Whereas substantial reductions have been made in tariff rates on textile products in various trade agreements with foreign countries; and

Whereas the value of imports of cotton manufactures in January 1956 was 14 percent higher than in December 1955 and the value of imports of cotton cloth in January 1956 was 46 percent higher than in December 1955; and

Whereas more than 1 million persons are employed directly in the textile industry of the United States; and

Whereas in many sections of the Nation the entire economy of a community is tied directly to the healthy operation of the textile industry; and

Whereas the textile industry of the United States is a vital part of our national defense; and

Whereas the United States Senate in Senate Resolution 121, 84th Congress, directed the United States Tariff Commission to keep currently informed regarding the impact of imports of textiles and textile products on the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products in order to be prepared to act promptly on such investigations as may be requested by the President, or directed by resolution of either House of Congress, the Committee on Finance of the Sen-

ate, or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, or applied for by any interested party, under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, to determine whether any product upon which a concession has been granted in a trade agreement is, as a result in whole or in part of the concession, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is directed to make an immediate investigation pursuant to section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, to determine whether any textiles or textile products are being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that the text of a letter I have written to Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, urging early hearings on the bill (S. 2702) to encourage the sale of cotton for export and to limit imports of manufactured cotton products, be included at this point in the RECORD, together with an exchange of correspondence which I have had with the Lewiston (Maine) Chamber of Commerce on the textile import problem.

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

APRIL 10, 1956.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On July 30, 1955, Senator JAMES EASTLAND introduced a bill, S. 2702, in the Senate for himself and 62 other Senators, including myself. This bill would encourage the sale of cotton for export and limit imports of manufactured cotton products. To date no hearings or other action has been scheduled on this bill by your committee.

On February 27, I spoke on the Senate floor in regard to the effect of increasing cotton textile imports on the domestic textile industry. At that time, I urged that careful attention be devoted to all possible alternatives for alleviating further damage to the domestic textile industry. I further urged that consideration be given to the imposition of import quotas on cotton textile goods should the situation continue to deteriorate.

All available evidence indicates that the influx of imported cotton textiles has not abated. January imports of cotton manufactures and cotton cloth have increased significantly since December. The value of import of cotton manufactures, including such items as velveteen and bedspreads which have previously provided severe competition for the domestic industry, has increased from $7,978,685 to $9,084,949 in a 1-month period. In the same period (December 1955 to January 1956), the value of cotton cloth imports has increased from $4,173,829 to $6,105,558. The increase in the value of imports of cotton manufactures has been nearly 14 percent in 1 month, while in cotton cloth the increase has been approximately 46 percent. It should not be necessary to point out the adverse effects such increases are having and will continue to have on the domestic textile industry.

On March 23 of this year, the Bates Manufacturing Co., one of the largest textile industries in New England, announced that a reduced work schedule had been adopted for employees in 3 of Bates' 5 plants in Lewiston, Augusta, and Saco, Maine. Some shifts have been reduced to a 3- and 4-day week. These cuts have been prompted by an oversupply of goods, which in turn is due, according to the management of Bates Manufacturing Co., "in large measure to the Japanese production of millions of yards of fabric which have been shipped into this country since tariffs were lowered."

It is obvious that in an area where the average hourly wage is $1.30, laborers cannot afford a reduced working week. If layoffs in the textile mills are the result of imports of cotton textiles, then it would seem apparent that the situation has reached alarming proportions.

Recently I received a letter from the Lewiston, Maine, Chamber of Commerce which represents business, mercantile, and industrial groups of Lewiston, urging immediate efforts to insure adequate protection of Maine's textile industries and the people it employs. I am forwarding a copy of this letter for your information and consideration.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has before it a bill (S. 2702) which would, if enacted, control the level of textile imports. Only through extensive hearings on this proposed legislation can the facts of the textile import situation be conclusively established. I, therefore, strongly urge that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry schedule hearings on S. 2702 at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. PAYNE.

LEWISTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Lewiston, Maine, April 6, 1956.

Senator FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PAYNE: This letter is being directed to you in the avowed hope that this appeal by the Lewiston Chamber of Commerce will receive serious consideration by you, and also with the fervent wish that some serious threat to the economy of this community, as well as to the State of Maine in general.

After much deliberation, counsel, and discussion, the chamber has come to the conclusion that some action by our Federal Government is urgently needed to protect our domestic textile industry. As you well know, the economy of this community, and that of a large part of our State, relies heavily on this industry.

Today, this industry, still fighting to keep pace with its competitive counterparts within the United States, finds itself faced with a damaging situation—the rising importation of Japanese textiles into this country. The situation has reached alarming proportions and the industry already is showing effects of the low-cost Japanese textiles products that are glutting our markets. Our State's largest employer, which has plants here and in other Maine communities, has been forced to curtail operations at a number of its factories. Most of the products produced at these plants are in direct competition with those coming into this country from Japan's low-cost manufacturing plants.

The chamber has conferred with representatives of labor and management in the local textile industry, and it is convinced that the only recourse available for relief is through our congressional delegation. You, no doubt, are aware of this serious situation since it has attracted nationwide attention, and has been the subject of debate by some congressional committees.

The Lewiston Chamber of Commerce, as representative of the business, mercantile, and industrial groups of this community, is hereby appealing to our Maine congressional delegation to make every effort to see that this State's textile industry, and the thousands of jobs it provides for our people, are protected.

The chamber, being vitally concerned over this situation, urges that immediate efforts be made to obtain this protection, either through congressional action or by the Federal agencies delegated to administer such matters. The chamber sincerely hopes that this appeal will receive your prompt attention, and that the Maine congressional delegation will move to the forefront with proposals for remedial action.

When you have given this plea for action your consideration, we will expect to receive your observations of action you anticipate taking at your level to meet the existing threat to our textile industry.

Sincerely yours,

LEWISTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
MURRAY SHULTZ, *President.*

APRIL 10, 1956.

Mr. MURRAY SHULTZ,
President, Lewiston Chamber of Commerce, Lewiston, Maine.

DEAR MURRAY: This is to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of April 6, in regard to the effect of textile imports on the domestic industry.

Because the problems of the textile industry have been recurring ones, it might be useful to review what has been done, what is being done, and what can be done for the benefit of the textile industry.

As you have pointed out in your letter, the textile industry in Maine is meeting severe competition, not only from abroad, but also from its competitive counterparts in the United States. Since coming to the Senate in 1953, I have had the opportunity to work for measures to foster fair domestic competition in the textile industry and to prevent unfair foreign competition.

Several measures enacted by the Congress in the past 2 years have had the effect of bringing the terms of competition between the northern and southern segments of the textile industry more nearly into line. The increase of the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour, which went into effect March 1, will result in equalizing labor costs and will bring southern wage scales closer to the higher wage scales prevailing in Maine and the rest of New England, with the effect of more nearly balancing production costs throughout the industry.

In the past 3 years I have been active in securing increased appropriations for the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, so that sufficient funds would be available for adequate enforcement of minimum-wage laws throughout the country. Again this was directed toward insuring fairer competition from the textile industry in lower wage areas. Last year, I also advocated repeal of the Federal tax exemption on municipal bonds issued for industrial purposes. There are several bills now pending in the House, where all tax legislation must originate, which would repeal this exemption. If such a measure should reach the Senate it will receive my full support, with the intent that this action would make it less attractive for northern textile industries to migrate to other areas of the Nation.

During the last session of Congress, Senator JOHN KENNEDY and I jointly sponsored an amendment to the Walsh-Healy Act. This amendment would, in effect, prevent a trend to award Government contracts for uniforms and other textile manufactures to textile industries with lower wage scales. Because of a recent Supreme Court decision, which accomplishes the purpose of the Payne-Kennedy amendment, it is unlikely that congressional action will now be needed on this proposal.

Similarly, the members of the New England delegation have consistently supported measures to prevent unfair foreign competition. In this connection the Senate last summer passed a resolution, which I cosponsored, directing the United States Tariff

Commission to study the effect of imports of textiles and textile products upon the domestic textile industry. On July 30, 1955, Senator JAMES EASTLAND introduced, for himself and 62 other Senators, including myself, a bill (S. 2702) which would impose quota restrictions on cotton textile imports.

Early in this session, I spoke at some length on the Senate floor in regard to the textile industry and the problem of increased imports of textiles. At that time I urged that this problem be given the utmost consideration and that the various possible solutions, including the imposition of import quotas, be fully analyzed with a view toward positive action.

To date no action has been taken on S. 2702 by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Until hearings are held and a full and accurate analysis has been made of the entire problem of textile imports and their effect on the domestic textile industry, it will be impossible to get any favorable action on S. 2702. Because of this lack of action on the part of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I have written to Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, the committee chairman, urging him to schedule hearings on S. 2702 at the earliest possible date. I have taken the liberty of forwarding a copy of your letter to Chairman ELLENDER, so that he may know how representative groups in Maine, such as your organization, regard the problem of textile imports.

Under the terms of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, when an industry, such as the textile industry, feels that increased imports are seriously damaging the domestic industry, the industry may apply for an investigation by the United States Tariff Commission. If the results of the investigation indicate that serious damage is being caused by imports, then the Tariff Commission can recommend that the President invoke the "escape clause" to raise the tariff on the imports causing the serious damage. To date, the domestic textile industry has not requested such an investigation by the United States Tariff Commission.

Because the value of imports of cotton manufactures and of cotton cloth have increased substantially in January of this year, indicating that the domestic textile industry will meet even more severe foreign competition than in 1955, I introduced a resolution for myself and Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, which would direct the United States Tariff Commission to conduct an investigation of the effect of increasing textile imports on the domestic industry. A thoroughgoing investigation by the Tariff Commission should determine to what extent the distress of the domestic industry has been caused by imports, by intraindustry competition, and by competition from cotton-substitute textile industries. If the facts, when clearly established, indicate that the importation of foreign textiles is a primary cause of the current distress of the domestic industry, then the need for protection will be clearly demonstrated. It is my hope that this resolution calling for an investigation by the Tariff Commission will receive the full support of the textile industry, textile labor groups, and other interested parties such as your organization.

If the Senate Committee on Agriculture will act on S. 2702 and if the Senate will direct the Tariff Commission to investigate the effect of increasing imports, then it should be possible to get positive action which will alleviate the distress felt by the domestic textile industry as a result of increasing imports of cotton textiles.

It is regrettable that I cannot answer your letter with the promise of a panacea for this problem. I am sure you will agree that any action taken must be well thought out, and must, in fact, provide the relief the industry is seeking. You may be certain that I shall continue to work in the future, as I have in the past, to promote the welfare of Maine's textile industry and the people it employs.

Enclosed are copies of my letter to Senator ELLENDER, the resolution I introduced in the Senate, and the remarks I made on introducing this resolution.

With very best wishes to you and the members of your organization.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that a table based on Bureau of the Census statistics comparing the monthly average of United States imports of countable cotton cloth for 1955 with January 1956 statistics may be printed in the RECORD.

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

United States imports of countable cotton cloth, monthly average for 1955 compared with January 1956

	Total	From Japan
Monthly average, 1955	11,095,000	8,294,000
January 1956	24,638,000	19,992,000
Percent increase	122	141
Annual rate, based on January 1956	295,656,000	239,904,000
Percent increase over—		
1953	360	682
1954	302	402
1955	122	141

Source: Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. PAYNE subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier this morning, at the time I submitted a resolution on behalf of myself and my distinguished senior colleague from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and other Senators, I intended, because of the very great interest he has always displayed in any matter affecting the textile industry, to speak with the distinguished Presiding Officer, the President pro tempore, in connection with the resolution, to determine whether in his judgment it would be desirable for him to join as a cosponsor of the resolution.

Since then I have had an opportunity to discuss the matter with the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and I understand that he would like very much to be identified with the resolution.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his name may be included in my earlier remarks today, and that he may be listed as one of the original sponsors of the resolution which is now at the desk, and which will remain there until Monday, to give other Senators an opportunity to join as cosponsors.

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

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LANDS IN SINNISSIPPI LAKE, ILL.—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the name of my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2831) authorizing the acquisition of certain lands in the Sinnissippi Lake, Ill., in connection with the operation of Illinois and Mississippi Canal, and for other purposes, introduced by me on January 5, 1956.

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

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. GEORGE) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, the Chair submits, for appropriate reference, amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7225, the social-security bill. Without objection, the amendments will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and be printed. And, without objection, a statement, prepared by the Chair, relating to the amendment, will be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GEORGE

The purpose of this amendment is to enable the State of Georgia to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for coverage under the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System of those employees of the State who are covered by the Georgia State Employees' Retirement System and desire to obtain coverage under the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System. Legislation recently adopted by the general assembly of the State contemplated the State's entering into such an agreement under conditions which would not necessitate either the State's or the employees' contributing any additional funds for the cost of retirement benefits. That legislation provided, in effect, that the employees subject to the State employees' retirement system should have the option (1) of being covered under the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System and retaining their coverage under the State employees' retirement system but having their benefits under the latter system reduced as a result of the diversion of funds to pay the cost of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System coverage, or (2) of not being covered under the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System and continuing their coverage under the State employees' retirement system with no change in benefits. The existing provisions of the Social Security Act do not permit the State of Georgia to enter into an agreement such as was contemplated by the general assembly. However, if the amendment to H. R. 7225 which I am sponsoring is adopted and becomes law, it will be possible for the State to enter into such an agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit six proposed amendments to the House-passed social-security bill, H. R. 7225. Each of these six amendments has been pending before the Senate

Finance Committee in regular bill form since June 1955. In their original version, they are S. 2382, S. 2383, S. 2384, S. 2385, S. 2386, and S. 2389. I have had each of these bills recast as amendments to H. R. 7225 so that committee consideration of them may be simplified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956 — AMENDMENT

Mr. BEALL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 10004) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on March 7 I offered an amendment to H. R. 7225, the social-security bill. The number of the amendment is 3-7-56-D. The senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has asked to be a cosponsor of that amendment. I ask unanimous consent that his name may be added as a cosponsor.

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

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Text of address on the subject of joint disarmament and the foreign-aid program, delivered by him at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner of Young Democratic Clubs of Maryland in Baltimore on March 10, 1956.

By Mr. JENNER:

Radio address entitled "The Congress and the Constitution," recently delivered by him.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM B. HERLANDS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, April 18, 1956, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of William B. Herlands, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

Prior to the above-mentioned date all persons interested in the above nomination should file with the committee such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LIVINGSTON T. MERCHANT TO BE AMBASSADOR TO CANADA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador of the United States to Canada, vice R. Douglas Stuart. Notice is given that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

TRIBUTE TO BASEBALL AND THE MILWAUKEE BRAVES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared under the headline "Tribute to America's National Pastime and to the Milwaukee Braves—Ike's Hurling of First Ball Here Symbolizes United States Sportsmanship."

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

TRIBUTE TO AMERICA'S NATIONAL PASTIME AND TO THE MILWAUKEE BRAVES—IKE'S HURLING OF FIRST BALL HERE SYMBOLIZES UNITED STATES SPORTSMANSHIP

(Statement by Senator WILEY)

Next Tuesday, April 17, Americans will take a few hours off from their troubles—from concern about the Middle East and South Asia and farm parity, concern about dieting, gray hair, the cost of braces on the kids' teeth, or any other care. They will turn to our national pastime, baseball.

The folks here in our Nation's Capital will be trooping out to Griffith Stadium to watch the Washington Senators.

And we of Wisconsin will be crowding the Milwaukee County Stadium to watch what we feel is the finest team in the major leagues—the Milwaukee Braves.

Radio and TV sets all over the Badger State will be tuned in as the Braves show off their stuff and, we hope, blast a few "horsehide A-bombs" over the fence.

It will be my pleasure that day to join with Louis Perini, president of the Braves; with Charles B. Perini, first vice president; Joseph F. Cairnes, executive vice president; John J. Quinn, vice president and general manager; Joseph R. Perini, treasurer, in the opening-day ceremonies at the stadium.

To us of the Badger State, the Braves are, of course, more than a mere team. They are a real source of day-to-day inspiration on a great and wholesome sport, a living demonstration of outstanding team spirit.

Charley Grimm and his Battling Braves have proven what the enthusiasm of a hometown can mean in helping to revitalize a ball club and in keeping it in pennant contention.

Even before the Braves came to "wonderful Wisconsin" in 1953, setting a new National League attendance record, Wisconsin was wonderful baseball country. The largest home talent league in the world played in a belt 40 miles wide around metropolitan Milwaukee. In every crossroads there were at least a team of a dozen men and boys. Around our State capital was another large league. The Wisconsin State League played in other cities, and there were dozens of amateur and semipro circuits.

Wisconsin, as we all recall, took the Braves to its heart from the very outset, jam-packing the stadium from cavalcades by bus, rail, plane, car, and every other means. From every part of the State, the fans poured in, as excitement mounted, including, of course, a Portage barber who closed up, hung a sign on the door, saying, "I can't stand it any longer. Closed for 2 days. Gone to see the Braves."

The shot-in-the-arm that this gave to Milwaukee and all Wisconsin's economy was, of course, enormous.

It is, of course, our hope that the Braves will not only win National League honors, but that they will go on to take the World Series, as well.

But series or not Lou Perini and his Braves will be battling every inch of the way and will be serving as a fine example for both major leagues.

Meanwhile, there are well over 80 Wisconsin players in all of organized baseball, including, of course, the Braves' own Andy Pafko, of Boyceville, plus 10 other major leaguers, who are living in Wisconsin or who were born in our State, plus 20 Badger youngsters on Braves' farm clubs, and 60 Badgers on other National or American League farms.

I am hoping that this year will be a peak year for America's national pastime. I hope that it will encourage more of our youngsters to get out on the ball diamond themselves, whether it is in Junior League baseball, unorganized sandlot clubs, or any other type and enjoy the pleasure of swinging the bat at an oncoming ball or trying out to be a future Warren Spahn on the mound.

When President Eisenhower here in our Capital hurls out the opening day ball, he will symbolize America at play, having a good time and enjoying the best of sportsmanship.

ISRAEL IS HERE TO STAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, considerable comment has been caused by an editorial entitled "Israel Is Here To Stay," appearing in Life magazine on March 19, 1956.

I do not agree with everything that the editors of Life say in this editorial but I accept wholeheartedly the editors' main theme—the one stated in the title. If some of the other nations in the Middle East similarly accepted the permanence of the State of Israel, I do not believe that the present Middle Eastern crisis would be nearly as severe as it is.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, the editorial from Life entitled "Israel Is Here To Stay." There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL IS HERE TO STAY—UNLESS THE ARABS ACCEPT THIS, THERE CAN BE NO PEACE

The time has come for friends of the Arabs to tell them, with the bluntness of genuine friendship, something they seem unable to

understand. That something is this: "Israel is here to stay. It is going to stay. The American people, who helped create Israel, who were the first to recognize her, and who hold warm feelings of friendship for her, are going to see to it that she stays. Until you, the Arabs, accept, deep in your hearts, the fact that Israel is here to stay, there can be no real peace in the lands of either."

Something else also needs to be said: "It is you, the Arabs, who insist there is no peace. Israel does not say she intends to destroy the Arab world, but it is you who proclaim your intention to destroy Israel. It is your holy men who cry out for holy wars against her. It is your spokesmen who talk of driving the last Israeli into the sea. It is you who refuse to accept Israel's right to existence. Until you do accept it, you will have no moral case before the world."

A sad and dangerous thing is happening to the Arab nations. They have let their fanatical hatred of the Israelis cause them to open their gates to a piecemeal invasion by the Communists, the new colonial imperialists. Half-priced Communist arms are pouring into Egypt, and Soviet technicians with them. Syria, already deeply penetrated by Communist agents, is in the process of eagerly rising to the same bait to get a bargain whose real price is the eventual destruction of Syria as a sovereign nation.

When the northern tier of nations—Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan—soberly aline themselves to resist Soviet expansion, it is the oil-rich Saudi Arabians who pass out the bribes to set Jordanians rioting in the streets against the Baghdad Pact. It is the same gold, accompanied by proddings from agents of Egypt's Premier Nasser, which has led Jordan to dismiss the British professional soldier who made and kept the Arab Legion the most efficient military unit in the Arab world.

What is even sadder is that the man most responsible for this chaos in the Middle East, Premier Nasser, is a man who knows better, who had every capacity to become (and showed every indication of becoming) a statesman. He desired to raise his countrymen out of the mire of poverty, but instead he has allowed the anti-Israel clamor to divert him into the course so many other leaders have followed, of subordinating internal problems to external adventuring.

Nasser, the moderate who suppressed the fanatic Moslem Brotherhood, now sacrifices Egypt's welfare to Pan-Arabic political expediency and the avowed nation builder has become a saber rattler. He permits the Cairo radio to shrill incendiary falsehoods throughout the Middle East. This man who now caters to the wave of racial hatred is the same man, who, after being wounded in the disastrous 1948 war against Israel, repeated to his soldiers, "Comrades, our holy war is not here, but at home." Nasser knows, as he once eloquently said, that his true war should be against the ignorance and wretchedness of his people. While he stands mute before the insane cries for jihad, the children of his land go on wasting, as they have done since the days of Joseph, from rickets and trachoma, bilharziasis and starvation. By his rash or cynical expediency he now endangers the very measures—such as American aid—which would do most to help them.

Certainly it is an immensely difficult task for any Arab leader—even if, like Nasser, he is not a fanatical Israeli hater—to stand against this murderous wave and still retain power. Yet this very difficulty should present a challenge for the Arabs to produce the kind of leadership the world would welcome. We say to Gamal Nasser, "Lead your people up, into the light. Do not let the fanatics lead you into the abyss. You have never been known to lose your temper. Do not, then, let your people lose their reason. Instead of following the exploiters of hatred, teach your own patience to your people. Destiny has given you a chance for greatness; do not meanly forfeit or betray it."

We of Life have not hesitated to criticize the Israelis when we thought they were wrong—as they frequently are. We have espoused the Arab cause when we thought it right. We have condemned, repeatedly, Israel's failure to repatriate or compensate the 1 million Arab refugees driven from their homes. We have disapproved the tendency of Harry Truman to let domestic political considerations make him a rubber stamp for Israel, right or wrong. We have welcomed the wisdom of President Eisenhower in redressing the balance by his policy of strict impartiality between Israeli and Arab.

But when Americans recognized Israel it was not merely because, de facto, it had made itself a state. It was because of our debt to their religious traditions, as well as a moral sentiment of their right to a homeland as compensation, if any there could be, for the unspeakable horrors inflicted upon them in other lands. Americans will support their right to live in peace in this homeland. Until the Arabs do the same, giving up their unjust desire to obliterate the Israelis as a state and as a people, there can be no genuine settlement of the just claims the Arabs do possess. They are playing dice with the peace of the whole world by refusing to accept the fact of Israel in their hearts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

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

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

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Morse
Beall	Green	Mundt
Bender	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott
Curtis	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Laird	Symington
Duff	Langer	Thye
Dworshak	Lehman	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Wofford
Frear	McCarthy	Young

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement for the benefit of the Senate. It is our plan, when we conclude the consideration of the unfinished business, in the event the House has acted upon the conference report on H. R. 12, the farm bill, to proceed to the consideration of the conference report. If it appears possible to finish action on that report this evening, even by running past the dinner hour, the leadership has agreed to do that. If it does not appear that that is possible, the Senate will recess and return tomorrow at 11 o'clock, a. m., if that is agreeable to the Members of the Senate.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], is ready to report the supplemental appropriation bill.

Calendar No. 1184, Senate Joint Resolution 97, to amend certain laws relating to the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization, and Calendar No. 1193, Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House, may be taken up later in the week, or may be sandwiched in during times when it is convenient for the Senate to consider them. I want all Senators to be on notice about the program, and particularly to be on notice about the farm conference report.

After consulting with the minority leader, the chairman, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, it has been decided to keep the Senate in session, if necessary, until 7 or 8 o'clock, or perhaps even later, this evening. If action on the farm conference report cannot be completed today, we will have the Senate resume consideration of it tomorrow. What will happen will depend on the progress made with the unfinished business today.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an additional opportunity be now afforded to present routine matters, with a limitation of 2 minutes on statements, without the time being charged to either side.

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

AVAILABILITY OF SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS AS "FAVORITE SON" CANDIDATE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on the 10th of April the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] delivered a very able and eloquent speech which was directed primarily to the people of Texas. In the course of his remarks he not only made a stirring appeal for party unity, but he emphasized the value of the two-party system in our political life. The distinguished majority leader announced his availability to the people of Texas as a favorite son candidate, and

as chairman of the Texas delegation to the Democratic National Convention.

In the course of his remarks he said:

I have made it clear to the leaders of other States that I am seeking none of their delegates.

I cannot refrain from observing that when his name is presented to the convention as a favorite-son candidate from the great State of Texas, it will be impossible to prevent delegations from other States from adopting him as their favorite son.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

TO DWELL IN UNITY

(Address by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, over television and radio stations in Texas)

My fellow Texans, I want to talk to you tonight about something to which I have given a great deal of thought in the past few weeks. It is on a subject that is important not only to me but to every Texan and every American.

This year is the centennial of President Woodrow Wilson, the first great world leader which this Nation produced.

He was a wise man—a very wise man. It is not surprising to find that more than 40 years ago, he had already said what I want to say to you tonight.

This is what Woodrow Wilson said in 1915:

"This country is not going to use any party that cannot do continuous and consistent teamwork. If any group of men should dare to break the solidarity of the Democratic Party for any purpose or for any motive, theirs will be a most unenviable notoriety and a responsibility which will bring deep bitterness to them. The only party that is serviceable to the Nation is a party that can hold absolutely together and march with the discipline and with the zest of a conquering host."

I want you to think about those wise words of Woodrow Wilson while I am talking with you tonight, because I am going to talk about the delegation which Texas will send to the national convention of the Democratic Party in Chicago next August.

A MEANS TO AN END

Most of us—as Americans—will agree that a political party is only a means to an end. We should be interested in our party because we are interested in our country. We want our Democratic Party to be strong and united because it is the only instrument through which we can act effectively for our Nation.

Through the experience of more than 150 years, we have found that political parties are essential to effective action. We have also learned that they cannot survive if they are torn by factional strife or warfare over personalities.

And when the parties are torn apart, the Nation suffers.

We have in the world today the example of France, sorely troubled by unceasing warfare between a multitude of parties representing factional, rather than national, views.

WITH A UNITED VOICE

In the United States, we have learned—and, I hope, learned well—to conduct our affairs through the two great parties. Neither demands unswerving allegiance to the principles of one small group or one small faction. Therefore, between them, when they speak, they speak the voice of America.

In the Congress, both branches are now controlled by the Democratic Party. I have the honor to lead that party in the Senate. Another Texan—our beloved Speaker RAYBURN—leads the party in the House.

During the past 3 years, the Democrats in both branches have demonstrated that a party can be held together by a desire to serve the Nation—the Nation which belongs to all of us, whether Democrats or Republicans.

At the beginning of the last Congress, there were those who predicted freely that the Democratic Party would fly to pieces. But the hard, factual record demonstrated 77 unanimous party votes during the time I have served as leader of the Democrats—a mark almost without equal.

A CONQUERING HOST

Democratic Senators of widely divergent views—Senator GEORGE and Senator LEHMAN; Senator RUSSELL and Senator HUMPHREY—were able to vote together on principle. These men have not agreed on everything, but they were able to vote together most of the time on principle. Even when they differed, they did not attempt to divide or destroy the party's record for responsibility and patriotic performance. What can be done in the Senate can be done in Texas.

In the words of Woodrow Wilson, we have managed to "march with the discipline and with the zest of a conquering host." Yet we have marched only along the road which we believed would lead to the greatest security and prosperity for the United States.

That march will continue so long as our parties remain strong and vital. But they cannot do so if groups or factions within these parties abandon our traditional system of give-and-take discussion and seek to exercise a veto over all other groups or factions.

THE PROPOSAL

A few weeks ago, our great Speaker RAYBURN proposed that Texas place me in nomination for the Presidency at the Democratic National Convention. He suggested also that I head the Texas delegation to the Chicago convention.

I have given this proposal a great deal of thought. There are many considerations which must go into such a decision.

Frankly, I am not anxious to assume burdens in addition to those already carried. I am even more reluctant—in fact, completely opposed—to entering a popularity contest between Texans.

But this is not basically a question of a popularity contest nor should it become one. It is a question which involves the duties and the obligations that are owed to my friends and fellow Texans who have honored me over the years.

THE WILL OF THE MAJORITY

If it should be the will of the majority of the delegates to the State convention, representing the majority of the people of Texas, that my name be placed in nomination at the Chicago convention, I will be deeply honored. If it is also the will of the delegates to the State convention that I head the Texas delegation to the national convention, I will accept the responsibilities that this post brings, and be grateful for the trust and confidence reposed in me.

AMBITIONS FULFILLED

It should be emphasized once more that this is not a matter of personal ambition. You—the people of Texas—have already fulfilled my ambitions beyond the wildest dreams of my youth. For that, I am grateful beyond the power that any words can express.

I have made it clear to the leaders of other States that I am seeking none of their delegates. I am a Texan seeking to serve the people of Texas. I will have no part of any move that can create tensions and turmoil in our party.

If I can serve as an instrument to strengthen the voice of Texas in the councils of our Nation, I will be content.

BRETHREN IN UNITY

One lesson has been driven home to us. It is best expressed in the words of the 133d Psalm: "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

Personally, I believe that the people of Texas are united. Most of us, it is clear, are in fundamental agreement in our dreams, in our hopes, and in our yearnings.

We want our State—and our country—to be strong and united. But such unity can come only through our political parties when they are united through the medium of free discussion and by a sense of responsibility.

AN ISSUE OF PRINCIPLE

Texas should send a delegation of men and women to the national convention seeking the nomination of the very best person available in America to lead the Democrats of the Nation. I believe that delegation should abide by the decision of the majority of the convention and return to Texas to work for the election of the nominee.

I have no quarrel with those who want to support another party. I disagree with them but it is disagreement based upon principle and not upon a challenge to their motives or their patriotism.

TEXANS WILL DECIDE

In all of this discussion, there is one point that must be emphasized above all others. It is that Texans themselves will have the opportunity to decide their future.

On May 5, the precinct conventions will be held. They are the first step in the process that ultimately selects our delegation to the national convention.

These precinct conventions are the instruments through which your voices are felt. They give you the opportunity to exercise the American right which is most envied by the people of the world—the right of free choice.

A GLORIOUS HISTORY

From Sam Houston to SAM RAYBURN, Texas has had a glorious history. In time of war, we have produced the military leaders who led our forces to victory. In time of peace, we have produced the industrial and agricultural leaders who made our Nation prosperous.

Texas industrialists have given the world a prime example of efficiency. Texas oil provided the fuel that won two world wars. Texas cattle and cotton are second to none. Our influence in national affairs—since the immortal 40 nominated Woodrow Wilson at Baltimore—has been strong.

A Texan leads the majority in the House, and a Texan leads the majority in the Senate. Texans head the vital committees of Congress, and are in line for other key posts. Our soil is rich and our resources great. Our people have initiative and energy.

LET US REASON TOGETHER

Why cannot we also have the strongest and most effective delegation to the national convention? We can have such a delegation—a delegation of reasonable, loyal, and prudent men and women—if we will accept the words of the prophet Isaiah, who said, "Come now and let us reason together."

Let us, therefore, reason together, and let us go together to the precinct conventions on May 5. I hope that every Texan from every walk of life will be present and make known his or her desires.

Texas is important to me as it is to you. For three generations my ancestors, the Johnsons and the Baineses, have made their living from the soil of our State. I live on a central Texas hill country farm that was founded by my grandfather in the days of Sam Houston. Both of my grandfathers served in the Confederacy.

WE WORK TOGETHER

Through my 25 years of public service, you and I have worked together. Through all those years, I have stood up and been counted on every issue. We have gone together through sunshine and sorrow—through good times and bad times. And this has been the history of Texas—a State which was built by adventurous men with the spirit of the pioneer—by men who could unite—by men who with Benjamin Franklin realized that they must hang together or they would all hang separately.

This is one time when all Texans should come together in the spirit of unity. The right of choice is too sacred to be left to the narrow partisans of any stripe or to those who would place personal ambition or personal disappointment above the common good.

We must all turn out to the precinct, county, and State conventions—turn out with our wives and with our sons and our daughters. Turn out so that for all time to come you can look your fellowman in the eye and tell him that you thought enough of your American heritage to exercise your rights where and when they counted—at the precinct convention.

ALL DEMOCRATS

I am appealing to all Democrats without prefixes or suffixes. May 5 is indeed the day of decision. It is the day upon which the voice of Texas can be heard.

And whatever your decision may be, you know I will abide by it in good faith.

Let me remind you once more of those words of President Wilson:

"This country is not going to use any party that cannot do continuous and consistent teamwork."

This is LYNDON JOHNSON, your Senator. Goodnight, goodby, and God bless you.

JET-AIRPLANE ENGINE FIASCO—PRIZE-WINNING NEWS ARTICLES

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, during the past weekend in Atlantic City a great newspaperman was honored by the National Headliners Club for a superior job of reporting which won for his newspaper the 1955 National Headliners Club award for outstanding public service. Theodore Schafers of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat capped a long series of major stories with his exposé last fall of a serious blunder in the purchase of military jet aircraft, which cost the taxpayers of the United States more than a hundred million dollars.

He revealed that McDonnell Aircraft had delivered to the United States Navy 47 jet fighters, each costing about $2,600,000 which were equipped with Westinghouse engines not powerful enough to lift the planes off the ground. Theodore Schafers has set an example of alert and responsible news gathering which embodies the highest type of public service. His persistent prodding of tight-mouthed public officials and the imaginative scope of his inquiry led to the story which focused public attention on a major fiasco, and led immediately to a congressional investigation. House subcommittee chairman, CHET HOLIFIELD, praised the Globe-Democrat for doing a service to the Nation by publishing the facts as uncovered by Mr. Schafers.

I am proud to join in paying tribute to Theodore Schafers. The American people must rely on their newspapers for the facts they use in evaluating the performance of Government officials. There is no greater service to our democracy than the high standard of reporting which has won for Mr. Schafers and the Globe-Democrat the National Headliners distinguished award.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a news article appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on March 17, 1956, which describes Mr. Schafers' achievements in further detail.

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

GLOBE-DEMOCRAT WINS 1955 HEADLINERS AWARD ON JET SERIES—SCHAFERS' STORIES ON ENGINE FIASCO TAKE PRIZE FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

The Globe-Democrat has won the 1955 National Headliners Club award for outstanding public service by a newspaper, it was announced in Atlantic City yesterday.

Theodore Schafers' stories on the Westinghouse-Navy-McDonnell Aircraft jet plane fiasco "exemplified especially" the standard of public service by the Globe-Democrat which earned it the award, the judges said.

Schafers will go to Atlantic City April 6-8 to receive the Headliner silver medallion at the award ceremony, and to be an honor guest at the various dinners and events in the annual three-day Headliner Frolics.

The National Headliners Club, started in 1935 by the Press Club of Atlantic City, salutes those who have distinguished themselves in news coverage.

NINE JUDGES

A total of 1,500 entries from all news media, including foreign and domestic news reporting, radio, television, photography, editorial pages, sports and news magazines, was studied by the 9 judges who selected the 23 winners in various fields.

Only one annual award for outstanding public service by a newspaper is offered by the club, the one which was conferred upon the Globe-Democrat in the 1955 competition.

The Globe-Democrat's jet plane exposé was a story of an amazing military aircraft flop which cost taxpayers at least $122,200,000. This newspaper disclosed, in a series of stories which began last September, that McDonnell had delivered to the Navy 47 jet fighters which were grounded. The planes, each costing about $2,600,000, eventually were carried out of St. Louis by river barges.

ALL CRITICIZED

The failure resulted from use of Westinghouse engines which were not powerful enough for the planes. A congressional subcommittee, investigating after the Globe published the story, criticized McDonnell and the Navy for accepting the engines knowing that they "were below performance specifications for the airframe."

Westinghouse also was censured for not delivering the kind of engine it had promised.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, a California Democrat and chairman of the House Military Operations Subcommittee which conducted the inquiry, said the Globe-Democrat "did a service to the Nation" in bringing the costly blunder to national attention.

Schafers was curious last year when he saw a large group of the planes parked by the McDonnell Aircraft plant, at Lambert-St. Louis Municipal Airport. He observed, during periodic visits to the area, that the planes apparently were never moved.

DUG FOR FACTS

He started asking questions, and as his prodding increased, logical information sources began to dry up. The lack of cooperation by these sources increased Schafers' suspicions and he kept digging for the facts. He pinned down enough data from his contacts in industrial circles to warrant a Navy explanation on the grounded planes and what would be done with them.

But when Marsh Clark, a member of the Globe-Democrat's Washington bureau, began to press the Navy for this information, he, too, was met with evasive tactics. Meanwhile, in St. Louis, staff writer Carl Major joined with Schafers in running down additional phases of the story.

The persistent efforts of the trio finally yielded the facts which caused the congressional investigation that assessed the taxpayers' losses and fixed the responsibility for what the legislators called a "debacle."

Schafers, 41, became a Globe-Democrat copyboy when he was 14, and he has worked continuously for this newspaper for the last 27 years. While still going to school, he held various jobs on the paper, and learned the newspaper business from the staff members. He was added to the staff in 1938.

Schafers was assigned in 1940 to the Criminal Courts Building, and started a 15-year period of crime-story coverage, which was interrupted by a 2-year service with the Army.

His many news beats included the exclusive interview of John Hager, the taxi driver who tipped police on the Greenlease baby kidnap murderers. He got the story during the early morning hours, too late for the Globe's last edition. He knew that rival newsmen were searching for Hager, as was the Teamster's Union, which wanted to put the cabdriver on a national television show.

HID CABDRIVER

To protect his exclusive interview, Schafers talked Hager into hiding in a hotel until the Globe-Democrat could "break" the story the following night.

Other major stories by Schafers included the series with Globe Staffer Edwin D. Krell on the Missouri State Penitentiary scandal, which caused many major reforms and a multi-million-dollar rehabilitation program; and disclosure of a city jail racket in which big-shot labor racketeers were paying bribes to get special privileges.

Schafers is married and the father of five children. The Schafers live at 6735 Mathew Street, Northwoods. The newsman is a member of Sigma Delta Chi, the national professional journalism fraternity, and of the American Newspaper Guild.

Tom Duffy, editor of the East St. Louis Journal, also is a 1955 headliner award winner. He was cited for "consistently outstanding" feature columns for his daily feature, On the Home Front.

Other headliner awards include:

Michael J. O'Neill, United Press, for outstanding coverage of a major domestic news story, in his articles on Salk polio vaccine.

Andrew Tully, Scripps Howard Newspaper Alliance, for outstanding coverage of major foreign news, and especially for his series, Inside Russia.

Charles E. Shutt, Telenews and INS, for exclusive interviews with Russian leaders, including Malenkov and Bulganin.

Sports Illustrated, best news series in a magazine for its exposé, Boxing's Dirty Business.

Eric Sevareid, CBS, for consistently outstanding news broadcasting in his The World Tonight.

Movietone News and Georges Chassignes, cameraman, for outstanding newsreel coverage of a news event, the Algerian revolt.

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY IN FIFTH NATIONAL LAWRENCE S. MAYERS PEACE ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a New York merchant, Mr. Lawrence S. Mayers, awards an annual prize in an

essay contest which is open to seniors in high schools throughout the United States on questions relating to peace and disarmament. I have had the honor of serving on the board of judges for these essays year after year. I believe the prize-winning essay for this year, which was awarded to Miss Janet P. Bellin, of a small town in Oregon, is a particularly good one. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

My question: "During the next 5 years, what can I do to help bring about permanent world peace?"

I am an 18-year-old farm girl in a small town in Oregon. It is a logging community, and familiar to everyone's ear is the cry of "Timber" and the sound of a power saw snorting its way through the few remaining stands of second-growth fir and cottonwood. How hard it is for me to realize as I hoe in the warm sunshine and feel the firm, sandy soil beneath my feet that this tiny community is part of a clashing, struggling civilization that claws like a wild beast underneath while it clamors on the surface for world peace.

I have lived for 18 years on this earth. During that time my parents have provided me with food and shelter, love and affection, the opportunity to grow up and go to school in a free country. Teachers have taught me from books and opened new horizons of interest. Townspeople have invited me in for a cookie, attended school functions, and were interested in the fact that I was a child growing up. Now, after these years, the time has come for me to do what I can to make the world a better place for the children of tomorrow.

When I was in the fifth grade, Mrs. ——— came to school one day. She had a flag with her. She stepped to the front of the room, and as she unrolled the familiar Stars and Stripes I wondered why she had saved this tattered, faded flag. "Boys and girls"—she cleared her throat, her voice a bit unsteady as the room grew quiet—"Boys and girls, after my son was killed 4 years ago, I kept this flag which covered his grave. I'm leaving it here to fly above your school, and I pray that none of you will ever have to be shipped home dead to your mother from a strange land where you died for your country. Take this flag * * *." She couldn't go on. She left the room crying. I had never seen Mrs. ——— cry before. I'll never forget that moment. I have a twin brother, a boy friend, cousins, and friends. Mrs. ———'s son can only die once.

Next time, perhaps it will be me who stoops to remove a faded flag from a newly turned grave. In 18 years I have been taught to eat, to walk, to talk, to sing, to drive, and a thousand and one other things. But no one has ever taught me what to say in this moment when I ask myself, "What can I do during the next 5 years to promote permanent world peace?"

It does no good to look at the lives of famous people, living and dead, to see what they did to answer the question. They are not I and I am not they. This must be my own solution. However, the question is not mine alone. It belongs to every man, woman, and child everywhere. If each answered it not only in words, but in deeds, to the best of his ability there would be no such question for generations to come.

Next fall I plan to enter college. Surely there will I find an answer to my question. As a freshman, I haven't much choice of courses, but I ought to be able to squeeze in several hours a week for the study of international relations. Learning of the problems of coexistence is not the complete answer. A nationwide organization, the International Relations Club, might also help me to understand my question, even if it won't solve it. Perhaps if I major in political science, studying world politics, international law, European political theory, etc., and after finishing, find my place in one of today's international organizations, I will be doing my job.

It has been said that the people in countries across the sea have a strong dislike for the United States as a country. Part of these feelings are present through misunderstanding. By writing to a pen pal in Ireland, Japan, or another country, I would only be reaching one person, but at least I could tell that one person about this community where I live—so unlike the picture Communist countries paint of the extravagant, imperialistic United States of America.

Like most 18-year-old girls, I dream of someday having my own home and children—in some nice town, not too different from the place I live. If I were to be married next month, how could I use my 5-year time allotment to help promote world peace? Instead of the garden club, and bridge club and the numerous other societies which young wives of today find so attractive, I might join the town's United Nations Club, or if it didn't have one, start one. The American Association for the United Nations is very cooperative in helping such organizations to get on their feet. Such a group could study the U. N., raise money to help support its specialized agencies, provide milk and clothing for children in India and undertake countless other small projects. An even larger one could be sponsoring an exchange student or refugee.

By teaching my children to respect other people and their property, to control their tempers when in an argument, and to make every effort to get along with the other children of the neighborhood, I would be promoting peace—even if it were on a very small scale.

I hope to graduate from college and teach in Oregon schools. Here my peace promoting could operate on a slightly larger scale as I teach students the Golden Rule along with their other courses. In social-studies classes, I could help them to explore the countries which make daily headlines in the American press. Here, though they were influenced by their parents' feelings, they could learn to broaden their opinions and their understanding through group discussion about these trouble spots. Sending pencils to Korean children, soap and washcloths to the children in Panama—these are projects that would help answer my question and would answer it for my students, too.

My question has been presented to me in another way. Jesus said, "Be ye kind one to another." As part of my Christian heritage I must do all that is in my power to promote world peace. Again, it is hard to find an answer to this question which is so overpowering. To what degree shall I give? How hard shall I try to answer it?

A missionary in the steamy jungles of Africa could promote permanent world peace. In 5 years I could complete missionary training and represent my church in a missionary field. I would have to provide not only spiritual help and translations of the teachings of Jesus Christ, but I would also have to be, in part, a medical adviser, a counselor, and a friend—an ambassador of the United States of America.

"More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of." Perhaps I am overlooking the closest, but most effective way of answering my question. How simple it would be for me to dedicate a few minutes a day to prayer for world peace. Who can tell what power those collected minutes could hold? In this way I would be fulfilling my Christian duty, my duty as a citizen of the United States, and my duty as a citizen of the world.

No one ever thinks he has enough money. No matter what he has, he always needs more. Although my future earnings will certainly never total a million dollars, a small percentage of them could help organizations that are the means by which the average citizen may contribute to possible peace. Agencies such as CARE, and specialized agencies of the U. N.—UNESCO and UNICEF, for example—spend dollars carefully, aiding the most people possible, helping them to become better educated, to be healthier and thus, enable them to better understand why world peace is the route to happier living for all mankind. Because I have visited the United Nations headquarters in New York and spent a week there studying its functions, I am convinced that promoting the U. N. is synonymous with promoting world peace.

I offer no solution for impressing upon people their duty to serve in this capacity. I have invented no secret weapon that will cause the world to "heel" at my command. All I have to offer is the minute bit of knowledge that I have acquired, plus my faith in God and the future.

It's up to me as an individual of this world, who has been lucky enough to attend school for 12 years, to send CARE packages, join the International Relations Club at college, study foreign affairs, write to a foreign pen pal, and be constantly on the lookout for new and more efficient ways to complete my task.

I pray that someday everyone will hear my question, answering it to the best of their ability, and, in some year to come, perhaps the soldier's question will be changed. As he puts aside his gun forever, he may look wonderingly at a comrade and ask in hushed tones, "Why is there peace?" The people who have answered my question will know.

THE DECLINE OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am completely confident that thousands of Princeton alumni read with shame and disappointment a news dispatch this week indicating that Alger Hiss had been invited to speak at Princeton University. It is indeed unfortunate that so great a university should be thus embarrassed and involved.

I rather think, sir, that the Washington Daily News put it both succinctly and significantly in its editorial columns of day before yesterday when it ran the following editorial under the heading of "Hiss." It reads:

This business of inviting Alger Hiss to speak at Princeton strikes us as corny show-off, pure and simple.

Hiss is scheduled to talk before a campus debating society April 26 on the meaning of Geneva. Presumably, he gained special insight to affairs of state from his 4 years in jail for lying about his part in a Communist spy ring.

The debating society takes the usual out that "while it does not approve of Hiss' record," etc., it does want to get his views. It's our guess that, rather than Hiss' views, they are plumping more for public attention for imagined courage in inviting a jailbird to speak before them.

Well, it wasn't so long ago that some Princetonians were winning notoriety by swallowing goldfish. They now think they can get more of it by swallowing Alger Hiss.

Indeed, Mr. President, for university students to engage in goldfish swallowing contests and in pajama wars is bad

enough. But to invite convicted agents of the Communist conspiracy to visit the campus and to advise them on the meaning of Geneva hits an all-time low. Surely a much more appropriate theme for Alger Hiss would be the betrayal at Yalta.

What has happened to our universities? What campus influences are at work thus to seduce the collegiate mind? Where, indeed, is the American spirit of earlier times which would have impelled students themselves to rise up and protest such perversions of a university forum?

Will we next read that Princeton—because of some inane interpretation of academic freedom, I presume—is inviting Lucky Luciano to visit the campus to lecture students about narcotics? Will some Federal convict be asked in to tell them about counterfeiting? If this is modern education or academic freedom, heaven help all of us.

THE SOUTH IS ON THE MOVE AGAIN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I now desire to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the South may be docile but it is not down. Based on personal observations which I have made in addressing southern audiences during the past few years, I am convinced that the proud people of Dixie have reached a point in our national history where they are no longer content to be pushed around and humiliated by the northern politicians who have counted on the southern votes to be "in the bag" for the Democratic Party for so many elections that they have come to believe that southern ideals and aspirations may be ignored without political risk to northern Democratic politicians.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to a news release which I issued on this subject on April 3 and which was given wide circulation by the Associated Press. It reads as follows:

SENATOR MUNDT NOTES SIGNS THAT THE SOUTH MAY HAVE HAD ENOUGH

"A political uneasiness and uncertainty is pervading all the States of the Old South," Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, told a Capitol Hill reporter here last week. "Beginning as far back as 1944, and gaining strength in each quadrennial election since then, the restlessness of the Southern States at being straitjacketed in the grip of a one party system which rejects its policies, resents its political leadership, and repels some of its convention delegations at the Democratic National Conventions, hits its heights in 1952 when five Southern States voted for Eisenhower and several others came within a few thousand votes of doing the same thing.

"The Presidential election of 1956 is likely to witness a similar revolt on the part of Jeffersonian Democrats in Dixie who have about had enough of the Rooseveltian formula of pitching the party policy to attract northern minorities while relying upon Southern docility and political prejudice to furnish over 100 electoral votes in each election to a pyrrhic victory which elects their party but rejects every policy and principle in which the South believes.

"The present controversy over integration versus segregation is but a single manifestation of the wide open split between Southern and Northern Democrats," MUNDT continued. "Actually, there is a whole pattern of programs and policies which Stevenson, Harriman, Kefauver, and the Democratic National Committee offer as 'lures' to Northern voters in big metropolitan eastern cities which are repugnant to the States rights advocates who predominate among Southern voters. Southerners consider the 10th amendment to the Constitution as important as any of the other stipulations of our famed constitutional Bill of Rights whereas, increasingly, New Dealers, Fair Dealers, and modern machine Democrats seek to solve every social and economic problem by increasing the powers of the central government in Washington and decreasing the self-determinative powers of individual citizens and separate States.

"The resentment of the South at their own one-party political trap is increased rather than decreased by realization of the fact that 8 of the 9 Supreme Court Judges who made the segregation decision which they abominate were appointed by the political party which their votes had kept in power for 20 consecutive years. Thus, their recent manifesto signed by nearly 100 Democratic Senators and Congressmen is an unhappy lamentation over their futility and their fate—but proposes no specific course of action to extricate themselves from their self-made trap. However, that manifesto, if it means anything at all, is a warning shot over the prow of the ship manned by Northern Democrats that the days of docility and blind obedience to the demands of their city-machine associates are over. Whether this results in another third party movement in the South or another mass shifting of voters to the support of Eisenhower, it is too early to speculate but it clearly indicates that unless the Democratic National Committee nominates a conservative Democrat (which it won't) the South cannot be counted upon for the type of blind political support it used to provide nor the 100 electoral votes it used to deliver.

"Almost solid Southern support for our recent attempt to win support for a constitutional amendment providing for electoral colleage reform is another indication that the South is weary of riding in a political automobile which it can never steer. Pressure groups playing for the block votes of States with large units of electoral college votes seek to bargain with both parties and sell their support to the one making the highest bid, realizing this, the South may develop a political mechanism of its own for tying together the largest electoral block in America, over 100 votes, and thus cease giving away for nothing a political commodity which could prove to be the determining factor in every political election. Thus, the South may be about to write a new chapter in American political behavior. It is something to be watched."

Mr. President, since the publication of this news item, I have received many letters and communications from the South—by far the vast majority of them expressing agreement with these observations. In addition, I have received numerous editorials from southern newspapers in which the editors concur in my belief that something is stirring in the South and that the good people of that great area have finally learned the basic lesson in politics which teaches that when an area of the country, or any specific segment of our society, gives its votes away by habit or prejudice the politicians who profit by such blind allegiance soon cease listening to the expressed desires of those who sell their franchise so cheaply. Only by remaining or becoming unpredictable can any group of citizens long have any important impact in helping to determine America's long-term destiny.

The Augusta Chronicle, published in Augusta, Ga., carrys on its masthead the significant legend "The South's oldest newspaper." It was established in 1785. For that reason, I have selected from the editorials sent to me an editorial from the April 5 issue of the Augusta Chronicle for incorporation in the RECORD at this point. It refers to my release of April 3 and provides additional evidence that political docility is dying out in Dixie. There is therefore good cause to hope that this great area of the country may once again become important in our national American political scene. If such portents come true, I am confident the effect upon all Americans will be wholesome.

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

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

GROWING RESTLESS

Adlai Stevenson, trying his best to say words that would please southerners, dropped off in Atlanta Tuesday to make a little hay during his brief Georgia stay.

He said among other things, that he stands by his original statement that he opposes any use of force to carry out the Supreme Court's desegregation ruling.

But no sugar-coated words, or half-hearted gestures of appeasement, can mask the Democratic candidate's real feelings about segregation and the racial issue. These were revealed in this direct quotation from Mr. Stevenson's Georgia interview:

"Eliminating segregation in the schools of some of our States presents us today with a national challenge to show our maturity as a people. For my part, as most northerners, I feel that the Supreme Court has decreed what our reason told us was inevitable and our conscience told us was right. I feel equally strongly that whether you agree with that decision or not, it is the law and should be obeyed."

Thus Adlai Stevenson, who is being called the "moderate," comes South to woo the southern electorate which before many months may be called upon to support him as the Democratic candidate for President. He doesn't believe in force, but he does believe in racial integration.

Some distance removed from the South a western Senator perceives the fact that the wool is not being pulled over the eyes of a large and growing segment of the southern population.

Politically, the South is growing restless, rebellious, thinks Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota.

"The South," he says, "is weary of riding in a political automobile which it can never steer. This election year may see a revolt of Jeffersonian Democrats in Dixie. * * * A political uneasiness and uncertainty is pervading all the States of the Old South."

Senator MUNDT added these pertinent thoughts:

"Jeffersonian Democrats in the South have had about enough of the Roseveltian formula of pitching the patry policy to attract northern minorities while relying on southern docility and political prejudice to furnish over 100 electoral votes in each election."

Senator MUNDT is right in saying that the Democratic South is becoming uneasy and restive in its political straitjacket. Segregation is merely one manifestation of Deep South restlessness over the course that political events are taking, with southerners

still being called upon to continue their demonstration of loyalty to a party which tells them to stand in the corner every time they ask for some consideration.

Whether this dissatisfaction will be evidenced in the South going Republican, or forming a third party, or doing nothing at all, remains to be seen. But there promises to be an extraordinary violent display of fireworks at the Democratic National Convention.

The South is getting uncomfortable "in the bag," and this is the year that it might want out.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to but one other southern editorial at this time from among the many on this theme which are appearing in the press of the South.

This one is from the Texarkana Gazette, of Texarkana. I have spoken in this delightful and unusual Southern city lying on the border of two of our great and important Southern States, Arkansas and Texas. Texarkana people are as progressive as pioneers and as independent as a Texas rattlesnake. They are also opinionated, proud, and well-informed. Along with millions of other southerners they are growing weary and restless under a political whiplash which drives them in national elections to vote for people and for policies which they know, in advance, will do violence to their traditions and insult the ideals for which they stand. They are reappaising the dimensions of the political trap which for too long has thwarted their purposes and prevented their attaining the political stature to which all areas of the country are entitled, but which has been denied to so many of the South because they have loaned their birthright of a free and unfettered franchise to Northern Democratic bosses to exercise in their own behalf. Such supine support of a party which has ceased to represent their aspirations and their ideals is, in my opinion, about to be terminated by a great new declaration of political independence by the good people of Dixie.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SENATOR MUNDT MAKES A POINT

Senator MUNDT, one of the most politically astute Republicans in Washington, has been planting some seed in the South in recent weeks that may take root.

He has observed what he chooses to call "the restlessness of Southern States at being straitjacketed in the grip of a one-party system which rejects its policies, and resents its political leadership."

MUNDT goes on to say that Southern people are getting fed up with the Rooseveltian formula of pitching Democratic Party politics to attract northern minorities while relying on southern docility and political prejudice against Republicans to furnish over 100 electoral votes in each election.

MUNDT states further that Southern resentment of their one-party political trap is increased by the knowledge that 8 of the 9 Justices of the Supreme Court who handed down the decision against racial segregation in public schools were appointed by New Deal Democratic Presidents.

Although we all know that the political sagacity of MUNDT is dedicated to the proposition of obtaining more Republican votes in the South, the fact remains that he is speaking the truth. The South is the most persecuted of all political minorities and it's getting pretty darn tired of it. If the Democrats refuse—and we believe they will—to nominate a conservative candidate, another third party may be formed in the South. If not, then many southerners may decide to take a walk, which is what Senator MUNDT hopes they will do.

HISTORIC LETTER BY GEORGE WASHINGTON TO THE HEBREW CONGREGATION IN NEWPORT, R. I.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, lately I have had occasion to reread an historic letter written by the Father of Our Country, George Washington, to the Hebrew Congregation in Newport, R. I. It is not only one of the greatest testaments of liberty I have read, but it is also one of the most beautiful expressions of America's faith in freedom.

It would be well if this letter were required reading in every school and university in the country. But it should be unnecessary to require the reading of this magnificent utterance by the Father of Our Country. It should be read with eagerness and with wonderment at the stirring sentiments so grandly expressed.

Recently I had occasion to address a message to a luncheon meeting of an organization which is engaged in an effort to restore the famous Touro Synagogue in Newport, R. I. In that message I commented on one particular sentence in this letter. I ask unanimous consent that George Washington's letter be printed at this point in my remarks and that, as a minor footnote to this great document, my message to the Touro Synagogue restoration committee be also printed in the RECORD.

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

To the Hebrew Congregation in Newport, Rhode Island:

GENTLEMEN: While I receive, with much satisfaction, your Address replete with expressions of affection and esteem, I rejoice in the opportunity of assuring you, that I shall always retain a grateful remembrance of the cordial welcome I experienced in my visit to Newport, from all classes of Citizens.

The reflection on the days of difficulty and danger which are past is rendered the more sweet, from a consciousness that they are succeeded by days of uncommon prosperity and security. If we have wisdom to make the best use of the advantages with which we are now favored, we cannot fail, under the just administration of a good Government, to become a great and a happy people.

The Citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to Mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise, of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

It would be inconsistent with the frankness of my character not to avow that I am pleased with your favorable opinion of my Administration, and fervent wishes for my felicity. May the Children of the Stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other Inhabitants, while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and figtree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy.

G. WASHINGTON.

APRIL 7, 1956.

TOURO SYNAGOGUE RESTORATION COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention: Mr. William Zeckendorf.)

MY DEAR FRIENDS: I deeply regret that prior engagements make it impossible for me to be with you at the luncheon to consider plans for the restoration of the Touro Synagogue. Yours is a most worthy purpose. The restoration of the Touro Synagogue will certainly be a notable addition to the shrines in Washington, the Nation's Capital.

I am deeply moved to know that at your luncheon the justly famous and inspiring letter from George Washington addressed to the Hebrew congregation in Newport will be on display in its original form and that you are choosing this letter as the theme of your luncheon discussion. I have often reflected on the grace and eloquence of that letter. It is, in my judgment, one of the great documents of the literature of liberty in America.

There is, for instance, the sentence in which the great Father of Our Country said of his fellow citizens: "All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship." The concept of immunities of citizenship was fixed into the 14th amendment to the Constitution where it is provided that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.

In recent years the Supreme Court has been giving renewed life to this language. It is well to remember that this sentence in the 14th amendment has a direct relationship to the reference made by our first President and that in America all citizens should have truly equal rights.

But there is little that I can add to the sermon of liberty and equality contained in George Washington's famous letter. It serves well as the theme of America itself.

I only wish that I could be with you on the occasion of your luncheon to see the original of this historic document.

I scarcely need add that I strongly support the Touro Synagogue restoration project.

Yours very sincerely,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

BATAAN DAY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it was 14 years ago, on April 9, that the American flag was hauled down in defeat and surrender on the mountain stronghold of Bataan in the Philippines. For long and bitter weeks and months, Filipino and American forces—most of them Filipino—had fought side by side in a gallant defense of this famed redoubt, the last but one where American authority remained in the Far East. The last was Corregidor. It seemed incredible to the world, as it was incredible to the Japanese attackers, that the defenders of Bataan should be able to maintain their defense, day after day and week after week, though plagued by

disease, short of ammunition, short of food, short of medicine—short of everything but raw courage.

But it is unnecessary, even today, 14 years later, to retell this great story. The world knows it. The American people remember it.

It was a saga of heroism. But, much more, it was an epic of Philippine-American devotion. Filipino troops fought just as hard, and just as heroically in defense of Bataan, as the Americans. And they were fighting for America.

Four years later, on July 4, 1946, the American flag was hauled down again from the flagstaffs of the Philippines, but this time not in surrender, but in victory. On that occasion we gave the Philippines their independence. That was a great day for America in the Far East. It was a great day for the cause of freedom and democracy. I am referring, of course, to the day when the United States turned over the sovereign control of these islands to the Filipino people.

The Filipino people have justified all the confidence we had in them. They have proved the validity of democracy. They have managed their most pressing economic problems. They have continued to repair the ravages of war and occupation. They have held three national elections. They have remained strictly faithful to the traditions of democracy.

They continue today to be the showcase for democracy in the Far East, reflecting the best lessons we taught them, in the highest traditions of government under law.

Their president, Mr. Ramon Magsaysay, is a great leader of men. But more than that, he is a great believer in, and practitioner of, democratic ways. He is not only a friend of America—he is a friend of the cause of freedom.

I am afraid that we are inclined too much to take the Philippines for granted. We eagerly court our former enemies, while we somewhat neglect our friends. I hope that our Government will give a more attentive ear than it has in the recent past to the needs and aspirations of the Filipino people.

One of the troublesome questions now being dealt with between the Philippine Republic and the United States is the question of title to certain military sites in the Philippines. It seems to me, although I do not know too much about it, that it ill behooves us to stand on fine legalisms in pressing our claims. Let us be more than generous with these faithful friends of ours. No base rights in a foreign country have any meaning except by the full consent and support of the people of the country concerned. It should be our object to continue to cultivate the support and friendship of the Filipino people. That is our chief asset and our chief source of strength in this area.

I am glad to salute the Philippines on the occasion of Bataan Day, and to urge that it be an occasion throughout America for reaffirmation of Philippine-American friendship.

NATURAL RESOURCES POLICIES OF THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the course of its comprehensive study of the state of our Nation's economy, based upon the economic report of the President, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has taken a hard look at the natural resources policies of the present Republican administration. Eight members of this joint committee—the learned chairman, Senator DOUGLAS, the able vice chairman, Representative PATMAN, Senators SPARKMAN, FULBRIGHT, and O'MAHONEY, and Representatives BOLLING, MILLS, and KELLEY—submitted a supplemental report on a number of aspects of our economic situation. In expressing their concern over the administration's attitude toward resource development, these distinguished Members of Congress referred to flood control and conservation of water resources; timber and mining policy; reclamation policy and hydroelectric development.

They say, as I said in a recent speech in this body, that we should favor the building of the Aswan Dam in Egypt and the proposed TVA-type development of the River Jordan. But they continue:

> We wish the administration would show equal concern for domestic projects for water conservation, flood control, and power development. It seems to us utterly illogical to undermine our domestic programs while promoting such projects abroad.

And they correctly point out that this Republican administration's use of the slogans of "free enterprise" in the field of developing the resources of the Federal lands and rivers is only "a platform of inaction" and "a springboard for the parceling out of great resources to unbridled exploitation without regard to the national interest." They conclude:

> We do not believe that development or conservation of our natural resources would constitute "intrusion of government into private affairs." It was not so regarded in the time of Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, Charles McNary, George Norris, and other distinguished Republicans.

Mr. President, the points made by these able members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report are well taken and important, and I ask unanimous consent that the section on natural resources of their supplemental report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT

(March 1, 1956)

NATURAL RESOURCES

The majority of this committee is deeply concerned with the administration's attitude toward development, utilization, and conservation of our great resources—human and material.

It is crucial that we make the most of the resources we now have, as the committee has observed in point 4. We must also develop those resources which are potentially ours, and expand and accelerate our development of new resources and substitutes for those we now use. The development and efficient utilization of our resources is the key to an expanding economy, to future stability, and to national strength.

Today, the United States has passed from a "have" to a "have not" nation in the matter of raw materials. We are running out of iron ore, copper, oil, lead, bauxite, and many other vital materials. The Paley Commission on Natural Resources reported that this Nation is critically short of 44 strategic and critical materials.

The need for effective flood control and water conservation programs was dramatically illustrated by the 1955 New England floods and this year's floods in California and Oregon. Property losses were more than $1 billion in New England and $100 million in California.

By 1975 the industrial and home demands for water will be doubled. Vast areas of California, Texas, the Middle West, and portions of the East face the limit of their industrial and urban growth unless new supplies of water are provided. In 15 years the problem will be acute. China, India, and Soviet Russia have undertaken mammoth flood control, conservation, irrigation, and hydroelectric programs, and are pushing them with all possible speed.

The United States, however, ranks third in per capita development of electric power, behind Canada and Norway, although it is the greatest industrial nation in the world.

The United States daily consumption of crude oil has risen from a wartime peak of 6.2 million barrels in 1945 to 8.7 million barrels this year. In 1955 we increased our oil imports 18 percent and as we place more automobiles and trucks, tractors, and other power equipment into service in the future the drain on our oil resources will continue to increase.

The United States has never met its timber requirements on a sustained yield basis.

In the face of our resource needs, we find:

Our stockpiling of critical and strategic minerals is being halved.[1]

The Paly Commission report was received, filed, and so far as we can determine, forgotten.

In spite of the enormous flood damages we have sustained, the administration proposes to spend only $20 million in New England next year, and a total of only $157 million for all flood-control projects in 1957.

The policy in relation to water resources is disastrously inadequate over the long term. Our policy now seems to be to pray for rain in the drought areas and to rebuild the damage and pray for drought in the flood-devastated regions of the country.

The Benson-McKay-Wilson committee report to the President on water-resources policy represents a retreat from Federal responsibility for the development and conservation of water resources. It would reverse policies which have been evolved through a series of Federal laws since 1906. The approach recommended in this report would split up the various water resource development programs, assign bits and pieces to a multiplicity of private groups and public agencies, and would inevitably result in less flood control, less navigation, less power development. It would establish a basis for challenging the Federal Government's rights with respect to water resources projects. It would junk completely the river basin development concept which experts agree is the only sound and economical approach to water problems.

There is no program to meet the need for a rapidly expanding supply of water for industrial and residential uses.

Reclamation projects have been sorely restricted, the Tennessee Valley Authority given the shock treatment, and great public reclamation projects reduced or consigned to private interests.

In regard to synthetic fuels to supplement our dwindling supply of petroleum, the administration closed out the Louisiana, Mo., plant experiment for production of oil from

[1] Budget Message of the President, p. M30.

coal, and the Rifle, Colo., plant experiment for production of oil from shale. Both of these experiments offered great promise, and in the case of shale production the cost of producing a gallon of oil had been brought to within a fraction of the cost of producing regular petroleuem.

Secretary McKay stated that added demands are being created for the development and use of public lands and their resources. He said:

"Individuals and corporations want to use and acquire public lands for grazing, logging, mining, farming, industry, commerce, residence, recreation, and other purposes." [2]

Other congressional committees have concerned themselves with the rapacious scalping of our timberlands under mineral leases granted by this administration. We regard such acts as indefensible. We have hitherto suggested that the Government could give impetus to its soil-bank program by withdrawing these lands from exploitation. There is no apparent concert of programs between the Departments of Agriculture and Interior for land and timber use. The present policy is apparently to turn over vast resources of timber for private logging operations.

The majority members of this committee have supported foreign-aid programs. We believe this is a sound investment in national security. We approve the building of the Aswan Dam on the Nile in Egypt at a cost of $1.3 billion, and the proposed TVA development of the River Jordan. We wish the administration would show equal concern for domestic projects for water conservation, flood control, and power development. It seems to us utterly illogical to undermine our domestic programs while promoting such projects abroad. Sound policy calls for progress in both fields.

The Economic Report states that:

"Today, we believe as strongly in economic progress through free and competitive enterprise as our fathers did, and we resent as they did any unnecessary intrusion of Government into private affairs." [3]

Secretary McKay also stressed the Government's "partnership policy" in the development and use of resources. We believe in free and competitive enterprise as strongly as the administration. But we fear that the first statement is something of a platform of inaction; the second a springboard for the parceling out of great resources to unbridled exploitation without regard to the national interest. We do not believe that development or conservation of our national resources would constitute "intrusion of Government into private affairs." It was not so regarded in the time of Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, Charles McNary, George Norris, and other distinguished Republicans. It is apparent that this administration has undertaken, under a variety of slogans, a negation of the historical and continuing resources policy that began with Alexander Hamilton.

TARIFFS ON JEWELED WATCHES AND JEWELED WATCH MOVEMENTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the subject of tariffs on jeweled watches and jeweled watch movements; a letter written by Paul F. Mickey, vice president, American Watch Manufacturers Association, Inc., to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and published in the March 18, 1956, issue of that newspaper; and a letter written by Daniel J. Edwards to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and published in the March 30, 1956, issue of that newspaper. The letters are in answer to the arguments made by the Swiss spokesman in the Washington Post and Times Herald article to which I have referred.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CURTIS

Constant complaints are heard from the Swiss that American tariffs on jeweled watches and jeweled watch movements are crippling what is a basic industry in their country. No one doubts that the Swiss have every reason to be concerned for their watch industry. After all, the British, French and Germans, to protect their own jeweled watch industry have imposed high tariffs and quotas on Swiss watches. In addition, these countries provide substantial subsidies for their domestic manufacturers of watches and clocks. Moreover, the Russians, long heavy purchasers of Swiss watches, are now making their own watches and clocks.

There is a very good reason for all this. The British, French, Germans, and Russians have learned at great cost, particularly the British and French, that no nation can depend on another nation for the production of timing devices and that the jeweled watch industry is the basic element in the manufacture of timing devices. The jeweled watch industry is the industry that provides the solid core of scientists, engineers, metallurgists and draftsmen needed to develop the methods and machinery needed for the mass production of timing devices in time of war.

As a result of their failure to sell watches to other countries, the Swiss have been engaged in what amounts to a dumping operation in the American jeweled watch market. Recently, a leading spokesman for their watch industry complained in an article in the Washington Post and Times Herald that when President Eisenhower ordered an increase in the tariff on jeweled watches, the Swiss were able to send so few watches here that their economy was seriously damaged.

Was this the fact? Certainly not. Let me quote the Wall Street Journal:

"In 1953, the Swiss shipped an unprecedented 13.5 million watches and movements to the U. S. The first half of 1954 made it clear this unusual pace could not be sustained by demand. The tariff hike became effective in August of that year and got most of the public blame when the 1954 total fell to 10.2 million. But in the past year the Swiss proved able to shove their stateside sales up again to 10.9 million."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 18, 1956]

SWITZERLAND SPEAKS

American watch manufacturers would indeed be gratified if they could obtain as much space, paid or otherwise, in Swiss newspapers to explain their side of the tariff story as the Washington Post and Times Herald made available to the Swiss to explain theirs in the March 11 supplement on Switzerland. This gratification would be compounded if the space were made available in Bern at a time when the Swiss Legislature is in session, in which case our story would have an impact comparable to the impact the Swiss story as told in the Post must have had on Senators, Representatives, members of the White House staff, other Government officials, and national opinion leaders.

That the free exchange of ideas is just as important as the free exchange of goods is indisputable. Yet, it seems that the Swiss believe in neither in spite of their protestations to the contrary.

When President Eisenhower ruled that the tarriff on jeweled watches should be raised, American watchmakers were well aware that the Swiss people might regard this as a discriminatory act. To forestall such misunderstanding an effort was made to place in Swiss newspapers paid advertisements explaining the American view that a sound horological industry is an essential part of any nation's defense production base. The Swiss rejected that advertising and it is difficult to reconcile such action with their claim that Swiss ideals and practices of freedom are like our own.

The Swiss know full well that no nation can afford to be dependent on another nation for its time-keeping equipment and timing devices. England learned this truth too late, with the result that after World War II it was forced to expend a great deal of money, time, and talent reviving the jeweled watch industry it let be swept away by foreign competition between World War I and World War II.

In this connection, it is worth noting that Communist Party boss Nikita Khrushchev told the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R. that Russia planned to increase its production of timepieces from the present level of 19.5 million to 33.6 million by 1960.

It is also difficult to reconcile Swiss assertions that they are exponents of free international trade. In his article on Swiss watches and tariffs, G. Ketterer, vice president of the Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers Association, writes of the "revival of protectionism in America." For a Swiss to characterize as protectionism the modest efforts which our Government has made to keep alive a small, essential industry is particularly ridiculous since the Swiss themselves have long practiced the most rigid sort of protectionism.

For example, Mr. Ketterer refers to Switzerland as a low tariff country, while Swiss tariffs are on an average 60 percent higher than American tariffs. In addition, the Swiss make extensive use of quotas while the restrictive practices of their watch cartel make the worst of our American monopolists look like amateurs.

It is this cartel, incidentally, that levies a tax of approximately 12 cents on every watch or watch movement manufactured in Switzerland. This fund is used to further Swiss efforts to monopolize the world market for watches, and it is estimated that it amounted to approximately $2.5 million last year.

Mr. Ketterer was certainly evading the facts when he failed to mention that the Swiss now have about 80 percent of the market for jeweled watches in the United States. American jeweled watchmakers have no desire to force the Swiss to give up any substantial part of this market. They want only to be able to sell enough watches in this country to keep production at levels which will insure the adequate use of skilled workers and machinery.

This cannot be considered an unreasonable demand when one considers that the reason the Swiss captured so large a part of the American market was that American manufacturers gave up making jeweled watches during World War II so that they could devote their entire facilities to defense production.

In his article, Mr. Ketterer refers to the American watch industry as a "rival." This Mr. Ketterer must know is patently absurd. The Swiss cartel dominates world trade in jeweled watches. This dominance would be even greater had not England and France found it necessary to increase their tariffs on jeweled watches and impose import quotas. And it will obtain a complete monopoly of the United States' market unless our

---

[2] Hearings, p. 544.

[3] January 1956 Economic Report of the President, p. 10.

Government continues to keep a watchful eye on the small American industry.

PAUL F. MICKEY,
Vice President, American Watch Manufacturers Association, Inc.

WASHINGTON.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 30, 1956]

SWITZERLAND SPEAKS

When the section on Switzerland was published a couple of weeks ago, I felt that there would be many letters protesting Mr. Ketterer's use of statistics. Not only has no one protested as yet, but not even Mr. Mickey brought this to our attention in his letter.

The questions I have are, first, why did Mr. Ketterer use an absolute reduction in numbers for the entire year without stating from what base this decrease took place? Second, why did he use a percentage figure for only a 6 months period? Was there an increase in imports for the last 6 months? This use of statistics is not consistent and may be misleading.

Then, the following appeared in the Wall Street Journal of the 21st:

"In 1953, the Swiss shipped an unprecedented 13.5 million watches and movements to the United States. The first half of 1954 made it clear this unusual pace could not be sustained by demand. The tariff hike became effective in August of that year and got most of the public blame when the 1954 total fell to 10.2 million. But in the past year the Swiss proved able to shove their stateside sales up again to 10.9 million. This resurgence plus expanding markets in such places as Spain and India have left the Swiss watchmakers today with a solid order backlog and a labor shortage."

There appears to be an inconsistency in somebody's statistics. Can Mr. Ketterer clarify this apparent discrepancy? Are his statistics like his country's famous cheese?

DANIEL J. EDWARDS.

GREENBELT, MD.

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. 31 An act for the relief of Shih Ming Wang;

S. 83. An act for the relief of Ottilie Hitzlberger Lachelt; and

S. 1255. An act for the relief or Brigitta Poberetski.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6268) to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. METCALF, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. BERRY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

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

H. R. 842. An act granting increases in the annuities of certain former civilian officials and employees engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes;

H. R. 909. An act for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Road Commission;

H. R. 1096. An act for the relief of Nathan Phillips;

H. R. 1476. An act for the relief of the Spicer Ice & Coal Co.;

H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen;

H. R. 2005. An act to further amend the provisions of the acts authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the Armed Forces;

H. R. 2524. An act for the relief of Oather S. Hall;

H. R. 4635. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Robert T C. Rasmussen, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to certain inventions;

H. R. 4851. An act for the relief of the Kelmoor Fox and Fur Farm, Inc.;

H. R. 5274. An act extending to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H. R. 5382. An act for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc.;

H. R. 5453. An act for the relief of the estate of Robert Bradford Bickerstaff;

H. R. 5478. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5813. An act for the relief of W. R. Zanes and Company of Louisiana, Inc.;

H. R. 6313. An act for the relief of Vincent N. Caldes;

H. R. 7611. An act to establish a date of rank for pay purposes for certain Naval Reserve officers promoted to the grades of lieutenant and lieutenant commander;

H. R. 7646. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, to incur expenses incident to the representation of their personnel before judicial tribunals and administrative agencies of any foreign nation;

H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.;

H. R. 7952. An act to require the inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers;

H. R. 8477. An act to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8547. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.";

H. R. 8634. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.;

H. R. 8807. An act to extend for an additional 3 years the time within which the State of Michigan may commence and complete the construction of certain projects heretofore authorized by the Congress;

H. R. 8904. An act to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement;

H. R. 9132. An act to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project;

H. R. 9838. An act to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 513. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built cargo vessels and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 580. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 591. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 592. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 221) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1834. An act to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by the law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provision of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended;

S. 2438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever;

S. 3269. An act 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; and

H. R. 8107. An act to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

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

H. R. 842. An act granting increases in the annuities of certain former civilian officials and employees engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 909. An act for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Road Commission;

H. R. 1096. An act for the relief of Nathan Phillips;

H. R. 1476. An act for the relief of the Spicer Ice & Coal Co.;

H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen;

H. R. 2524. An act for the relief of Oather S. Hall;

H. R. 4635. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Robert T. C. Rasmussen, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to certain inventions;

H. R. 4851. An act for the relief of the Kelmoor Fox and Fur Farm, Inc.;

H. R. 5274. An act extending to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H. R. 5382. An act for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc.;

H. R. 5453. An act for the relief of the estate of Robert Bradford Bickerstaff;

H. R. 5813. An act for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc.;

H. R. 6313. An act for the relief of Vincent N. Caldes;

H. J. Res. 580. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 591. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 592. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2005. An act to further amend the provisions of the acts authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 5478. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; and

H. R. 9132. An act to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7611. An act to establish a date of rank for pay purposes for certain Naval Reserve officers promoted to the grades of lieutenant and lieutenant commander;

H. R. 7646. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, to incur expenses incident to the representation of their personnel before judicial tribunals and administrative agencies of any foreign nation;

H. R. 8477. An act to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8904. An act to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement; and

H. R. 9838. An act to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.; and

H. R. 8634. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7952. An act to require the inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers; and

H. J. Res. 513. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built cargo vessels and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8547. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y."; and

H. R. 8807. An act to extend for an additional 3 years the time within which the State of Michigan may commence and complete the construction of certain projects heretofore authorized by the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 221) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-8039686, Bartol, Dimitri.
A-7828332, Blicher, Adolf.
A-7948074, Blicher, Anna.
A-7945613, Crynberg, Natalia.
A-6848437, Chen, Tung-Kei, now Phillip Kei Chen.
A-6973683, Chow, Liang-Yen.
A-8021361, Chu, Pauline Jo-Nan Chou.
A-7095539, Emmus, Roland.
A-7095540, Emmus, Leida Maria.
A-6881711, Hai-Chow, Lee.
A-6779249, Hnykova, Maria Irena.
A-6962958, Hsu, Carlton W.
A-7395104, Iliescu, Maria, formerly Negoita (nee David).
A-6903727, Irany, Fuad Jalil Zend.
A-7138237, Kao, Lindberg Lin Pai.
A-6159692, Korbel, Josef.
A-6159691, Korbel, Anna.
A-7197504, Korbel, Marie Jana.
A-7197503, Korbel, Anna Catherine.
A-7197505, Korbel, Jan Josef.
A-6837688, Kroha, Rudolph Filip.
1300-127922, Lee, Hai.
T-2659454, Mah, Ling Kam.
A-7061846, Onon, Peter, alias Urunoge, Urrounge, or Urgunge Onon.
A-7415227, Onon, Nina (nee Pei-Lien Chen or Lien-Chen Pei), alias Lien-Chin Onon, Narangerel Onon, or Lien-Chen Urrounge.
A-7415228, Onon, Sally, alias Salungwa or Salunga Onon.
A-7779057, Pan, Ju Chu.
A-7809055, Patyk, Jozef, also known as Jozef Franciszek Patyk.
A-8001814, Patyk, Julia (nee Julia Katarzyna Assman).
A-8001815, Patyk, Barbara, also known as Barbara Kazimiera Patyk.
A-6967335, Pe-Sheng, Wang.
A-7858205, Radolli, Constantino.
A-6992030, Siu-Lung, Li or Sister Mary Sira.
A-8082043, Sun, Flora H., also known as Hu Ling Feng.
A-6949479, Sutt, Michael or Mihkel.
A-8952903, Teng, Yung Ching Wang.
A-9690989, Tong, Chu or Sun Fong.
A-9568320, Tsu, Teh Kwei.
A-6967742, Chen, Mei Chio.
A-6881784, Chu, Hu-Nan or Chu Hu-nan.
A-6334725, Donat, Alexander, also known as Mojzesz Grunberg.
A-6334726, Donat, Leona, also known as Laja Grunberg (nee Liberman).
A-6334727, Donat, William, also known as Wlodjimierz Grunberg.
A-6381287, Hou, Ling.
A-9734422, Kow, Lai or Lai Gow.
A-7463421, Valvur, Ludvig.
A-7124540, Vcela, Vladimir.
A-6730656, Verhovsky, Andrew.
A-9554376, Wong, Sau or Shau Wong or Wong Sau.
A-7354808, Wu Wayne, also known as Wai-Ye Wu.
$300-399163, Yip, Kin.
A-9542540, Youw, Lee Ah.
A-6848713, Yu, Ting Chi, also known as Richard Ting Chi Yu.
A-8082029, Zez, John, formerly Ivan Sime Zec.
A-9510296, Bacanovic, Jovo.
A-6923147, Balogh, Barna.
A-6702207, Liu, Lillian Hsuan Yu.
A-7985663, Moh, Tan Yoek, also known as Moh Yeak Tan or Tan Yoeh Heh.
A-6944241, Wu, Tien-Hsing or Edward Tien-Hsing Wu.
A-8082839, Tung, Chen Tse.
A-6912324, Wang, Ven Ling, also known as Raymond Wang.
A-7249877, Berzins, Arvids Voldemars.
0300-390570, Chan, Kan Cheong.
A-6848411, Chiu, Jeanne also known as Chiu Kung-Chen.
A-7863017, Klavins, Arvids Leonids.
0300-425608, Kwai, Chan or Chenk Kay.
V-606154, Lee, Ling Yun.
A-7863009, Pukulis, Andrejs.
A-5928452, Shee, Lai.
A-5963617, Yen, Pao-Ming.
0300-83904, Yeu, Cheng Cho or Cheng Yeu.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 11, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1834. An act to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended;

S. 2438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever"; and

S. 3269. An act 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.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative 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.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, there are several committee amendments. Under the unanimous consent agreement, debate on any amendment is limited to 1 hour; and the time on each committee amendment is to be controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and by the majority leader or the minority leader. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's statement is correct. There are about a half dozen committee amendments to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand, debate on the resolution itself is limited to 2 hours.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are several committee amendments which are to be acted on first. If any Senator desires time, time can be yielded on an amendment; and the unanimous-consent agreement provides also for 1 hour to each side on the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am opposed to the concurrent resolution and have filed minority views. I should like to have some time allotted to me so that I may speak in opposition to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator can be yielded time by either the majority leader or the minority leader. Does the Senator wish to have time yielded to him?

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to speak for about 5 minutes a little later in the debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, would the Senator from Georgia be agreeable to speaking in opposition to a committee amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to make a brief statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may the clerk state the first committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, 21, after "report", it is proposed to strike out "public."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have such high regard for the ability and the patriotism of the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who is the principal sponsor of the concurrent resolution, that ordinarily I am reluctant to differ with him on legislative matters. But in the case of the pending concurrent resolution, I can but believe that the efforts of the Senator from Montana are based upon a mistake of fact and a misapprehension of the functions of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I was unable to be on the floor Monday when the debate occurred on the concurrent resolution, but I have read in the RECORD all that occurred, and I do not find that there was advanced one substantial argument, predicated on established facts which would justify the Senate in adopting the concurrent resolution.

Some Senators who addressed themselves to the resolution on Monday last seemed to hold the opinion that the CIA was a policymaking agency. That theme ran all through the remarks which were made in advocacy of the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. President, the Central Intelligence Agency is far from being a policymaking agency. It makes no policy. It was established to coordinate all the activities of the various agencies of the Government which gather intelligence vital to our national security, to coordinate the intelligence thus obtained, to gather intelligence on its own initiative, appraise it, and present it to a policymaking body, one that is seldom heard of, but which is probably the most important policymaking body in our Government, namely, the National Security Council.

Mr. President, the argument was made that the failure to apprise Members of Congress of the detailed activities of the Central Intelligence Agency was an invasion of the prerogatives of the Congress. I will lay my record in this body, in defense of the prerogatives of the Congress of the United States under the Constitution, against the record of any other Senator who serves here today or who has served during my tenure of office. I have jealously sought to guard every prerogative of the Congress. I complained when I thought those prerogatives were being taken over by the executive branch of the Government, when the President of the United States was a member of my own party, as I have when the President was a member of the Republican Party. I have complained about the invasion of the prerogatives of Congress by the judicial branch of the Government.

But, Mr. President, we go very far afield when we undertake to predicate a resolution of this nature on the right of individual Members of the Congress to know all the details of all the agencies of Government that are working in secrecy in an effort to secure information which would warn us, for instance, of a sneak act which might destroy us, or which would advise us as to the potential strength of the enemies who are arrayed against us.

There have been intelligence agencies in the Army since the beginning of our Government. There have been intelligence agencies in the Navy since the Navy was established. The Air Force has had its intelligence agency since the Department of the Air Force was created. To my knowledge, not once has a Member of Congress risen on the floor and said he was being denied his prerogatives because he was not informed as to all the activities of all the agencies which were seeking to gather vital security information. Now the situation has allegedly changed because, forsooth, the three departments have been coordinated into one. In addition, there has been brought into the picture the OSS, which did invaluable service behind enemy lines in World War II.

I shall not accept that argument. I do not believe we should announce a principle of that nature. I am proud of the Senate of the United States, but I must say that early in my service I became disillusioned on finding that information classified as secret which was given in committees in executive session, within a couple of days had trickled to the press of the Nation. That has been my one disillusionment with the Senate of the United States, and, indeed, with both bodies of the Congress.

I say here today that, in my judgment, it would be more desirable to abolish the CIA and close it up, lock, stock, and barrel, than to adopt any such theory as that all the Members of the Congress of the United States are entitled to know the details of all the activities of this farflung organization.

Mr. President, it was stated in the debate, which I read in the RECORD, that the Central Intelligence Agency does not present to the Congress a detailed budget estimate of all its expenditures. That statement is true. It does not present to the Congress an estimate such as comes from the Department of Agriculture, the Post Office Department, the Treasury Department, and other departments of government, because to do so would be to give the Soviet Union a blueprint whereby it might readily run down and ascertain the activities and the identity of every person who is risking his life today in an effort to secure information which can be vital to the future of the United States.

I say, and I say it in the full conviction of the correctness of the statement, that one bit of information which has been used on 2 or 3 occasions is well worth the total cost of the administration of all our security agencies. They undoubtedly waste some money. They make mistakes. They have not been able to penetrate behind the Iron Curtain and gather the last detail as to the strength of the Russian forces. Other agencies, such as the British intelligence, which was in existence long before our agency was, have likewise failed. That is certainly no reason for circumscribing the Central Intelligence Agency's efforts and hampering it at the very top, when the program is developing and bringing to us information which is of vital value.

There has been talk about the amount of money involved. I shall not state what it is, but I will state it is a very, very small percentage of the amount of tax money spent each year by the Armed Forces for research and development of new weapons. Certainly, we should not complain about a portion of the amount of money spent for research and development being expended in an effort to keep up with the activities of those arrayed against us in that field. I say no person would risk his life in carrying on this work if every Member

of the Congress and the large staff of a new committee were in a position to know where that person was every day and to know the nature of the work in which he was engaged.

I was interested to learn that the distinguished author of the resolution said it was contemplated that the committee would have only a small staff. Every Senator present has had experience in that field. It is next to impossible, when a committee is created, to keep the staff down to the size intended originally. Every Senator knows of occasions when a committee has started with a small staff, with the assurance that it would be kept small, and in 2 or 3 years it has been extended all over the Capitol. Most of us are, instinctively, empire builders. We build in our own little field whenever we have authority to do so. It would not be long before the staff of the proposed committee would be large.

The point has been raised that there is not any committee supervision over the Agency. The Committee on Armed Services, and its predecessor committees, have, since the inception of the Congress, had jurisdiction over intelligence activities of the various branches of the service. During World War II that committee had supervision over the activities of the OSS. Therefore, it was but natural that the Armed Services Committee would be considered the parent committee of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I hope I have not been derelict in my duty in reference to this very important Agency. I appointed the subcommittee, having jurisdiction over it, which I am confident is composed of as able men as any who sit in this body. The distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is vigorously opposed to the resolution, the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], are members of that subcommittee.

On at least 2 occasions in each year, and more often on 3, we have had before us the head of the Central Intelligence Agency and his staff. We have never had them fail to respond to a single question we have asked them. They have been forthright and frank.

On the floor of the Senate the statement has been made, in effect, that we have not told all the country about what we have learned from the Central Intelligence Agency; and one Senator said the country was entitled to know. No, Mr. President; we have not told the country, and I do not propose to tell the country in the future, because if there is anything in the United States which should be held sacred behind the curtain of classified matter, it is information regarding the activities of this Agency. I repeat that it would be better to abolish it out of hand than it would be to adopt a theory that such information should be spread and made available to every Member of Congress and to the members of the staff of any committee. Rather than do that, it would be better to abolish the Central Intelligence Agency and, by so doing, to save the money appropriated and the lives of American citizens.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; if I have the time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the time limited?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I merely wished to make an observation and to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Georgia and I have had some mutual experiences along this line. He was a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, which was the predecessor of the present Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. At all times since its creation, he has been a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; and I have shared that experience with him, to my very great benefit. So I am intrigued and interested and very much moved by the argument of the Senator from Georgia.

Having served, myself, on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and understanding that an attempt has been made by some Members, on the floor of the Senate, to draw an analogy between the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the proposed Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, I merely wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that I believe he is utterly correct in what he has said. There is no real parallel between the problems confronting the two groups. The work of the Central Intelligence Agency is vastly different from that of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, even though probably it is not more vital and requires no greater secrecy than some of the activities of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in its dealings with the atomic energy program.

But I myself cannot adopt the philosophy that because we have a Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and because its operations are secret, the establishment of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, to deal with the Central Intelligence Agency, is justified.

So I commend the Senator from Georgia on his very powerful and forceful argument along this line.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for bringing out that point, which I had overlooked thus far in my discussion. The point he has mentioned has been raised.

I started serving with the Senator from Iowa on what was first the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, when it was created.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, both of us were on that special committee, which was created to write the Atomic Energy Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. Since that time I have served—with great profit to myself—with the Senator from Iowa on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I have also served on the Committee on Naval Affairs, a predecessor of the present Armed Services Committee, since I have been a Member of this body. I state on my responsibility as a Senator that there is no comparison whatever between the activities of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency or the contemplated activities of the proposed Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. They operate in two different fields. Although secrecy is involved in both, the methods of operation and of accomplishment of the two groups are entirely different.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. For example, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has the duty of maintaining surveillance on a very large and important construction program, under which certain production is had. In that work, thousands of persons, including scientists, are employed, and a large part of that work is devoted to seeing to it that the production program and the construction program of the Atomic Energy Commission are maintained. But nothing whatever of that nature pertains to the secret intelligence work of such a group as the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has placed his finger on one of the most important differences between the two agencies. There are other differences, of course, but I shall not attempt to discuss them at this time. Suffice it to say that the operations of the two groups are fundamentally and basically different, and it is inherent in the operation of the CIA that it be given certain broad powers and authority, subject, in my judgment, to the major supervision of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. Of course, the National Security Council has direct supervision over it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. But I wish to reiterate that although Mr. Allen W. Dulles has been before us and although we have asked him very searching questions about some activities which it almost chills the marrow of a man to hear about, he has never failed to answer us forthrightly and frankly in response to any question we have asked him. I think the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has been present at practically every one of those meetings during the past 2 or 3 years.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask only one other question, and then I shall conclude.

As the Senator from Georgia well knows, before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy we have had Mr. Allen Dulles and his top assistants, in connection with the various categories of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. They have appeared before our committee in connection with matters applicable to our responsibility in the atomic energy field. I also wish to testify, following the statement of the Senator from Georgia, that at no time has Mr. Dulles or any of those under him who are knowledgeable regarding so broad a subject, failed to give us full, complete, and frank answers to our questions regarding the matters which come within our responsibility. Let me say that we,

as a committee, do not attempt to trespass upon the responsibility of other committees in other areas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; Mr. President; that has been the experience of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First of all, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia for the very powerful argument he has made in regard to the differences between the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the proposed Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

As the Senator from Georgia well knows, among the other differences is the fact that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was created by statute and was given legislative power, as a legislative committee. Matters relating to the Atomic Energy Act go to that committee.

Second, I refer to a fact which must be brought home in this connection: I know that the President of the United States and others in the executive branch of the Government have very grave misgivings regarding the pending concurrent resolution, not only for the reason that the lives of Americans who may be seeking to obtain information which we need for the very defense of our country may be involved, but also because we have cooperative arrangements with other agencies and perhaps with friendly countries, and the slightest leakage of information regarding perhaps just one field of activity might result in the disclosure of all the agents who had been operating there, and might mean their death by hanging or execution in the matter of a few days' time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course they would be liquidated immediately.

Mr. President, I shall not dwell on all of the many differences between the CIA and the Atomic Energy Commission. Instead, I shall point out only one or two.

In the first place, the principal operations of the Atomic Energy Commission are within the United States, whereas most of the operations of the CIA are outside the United States. The Atomic Energy Commission is primarily concerned with preserving security. On the other hand, the CIA is primarily concerned with breaking security and obtaining secrets. There is a great deal of difference between the two groups, when we consider that fundamental of their activities.

I feel very deeply that it would be a serious mistake to approve the concurrent resolution.

The Committee on Appropriations is headed by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. Representatives of the Central Intelligence Agency come before the Committee on Appropriations each year. I have been present on 2 or 3 occasions when the committee was hearing the request of the CIA for funds with which to operate. The representatives of that Agency have never failed to answer a question which was asked on any of the occasions when I was present, as to the operations and the use of the money which had been appropriated for the Agency.

Great stress has been laid on the fact that the law does not limit the expenditures for individual personnel, as made by the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. I can say here—and I do not think it involves any violation of secrecy—that that question has arisen repeatedly, both in the Appropriations Committee and before the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, when the Director of the CIA appeared before the subcommittee. With the exception of the Director and his assistant, whose salaries are fixed by statute, all the other employees are paid according to civil service scales.

It has been exceedingly difficult to obtain the character of men needed to carry on this work. The CIA cannot send a mere plodder or dullard, however earnest he may be, to do some of the work which is necessary to be done. With the exception of the Director and his assistant, whose salaries are fixed by statute, the agency pays only civil service scales.

Mr. President, I can think of no sound reason which would justify approval of this concurrent resolution. I think it would be just as appropriate to establish a joint committee to deal with foreign policy—or perhaps even more appropriate—as it would be to establish a joint committee to deal with the Central Intelligence Agency.

I shall endeavor, to the best of my ability, to keep in touch with what the CIA is doing. I do not mean to say by that that I intend to undertake to find out whether or not we have an agent in some foreign country—perhaps a satellite—who is tapping the telephone of some foreign embassy, or anything of that nature. However, I shall undertake to exercise as close supervision over this Agency as is ordinarily exercised by the parent committees of the Congress in dealing with the agencies which are responsible to them.

I doubt very much whether the heads of many of the independent agencies have spent more time with the committees to which they are supposed to report, over the course of the average year, than Mr. Dulles, as Director, has spent before my committee.

This is a grave question, and one which should not be considered from the standpoint of politics. It should be considered only from the standpoint of the national interest. In my judgment, the national interest does not require that we create a new joint committee, with a new staff. To do so would result only in increasing the hazards to the lives of those who work for the CIA, and dry up sources of information which are vital to the national security.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the Senator agree with me that the CIA is essentially a service agency? It is not a policymaking body in any way, as is the Atomic Energy Commission, to which reference has been made. The differences between the two have been pointed out. The CIA is a service agency. The Director, Mr. Allen Dulles, does not make policy. He does not judge conditions. He merely reports to the National Security Council, which is directly under the President, who is the Director's boss.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I undertook to state at the outset of my remarks, I was somewhat dumbfounded to note that the argument had been made that the CIA was a policymaking agency. I think it is far from that. The best analogy I can draw is this: When the National Security Council meets—and there is present in the Chamber at this moment the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], a former Vice President of the United States, who sat with that Council through some of the very trying hours in the life of this Republic—it has two primary advisers. The first is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Military Establishment, to advise as to the military situation. The second is the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, who gives the National Security Council the results of the efforts of his Agency in relation to the intelligence it has been able to assemble concerning the problem at hand. He is an adviser. He is not even a member of the National Security Council, and by no stretch of the imagination can the CIA be considered a policymaking agency.

In the course of the debate on Monday, which I have read, a number of extraneous questions were brought up. Among other things, it was stated that there had been some secrecy in connection with the Dixon-Yates contract. That was unfortunate. I deplore it, but I hope Members of the Senate will not lay at the feet of the CIA responsibility for any secrecy which may have obtained with respect to a telephone call from someone at the White House regarding the Dixon-Yates contract.

Some question was raised with respect to the signing by the Chief Executive of executive agreements concerning which Congress had no knowledge. I feel as deeply on that subject as do most other Members of the Senate. Perhaps I do not feel quite so deeply about it as does the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], but I have followed him in his efforts to see that such executive agreements were not made. However, we cannot attribute to the CIA responsibility for the fact that executive agreements were made. The CIA has no power even to negotiate executive agreements.

Other arguments were made. Something was said about the impounding of Marine Corps funds. That has no relation whatever to the functions of the CIA, or the desirability of our doing all we can, while still performing our functions as a legislative body, to see that the lives of those who work for this agency are not endangered by any haphazard administration by the large staff of a joint committee, which, in my opinion, would be a very cumbersome fifth wheel.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the acting minority leader have charge of the time in opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course, the Senator from Montana is in favor of the concurrent resolution, so he would take time on the affirmative side.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are pending 2 or 3 committee amendments, on 1 of which I believe the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] took time to discuss the concurrent resolution itself. Has any limitation of debate been imposed up to this time with respect to amendments?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think the answer is that an hour is allowed on each amendment, 30 minutes to a side, and 2 hours on the concurrent resolution itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am willing to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana. Has the first committee amendment been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has time been consumed on that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time is now running on that amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has all time been used on that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opposition time is exhausted. Thirty minutes remain on the affirmative side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader controls the time on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration [Mr. HAYDEN], so he controls only the time in favor of the amendment. Is the Senator from Montana opposed to the amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am not opposed to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the acting minority leader yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am glad to yield time to the Senator from Montana. I respectfully suggest to the majority leader that I do not think there is any objection to the committee amendments. It seems to me that the Senate could agree to the committee amendments, and then proceed to debate the concurrent resolution itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senate will permit me to do so, we will charge the time the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has used to the time of the opposition, and I will then yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would it be possible at this time to vote on all the amendments en bloc?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent it could be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate on the concurrent resolution itself. I do not know how much time I may want to use, but I do not wish to deprive myself of addressing the Senate on the resolution. If I agreed to the adoption of all the amendments en bloc, that would leave time only on the measure itself, as I understand. May I inquire how I may obtain some time to speak on the resolution, and when I may have that time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Kentucky may have as much time as he wishes to use, if he will indicate to me when he desires to speak, and how much time he may want.

Mr. BARKLEY. I told the Senator from Arizona that I would like not less than 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Kentucky desire to use that time now?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assure the Senator from Kentucky that he will have 10 minutes, and 10 additional minutes if he should desire them.

As this time I do not agree to the adoption of the amendments en bloc. I have yielded 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana. After the Senator from Montana has concluded his remarks, I am prepared to yield time to other Senators. I am now yielding 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not believe I desire to take 10 minutes at this time, because I am beginning to feel a little like David facing Goliath, although I fear the results will not be the same. Inasmuch as I am to be the only one who will speak in favor of the resolution, I do not wish to be squeezed in this early. Therefore, if the majority leader does not mind, I shall wait until the distinguished former Vice President, the distinguished minority leader, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and other Senators, have an opportunity to speak. Then I should like to make some remarks in favor of the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Montana will have ample time to speak. Does he yield back the time I yielded him?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield back the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does any other Senator desire time to speak in favor of the committee amendment?

If no other Senator desires time at this time, I am prepared to yield back my time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield time to the Senator from Kentucky, if he desires to speak now. Does the Senator from Kentucky desire that I yield him some time?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know that I shall need 15 minutes. I am very deeply concerned about the resolution. If it were a bill or a joint resolution, instead of a concurrent resolution, I feel very definitely that the President of the United States would have no alternative except to veto it. I sincerely regret to say that I am compelled to disagree with my good friend from Montana about the wisdom of the resolution.

We have before us a concurrent resolution which proposes to set up a committee of 12 members, with a staff. It would cost $250,000 a year. I would not object to that sum of money being appropriated, if the proposed joint committee were needed. In my judgment it is not only not needed, but it would be very unwise on the part of Congress to establish it.

The concurrent resolution would authorize the joint committee to summon members of the Central Intelligence Agency. It would authorize the joint committee to summon all the papers and documents of the Central Intelligence Agency, and to obtain from that Agency all the information the joint committee desired to obtain, which information, of course, would then be public.

I ask my colleagues if the desire to make public, for the benefit of the American people, all the confidential information the CIA obtains all over the world is sufficient reason to justify the danger, to which we would subject ourselves and which we would assume by the creation of such a committee and taking the chances on its operations.

As the Senate knows, Congress enacted a law creating the Central Intelligence Agency. That Agency is a confidential body. It is an arm of the President of the United States for obtaining, not only in the United States, but all over the world, information which is of advantage to him in the protection of the interests and rights of the American people. Being an arm of the President, it is therefore an arm of the National Security Council.

CIA is the information-gathering agency of the National Security Council. The duty of the CIA is to gather from all sources and to lay before the President and the National Security Council information of the most intimate and confidential nature, which will enable the President and the National Security Council to act to protect the security of our own country, without making public the information which this Agency has gathered from all parts of the world.

I sat on the National Security Council for 4 years as Vice President of the United States. The present Vice President has sat on it since his induction into office, on the 20th day of January 1953. Some of the information gathered by the Central Intelligence Agency and laid before the National Security Council itself was so confidential and secret that the very portfolios in which it was contained were under lock and key. The members of the National Security

Council were not even permitted to take those folders and portfolios to their homes. They had to be unlocked in the presence of other members.

One of the distinguished heads of that Agency for 2 or 3 years was Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, the famous soldier and diplomat. During the time when he was the head of the Agency he sat in the National Security Council. The information I received as a member of the National Security Council, in my capacity as Vice President, was so confidential that I would lose my right arm before I would divulge it to anyone, even to members of my own family.

To say that now we should establish a joint committee to pry into and look into secret documents, to submit them before the joint committee, and to make them public seems to me incredible.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would appreciate very much the Senator's views on what a staff member of such a committee could do. It seems to me that a staff member could do nothing.

Mr. BARKLEY. I presume the staff members, whoever they might be, would be under the direction of the joint committee, and perhaps under the chairman of the joint committee, whoever he might be. According to the custom of committees, whether joint or single, the staff members would probably be authorized by the joint committee, if not directed, to invade the precincts of the National Security Council and obtain confidential information for the benefit of the joint committee, preparatory to a public hearing, to which they would have the right to summon members of the Security Council, and for which they would have the right to subpena documents.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In that capacity I have received information upon many occasions which I would regard as just as confidential, just as delicate, just as sensitive, as is the information to which the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky has referred. It is difficult for me to draw the line of distinction. How is it that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy can deal with the topmost secrets of the Government and establish a responsible record in doing so, a record both in the retention and safeguarding of secrets given in executive session, and also in the conduct of public hearings, when some other committee could not establish a similarly satisfactory record?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Iowa a moment ago discussed the fundamental difference between the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the proposed Joint Committee on the CIA. The Senator from Tennessee may not have been present at the time the discussion took place, and I should be glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia if he wishes to repeat what was said, because I am not a member of the Atomic Energy Committee, a member of the Armed Services Committee, or a member of the Appropriations Committee. Both the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee receive information from the CIA and also from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I should prefer that the Senator from Georgia answer the question of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I stated that I was on the original Atomic Energy Committee of the Senate which wrote the legislation creating the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I have served on that committee, although not so actively as has the Senator from Tennessee, during the past few years. I was on one of the original committees which was superseded by the Committee on Armed Services, and I had been on the Naval Affairs Committee ever since I became a Member of the Senate.

In my opinion, there is no comparison whatever between the activities of the two committees. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is supposed more or less to be a policy-developing agency which deals with tremendous programs of construction and production. Its primary function is to undertake to preserve secrecy within the United States. On the other hand, the CIA, which is a consolidation of the intelligence agencies which existed heretofore, functions outside the United States, and its principal endeavor is to break secrecy and to obtain secrets.

There is a great deal of difference between undertaking to preserve secrets as to what occurs in one of the great plants of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the case of Joe Jones who may be endeavoring to obtain secrets in one of the satellite countries, and who, if his activities were disclosed, would be liquidated immediately.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. A little more than an hour from now a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is scheduled to meet in executive session. One of the great military figures of our country is scheduled to testify before it. He is called to testify on one of the most sensitive and delicate matters of national policy. He is to discuss stockpiling and stockpile needs and requirements. That is just as secret, just as sensitive, just as necessary to be safeguarded as is the information to which the able junior Senator from Georgia has referred.

As I understood his remarks the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky was addressing the Senate on the inadvisability of having a joint committee of the Congress deal with highly secret matters. I rose to point out that the committee on which the junior Senator from Georgia and the junior Senator from Tennessee have the opportunity to serve has established an enviable and almost unblemished record of preserving secrets, dealing with them responsibly, and also holding public hearings so as to enlighten the public on matters which can safely be brought to public notice. I cannot quite draw the line of distinction.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Kentucky will indulge me, I did not make the point he cited. The Central Intelligence Agency does report to the Armed Services Committee when it is requested to do so. I have stated that they have answered frankly, forthrightly, and fully every question asked by the Armed Services Committee. There is no necessity for having the proposed joint committee when there are four committees which are in a satisfactory manner supervising intelligence activities, as has been done since the beginning of the Republic. I stated that there was no need of creating a joint committee, with a staff added, to undertake to delve into the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency overseas.

I do not wish to prolong the discussion. I appreciate the indulgence of the Senator from Kentucky, but I must state for the record that I disagree with the Senator from Tennessee that there is no difference between evidence relating to stockpiling in the United States and evidence relating to someone who has succeeded in some satellite country in tapping the telephone of a foreign ambassador. I think there is a considerable difference. If we adopt this kind of policy and establish a new joint committee, we are going to dry up sources of information. Men will not be willing to endanger their lives, and there will be a disruption of the very fine cooperative relations existing between our Agency and the similar agencies of other countries, notably the British Intelligence Agency, which has been one of the best for many years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] was called from the floor and asked me temporarily to function in his absence. I shall be glad to yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky.

The observations of the junior Senator from Georgia are well taken with reference to the substantial ground on which he has indicated he is opposed to the pending proposal. Other than on the ground that a joint committee cannot be trusted with preserving essential secrecy, I shall not challenge his position. But I would respectfully challenge the position taken by any Senator, if such a position should be taken, that a joint committee could not responsibly deal with the most sensitive secrets of our Government. It was for that purpose that I rose, and I thank my distinguished and able friend from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is one thing which differentiates the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy from the proposed committee. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy deals legislatively with atomic energy. I have nothing but the greatest admiration for the manner in which that joint commit-

tee has functioned. But the Central Intelligence Agency deals with all manner of subjects, everywhere throughout the world. It is not limited to any particular form of defense or any particular form of offense. It is the duty of the CIA to encompass the entire world, and to report to the Security Council and the President. On the Security Council the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff sits, just as does the chairman of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I feel very deeply and sincerely that to open the records and the personnel of the CIA, which is an intelligence agency that gathers valuable and highly confidential information from all over the world, would handicap the CIA in obtaining the information which is so essential to our defense. The activities of the CIA cover the entire world, and the CIA makes reports on the entire world situation.

Because I believe it is not now necessary to create such a joint committee, and because I believe that to do so would be fraught with great danger, I shall oppose and vote against the concurrent resolution which is now before the Senate.

There is nothing more that I can say, and nothing more that I desire to say, in regard to the matter. I hope the Senate will not agree to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not know whether any other Senator, while I am acting temporarily for the Senator from Texas, desires to have me yield him time.

If the Senator from Montana were agreeable, I would have no objection to having the committee amendments agreed to en bloc, and then yielding to the Senator from Montana such time as he might desire as the author of the concurrent resolution.

I may say to the Senator from Montana that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] wishes to speak for a few minutes. Did the Senator from Montana wish to conclude the debate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not necessarily. I shall be glad to follow the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, with the agreement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is the acting minority leader, I, as the acting majority leader, ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered as agreed to en bloc, and that the time remaining on the amendments be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 21, after the word "report", to strike out "public"; in line 23, after the word Senate", to strike out "The cost of such services to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee"; on page 4, line 6, after the word "Government", to insert "on a reimbusable basis with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration"; in line 11, after the word "paid", to strike out "one-half"; in line 12 after the word "Senate", to strike out "and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives"; and in line 14, after the word "chairman", to strike out "Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made."; so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence to be composed of 6 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the 6 members to be appointed from the Senate, 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate. Of the 6 members to be appointed from the House of Representatives, 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. Not more than 4 members appointed from either the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be from the same political party.

"SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and of problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government. The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Central Intelligence Agency shall be referred to the joint committee.

"(b) The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (1) referred to the joint committee, or (2) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

"SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate.

"SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government on a reimbursable basis with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration.

"SEC. 6. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $250,000 per year, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would have to yield time to the Senator from Missouri. Although I am very much opposed to the concurrent resolution, I, as the acting majority leader, am supposed to yield time only to Senators who favor the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the committee amendments have been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have been agreed to en bloc. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 10 minutes, or as much of that time as he desires, to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] who wishes to speak in opposition to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I appreciate the kindness of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

As a former member of the National Security Council, I have had considerable experience with the Central Intelligence Agency, which reports to the National Security Council.

In my opinion, it would be a mistake to establish the proposed joint committee. The Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services is composed of the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as chairman; the majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]; the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]; the present acting minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]; and the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is the ranking Republican Member of the Senate.

Where could one find a better committee of the Senate?

I do not see why, under the present circumstances, there should be a special joint committee to supervise the Central Intelligence Agency.

I am sorry not to have been present for all the debate, having just returned from Omaha, Nebr., and have just now reached the floor.

This is one of the few times it has been my misfortune not to be able to vote with my able colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Montan [Mr. MANSFIELD]. He knows of my respect and affection for him. Nevertheless, in this case I cannot agree with him.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the junior Senator from Montana as much time as he may desire from the 2 hours on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall take only 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Montana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish my friend, the distinguished Senator from Missouri, had remained in Omaha. Unfortunately for the concurrent resolution, he has returned and is opposed to it. That means, of course, that the odds are lengthening a little more, because in addition to a former Vice President of the United States, who also was a member of the National Security Council; in addition to the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is a great statesman and a fine friend, and is outstanding as the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services; in addition to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who has served his State ably and well since it achieved statehood, and who also is a very fine friend; in addition to the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]; and in addition to the minority leader of the House; we find also that the President of the United States and the Central Intelligence Agency itself are opposed to the concurrent resolution.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] suggested that the statement with reference to the $40 million appropriated by Congress last year for the Marine Corps which the executive branch did not use to carry out the unanimous intent and mandate of Congress, had no proper connection with this subject. Of course, it has no connection directly, but it has a connection indirectly.

What is the executive branch trying to do? It is trying to take over, lock, stock, and barrel, as many of the functions of the legislative branch as it possibly can. Let us examine the record, simply to prove that point. The criticism applies to Democratic as well as to Republican administrations.

When President Roosevelt was in office, on three separate occasions he promulgated executive agreements which were, in effect and in fact, treaties of friendship and commerce. Under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution, those treaties should have come before the Senate for consideration and approval. Mind you, Mr. President, there were three executive agreements which should have been negotiated as treaties of friendship and commerce, and which should have come before the Senate for its advice and consent. But what did the Senate do in that respect? The Senate did nothing. It willingly relinquished the authority and the responsibility which were accorded it under the Constitution.

President Truman acted in similar fashion. Again, what did Congress do? Congress appropriated funds for a 70-group Air Force. What happened? President Truman impounded the money and allowed only enough to be spent for a 48-group Air Force. That was just before the Korean war. Do Senators remember that? If that was not a flouting of congressional authority, I do not know what it was. Certainly it meant that the executive branch was not a coequal branch of the Government, but was the predominant branch of the Government.

We find that last year Congress unanimously restored $40 million in order to keep the Marine Corps at its then strength, to prevent its reduction by some 25,000 men in this fiscal year. That was done under the leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who now speaks against the concurrent resolution.

Was it only the Marine Corps which was cut down last year? Not at all. The strength of the Army was reduced by approximately 300,000 men. So on June 30 of this year there will be 1,025,000 men in the Army of the United States. Think of that, notwithstanding the worldwide commitments we have. In addition, the Navy was cut down. Those actions on the part of the administration indicate to me that there is a trend—a strong trend—and a trend to which the Senate and the Congress are acceding—on the part of the executive to take over more and more control.

I cannot understand why the constitutional lawyers in this body do not rise on their hind legs and protest against the loss of power which is being suffered by the Congress, and especially the Senate, and take some action to regain the powers which the Executive, through the praetorian guard it has in the White House, and certain agencies, has taken unto himself. If Senators do not wake up, some day they will find that they are members of a debating society, and not Members of the Senate of the United States, as the Constitution intended them to be.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall yield in a moment. What happened when the resolution was to be considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration? Two days before, the President of the United States announced the creation of an 8-man Civilian Board to advise him on the CIA. What kind of powers does that Board have? None, really. It is to meet once every 6 months. To whom is the Board to report? To the President of the United States. Will the members of the Board be able to give out any information to anybody else? No, not at all. In this particular instance where does Congress come in? What type of men are we? Do we have responsibilities? We are elected. We have to fight for these jobs. We represent the people. We are not appointed. We have to make an accounting of the responsibilities which have been thrust upon us.

When word was received that the resolution was going to be considered, the President announced, and I believe hurriedly—and I do not blame him for it—that the Board had been created, and he said he was doing it in accord with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. He was partly right, but only halfway right, because the Hoover Commission said that not only should a civilian board be created, but that a joint congressional committee should be created as well. And that was the second time the Hoover Commission had recommended the creation of a joint congressional committee.

What do we have now? We have the CIA doing everything it possibly can to defeat this resolution—a resolution which is intended to safeguard them and give them some security and an outlet which they do not have now, because the contracts they have with the Congress are very thin, indeed.

What did the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts say on Monday last? Twice a year the CIA appears before the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. Once a year it appears before the Appropriations Subcommittee, and at that time the officials of the CIA ask for money. Ask for how much? What do we know about the funds appropriated to them? What do we know about the agency's personnel? We do not know anything. Perhaps we should not, but we ought to have a standing joint committee which can take care of it.

I think it is well to refer to another point, since the distinguished Senator from Georgia has brought it out. The Senator referred to my remarks about a small staff. Of course, that staff would have to have the highest possible clearance. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if in the meetings, having to do with the CIA, which Mr. Allen Dulles and his assistants have with the members of the Armed Services Subcommittee and with members of the Appropriations Subcommittee, staff members are absent and only Members of the Senate are in attendance.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall answer the question of the Senator from Montana with a "no," even though he would not permit me to ask a question a moment ago. I have had one staff member present during the course of the hearings. I have had one staff member present, and only one, who has been with the committee since I have been a member of the committee. I have not brought in other staff members of the committee, even though I have full confidence in them, because I see no necessity for it, just as I see no necessity for an appropriation of $150,000 for a new staff which it is proposed to create.

The Senator from Montana has said the Armed Services Committee knows nothing about the agency, and that the Appropriations Committee knows nothing about it. Before the debate is concluded, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] will state that officials of the agency come before the Appropriations Committee, and the committee members know as much about how the agency spends its money as they know in the case of many other agencies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator, and apologize to him for not having yielded when he asked me to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly intended no criticism of the Senator for not yielding to me. I know how it is when the Senator is in the course of making his

remarks, which he has outlined in his mind. I would not have interrupted the Senator, who was making a very eloquent speech, if I had not wanted to call something to his attention, which I have forgotten now. I hope my interruption did not have the effect of annoying the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, indeed.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree with much of the remarks of the distinguished Senator regarding the encroachment of the executive on the legislative branch of Government. I am sure the Senator knows, in illustrations he gave with respect to the Military Establishment, what my feelings are in those matters. But we have a fine subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee handling the CIA from the standpoint of Senate legislative analysis and determination. I think that committee as capable a committee—and I believe the distinguished Senator from Montana would agree—as could be obtained in the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I certainly would agree with the Senator. It is a good committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If he believes the committee has been remiss in its handling of the CIA, which is a function of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I shall be very glad to cooperate with my distinguished friend from Montana in any suggestions he may care to make.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Missouri, that the one thing he could do to put into effect his offer is to vote for the resolution, because what the resolution proposes to do is to bring the subcommittees together. It would not break the continuity they now have with the CIA. The same persons would be involved, but there would be a standing joint committee, with a small staff, with the highest possible clearance. This committee could furnish an outlet for both the Congress and the CIA. I think this is the best way to handle the matter.

Certainly, I have never advocated that we should exercise undue oversight over the CIA, because I recognize the need for a certain amount of secrecy. I have not even advocated open sessions of the joint committee, if it should be created, because the occasions would be rare when such an instance would arise. Had there been a joint committee at the time the CIA headquarters fight was on, perhaps something could have been done; but otherwise there is no reason I can see why any of the meetings should be open.

There is no reason for anyone to suspect or be suspicious that the sponsors of the resolution want to pry into the secrets of the CIA; but I say to my colleagues that the Senate and the House—the Congress of the United States—have the right, under our system of checks and balances, to exercise some degree of control, not through subcommittees which meet occasionally, but through a regular standing joint committee. I, for one, feel that Members of Congress can be trusted as well as can a group of private citizens who may occasionally be given such information as the Agency wants to put before them. I think Members of the Congress can be trusted just as much as can the members of the National Security Council. Certainly I have every faith in the men and women with whom I am associated in the Congress; and I would say that insofar as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is concerned, it has exercised a high degree of discretion during the many years it has been in operation.

The distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], formerly Vice President of the United States, told the Senate about his contacts with the National Security Council while he was Vice President, and he referred to Gen. Walter Bedell Smith. I should like to inform the Members of the Senate that, so far as I know, Walter Bedell Smith is in favor of a measure of this kind, and I believe he has so stated on a number of occasions. I believe that any right-thinking Director of the CIA would welcome such a group, if for no other reason than the agency's security and its protection from unjustified attacks by individuals or groups.

Mr. President, there are other things I should like to discuss.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana as much further time as he may desire to have.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to have 10 more minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield an additional 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today our attention has been called to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and its application to the pending proposal. Let me point out that at the bottom of page 12 of the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration in regard to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, we find the following recommendation—one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission:

RECOMMENDATION

(a) That the President appoint a committee of experienced private citizens, who shall have the responsibility to examine and report to him periodically on the work of Government foreign intelligence activities. This committee should also give such information to the public as the President may direct. The Commission should function on a part-time and per diem basis.

The second part of the recommendation of the Hoover Commission is the important one:

(b) That the Congress consider creating a joint congressional committee on foreign intelligence, similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In such case, the two committees, one Presidential and the other congressional, should collaborate on matters of special importance to the national security.

What did the President do? He appointed a group of private citizens, but he took a stand against the creation of a joint committee; and, according to the newspapers, he said that the CIA was too sensitive for Congress to take up.

Mr. President, who does the President of the United States think the Members of Congress are? In our own way, we have just as much responsibility as he does; and I, for one, intend to do everything I possibly can to see to it that the powers given to Congress by the Constitution are retained by the Congress, and are not whittled down or taken away, and are not willingly given up. I think the Congress is in danger, and we should recognize that fact.

I should also like to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. Clarence Francis, chairman of the Committee for the Hoover Report. He was a member of the Hoover Commission when it was in operation. In speaking for the Committee for the Hoover Report, he comes out in wholehearted support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

Let me point out that two Members of the Senate were members of the Hoover Commission—the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. According to information given to me by the Senator from New Hampshire, they went on record, during the time when the Commission was in existence, as being opposed to the creation of a civilian commission, and as being in favor of the establishment of a joint congressional committee. Those two Senators were our representatives on the Hoover Commission; and that was their recommendation, as I understand.

Instead of having this matter handled by the two subcommittees to which reference has been made—which meet occasionally, but are not vitally and solely interested in the CIA, for they have many other duties—I certainly believe that a regular, standing joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives should be established to look after the interests of the Congress and also to look after the interests of the people of the United States in this field. I trust those with whom I am associated in the House and the Senate; I trust them, regardless of whether they be Republicans or Democrats.

Certainly we as a body are entitled to as much consideration as are members of the National Security Council or members of a private commission or members of any other group. After all, the Congress has the ultimate responsibility. Congress has the obligation of appropriating the moneys used in the Government service. Congress creates the various agencies, but then sits back and lets the Executive take over as much control as it desires to have. Mr. President, I think it is about time for the Senate to wake up.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not wish to prolong the debate, but certainly I do not like to have the Senator from Montana leave me in the position of seemingly wishing to surrender any of the powers of the Congress.

What I am trying to have the Congress do is keep where they are now, in

the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee, the powers which the Senator from Montana proposes to take from those committees and lodge in the proposed joint committee. I know of nothing such a joint committee could do that the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee cannot do.

The Senator from Montana referred to the Marine Corps fiasco in the executive branch of the government. To the very best of my ability, I have fought to obtain the appropriations for the Marine Corps. I have expressed my grievous and distinct disapproval of the action of the executive branch in not expending those appropriations for the purpose for which they were made by Congress. I have undertaken to—well, Mr. President, I do not like to use a strong word, but I have made it perfectly clear to the Secretary of Defense and to the Joint Chiefs of Staff that I think they have gone directly counter to the clear intent of the Congress. Of course, they added insult to injury by submitting budget estimates by means of which they undertook to have the money we appropriated for the Marine Corps used by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and by other civilian agencies. On yesterday afternoon I had the privilege, in the Appropriations Committee, of making a motion to strike out that language, so as at least to show that we do not propose to stand by and have insult added to injury.

But I must confess that I do not exactly see the relationship between the Marine Corps incident—much as I deplore it and much as I condemn it—and the efforts which are being made to remove these powers of supervision from the committees which now have them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to say again—I have already said it many times—that the Marines have never had a better friend than the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. That is a well known and an established fact; and I know he was the one who was primarily responsible, behind the actions of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], last year, in bringing about a restoration of the $40 million which Mr. Wilson, the Secretary of Defense, acting for the President, impounded, and later used in part for other purposes in the office of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and a few other of the agencies under his jurisdiction. So I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Georgia did what he did on yesterday. I only hope that he will see to it that if these moneys are not used for the Marine Corps, as they should be, they will be returned to the general Treasury and will not be used for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will indulge me, let me say that I think the funds should be reappropriated, so as again to have the Congress go on record regarding its desire to have the money used for the Marine Corps, and so as again to show that the present Department of Defense, acting under the Chief Executive, has been clearly flouting its responsibility to act in accordance with the directives of the Congress, which has the responsibility of raising and maintaining armies for the defense of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Am I to understand from what the distinguished Senator says that if he has his way this money is to be used by the Marine Corps for the purposes intended?

Mr. RUSSELL. We shall have to reappropriate it, but I shall certainly make every effort, when the defense bill comes before the Senate, to see that it is reappropriated for the Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Referring to the second part of the Senator's question, I did not say that the Marine Corps matter, the 70-group Air Force matter, or the matter of executive agreements was directly connected with the CIA. However, I tried to indicate that indirectly, through the years, both during Democratic and Republican administrations, there has been a tendency on the part of the Executive to assume our responsibility, and to get away from the idea of coequality, as provided by the Constitution. I certainly did not mean to imply any personal responsibility on the part of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, whom I recognize as one of the great constitutional lawyers of this body. I tried to indicate that that was being done willingly, so far as the Congress as a whole was concerned, because we are not fighting the tendency to shift power away from us.

Mr. RUSSELL. So far as the Senator from Georgia is concerned, he will condemn such a trend at every opportunity. I know of no other way to fight it. I regret that there are not more Member of Congress who feel as does the Senator from Montana, who has expressed himself so forcefully.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes in oppositon to the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I have listened to the debate this afternoon with a great deal of interest. I have been undecided as to whether I would vote for or against the concurrent resolution.

I have profound respect for my colleague, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], with whom I serve as a member of the Appropriations Committee; and likewise for the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Logically there is much truth in what has been said, to the effect that there is little justification for the creation of another joint committee. We have an adequate number of standing committees now, if they function effectively and discharge their duties as they should. It is true, as the Senator from Georgia pointed out, that probably we now have access to information, data, and records of the Central Intelligence Agency through the Armed Services Committee, of which he is the chairman, and likewise through the Appropriations Committee.

I have had some experiences in this connection during the past year. A year ago I was assigned to membership on the subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. For a long time I had had certain misgivings and uncertainty with respect to the operations of the CIA. I was very eager to find out something about the CIA, because it is a very vital and important agency in the executive department of the Government.

When the director of the CIA appeared before the Senate appropriations subcommittee, I was so naive as to think that, as a member of the committee, and a Member of the Senate, I might be entitled to some information.

I ventured to ask certain questions of the director. I was told very emphatically "This information is classified." Information as to the number of personnel is classified, whether there are 1,000, 10,000, or 20,000 employees and officials working for CIA. Oh, Mr. President, that is highly classified information!

Then when I directed questions to the director about the amount of money required to operate the CIA, I was again told, quite forthrightly, "This is classified information." Hush, hush! Members of the Appropriations Committee must be willing to assume that the CIA, as a part of our Defense Establishment, is operating efficiently. We are told that it should not be our concern to inquire whether we are obtaining full value for the several millions of dollars which are appropriated annually for the CIA.

At this point I should like to have the RECORD show that while I do not think it is necessary to establish another committee to ride herd on the CIA, I am wondering whether members of the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee are fully informed as to the far-flung operations of the CIA. I wonder whether the former Vice President, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who was formerly the head of the Air Force of our country, are fully informed.

The CIA must operate in a manner which provides the maximum safeguards for the safety of those who place their own lives in jeopardy when they go abroad to work in countries behind the Iron Curtain and obtain information essential to our national defense. But, Mr. President, I think it is the direct responsibility of the Congress and its duly constituted committees to take a profound interest in the operations of the CIA, and to determine whether or not an efficient job is being done. It is not enough to receive assurances from the Director that his agency is doing outstanding work and to say at that point that the Congress of the United States has no further responsibility with respect to the operations of the CIA.

During the past year the CIA personnel near the top level probably have been concerned with many vital questions of intelligence. However, they have not been too busily engaged to avert a controversy concerning the proposed construction of a $50 million showplace across the Potomac in Virginia.

I wonder, if the CIA spreads out its personnel throughout the entire world to

gather this vital information, why it is necessary to build a grand showplace on the Potomac costing $50 million. I do not know how many employees would be housed there, but I leave it to the good judgment of my colleagues to say whether it is necessary to have a $50 million administration building for the CIA. If it is, then obviously it is proposed to house probably several thousand employees. I think the newspapers have indicated that 6,000 or 7,000 employees would be located in this magnificent palace on the banks of the Potomac.

I ask Members of the Senate whether the CIA operatives and officials propose to obtain this vital secret information right here in the National Capital. Why should it be necessary to house 6,000 or 7,000 employees in the National Capital? I had assumed that the primary function of the CIA was to visit the far-flung areas of the world to gather this vital information. I certainly hope the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services will make it his responsibility to find out why it is necessary to have that grand showplace on the Potomac. It is already being called the Little Pentagon.

I remember when some Members of the Senate, especially of my own party, were critical of a Democratic President who had the Pentagon constructed at a cost of about three times the funds that had been originally requested of Congress. We were quite critical, because we thought it was too lavish a building for the military.

Now we are to have a little Pentagon. It may be very difficult to get CIA operating personnel to leave the lush showplace on the banks of the Potomac and undertake dangerous and hazardous missions in countries throughout the world.

Mr. President, last summer, I like many other Americans, read articles in the press and listened to reports over the radio which indicated that possibly in the Soviet Union an economic upheaval of some kind was imminent.

There was confusing information available upon which to base any definite conclusions. Therefore, with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and other Members of the Senate, I made a brief visit behind the Iron Curtain last September. We visited Moscow for 6 days, including 2 hours conferring with Khrushchev and Bulganin, as well as with Ambassador Bohlen and members of his staff.

The most amazing and astounding thing we learned on our visit behind the Iron Curtain was that there was little evidence of an impending economic upheaval or crash of any kind. I was somewhat dumfounded as I viewed the situation there. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee will agree with me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield five additional minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who likewise traveled behind the Iron Curtain, made similar observations. Is that not true?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho that I spent 17 days in Russia. I went from the Baltic to the Caspian over to the Black Sea, and up to Kiev, through the center of Russia, and I found that there was no impending revolution. If there was, it was certainly well disguised from the eyes of tourists.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Did the Senator from Georgia see any apparent evidence of the oncoming crash of any kind?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I did not. Of course, under the Soviet system, no one has very much to have a crash with, unless it be a failure of crops. From what I saw, they had fairly good crops when I visited the farms.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In the city of Moscow it was apparent that seven or eight million people were enjoying economic security to a large extent. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. They were not enjoying the kind of standard living that Americans have. However, according to their standards, I suppose that is so. They had plenty of bread and enough clothing, so far as I could see.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator for his observation. The only reason I am referring to my experience behind the Iron Curtain is that I was convinced the highly rated CIA, charged with the responsibility of getting information in farflung places, did not have any information, or very little reliable information, concerning the economic status of people behind the Iron Curtain.

Again I ask Members of Congress whether it is not our responsibility to learn whether the millions of dollars which we annually appropriate for CIA are used properly and effectively. If Members of Congress, after spending a few weeks behind the Iron Curtain can come home with definite ideas about the economic conditions in Russia, then certainly it is not expected too much of CIA to be able to gather the information for the people of this country. Congress, the armed services, and the National Security Council should be properly informed about the very vital conditions that exist in the countries which are opposed to our way of life.

I shall not belabor the point, Mr. President, because I feel sure that the concurrent resolution will not be adopted. However, I hope that those who are responsible for the operations of the CIA will not assume that such action is evidence that Congress is not interested in what is done by that agency. Certainly CIA has features which require its operation without complete disclosure of what is being done, but the agency should make reports to standing committees, like the Committee on Appropriations and the Armed Services Committee. However, I think it is our responsibility, and I charge the two committees and the chairmen of those two committees to see to it that we do not permit the CIA to operate in any but in the most efficient manner, which will justify the appropriations which are being made for its operations. Because the funds for the agency are integrated with the funds appropriated for the armed services, it should not be assumed that Congress is not interested in—or that the American people are not demanding—a full report to the responsible committees of the Congress.

In closing, Mr. President, I should like to say that, whether we have a special committee appointed or have standing committees deal with this vital question, I take the position that Members of Congress can be trusted to consider any vital classified information to the same extent that the civilian employees of CIA can be trusted.

Likewise, I hope when the great showplace on the Potomac is completed—its construction has already been authorized—that CIA will not make the tragic blunder of housing surplus employees there and giving them soft berths when they should be operating in the field. It is the responsibility of Congress to make certain that CIA knows what is going on behind the Iron Curtain and that it is aware of conditions that exist everywhere in the world, if it is to function in accordance with its obligations and responsibilities as a vital arm of our defense.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes in opposition. I wish the RECORD to show in this debate that I am very much opposed to the concurrent resolution. I gave my reasons at length on Monday when I debated the matter with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

I merely wish to add at this time that I am opposed to the resolution because it is impractical and because I believe it is unnecessary. It is impractical because it will be a step toward drying up the sources of our information which it is necessary for our intelligence agency to have, and will make it very dangerous for the grave men who are conducting our intelligence activities.

I believe it is unnecessary because two subcommittees of committees of the House and of the Senate now have the responsibility of looking into CIA and its duties and into the way it is carrying out its duties. If Congress is not given sufficient attention, it is the fault of Congress, not the fault of methods of organization. For these reasons and for the reasons I gave last Monday, I am opposed to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes, or as much time as he may need in opposition, to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration I filed my individual views in opposition to the pending concurrent resolution, and I ask that they be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the debate, and, like the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I have very carefully read

the proceedings of last Monday, not being privileged, as he was not, to be present at that time. I was interested in noting that there was a repetition of the idea expressed by the provision in section 2 of the concurrent resolution that "the Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to all of its activities." It was urged that the information thus disclosed should be made available not only to members of the joint committee, but, it was further stated, to all Members of the Congress and even generally to the American people. How it would be possible to keep the American people fully informed and at the same time keep our Communist enemies in Moscow in the dark, it is difficult to imagine.

There must be secrets. There are men all over the world who are engaged in the service of the CIA. Are we to tell the dictators in Moscow how much money we are spending in employing these men, and where they are employed? If a representative of the Central Intelligence Agency should penetrate into China and obtain information from a Chinese, for which he had to pay, would it be required that the Chinese sign a voucher for it? That CIA cannot do business that way. If it became known that a resident of China gave any information about the widespread human slavery which communism has imposed upon the people there to one of our Central Intelligence agents, he would not live very long.

I was interested in the assertion that we must maintain some kind of supervision and control of congressional prerogatives. A Marine Corps appropriation was used as an illustration. The facts in the Marine Corps case were that Congress appropriated money to maintain the Marine Corps at 215,000 men, and the administration allowed the corps to drop down to less than 200,000 men, and consequently did not spend the money which Congress had appropriated. There is absolutely no way to compel the executive branch to spend money which Congress has appropriated. I found that out when I first became a Member of the House of Representatives. I made my first political campaign in Arizona in an Apperson Jackrabbit automobile, which became stuck in the quicksands of the Gila River and we had to have the help of Apache horsemen who used their ropes and saddle horns to pull us out. At that time I made a vow that if I should be elected to Congress I would try to have a bridge built across the Gila River. When I was elected I proceeded to try to carry out my vow. I introduced a bill, which provided money to build a bridge across the Gila River on the San Carlos Reservation.

When the bill was under discussion, Mr. James R. Mann, the Republican minority leader of the House at that time, insisted that since the Osage Indians who were once very poor but who had become rich through oil discoveries, the San Carlos Apaches might some day become wealthy and in that event should reimburse the Government for the cost of the bridge and his amendment was adopted. The Bureau of Indian Affairs refused to build the bridge so long as that condition was attached; Congress had appropriated the money for it but the bridge was never built.

The Constitution provides that the President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed" but does not fix the time when he shall do so. Congress can appropriate money for maintaining the Marine Corps at full strength but the President does not care to spend it, there is nothing we can do about it. There is no way of compelling any executive department to spend money if it does not wish to do so. Consequently there is no connection between the failure of the administration to spend money appropriated for the Marine Corps and the need for the pending resolution.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no direct connection, but there is a pattern. I tried to point out earlier in the debate that 2 days before we had a hearing the President hurried up his appointment of the private commission recommended by the Hoover Commission. I think he did it to forestall action by the Senate committee and to make certain that he could say, "I followed the Hoover Commission's recommendations," which he did in part, but he did not follow the main part, which was the creation of a joint committee on the CIA, a proposal which had been advocated by both this and the previous Hoover Commission some 5 years before.

The executive department, I submit, is arrogating unto itself more and more power all the time. I stated that under Roosevelt there were executive agreements which were in reality treaties of friendship and commerce and which should have been brought before the Senate. Under Truman, Congress appropriated funds for a 70-group Air Force, but these funds were impounded by the President and enough allowed for only a 48-group Air Force. Under Eisenhower, Congress appropriated $40 million, which Congress said should be used to maintain the Marine Corps at its then present level. So they tie in.

Mr. HAYDEN. In my opinion, there is no tie-in. The Central Intelligence Agency is an arm of the President. Under the Constitution, I feel we have no right to attempt to regulate an agency which is designed solely to provide the President, who, under the Constitution, is responsible for our foreign relations, with information to enable him to make decisions.

There is complaint that the various departments do not tell us all we should know. If that be the case, and they do not give Congress all the information it should receive, why not appoint a watchdog committee to supervise the President's Cabinet? Cabinet members can perform their duties out loud or be quiet about it, but their official actions are included in the responsibility placed upon the executive department. There are three distinct branches of government. I am just as much opposed to congressional invasion of the executive branch as I am to an invasion by the executive of the congressional branch. Each has its place. If we are to place watchdogs elsewhere, why not insist that Congress have a watchdog in attendance at every meeting of the President's Cabinet?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the Senator is taking an extreme view of the resolution. The purpose is not to pry into the secrets of the CIA. The idea, in reality, is to safeguard and secure the CIA in furnishing outlets both ways. I do not see how the Senator can disagree with reference to treaties of friendship and commerce——

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not wish to enter into an argument with my good friend. I know there have been at times efforts on the part of the legislative branch to exercise dominating power. The Senator will remember the attempted impeachment of President Andrew Johnson. The legislative branch can go to extremes and the executive branch can go to extremes. Some complaints have recently been made that the judicial branch has gone to extremes. But there are certain constitutional limitations on all three branches of the Government and, because of those limitations, our Government is today the oldest continuous government in the world. We should keep our Government of divided responsibility the way it is. Nothing of value would be gained by agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the Senator from Arizona that our Government should be conducted as it was intended to be conducted under the Constitution. But am I not correct in assuming that differences relative to the equal division of powers, so-called, and supposedly, between the executive branch and the legislative branch can be settled in the judicial branch by the Supreme Court?

Mr. HAYDEN. Sometimes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If that is the case, why not agree to a concurrent resolution, which will be purely congressional action, which does not call for approval by the President of the United States, but which requires only a majority vote of both Houses? Then, if the executive branch thinks that the legislative branch is infringing upon the powers of the Executive under the Constitution, let the matter be taken to the Supreme Court, so that the executive and the legislative branches can ascertain where they both stand.

Mr. HAYDEN. There would be no necessity for the executive branch to take such a matter to the Supreme Court. The Executive could simply refuse to cooperate and Congress could not do anything about it. As I have said when the executive branch does not want to spend appropriated money, it does not have to do so. When the executive branch wants to hold a closed-door

meeting of the Cabinet, it can do so, and Congress can do nothing about it.

EXHIBIT 1

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. HAYDEN

STATEMENT

Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 is based upon the mistaken and erroneous assumption that the Congress has maintained little or no control over the expenditures of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and that Senators and Members of Congress who should be informed have been kept in the dark as to its activities because of a veil of secrecy imposed by the executive branch. The truth is that the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives have continuously and do now maintain supervision over the operations of that Agency to an entirely adequate degree. This is made clear by quoting a paragraph from a letter addressed on January 26, 1956, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration by the Senator from Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL, who is the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services:

"The responsible officials in the Central Intelligence Agency have demonstrated their willingness to keep the Armed Services and Appropriations Subcommittee fully informed on the subject of the Agency's activities and operations. Although I cannot speak with authority on the extent to which all the existing subcommittees on Central Intelligence Agency carry out their functions, I do know that the subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee has had periodic contact with the appropriate Central Intelligence Agency officials. At these meetings the Central Intelligence Agency representatives have candidly furnished the desired information and have responded to the specific complaints and criticisms that have been voiced in Congress and in the press. It is entirely coincidental but it happens that the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee is holding its first meeting of 1956 with Central Intelligence Agency officials on the same date that your committee has scheduled for the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2."

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

While no definite rule has been adopted by either body conferring jurisdiction over legislation relating to the Central Intelligence Agency upon the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives there is a clear precedent which establishes that jurisdiction. The National Security Act of 1947 created the Central Intelligence Agency and since then the 3 subsequent amendments to that act affecting the Agency have all been considered by and reported from those 2 committees.

The functions of the Central Intelligence Agency are essentially functions of an executive character in assisting the President of the United States, the National Security Council, the State Department, and the Department of Defense to carry out their responsibilities. If a joint committee of the Congress is established to supervise the work of this executive Agency, it might very well be argued that due to some failure of the standing committees of both branches of Congress properly to perform their duties, a joint committee should be set up for each of the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and other executive agencies. If the CIA must have a "watchdog" joint committee, why not have one for the FBI?

THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES

Owing to the active interest taken by the ranking members of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees in the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency, it has not been necessary for like members of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees to devote as much attention to what the Agency is doing as would otherwise be required. When submitting requests for funds to carry on its activities, responsible officials of the Agency have demonstrated each year their willingness to keep the designated members of the Appropriations Committees fully informed as to its operations.

There has been open and free exchange of all necessary information required for an adequate liaison between the Congress and the Central Intelligence Agency. No information has been denied and all desired information has been candidly supplied.

I can also personally certify that committee members have, from time to time, refused proffered information because such information has no relation to the normal legislative procedures of Congress. How far to go in seeking detailed information is well stated in this further quotation from Senator RUSSELL's letter:

"Throughout my tenure in the Senate I have consistently advocated the right of Members of Congress to information that was required for the formulation of legislation. In this instance, the legislation affecting the Central Intelligence Agency is not of sufficient magnitude to be burdensome. On the other hand, the importance of the results of Central Intelligence Agency activities to our national safety can hardly be exaggerated. If there is one agency of the Government in which we must take some matters on faith without a constant examination of its methods and sources, I believe this Agency is the Central Intelligence Agency."

The concurrent resolution leaves little or no room to "take some matters in faith" by specifically directing that—

The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to all of its activities.

INVESTIGATIONS OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

As the history in the majority report indicates the Central Intelligence Agency has been intensely and repeatedly investigated by various special commissions during the past 5 years. Reference is made to a number of recommendations by these commissions and the report implies that there is little or no evidence of any action by the Central Intelligence Agency as a result of these recommendations. It is not alleged that the Central Intelligence Agency has failed to cooperate fully with commissions, sponsored both by the Congress and by the Executive, which have investigated its activities, or that it has failed to take positive action on their recommendations and to report such action to the appropriate congressional committees.

For example, the majority report refers to recommendations in the 1949 Hoover Commission report that a top-level evaluation board be set up within the Agency and that the internal structure of the Agency be reorganized and improved. In 1950, such an evaluation board was set up, and the internal structure of the Agency has been reorganized so as to improve its effectiveness. It is a fact that successive commissions which have investigated the Central Intelligence Agency have disagreed with the recommendations of their predecessors. It is also a fact that the Agency has adopted legitimate recommendations made in such reports without disrupting the continuity of its organization and activities.

The majority report also shows that, as recommended in the 1955 Hoover Commission report, the President by an Executive order issued on February 6, 1956, has established a board of consultants consisting of eight distinguished citizens, outside of the Government, to keep him regularly advised on the conduct of activities in the foreign intelligence field and to report its findings at least twice a year. The imposition of another supervisory committee with jurisdiction over the Agency would only serve to complicate matters.

The Congress and the President have given the Central Intelligence Agency a most important job to do. Subcommittees of standing committees of Congress have been created to provide for the appropriate jurisdiction of the Congress over this activity. The greatest service we can do now is to facilitate the important work of the Agency and to let it get its job done without being watchdogged to death.

THERE IS NO SECRECY FOR THE SAKE OF SECRECY

It should be emphasized, most strongly, that secrecy for secrecy's sake does not exist in, nor is it an objective of, the Central Intelligence Agency.

Such confidential and secret procedures and operations necessarily characterize its activities are designed wholly for the security of this Nation, the saving of men's lives and the obtaining of essential information which will achieve these vital ends. There is no present evidence of any policy of secrecy having become sacrosanct. Upon the contrary, such secrecy as is being observed is appropriate and necessary.

Furthermore, I repeat that the Central Intelligence Agency is subject to congressional review by four established and fully authorized subcommittees. The first 2 of these are the subcommittees on the Central Intelligence Agency of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees; the second 2 of these are subcommittees of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees. These subcommittees seem clearly to be adequate for such a supervisory purpose and function. If they are not doing their job fully and properly, it should be brought promptly and emphatically to their attention as a more appropriate and effective means of achieving the end desired than the creation of a new joint congressional committee for such a purpose.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE STAFF

It would be almost impossible for the staff of such a joint legislative committee to function helpfully because of the high security demanded in the work of the Central Intelligence Agency. The information given to Members of Congress by officials of the Central Intelligence Agency is given to them personally and their judgment as to what may be properly reported is final.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 empowers the joint committee "to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary" and the majority report states that—

"The establishment of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence will insure the existence of a trained, specialized, and dedicated staff to gather information and make independent checks and appraisals of CIA activities prusuant to the committee's directives and supervision."

This statement appears to contemplate that the staff will do the work and reach conclusions as to how effectively the Central Intelligence Agency is operating.

A new and separate staff of some magnitude must be contemplated since an annual expenditure of $250,000 is authorized. This is almost as much as the $258,000 now available to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which at present maintains a professional and clerical staff of 21 individuals.

There is actually no real need for such a staff either large or small. Despite the flexibility which the Congress has granted to the Central Intelligence Agency in carrying out its unique functions, the Agency has administratively taken measures to control its expenditures in at least as strict a manner as other Government agencies and to require a complete accounting for the use of

all of its funds, vouchered or unvouchered. This system, and the actual use of the funds are described each year to the appropriations subcommittees.

The Central Intelligence Agency is essentially any executive Agency. It is not an arm of the Congress to carry into effect legislative policies as are the Interstate Commerce, the Federal Trade or other like Commissions. The act of July 26, 1947, after first creating a National Security Council to advise the President on natonal security matters then established the Central Intelligence Agency under the National Security Council. The principal functions of the Agency were to correlate and evaluate for the Council information obtained from other departments and agencies of the Government and to keep the Chief Executive informed from day to day as to the activities of foreign governments with whom the Constitution gives the President the sole right to conduct foreign relations and to negotiate treaties.

It is obvious that there is no possible way for the joint committee to keep "fully and currently informed" with respect to all of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency except to have a member of its staff sit in as a "watchdog" at all meetings of the National Security Council, and after each meeting make a report to the joint committee of what he has learned.

THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH CANNOT TAKE OVER AN EXECUTIVE FUNCTION

The creation of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, with the functions and powers provided for in Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 would be certain to raise a constitutional issue on the separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. Activities are undertaken by the Central Intelligence Agency only in accordance with directives of the National Security Council. The availability of intelligence of the highest order to the President and to the National Security Council is an essential element in the formulation of the foreign policy of the United States, and in the conduct of foreign relations by the President in carrying out that policy. Any congressional action which seeks to alter the legally established relationship between the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Council would tend to impinge upon the constitutional authority and responsibility of the President in the conduct of foreign affairs.

The provisions of the National Security Act are a recognition by the Congress of the highly sensitive nature of Government intelligence activities. Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, if adopted, will not be submitted to the President for approval or disapproval. Consequently, any of its provisions which contravene existing law will have no mandatory effect. The existence of such provisions in a resolution agreed to by both Houses, however, would lead inevitably to continuing difficulties of construction and interpretation which would impair the continuity of sound and proper relationships between the executive and legislative branches in intelligence matters.

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY AND THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Central Intelligence Agency and the Atomic Energy Commission have nothing in common except the secrecy which is required because both deal with highly classified matters of the greatest importance to the national security. Beyond that, their functions are not comparable. Through the Commission as its operator, the Government is in the manufacturing business—the business of making nuclear energy. Consequenty, the Congress has a very different relationship with that Commission than any other governmental agency.

The cost of this business operation is enormous. Beginning in 1941 with the Manhattan project, financed first from the emergency fund for the President and later in various hidden amounts in appropriation bills, and continuing with the Atomic Energy Commission since 1947, appropriations have totaled $15,202,600,000, of which $6,806,200,000 has been expended for operations and $8,396,400,000 has been expended for facilities. The total amount made available to the Central Intelligence Agency since it was created in 1947 is only a minor fraction of even the smallest of those vast sums.

There has been need to make only minor changes in the act creating the Central Intelligence Agency, but the problems of atomic energy are constantly changing. Legislation concerning the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission must be frequently brought up to date to permit it to function adequately.

The dynamics of the program for developing peacetime aspects of atomic energy have tremendous potential consequences for major aspects of national policy. The future production of electric power from coal, oil, or natural gas may be vitally affected. Atomic Energy Commission policies can give rise to conflicts of interest between various groups and individuals and the resulting issues must be subjected to legislative scrutiny. For example, bills before the Joint Committee have such subjects as construction of industrial facilities, housing at Oak Ridge and self-government at Hanford, taxation, patents, contract awards, and guaranty of uranium ore prices. No such factors relate to the conduct of foreign intelligence.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was established because of the particular nature of the nuclear problem and the fact that the Federal Government was forced to go into private business on a massive scale. This had important domestic implications in a broad range of fields. The intelligence activities, which it is proposed be subject to a joint committee's scrutiny, are peculiarly the prerogative of the Executive and intimately associated with the conduct of the foreign relations of the country.

I am firmly convinced that Congress now, through its regular Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations has the opportunity to get the necessary information from the Central Intelligence Agency and the designated members of those committees are doing so without in any way endangering the security of the information given them. We must also remember that the Central Intelligence Agency carries on its work outside the United States boundaries. Many of its agents are in constant physical danger. We, as Members of Congress, must do our part to see that the work is carried on wisely, efficiently, and with due security to the persons who are working in the interests of our Government.

The contacts between the Central Intelligence Agency and the Congress should never be allowed to prejudice or compromise the highly secret work of that Agency. What the Congress has needed to know in the past it has been told. What the Congress will require to know in the future it can obtain through means already in existence. A new joint committee will only complicate the process.

For the above stated reasons I voted against reporting Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 to the Senate and urgently recommend that it be not agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to speak for 2 minutes in opposition to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself fully with the remarks recently made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and also with the position so ably taken by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], both in his written individual views and on the floor. I think the Senator from Arizona has made the situation very clear and has covered three important points.

I should like to emphasize, first, that the language of the concurrent resolution seems to me to be utterly impossible of fulfillment when it provides:

> The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities.

I consider it to be absolutely impossible for the Agency to function in that manner. If it tried to do so, it would endanger the lives of Americans who may be in the service of this Government behind the Iron Curtain, and of persons who may be prisoners of war or who may be, indeed, nationals of some of the countries which are behind the Iron Curtain. I think it would be a perilous undertaking, and on that ground alone the concurrent resolution should be rejected.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has pointed out very ably that the Central Intelligence Agency is a functionary of the executive branch and is intimately associated with the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States. That, I believe, is true and should be true.

The important thing in connection with the administration of the CIA is that we have as the top Administrator of that organization a man of the highest quality and the greatest ability. I take this opportunity to say that I believe the Government and the country as a whole are very fortunate to have in that position now, in the person of Allen Dulles, a man who is ideally suited by experience, by temperament, and by character to fulfill the obligations of that office.

Therefore, Mr. President, I join very strongly with the distinguished Senator from Arizona in opposing the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have listened with much interest this afternoon to my friends, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona and the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut. It was an unusual feature of today's session to hear the Senator from Arizona relate some of the experiences of his early days in politics. I wish to assure the Senator that not only were they apropos, but they were well appreciated.

The Senator from Arizona in his individual views has raised a number of questions, and I should like to try to answer some of them, so long as the report and the individual views of Mr. HAYDEN will be included in the RECORD of today's debate.

On page 24, in the individual views of Mr. HAYDEN, the Senator from Arizona states:

> If the CIA must have a "watchdog" joint committee, why not have one for the FBI?

As I understand the FBI is a part of the Department of Justice. There are committees in both House of Congress whose purpose it is to supervise matters affecting the Department of Justice, of which the FBI is a part.

Further on the same page, the Senator from Arizona states:

> The concurrent resolution leaves little or no room to "take some matters in faith" by specifically directing that—
>
> The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to all of its activities.

The word "all" is italicized.

I would be willing to agree to the elimination of the word "all," so that the sentence would read:

> The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities.

In that way, a wrong interpretation could not be attached to that particular word.

The question relative to the joint committee staff has been answered in the colloquy between the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself. Once again, all I can state is that I recognize the difficulties which the CIA apprehends, and that the staff to be selected, if the resolution shall be agreed to, should be very small and certainly should have the highest possible clearance.

Reference has been made to the sum of $250,000 provided in the concurrent resolution. I would say that the amount is unimportant; that when I submitted the concurrent resolution, the space for the amount was left blank. The amount of $250,000 was inserted by the Committee on Rules and Administration. So far as I am concerned, $25,000 would do the job. I think that amount would be sufficient.

At the bottom of page 26, the Senator from Arizona states:

> The legislative branch cannot take over an executive function.

I cannot agree with that statement, because I have tried to point out that that is not the purpose of this particular concurrent resolution. The purpose of the concurrent resolution is to retain for Congress the powers which have been granted to it under the Constitution, and to stop the trend of power grabbing which the administrations, both Democratic and Republican, have been following in recent years.

I wish to say again that I think the Senate, and Congress as a whole, ought to wake up to its responsibilities, to guard them, and to guard them well. I wonder if Senators think it odd that the CIA does not want a committee of the kind proposed by the concurrent resolution? Can Senators think of any other agency of the Government which would willingly agree to have a congressional committee supervise it? Not at all. If Senators will examine the legislative history, they will find that all executive agencies do not want to have any congressional supervision, because they feel they will be hamstrung, they will be held down, they will not be allowed to spend as much as they would like to spend. That is the history of bureaucracy under Republican and Democratic administrations.

Do Senators think the executive branch trusts Congress? I think that is immaterial. The question I want to ask is, Does Congress trust itself? Do we think that civilian groups should be given greater authority, and that the Executive should show more confidence in them than we can place in ourselves?

I think we should consider this particular matter and recognize that the concurrent resolution now before the Senate does not call for presidential approval. It is a matter which Congress itself—the Senate and the House—must consider and pass upon. In conclusion, I only say that the choice is ours.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I rise in opposition to the Mansfield resolution. I thought the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] made a very powerful argument, and I only wish that all the Members of the Senate had been present to hear his remarks and the other debate on the pending concurrent resolution which took place on the floor. The situation with respect to the proposed joint committee is not comparable with that affecting the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as has so ably been pointed out by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without taking it from his time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. While I disagree with the Senator from California, I think the Senate should hear him.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield for that purpose?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I yield for that purpose, with the understanding that the time will not be taken from either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is the request that there be a quorum call, without the time being taken from either side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Carlson	Ervin
Allott	Case, N. J.	Flanders
Barkley	Case, S. Dak.	Frear
Barrett	Clements	Fulbright
Beall	Cotton	George
Bender	Curtis	Goldwater
Bennett	Daniel	Gore
Bible	Dirksen	Green
Bricker	Douglas	Hayden
Bridges	Duff	Hennings
Bush	Dworshak	Hickenlooper
Butler	Eastland	Hill
Capehart	Ellender	Holland
Hruska	Martin, Iowa	Robertson
Humphrey	Martin, Pa.	Russell
Jackson	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Jenner	McClellan	Schoeppel
Johnson, Tex.	McNamara	Scott
Johnston, S. C.	Millikin	Smith, Maine
Kefauver	Morse	Smith, N. J.
Kennedy	Mundt	Stennis
Kerr	Murray	Symington
Knowland	Neely	Thye
Kuchel	Neuberger	Watkins
Laird	O'Mahoney	Welker
Langer	Pastore	Wiley
Lehman	Payne	Williams
Malone	Potter	Wofford
Mansfield	Purtell	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). A quorum is present.

The Senator from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, to continue with my statement, let me say that I speak in opposition to adoption of the pending concurrent resolution, which was submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], on behalf of himself and certain other Senators, and which proposes to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

Earlier, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] very ably pointed out that the proposed Joint Committee on Central Intelligence and the existing Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are not comparable; and the accuracy of that statement by him was borne out by the distinguished former chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was created by statute, and was given legislative powers. It deals with a subject primarily within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

Furthermore, as has been pointed out, I think the key to the present situation is to be found in the fact that the Central Intelligence Agency gathers information outside the United States, in hostile areas of the world where the slightest slip, inadvertent though it might be, could result in uncovering our intelligence system in those areas, and would jeopardize not only the lives of American citizens, but also the lives of the citizens of our allies who may be working in cooperation with us, as well as the lives of many other persons. The lives of all those persons would immediately be endangered; and, as a result, the whole fabric of such a system would be destroyed.

It has been pointed out that at the present time supervision of the CIA is being handled, in part, by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, which is under the able leadership of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who has named the members of that subcommittee who have met with Mr. Allen Dulles, the head of the Ceneral Intelligence Agency; and it has been pointed out that such supervision is also shared by a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], one of the senior Members of this body. Those Senators have joined in minority views in opposition to adoption of the pending resolution; and

I hope all Members of the Senate have now read their views. It has also been pointed out that those subcommittees have available to them whatever information may be necessary.

Some Members of the Senate had, I believe, originally intended to support the pending resolution, based on the report of the Hoover Commission. However, I call attention to the fact that on page 9 of the report which Senators have on their desks, it is shown that the recommendation of the Hoover Commission was that there be established a small, permanent, bipartisan commission composed of Members of both Houses of Congress and other public-spirited citizens commanding the utmost respect and public confidence. The Hoover Commission recommended that such a commission be established by act of Congress, that the commission should make periodic surveys, and so forth. However, the joint committee proposed to be established by the pending resolution is not at all of that type.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from California.

Let me say that I was a member of the Hoover Commission, along with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. We went very carefully into this situation. I have always felt that this field of government is a very sensitive one, but I have also felt that some check should be had upon it.

I wish to say that the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is, I know, a very conscientious and a very able Member of the Senate, and is seeking the answer to this problem; and he has proposed one approach to it.

The approach recommended by the Hoover Commission, of which I had the honor to be a member, was a little different. It recommended an approach by means of an act of Congress or a resolution, under which the President of the United States would enter the field, and under which the Members of both Houses of Congress would be represented on a commission, along with other public-spirited citizens.

I find that I do not agree particularly with the way the President has proceeded by appointing an independent group of citizens, without congressional authority. I am not in accord with the proposal made by the Senator from Montana, in connection with the pending concurrent resolution. I believe that the approach recommended by the Hoover Commission is the best one.

However, I concede, first, that the President, in endeavoring to meet the need to deal with this subject, has proceeded according to his best judgment; and I think he has done so in order to fill this vacuum. I think the Senator from Montana has proceeded according to his best judgment. But somewhere between the two approaches the Hoover Commission plan is probably the most equitable and logical answer to the problem. For that reason I commend the Senator from California for bringing out the particular phase of the approach which was recommended by the Hoover Commission.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hold in my hand a letter dated March 13, 1956, addressed to me and signed by Mr. Clarence Francis, Chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, who was, I believe a member of the Hoover Commission. This letter was placed in the RECORD on Monday, but for the benefit of the distinguished minority leader I read the following portion:

> I am pleased to inform you that the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report believes that House Concurrent Resolution 2,

It should be "Senate Concurrent Resolution 2"—

> would if enacted implement fully the recommendations of the Commission that there be created a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Intelligence.
>
> Yours sincerely,
>
> CLARENCE FRANCIS,
> *Chairman.*

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator. Of course, that is not the recommendation which the Hoover Commission made, although obviously the Senator is entitled to his opinion.

I fully concur in what the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] says. I have the highest respect for the Senator from Montana. I know that he is concerned with this problem. I know that other Members are concerned with it. But I think there is great merit in what the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] pointed out. We are dealing with an extremely sensitive field, involving jeopardy to the lives of our own citizens and those with whom we are associated abroad. While I will not go so far, perhaps, as to say, as he did, that we would be better off by abolishing the CIA than by establishing this type of committee, through which we might uncover and destroy the effectiveness of this agency at a time when we are perhaps facing some of the most crucial intelligence problems the country will confront, I think there is much merit in what the Senator from Georgia said.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall certainly be glad to sit down with the Senator from Montana, as I know the able Senator from New Hampshire would be glad to do, and discuss means of meeting some of the very real questions he has in mind.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not agree to the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield myself an additional 2 minutes, and yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say to the able Senator from California that, while he has made a very good presentation, I heartily disagree with him.

I wonder if he knows that Mr. Bundy, who contributed $400 to Alger Hiss' defense fund, is now being appointed to a top position in the CIA.

I should also like to say to the able Senator that I have roughly 100 pages of documentation covering incompetence, inefficiency, waste, and Communist infiltration in the CIA, which I am holding in the hope that a committee will be established so that I can turn the information over to it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that I do not have the facts which he states he has. However, I respectfully say to the Senator from Wisconsin, who has been deeply concerned by the question of Communist infiltration and Communist expansion in the world, as have other Members of this body on both sides of the aisle, that when it comes to the question of the defense of our country there is no center aisle in this Chamber. I believe that Members on both sides of the aisle are vitally concerned with the ultimate security of our country and the preservation of a free world. However, I know, as well as I know that I stand here, that if the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin were to present the facts to which he has referred to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in whom I know he has great confidence; to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who serves on that committee; to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who serves on the Committee on Appropriations as well as on the Committee on Armed Services; or to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN], on which committee the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin serves, they would be in a position to go into the subject very fully, without the necessity of creating a new joint committee in this manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has again expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. The unfortunate situation is that Mr. Dulles takes the position that we cannot call any witnesses from the CIA. I think it would require a committee such as the able Senator from Montana suggests to empower the Senate to subpena the proper witnesses from the CIA.

As the Senator from California knows, the CIA has hundreds of thousands of dollars of unvouchered funds. There is no accounting for those funds. The CIA is making foreign policy, and refuses to respond to subpenas. I do not believe any of the committees the Senator has

mentioned have the power of subpena. I think the able Senator from Montana has arrived at the proper answer to this problem. Without further discussion, let me say that I will heartily support the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has again expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield myself 2 minutes.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Wisconsin. Of course, he is entitled to his opinion and judgment. However, I believe that under the rules of the Senate the existing Committee on Armed Services has the power of subpena. I think there is no question about it. In any event, Mr. President, I know that the President of the United States, who has had some experience in the field of intelligence, as Supreme Commander in Europe during the war, feels that this proposal would jeopardize the Intelligence Service of this country abroad.

I hope the concurrent resolution will be defeated.

DECISION OF SUPREME COURT IN PENNSYLVANIA ANTISEDITION CASE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I request that either the proponents or the opponents of the concurrent resolution yield me 7 minutes. I have two bills to introduce, and I should like to discuss them very briefly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator. I now introduce the bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

S. 3602. A bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3603. A bill to amend section 3231, title 18, United States Code, to reaffirm the jurisdiction of State courts to enforce State statutes prohibiting subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a decision by the Supreme Court, announced last week, urgently requires action by Congress.

In the case of Commonwealth of Pennsylvania against Nelson, the Court ruled that Pennsylvania's Sedition Act was unconstitutional because the Federal Government had preempted the antisedition field. The effect of this extraordinary ruling is to invalidate all State laws providing for prosecution of subversion and sedition.

The Nelson decision was based primarily on the argument that, in enacting various Federal statutes against subversion, Congress intended to exclude the States from this field. A more ridiculous interpretation of the Federal statutes can hardly be imagined. There is not a word in the United States Code that permits this inference; and, as a matter of fact, one section of the code explicitly recognizes the concurrent jurisdiction of the States.

Fortunately, however, this error can be corrected. When the Supreme Court makes a bad decision as the result of misinterpreting the will of the Congress, Congress can remedy the situation by passing new legislation. Therefore, I am introducing today a bill which will put beyond doubt the intention of Congress to share with the States responsibility for protecting this country against subversion. My bill provides, in effect, that no Federal antisubversion legislation shall be construed to deprive the States of jurisdiction to enforce their own antisubversion or antisedition statutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator by the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much.

I may say, Mr. President, that I think this matter is of utmost urgency. I hope the Judiciary Committee will report this bill, or one substantially like it, with all possible haste. But I want to say also that I deeply resent the fact that Congress is called upon to enact such legislation. Congress has enough to do without having to spend its time repealing laws enacted by the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court's job is to interpret laws, not to make them. And the Court's decision in the Nelson case is the most outrageous instance of judicial legislation that has ever come to my attention.

By no stretch of logic—or even of the fertile imaginations for which this bench is famous—is the Nelson decision a reasonable interpretation of existing laws. The Court's ruling, and the arguments cited to support that ruling, compel the conclusion that the Court simply made up its own mind about what was best for the country, and then set about looking for reasons, however implausible, to support its position. There are some questions on which reasonable men can differ, but I deny that the issue of supersession as raised in the Nelson case is one of them.

Let me review briefly the reasoning cited by the majority of the Court to support its decision. The Court conveniently listed its reasons as "first," "second," and "third," so let us take them in order.

First, the Court contends that, after reviewing all Federal subversion and sedition laws, "the conclusion is inescapable that Congress has intended to occupy the field of sedition." But the Court does not cite a single passage of any Act that supports this contention. It could not because none exists. Beyond this, the majority of the Court completely ignored a provision of the Federal law which explicitly contradicts its contention. The Smith Act of 1940, which the Court cites as primary evidence that the Federal Government meant to preempt the antisedition field, is contained in title 18 of the United States Code. Section 3231 of that title provides that "nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof."

Now, Mr. President, what could be clearer than that?

It cannot be said that the majority of the Court was unaware of this provision for it is cited by the dissenting judges as a "decisive" reason "in and for itself" for upholding the Pennsylvania statute. I do not see how the Supreme Court can look at an enactment of Congress and proclaim that it means exactly the opposite of what the language plainly says, and still maintain the respect of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much.

Second, the Court states that the "Federal interest" in the antisedition field "is so dominant that the Federal system must be assumed to preclude endorsement of State laws on the same subject." The Nelson dissent proves that the cases cited by the majority to support this contention are completely inapplicable to the antisedition laws. But more important, Mr. President: Let us note that the Court is announcing a new and revolutionary doctrine here—namely, that the States do not have a sufficient interest in attempts to overthrow American institutions to justify measures of self-protection. If this doctrine is allowed to stand, we might as well quit talking about a Federal system, and admit that the States have become meaningless political shells. This doctrine is, of course, entirely contrary to our Constitution. Under the Constitution, the States are sovereign bodies except to the extent that they have delegated specific powers to the Federal Government. The States have never delegated to the Federal Government the attribute of sovereignty in question; namely, the right of self-protection. It is perfectly obvious that the States would be powerless to protect themselves if the Federal Government were overthrown by the Communist conspiracy. Therefore, the States have an undeniably legitimate interest in preserving the National Government as well as their own governments. It is for this reason that, until the day of the Nelson decision, it was never doubted that the States shared with the Federal Government a concurrent responsibility for protecting the Federal Government against overthrow by force or violence. To say that the Federal Government has a "dominant" interest in this field so as to preclude concurrent State jurisdiction is to undermine completely the principles of our Constitution.

Third, the Court argues that the enforcement of State sedition acts "presents a serious danger of conflict with the administration of the Federal program." In this instance, the Supreme Court is simply talking off the top of its head. It cites no evidence to support this contention, and conveniently ignores the evidence that proves the contrary.

The best the Court could do by way of supporting its position was to cite a statement by President Roosevelt made in 1939, and another by J. Edgar Hoover,

made in 1940—which were to the effect that it is desirable for local law enforcement agencies to furnish the FBI with evidence of subversive activities. Neither of these statements says a word about it being necessary or advisable for State governments to desist from prosecutions.

The clearly competent and therefore appropriate authority on this point is the Justice Department—the Federal agency which is responsible for the enforcement of Federal sedition laws. Plainly, no one is better qualified to determine whether the efforts of the Justice Department to enforce Federal laws are hampered by State laws than the Justice Department itself. Now, in this very case, the Justice Department filed an amicus curiae brief, which dealt with the point as follows:

> The administration of the various State laws has not, in the course of the 15 years that the Federal and State sedition laws have existed side by side, in fact interfered with, embarrassed, or impeded the enforcement of the Smith Act. The significance of this absence of conflict in administration or enforcement of the Federal and State sedition laws will be appreciated when it is realized that this period has included the stress of wartime security requirements and the Federal investigation and prosecution under the Smith Act of the principal national and regional Communist leaders.

But the majority of the Court failed to even mention the Justice Department's views. Just as the Court second-guesses Congress on the question of what Congress intended, just so the Court second-guesses the Justice Department on the question of whether State sedition laws interfere with the enforcement of Federal sedition laws.

I do not think it is necessary, Mr. President, for me to point out that it is desirable for the Congress to reaffirm the concurrent jurisdiction of the States in the sedition field. For the past 30 years the States have played an important role in investigating and prosecuting those who are involved in the Communist conspiracy. State Governments have aided the Federal Government in this field, not obstructed it. It is clearly in the national interest to have as many competent governmental authorities as possible working on the problem of protecting our institutions against the Communist attack. But there is one further point: Let us note that it is not only State prosecutions of communism, but also State investigations of Communists that are affected by the Supreme Court decision. If the States have no jurisdiction to prosecute Communists, then it would seem to follow that the States are also deprived of jurisdiction to conduct investigations looking toward prosecution of Communists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have one more page. I wonder if the Senator from California will yield me another minute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should be glad to, but I have one commitment of 1 minute and another commitment of 2 minutes, and I find I have only 3 minutes remaining. I am sure the acting majority leader will be glad to arrange to give the Senator a few more minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I will presume, without any authority, to yield the Senator from Wisconsin 3 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, unquestionably, some of the most valuable work in exposing the Communist conspiracy has been accomplished by the investigating committees of State legislatures. It is in the national interest that these committees be permitted to continue their work.

Let me say that I associate myself entirely with the sentiments recently expressed by Representative SMITH of Virginia, that the Nelson case is "merely a symptom of the dangerous disease that has threatened to destroy completely the sovereignty of the States." The Nelson decision is just one of a long series of decisions in which the Supreme Court has hacked away at the foundations of our Federal system, and one of the many in which the Court has relied on a spurious interpretation of congressional legislation to support its position. I therefore believe that the bill introduced by Representative SMITH 2 years ago—which forbids the Supreme Court to construe a congressional act of Congress as depriving States of jurisdiction unless Congress expressly states its intention to do so—is necessary and urgent legislation. I do not believe, however, that the Smith bill can deal with the problem raised by the Nelson case, since I doubt whether his bill could be enforced retroactively.

Therefore both my bill and Congressman SMITH's bill are necessary. I hope the Congress will act on both of them during this session.

Let me add, Mr. President, that since I prepared my remarks on the Nelson case, the Supreme Court has handed down another ukase that flagrantly violates States rights. In the Slochower case, the Court reached a new low in judicial irresponsibility. And it has handed another solid victory to the Communist Party. This extraordinary decision forbids a State educational institution to fire a teacher because he refuses, on the grounds of the fifth amendment, to testify before competent authorities with respect to alleged Communist affiliations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin 2 more minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia.

The Supreme Court maintains that it is unreasonable and arbitrary, and thus a violation of due process, for the city of New York to decide that a person who says, "I will not testify about my alleged Communist associations because a truthful answer might tend to incriminate me," is unfit to teach its youth. It is bad enough that a majority of the Justices have fallen hook, line, and sinker for the leftwing view of what taking the fifth amendment implies; but that the Court should have gone further, and said that a contrary interpretation by a competent State body is impermissible is—as a matter of constitutional law—outrageous.

The Slochower and Nelson decisions are only the latest in a recent series of judicial rulings that aid the Communist Party. The Federal judiciary is making a full-scale assault on efforts by various Government authorities to protect American institutions. It is time the American people recognize the seriousness of the threat posed by incompetent and irresponsible judges. It is absolutely essential for State and Federal legislative bodies to work together in seeking means of preventing the judiciary from erecting a wall of protection around the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 1 minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The whole trend of the actions of the Supreme Court in recent months, including the two decisions which the Senator has mentioned, indicates that the Court has dedicated itself to abolishing completely the States and federalizing the American people. Such actions can only lead to the destruction of the rights and liberties of the American people.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Georgia; and I agree a hundred percent.

Mr. McCARTHY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Sinister Meaning?" which was published in the Washington Evening Star of today.

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

NO SINISTER MEANING?

A five-man majority of the Supreme Court has ruled that New York City cannot dismiss a Brooklyn College professor because he refused to answer a question concerning past Communist affiliations on the ground that a truthful answer might tend to incriminate him.

In a vigorous dissenting opinion, Justice Reed said that this ruling, based on the Federal due process clause, "strikes deep into the authority of New York to protect its local governmental institutions from influences of officials whose conduct does not meet the declared standards for employment." At what point does this intrusion of Federal authority into municipal affairs end? If New York cannot dismiss a professor who refuses to say whether he was a Communist, is its authority equally restricted in the case of a policeman who, on a plea of possible self-incrimination, refuses to say whether he is a grafter? It is true that Justice Clark, speaking for the majority, went on to disclaim any intention of saying that the professor has a constitutional right to serve on the Brooklyn College faculty, and to assert that it "may be that proper inquiry" would show his continued employment to be "inconsistent with a real interest in the State." Just what this may mean is not clear. At the least, however, it means that a city employee cannot be dismissed for refusing to answer questions put to him by a duly qualified investigating agency. To this extent, the freedom of the local authorities to choose their own employees is circumscribed.

There is another aspect of this case worth noting.

The New York board of education said that one of two inferences had to be drawn from the professor's refusal to testify: (1) That a truthful answer to the question would tend to prove him guilty of a crime in some way connected with his official conduct, or (2) that in order to avoid answering the question he falsely invoked the claim of self-incrimination.

This was rejected by the Court, which said that "at the outset we must condemn the practice of imputing a sinister meaning to the exercise of a person's constitutional right under the fifth amendment. * * * The privilege against self-incrimination would be reduced to a hollow mockery if its exercise could be taken as equivalent either to a confession of guilt or a conclusive presumption of perjury."

Does it follow that no inference may be drawn in such a circumstance? When an intelligent man, claiming no misunderstanding and advised by counsel, refuses to answer a proper question on the ground that a truthful answer might incriminate him, is he to be persumed to be innocent of any wrongdoing? It seems to us that the inference which the board of education drew was justified in the circumstances, and that Brooklyn College should have been as free to get rid of this professor as a banker would be free to fire a teller who had refused, on a plea of possible self-incrimination, to say whether he was an embezzler.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am one of the cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, but I now expect to vote against it. Hence I desire to state briefly the reasons for the vote I shall cast.

I offered my name as a cosponsor of the concurrent resolution in the belief that the Central Intelligence Agency needed closer supervision; that it needed to have a sharper sense of responsibility in the spending of money illustrated, for example, by the exorbitant figure they asked for the construction of their new building, and because of other evidence of an indifference to the dollar sign.

I thought it might be desirable also to have joint meetings of the subcommittees of the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services and the subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations which deal with the Central Intelligence Agency. I think it might be desirable to have such meetings in any event, whether the concurrent resolution shall be agreed to or not.

I think it might be desirable also—and I hope that will be the result of this discussion—for the subcommittees which deal with the Central Intelligence Agency to exert a greater sense of responsibility and closer supervision with respect to some of the activities of that agency.

I have concluded to vote against the concurrent resolution because in the broad authority to create a large staff, and in the provision for the borrowing of consultants, experts, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistance from various agencies of the Government, I think I sense possibilities that some very highly classified information might become too widely diffused.

In that connection, I am reminded of the story——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I have 1 more minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am reminded of the story once told by CHARLIE HALLECK, a Member of the House of Representatives. Mr. HALLECK told of the man who said, "I never have any trouble in keeping a secret. The trouble is that the folks to whom I tell it will not keep their mouths shut."

In this instance, the trouble might be that if we start to borrow clerks and assistants from agencies of the Government to create the kind of staff which would be represented by $250,000, we might be having secrets told to too many people.

I believe, therefore, that the responsibility should rest where it now does, namely, with the Committees on Armed Services and the Committees on Appropriations. But I sincerely hope that as a result of the presentation of the concurrent resolution and the discussion in connection therewith, those committees will exert a closer scrutiny upon the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION PROGRAMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to speak for 5 minutes in connection with the introduction of a joint resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution for appropriate reference, and I desire to make a brief statement in connection therewith.

The United States Advisory Commission on Information, established pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress, is making public today its 11th semiannual report to Congress as required by law. Congress authorized this Commission in order that the public interest might be adequately represented in the conduct of our international information programs. The five members of the Commission are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman of the Commission is Dr. Mark May, director, institute of human relations, Yale University. Other members are Edwin D. Canham, editor, Christian Science Monitor; Sigurd S. Larmon, president, Young & Rubicam; Judge Justin Miller, retired chairman of the board, National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters; and Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board, General Electric Co.

This group of distinguished Americans has performed a real public service in their efforts to strengthen our international information programs. The members have been in constant touch with the planning and operations phases of those programs. Periodic visits have been made to the field offices of many of the countries where we maintain an information program in order to learn firsthand the problems which must be met on the local or country level and quickly resolved. They have studied the activities carried on by unfriendly forces abroad to discredit the United States and to confuse the public mind about American intentions. The Commission has never hesitated to be critical of any phase of our information activity where the facts have required such criticism. Above all it has sought to bring stability, efficiency, imagination and public understanding to a function of government which has been forced upon us by circumstances largely beyond our control.

The United States Advisory Commission on Information is to be congratulated for the constructive and pioneer work it has accomplished since its creation in 1948.

It is the practice of the Commission, in connection with its semiannual report to Congress, to set forth a series of recommendations based upon its studies and findings during the preceding 6-month period. Those recommendations are made in order to effectuate the purposes and objectives of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948—Public Law 402. Such recommendations have been directed to the President, Congress, and to the executive responsible for the direction of our international information program. It is encouraging to note that most of the recommendations made by the Commission in previous reports have been acted upon favorably. Members of Congress will want to study carefully, and act upon, the many recommendations made by the Commission specifically to the Congress in part III of today's report.

But there is one item which, I believe, demands our immediate attention and speedy compliance. There is one basic recommendation which has been advanced since 1953 on which no action has been taken as yet. That is the recommendation to Congress that it establish a Joint Committee on International Information Programs.

In its Seventh Semiannual Report to Congress dated February 20, 1953, the Advisory Commission recommended "that a permanent Joint Congressional Committee on International Information be established to provide liaison between the legislative and executive branches." In support of this recommendation the following statement appears in that 1953 report:

The need for such a committee was also apparent in past years. Mr. Elmer Davis, wartime Director of the Office of War Information, in his concluding report to the President, stated that such a joint committee would be needed should the occasion for overseas propaganda operations ever again arise. Such a need is now more than evident to the members of this Commission.

This same recommendation was repeated in the Ninth Semiannual Report under date of February 2, 1954.

In its 10th Semiannual Report dated February 10, 1955 this same recommendation was again repeated.

The 11th Semiannual Report of the Advisory Commission made public today repeats this recommendation once more.

The report carries this statement in support of the recommendation:

For the past 3 years this Commission has believed that the appointment of such a committee would be instrumental in strengthening the work of the United States Government in this field. We would not ask the Congress to add another committee to the almost overwhelming number that now exist were it not for the inescapable fact that the importance of information in international affairs, and for our own national security, is rapidly increasing.

The Commission report also takes specific notice of House Joint Resolution 433, introduced by Congressman FEIGHAN, of Ohio, to provide for the creation of a Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs. The Commission endorses this resolution and now urges the Congress to act favorably on it.

This resolution, identical with House Joint Resolution 433, is very carefully drawn. It emphasizes the need for a bipartisan approach to the conduct of our overseas information work. It calls for an 18-member committee, 9 from the Senate and 9 from the House. Two members, 1 from each party, are to be selected from each of the following Senate Committees: The Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations. Provision is made for 3 members at large, 2 from the majority and 1 from the minority. This same procedure will be followed in the selection of members from the House.

The joint committee is to elect its own chairman and vice chairman. The chairmanship and vice chairmanship are to rotate between the two Houses with each session of Congress.

The terms of reference of this joint committee are carefully defined so as to avoid the possibility of duplicating the work of any of the standing committees. In addition to inquiring into the extent and effectiveness of our present international information programs, this resolution calls for an examination into the extent to which scientific research and development in the field of mass communications has progressed in the United States and the degree to which such scientific advances are utilized by our information programs. It also calls for constant study of the technique, special characteristics, and extent of all types of Communist propaganda in order to better understand what we must do to present the true facts about the United States and its policies to all the people of the world.

Through such a joint committee a continuous, cooperative relationship between Congress and the United States information programs will be built. The regular exchange of views, together with discussion of the major problems facing the information programs or hindering their most effective operation, should bring added stability and strength to the present work.

Since about 1948 a great deal has been said about the "cold war of ideas"; "the struggle for the minds of men"; "the unlimited power of ideals," and the "conflict of ideologies" between the East and the West. In 1950 President Truman called for a worldwide campaign of truth in order to prevent war and to win the peace. In December 1955 President Eisenhower, in a conference with the leaders of Congress, called for a greatly expanded international information program in order to meet the challenge of the latest Russian propaganda offensive. Leaders in practically every walk of life have expressed their opinions on the importance of an adequate information program. Few people today fail to understand how the advancement of science has reduced the size of the earth and made mass communications a new dimension in world affairs. The importance of a sound international information program to our national security is now beyond reasonable debate.

Mr. President, the Congress still has to play a full and useful role in assuring the American people of a sound and adequate international information program. The only opportunity Congress now has to make its contribution to this important work is when the appropriations bill for the USIA is before the Senate or House. This occurs once a year. Individual members have interested themselves in this work and have made splendid contributions to it. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has naturally taken an interest in the information programs. But Congress has not given the attention to this work which its promise for the future both warrants and requires.

With all the arguments advanced to point out the importance of our international information programs, I believe there is one which is more compelling than all others. That is the unwavering belief that mankind can win through to lasting peace despite the present obstacles to that cherished goal. Among those obstacles are ignorance and hatred. Despots and tyrants down through history have always played upon ignorance to generate hatred. No tyrant or despot can thwart the hopes of mankind without his historical allies of ignorance and hatred. Similarly, we as a Nation will advance toward our goal of peace in proportion to the progress we make in removing the factors of ignorance and hatred from the relations between nations and people. The demonstrated capability of modern means of mass communication present a real challenge to all those who work for a better world. That challenge is how we shall best use these modern means of mass communication to attain our cherished goals.

It is for these reasons that I now introduce in the Senate an identical resolution to House Joint Resolution 433. Through the bipartisan spirit expressed in the language of that resolution, I trust that a good number of my colleagues will join in with me in its introduction. Hence, I ask, Mr. President, that the joint resolution remain at the desk until the close of Senate business on Monday, April 16, so that other Senators may have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the proposal and to cosponsor it if they wish.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution which I am introducing may be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the joint resolution will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to establish a joint congressional committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) there shall be a joint congressional committee known as the Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs (hereinafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "joint committee").

(b) The joint committee shall be composed of 18 members as follows:

(1) Nine Members of the Senate, appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, as follows:

(A) Two from each of the following committees, 1 from the majority and 1 from the minority party: The Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Foreign Relations; and

(B) Three at large from the Senate, 2 from the majority and 1 from the minority party.

(2) Nine Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House, as follows:

(A) Two from each of the following committees, 1 from the majority and 1 from the minority party: The Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and

(B) Three at large from the House of Representatives, 2 from the majority party and 1 from the minority party.

(b) No person appointed by the Speaker of the House under section 2 (A) shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee of the House of Representatives of which he was a member when appointed to the joint committee, except that a member who has been reelected to the House of Representatives may continue to serve as a member of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress.

(c) A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(d) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members, and the chairmanship and vice chairmanship shall rotate between the two Houses with each session of Congress.

(e) Subject to applicable provisions of law, the joint committee may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it shall determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

(f) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the

contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee shall—

(1) conduct public hearings on, and cause studies to be made concerning, the extent and effectiveness of all United States international information programs;

(2) cause studies to be made of the technique, special characteristics, and extent of all types of Communist propaganda, including methods used to penetrate information media of the free world with such propaganda;

(3) inquire into the extent to which scientific research and development in the field of mass communications have progressed in the United States and the degree to which such scientific advances are utilized by the United States international information programs; and

(4) provide a continuous, cooperative relationship between Congress and the United States international information programs, counsel with executives and policymakers of such programs, and promote a better public understanding of the objectives of such programs.

(b) As used in this joint resolution the term "United States international information program" means any program operated by or financed in whole or in part by any department or agency of the Government utilizing media of communications or other psychological or informational means to inform or to influence opinion among people of other nations.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall report to the Congress twice annually (beginning on July 1, or January 1, after the effective date of this act, depending upon which date is nearest) on the extent and effectiveness of United States international information programs and at such other times as the joint committee deems necessary; and shall recommend to the President and to Congress steps considered necessary to improve the quality, coverage, and impact of all such programs.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this joint resolution the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The provisions of section 102 to 104, inclusive of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

PRINTING OF INDEX OF REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 111)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would be assuming authority I do not have if I yielded time under the control of the majority leader. I am sure the majority leader will be available in a minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, I submit herewith an index to the report, Various Study Committees, Staff and Survey Reports, and Supporting Documents of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

This index, which covers 16 reports published by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, was prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress at the request of the Committee on Government Operations.

Since the Commission inadvertently overlooked the preparation and printing of an index to these reports, which were referred to the Committee on Government Operations, the committee requested the Library of Congress to compile the index and approve its publication as a Senate document, to insure that the reports may be properly utilized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a documentation of incompetence, theft, and Communist infiltration in the CIA. I shall not introduce it into the RECORD, because it may contain some security information. But I want the Chair to know that the minute the proposed committee is established, I will promptly turn over all this information to the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield me 1 minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield my friend from North Dakota 2 minutes.

Mr. LANGER. As a cosponsor of the concurrent resolution, I wish to reply to the reference made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that the staff of the committee which would be created could not be trusted. He did not say anything about the 1,000 or 5,000 or 10,000 employees of the CIA. I would trust a staff made up of 5 or 10 or 25 persons as much as I would one, two, three, or five thousand employees working for the CIA, whose names we do not know, not one of whom has been confirmed by the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to the other side, because I do not know whether the majority leader has other commitments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I understand the majority leader does not have any other commitments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has about expired. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Morse
Beall	Green	Mundt
Bender	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott
Curtis	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Laird	Symington
Duff	Langer	Thye
Dworshak	Lehman	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Wofford
Frear	McCarthy	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, with the understanding that the opposition will do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the opposition has expired. The Senator from Texas has yielded back the time under his control.

The question is on agreeing to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If the Senator from Virginia were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—27

Barrett	Jenner	Morse
Clements	Kefauver	Mundt
Ervin	Kennedy	Murray
Fulbright	Kerr	Neely
Gore	Langer	Neuberger
Green	Lehman	Pastore
Hill	Mansfield	Payne
Humphrey	McCarthy	Smith, Maine
Jackson	McNamara	Welker

NAYS—59

Aiken	Duff	McClellan
Allott	Dworshak	Millikin
Barkley	Eastland	O'Mahoney
Beall	Ellender	Potter
Bender	Flanders	Purtell
Bennett	Frear	Robertson
Bible	Goldwater	Russell
Bricker	Hayden	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hennings	Schoeppel
Bush	Hickenlooper	Scott
Butler	Holland	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Hruska	Stennis
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Symington
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Thye
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Watkins
Cotton	Kuchel	Wiley
Curtis	Laird	Williams
Daniel	Malone	Wofford
Dirksen	Martin, Iowa	Young
Douglas	Martin, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—10

Anderson	Ives	Smathers
Byrd	Long	Sparkman
Chavez	Magnuson	
George	Monroney	

So the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) was rejected.

SIGNING OF CONFERENCE REPORTS BY MAJORITY OF THE MANAGERS OF EACH HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1193, Senate Concurrent Resolution 36.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement for the information of the Senate, if I may have the attention of Senators: I am informed that the other body has just rejected a motion to recommit the conference report on the farm bill—doing so by a vote of 238 to 181, or a majority of 57—and that the roll is now being called there on the question of the adoption of the conference report. The vote would indicate that the conference report will be adopted overwhelmingly, and will shortly be before the Senate. Therefore, I inform Senators that in the event the report is approved by the House and is received by the Senate within the next hour or so, it is planned that the Senate shall remain in session until late this evening, in an attempt to dispose of the conference report.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION REGULATION RESPECTING CERTAIN THICKNESSES OF LUMBER

Mr. JENNER obtained the floor.

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

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 6 minutes without the Senator from Indiana losing his right to the floor, on an emergency problem which has arisen in my State, with respect to which I think the Senate should be informed before the Committee on Banking and Currency holds a hearing tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 6 minutes, with the understanding that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] will not lose the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like particularly to have the attention of members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member.

Tomorrow morning a subcommittee of that committee will begin writing up the bill relating to the Federal Housing Administration. I shall appear before the subcommittee and ask for the suspension of writing up that bill until we can obtain the facts and correct what I am satisfied Senators will agree is a gross injustice which the FHA is imposing on builders on the west coast. Let me say to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] that this regulation will affect California in a matter of a few hours, as well as the State of Washington and my own State.

The situation is this: The FHA has written what, in my judgment, is an order which represents the height of bureaucratic asininity, an order which will stop construction, and is stopping construction this very hour, on many houses in my State. The situation will later spread to the other States, unless they use lumber of a thickness of twenty-five thirty-seconds of an inch, instead of the so-called ¾-inch lumber, which is twenty-four thirty-seconds of an inch in thickness. The 24/32-inch thickness of lumber has been used for years in the construction of FHA housing in the West. It is agreed by all, including FHA headquarters in Washington, that a 24/32-inch board will give a house all the structural strength it needs, and in excess of what it needs. But because there is a so-called standard of 25/32-inch thickness which is laid down by the American Lumber Standards Committee the Commissioner of the FHA is taking the arbitrary position that until that standard is changed by the American Lumber Standards Committee the FHA will continue to require lumber of 25/32 inch in thickness. This very afternoon its inspectors are closing down housing projects in Oregon, and I am advised will have to close them down, in the hours immediately ahead, in Washington and California as well because of the delivery of 24/32-inch lumber to the contractors and builders instead of 25/32-inch lumber.

This order is perfectly absurd and silly. What we need to do in the Banking and Currency Committee is to bring before that committee immediately the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration for a full disclosure and explanation of this arbitrary ruling on the part of the FHA.

Mr. President, a few minutes ago I released to the Press Gallery a press release on this matter, which reads as follows:

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, issued the following statement today in regard to what he termed irresponsible arbitrariness on the part of the Federal Housing Administration. He stated:

"As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have just listened to frantic appeals from representatives of home builders, contractors, mortgage-loan officials, and homeowners whose homes are in the process of construction, in protest over what must be characterized as an asinine ruling of the Federal Housing Administration at the Washington, D. C., level.

"For years FHA inspectors have approved construction inspection of FHA-financed homes in which boards with a thickness of twenty-four thirty-seconds of an inch have been used. On March 13 the Washington office of FHA sent a letter setting forth an order that, effective March 15, board thickness must be twenty-five thirty-seconds of an inch. The effective date of order, March 15, had arrived before the letter was even received in Oregon. It is admitted by all that the difference of one-thirty-seconds of an inch in no way affects the structural soundness of the houses. In fact, it is admitted that twenty-four thirty-seconds of an inch thickness produces a house with structural strength much beyond the minimum strength necessary. The physical fact is that much of the so-called twenty-five thirty-seconds of an inch lumber coming from the same sawmill will vary more than one thirty-seconds of an inch from cutting to cutting. Yet the FHA is standing behind its arbitrary order, with the result that today construction of FHA houses is being closed down, not only in Oregon, but the work stoppage is spreading up and down the west coast. This action by the FHA threatens the lumber industry of the Northwest and the construction industry of the west coast, and if this order is carried to its logical conclusion would require that the FHA measure every board going into every house that they are guaranteeing.

"This is bureaucratic asininity at its worst. I am appearing before the Banking and Currency Committee tomorrow morning, asking for a cessation of any consideration of the omnibus housing bill now before it until the FHA Administrator appears before the committee to clean up this mess."

I also wish to read to the Senate an article published in the April 6 issue of the Eugene Register-Guard, the newspaper of my home town, dealing with this subject matter, which reads as follows:

Lumbermen said Friday they were confident they would soon settle the controversy that led the Federal Housing Administration to man the ¾-inch-thick boards mills now are producing.

The FHA said it would have to reject loan applications on houses where boards were

stamped with the ¾-inch designation, since the American Lumber Standards organization calls for twenty-five thirty-seconds of an inch thickness in boards.

Lumbermen and FHA officials were agreed it was a technicality over one-thirty-seconds of an inch that could be straightened out April 30 when the American Lumber Standards Committee meets. If that committee approves ¾-inch-thick boards as the new standard, the FHA also will approve, J. Guy Arrington, Oregon FHA director, said.

Lumbermen said mills have been producing three-quarter boards for some years, but the trouble arises now because the mills have just begun stamping the thickness on the boards.

"Structurally, there is no difference in strength between a ¾-inch board and one twenty-five thirty-seconds of an inch thick. I don't think we should be stuffy about this. The main thing is we want a structure that is sound within the intent of our mortgage-guaranty program. We are going to rely on our officers. I'm hoping they will use their common sense," said Charles A. Bowser, Assistant Commissioner in charge of underwriting for the FHA in Washington, D. C.

Arrington said, however, his office would not approve loans where it was known ¾-inch board had been used.

"Of course, where a house is already built, we can't see what size is stamped on the boards. And if the boards are unstamped in new construction we probably can't tell the size—water content can make more than one thirty-second of an inch difference," Arrington said.

But Arrington said that where stamped lumber can be seen loan applications will be rejected until the national FHA office puts out a new directive or the American Lumber Standards Committee approves the ¾-inch board.

Mr. President, I have just been in long-distance telephone conference with representatives of homeowners, mortgage-loan bankers, contractors, and lumbermen. They say that this order is perfectly asinine.

On March 13 the FHA sent out a letter announcing that on March 15 the 25/32-inch-thickness requirement would be laid down. Before the letter reached Oregon the application date had already arrived. Carloads of lumber had already been loaded for shipment to builders and contractors. Lumber was piled up on building sites—24/32-inch lumber. But the FHA Administrator is laying down the rule that such lumber cannot go into the houses, because there is a standard laid down by the American Lumber Standards Committee, and the Commissioner is reported to me as having taken the position that it was understood in the industry that the industry should meet the standards of the American Lumber Standards Committee. However, I point out that I have been advised that for years so-called ¾-inch lumber has been used in FHA housing and inspectors for FHA know it and have approved the houses. Now all at once the Commissioner cracks down on the builders.

Mr. President, this order involves a terrific cost to the building-construction industry in the West. All the industry is asking for is a 30 days' suspension of the order—the policy involved has been in effect for years—until, at the Chicago conference of the American Lumber Standards Committee, to be held the latter part of April, this subject can be considered. At this conference it is expected that the old standard of twenty-five thirty-seconds will be changed, permitting ¾-inch lumber to be used.

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

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

One further point is that it is a physical fact that, day in and day out, lumber which is cut by a particular saw in a mill will vary during the day more than one thirty-second of an inch. The same saw will vary in its cutting. Yet we are confronted with a ruling that unless lumber is stamped in such a manner as to indicate that it is twenty-five thirty-seconds of an inch thick, it cannot go into FHA housing.

Mr. President, this means losses of large sums of money if this order is not suspended until the question can be cleared up. This order and the way it was issued is what I call government by arbitrary edict. It is the kind of arbitrary action which we must stop.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is scheduled for tomorrow morning a committee meeting of the Subcommittee on Housing. If the Senator would like me to do so, I shall be delighted to issue an invitation to the Federal Housing Commissioner to attend the hearing and discuss this question.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate very much the offer of the Senator from Arkansas who is the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. All I ask is an opportunity to bring the Commissioner before the Housing Committee to explain the order, and to answer the questions which I know my constituents will wish to ask him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will see that such an invitation is issued to him this afternoon to attend that meeting.

If the Senator will further yield, I ask unanimous consent that the full Committee on Banking and Currency be authorized to meet tomorrow afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much; and I thank the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] for his courtesy.

REEXAMINATION OF OUR FARM POLICIES

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which I send to the desk and ask to have appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3608) establishing the Joint Congressional Commission on Fundamental Farm Policy, introduced by Mr. JENNER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, in view of the action of the House just reported by the majority leader, I should like to discuss for a while the question of a reexamination of our farm policies.

Mr. JENNER. It is time for Congress to get off the treadmill of superficial discussion of the farm problem. We have an emergency farm problem, and I favor vigorous emergency measures to give the farmers whatever help is proper and just. That is why I have given my support to the measure recently passed by the Senate, the conference report on which will be before the Senate in about an hour.

There is no reason why the farmers should bear the brunt of all the errors and omissions made in all our Government policies, through the years.

We also have a long-term farm problem. We have been talking about it for 25 years.

We have spent billions of dollars and we have woven a mesh of governmental and supernational controls over our politically independent farmers, but we have not done one single thing to remedy the basic farm problems. The reason is that we have not yet dealt with fundamentals. We have talked about parity price, but what is parity price?

When we are finished with all the high-sounding explanations, parity price means, simply, that American farmers are smart enough to raise magnificent crops, but are not smart enough to sell them at prices which cover the outlay needed to remain in operation. That I do not believe. I am not willng to believe that American farmers and American businessmen are not smart enough to solve the problems of marketing farm production, but Government bureaucrats are smart enough to solve them, if the farmer leaves everything to them.

Let us look for a moment at the origin of our policy of Government aid to, and direction of agriculture.

In the great depression, we accumulated vast surpluses of cotton and wheat.

Congress set up the Federal Farm Board to dispose of the surpluses, chiefly abroad.

President Hoover appointed an able Board under an able and experienced Chairman, Alexander Legge, president of the International Harvester Co. Mr. Legge made every effort to move the surpluses, but he found farm surpluses could not be sold by Government, traded abroad, or dumped, without causing more evils than they cured.

State trading was no remedy. Only a realistic approach to the underlying factors in the marketing of farm products could give the farmers any higher income than the price they were offered in the world exchanges.

This conclusion, the classical conclusion of non-Socialist economists, means that the income of producers, farmers, or anyone else can be increased only by cutting the costs of the producers, raising the income of consumers, or opening up new markets.

All other remedies are a form of subsidy, open or hidden, which appears first as a gift from the Government to the producer, but ends ultimately in devaluation of the dollars in which the gift is paid.

When President Roosevelt took office in March 1933, the world depression was

8 months past its crisis. World trade was slowly climbing upward.

American farm prices were low enough so that we were recapturing, by simple business competition, foreign markets for cotton and pork which we had lost years before. Farm debts were the heaviest burden.

President Roosevelt inaugurated an excellent program, in the Farm Credit Administration, for quick refinancing of mortgages made at the height of postwar inflated land prices. This was a sound, conservative effort to cut the operating costs of farmers who had bought land during an orgy of land speculation.

It was not in the national interest to have able farmer-operators driven out of production, and farm families driven from the land, while farmlands were bought at distress prices by financial interests.

The Farm Credit Administration was working for a return to complete self-reliance by farmers, as soon as the speculative burden was lifted.

As a remedy for the depression, the normal rise in the business cycle, which was already underway, would have increased employment, and raised farm prices in the domestic market, the largest market for farm output. Farm income would have been pushed up, by fundamental recovery in the consumers' market.

A great many fancy tables and reports apparently prove that, because farm sales were just as high in depression as in prosperity, farmers could not improve their incomes without Government price-fixing. These tables and charts are the statistical mirage with which anything can be proven, if one does not look at fundamentals.

Farm prices, made in a free market, would have responded to the improved demand which was underway in 1933, just as rapidly as they responded to the falling demand which set in, in 1929.

Statistically, a gain in farm income from price manipulation by Government looks as good as a gain in farm income from healthy recovery in the entire economy. The difference is the same as in the case of the revived energy of a sick patient through overstimulating drugs, and his revival through elimination of germs and restored vitality of his body.

In March 1933, American agriculture stood in need of careful thinking by national leaders. We needed a national agricultural policy, to meet three separate problems:

First. The emergency problem causing widespread foreclosures.

Second. The world business depression which caused the steep fall in prices.

Third. The long-term change in the situation of American agriculture, due to the fact that our farmlands were facing heavy competition from new virginal farmlands outside our boundaries.

What went wrong, if the emergency program for refinancing debt was sound, and the cyclical influences were pulling farm income rapidly upward?

The answer is that the Socialist influences within the administration were stronger than those who advocated sound, economic remedies. I will show you this is the problem we have been wrestling with, in this body, in all the intervening years.

We have measured the ears of the elephant, the trunk of the elephant, the legs of the elephant, and the elephant's tail. But we have been blindfolded. We have never looked at the whole elephant, so we could not cope with the real obstacle in all of its many ramifications. We could not return to our proper path as a nation.

How were we persuaded to change to price controls and then production controls? I can give the answer. Within the farm board in 1932, there was a minority group which did not believe in free markets. Among them, Mordecai Ezekiel urged artificial price increases accompanied by production controls.

Part of Mr. Ezekiel's record can be found in a recent publication of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, the report on the Concord papers of Harry D. White.

His Socialist doctrine could make no headway with the marketing experts of the farm board, but after March 4, he found a haven in the Department of Agriculture, where Rexford Guy Tugwell was busy making America over.

Ezekiel and his friends helped draft the agricultural adjustment payments program, and its successors, and devised the Commodity Credit Corporation to serve their purpose—Government control of the marketing of farm products.

I need not remind Senators that a Communist cell had been organized within the Department of Agriculture, during the depression, under Harold Ware, son of one of the top Communist leaders.

I need not remind Senators that the atmosphere of the Department was sufficiently friendly to collectivism so that such admitted Communists as Lee Pressman, later counsel to the National Labor Relations Board, and others, served there for several years on the way to higher responsibilities in the mushrooming Federal executive establishment.

Another of the early members of the cell was Alger Hiss.

Dr. Wirt, a citizen of my own State, has told how the pro-Communists in Washington talked of the revolution to come, after Roosevelt, the American Kerensky, had opened the door of the citadel.

Dr. Wirt was hounded to an early grave by powerful left-wing forces in the administration.

The chairman of a House committee, Representative John O'Connor, was hounded to political extinction by the same forces because he came to regret his part in unjustly smearing Dr. Wirt, and publicly recanted.

It is true that Secretary Wallace purged some of the extremists among the brain trusters in the Department of Agriculture, but we must not take too much hope from that.

In a speech delivered on December 28, 1933, before the American Farm Economic Association, and other economic associations, Mr. Wallace stated again and again that the underlying purpose of the administration's farm program was "social discipline."

As a specific example of the new willingness to modify individual behavior for the larger purposes of society, he cited the current policy of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, to reduce wheat-acreage 15 percent, in line with the London Wheat Agreement, and to pay farmers who complied from tax funds.

When you cut away all the undergrowth is not that just where we are still?

There is always a great deal of plausible argument, wearying detail, and fancy verbiage, about any socialistic program. Otherwise, no one would buy it. But we, in Congress, cannot be deceived by the trimming.

Mr. Wallace said the farm program proved "the desirability of collective action," and he praised the farmers for "their willingness to undergo a certain amount of social discipline for the larger purposes of the group."

America has not become great by assuming a man must join a group in order to be able to think about the "larger purposes" of society. Imagine Franklin or Jefferson or Washington being told they could not think about the larger purposes of the Nation unless they joined a planning collective.

Mr. Wallace frankly referred to the program as "a planned agriculture." He admitted it was to be a long-term program, not a "dream born of the emergency, to evaporate when the emergency disappears."

If we plan, he said, on a nationalist course, "then a huge area of farmland must be kept out of cultivation, certain processing and handling trades will have to adjust themselves to it, and consumer purchasing power will have to be kept at a level high enough to support it. Each and all of these operations demand planning."

Such was the policy of the first two administrations of President Roosevelt.

Mr. Wallace also described "planned agriculture" in an era of internationalism. That is what we adopted with the third term of the Roosevelt administration. He said:

> If we decide for the international course, then there will have to be radical lowering of many tariffs, high-cost industries will have to be eliminated, and foreign purchasing power will consciously have to be increased; this, too, requires planning.

Surely, Mr. President, I do not have to point out to you how neatly Mr. Wallace defined our present policies, even if he did not suggest the names of GATT and OTC, mutual aid, and point 4.

The collectivists knew well what they were doing in 1933, but sometimes I wonder if we know it now.

This planned economy, said Mr. Wallace, "presupposes a social machine. I have always thought of the Agricultural Adjustment Act as fundamentally such a machine."

Such a machine, he said, "demands certain types of plasticity" in people, "vastly different from the little hard human particles which have been so characteristic of the past."

The pioneers who broke the soil would have been human particles much too hard for this planned economy.

Senators will also appreciate the role assigned to Congress in this planned agriculture. Said Mr. Wallace:

> It may be the duty of Congressmen as individuals to speak for specific selfish local interests among their constituents but the administration if it is to do its part in perfecting an enduring social discipline, must use its power, whether dealing with farmers, with wage earners, or with businessmen, to keep each within the bounds dictated by the general welfare.

At that very meeting, Mr. Wallace's description of a planned agriculture for the United States, based on Rex Tugwell's dream of the Soviet heaven on earth, was denounced in urbane but devastating terms by B. H. Hibbard, dean of agriculture at the University of Wisconsin and one of the founders of the original and very distinguished Division of Agriculture Economics in the oldtime Agriculture Department. He urged the need, at that time, for a long-range, fundamental analysis of agriculture.

What did American farmers get by this Government price-fixing and Government intervention in selling their products? They got more dollars, but, as always happens, the value of the dollar was forced down to half.

What was the result politically? Every farm State was subdivided into sections, in which the farmers were to decide on production quotas. But this districting, under the direction of county agents and agricultural officials, meant that the entire farming area of the United States was covered by an administrative grid, controlled from the central powerhouse in Washington.

What was this grid? It was a political machine, by means of which the administration could reach into every agricultural country in the United States, and spread its propaganda, support those local leaders who favored controls, and supply Washington with firsthand reports on political sentiment in each area.

All these things, added up, meant that a political machine centered in Washington, but reaching out to every acre of farmland in the country, was built up by Henry Wallace and his merry men, at the same time Hopkins was building his political machine at the grassroots, through WPA.

Mr. President, do you think President Roosevelt and Henry Wallace did not know they had a combined Gallup poll and Tammany Hall reaching from Washington into every farm community?

Do you think they did not use it to help Senators and Congressmen in their thinking?

Do you think Sidney Hillman missed this opportunity?

Do you think they were too scrupulous to use it to help reelect "good" Representatives and Senators, and help defeat the "reactionaries" who distrusted Government controls?

Do you think they never tried to persuade Senators and Congressmen from the farm areas to vote for nonfarm bills, like the Wagner Act, or later foreign aid, by a friendly reminder of the payments flowing into their districts from the Public Treasury?

Mr. President, what I am saying is that President Roosevelt's socialist advisers knew exactly what they were doing when they chose to help the farmers of this country by Government price controls and Government buying up of surpluses, instead of helping them by lowering costs, finding new markets, and lowering the cost of living for domestic consumers.

The Farm Credit Administration, which spoke for freedom of production and freedom of marketing, fought on for a while, but was soon absorbed by Henry Wallace and his collectivist brigade.

Maybe Senators think that is old stuff, Mr. President, but it is right here with us today.

We have changed the names of our Government buying programs, again and again, but we have never changed their philosophy.

Lend-lease was, in reality, a plan for buying up farm surpluses, as well as industrial surpluses, and then giving them away, to make producers still more dependent on Government aid, and to win political support for the administration. So were UNRRA and the Marshall plan.

I cannot take the time of Senators to show them what they can easily see for themselves.

Under all the outward differences, these programs had one effect—to make the farmers economically dependent on the Government to market their crops, so that farm families would vote to keep the collectivists in power.

I shall have to skip quickly over 25 years of history, but I assure you, Mr. President and Senators, I am charting the direction correctly, even though I do not point out every curve along the way.

During World War II, all the forms of collectivist control which had been perfected by 1940, were stretched to international dimensions. Then these supernational mechanisms were redesigned for postwar survival in the United Nations, the food and agriculture organization, point 4, and the rest. Every one of these agencies was a New Deal agency, in global form.

Mr. President, do any of us here in Congress really understand the intricate mesh of controls which now dominates our agriculture, since the growth of the United Nations, NATO, GATT, the various international commodity agreements, and all the other bits and pieces of supergovernment?

Do any of us understand how much of the price loss the farmers now face is due to economic causes, and how much is due to the political machinations of the Government?

Do any of us know what are the real policies of this supergovernment, or what we are acceding to, when we agree to the bills put before us by the bureaucracy, which leave most of our policies to supernational machinery we cannot control?

I maintain that the collectivist international mechanism is now so well-developed, so completely in control of national governmental policies, that changes in political party labels have virtually no effect whatever.

The American people may vote for changes today, as they did in 1932. But in 1932, when they voted for a change, the whole governmental operation could be changed.

Today, when they vote for a change in the party in power, their vote affects only a little band of national officials such as Cabinet officials, tightly wedged between the supernational agencies above them, and the supporting bureaucracy below.

The elected and Senate-approved officials can move a little, but they can change our real policies hardly at all.

I fully agree with Representative WHITTEN, of Mississippi, chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee in the House of Representatives.

I believe we have now reached a point, as a result of these supercontrols, where American agriculture is being manipulated to fit a world plan by which we are to be restricted to production for the domestic market only.

We are told that American farmers must reduce their acreage because surpluses are increasingly burdensome and that they depress prices.

Our Government has launched a multi-billion-dollar program of increasing productive acreage throughout the world.

Our Government is doing everything possible to increase agricultural production across the face of the globe.

A substantial portion of our foreign aid appropriations has been devoted to this purpose.

Through the programs, we taxpayers—including, naturally, the farmers—are paying to supply competitor nations with seed, farm machinery of every description, and hundreds of agricultural experts to increase their farm output.

And, while our own farmers have to pay dearly for such equipment and other factors, foreign farmers are getting it all free from the United States.

To top this one, we are also spending vast sums of money to provide irrigation and other soil improvements abroad—again free of charge—which will continue to skyrocket competitive farm production.

We hear the Secretary of Agriculture complain about the surplus of cotton in the United States. What has the administration done about it? It has made it possible, through United States money, for Mexico to double its cotton production. It has made it possible for India to increase its cotton production by 50 percent. It has made it possible for cotton-growing Egypt to add 2 million irrigated farm acres when the Aswan Dam is finished.

All this cotton growing is being encouraged by the State Department, at a time when world production, in the past 4-year period for which figures are available, has already increased by more than 5 million bales, all of which competes with United States cotton.

As a result, cotton exports from this country dropped nearly 40 percent in 3 years, while exports by other cotton-growing countries rose 46 percent.

United States wheat exports were cut approximately in half since 1948–49, while production and exports of countries receiving United States aid went up.

We had an opportunity to sell wheat in South America. Our Department of Agriculture wanted to sell it, but the State Department said, "No. We must take it up with our friendly allies."

So Canada was tipped off, and the Canadian Minister of Agriculture went to South America and made the wheat deal. Yet we talk about farm legislation for an emergency.

We hear the Secretary of Agriculture complain even more bitterly that there is a surplus of dairy products. Yet, the action of the administration in helping foreign dairy production to increase rapidly, has forced a drop of nearly 90 percent in United States exports.

This is only the beginning. Money to build up foreign farm competition is flowing as freely as the Mississippi River.

There are almost 750 United States farm experts abroad helping spend the money, helping foreign nations build up their farm production. This must stop if we are going to help American farmers realize an American standard of living. If we want to beggar them to the level of the Asiatic peasant, then the program so diligently pursued by our State Department is well on its way to doing the job.

One other important fact: Congress has provided legal authority to operate in world markets on a competitive basis, but the policies of the Agriculture and State Departments have ignored the law almost entirely.

When the Congress created the Commodity Credit Corporation, it made provision for the sale of agricultural products on the domestic market at a price based on costs, but at a world-competitive price on the world markets.

But what have we done? We have held our prices on the world market high, making an umbrella, and all our competitors have slipped beneath it, while we keep our products rotting in storage.

It was clearly the intent of Congress to offer our surplus commodities at a price which would be competitive in world markets, and so eliminate surpluses at home.

The extent to which the legislative will has been carried out by the bureaucracy is shown in these words of the chairman of the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee:

> The Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, has held its commodities off world markets.

Until this fantastic influence of the international network is corrected, no efforts by Congress to write farm legislation will meet the farmers' very real difficulties.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate some of the detailed facts on the manner in which policies of the Government have been used to undermine farm export possibilities, by increasing production in foreign lands, production which is in direct competition with our farm products, and which is in favorable position because of lower production and labor costs.

A part of the lower cost factor derives from the subsidy which American taxpayers are forced to pay foreign producers.

I have already mentioned the extent to which our Government is helping to increase farm production abroad. The actual figures are even more striking. In the 7 years beginning April 1948, the United States foreign-aid program provided, for the promotion of foreign agricultural production, a total of $984,159,436—nearly a billion dollars.

A half billion dollars went for the purchase of agricultural machinery and equipment—all as a gift to foreign farmers who are now able to compete with American farmers, who find no overgenerous Uncle Sam to give them tractors, or reapers, or trucks, or seed, or fertilizer, but who, on the contrary, in addition to the cost of operation of their farm machinery, have to pay the tax bill.

One reason why the cost of farm machinery and other things that the farmer buys is so high is the unbearable tax burden to pay for foreign gifts.

In addition to this billion dollars, the United States has set up over $700 million in counterpart funds, also to help agricultural production.

To make certain foreign farmers get to use this free American equipment, the State Department has sent a division of more than 700 agricultural experts abroad to give aid and advice.

This direct aid is only a part of the total picture. The Government has given tax privileges and other forms of incentives to encourage private investments abroad. Also, the policy of keeping American goods off world markets has, in effect, encouraged private investors to expand production abroad without fear of having any real competition from American farm products.

The 1 million acres of farm lands added to Mexican farm production were financed largely by American money. The story is the same all the way across Latin America.

Here we are, working on a farm bill. We are going through the motions of developing laws that will help the farmers. But we are working in a vacuum, a vacuum created by executive action not consonant with the farm legislation of Congress. We can stay here 24 hours a day, but we shall never work out a farm bill that will solve the real problem.

We are working on one side of a building, which has crumbling walls on the other three sides. No matter how well we build the one wall, how strongly we reinforce it, the wind and rain will destroy it from the other three sides. We are doing that to the American farmer.

Our Government is like Penelope, of Greek legend. Penelope knit by day and unraveled by night. That is what our Government is doing with the farm program. What little is knit by our Agricultural officials is quickly unraveled in the stealth of the night through the State Department. We are working hard and getting nothing done. If you have any doubts, Mr. President, just ask the farmer.

We recently invited over here a party of Russian "private citizens," led by the man already chosen to head their agricultural ministry. We told him everything we knew about seed, fertilizer, equipment, and the more elusive elements of know-how in achieving high farm production.

But note this: the heaviest military handicap of the Soviet system is that they need to keep 3 or 4 workers on the farms to produce what 1 man would produce under our system.

But if we teach Soviet officials how to get more production per man, and thereby free millions of workers from the farms, where will those extra workers go? They will go into the Russian armed forces, into the munitions plans, or into the factories making goods for the Soviet give-away programs in Egypt, India, Afghanistan, and Latin America.

We cannot put all the blame for this folly on our Secretary of Agriculture. Operations of any Federal agency outside of the United States are caught in the many-stranded web of State Department officials interlocking with the supernational agencies.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] has given us the record of GATT, through which the internationalists decide what farm products we may sell. The United States has made commitments to consult with the other nations in GATT on the effect of our laws limiting import of farm products. We must even discuss with them such details as whether the statistical base period used by the United States in setting import quotas under section 22 is a proper one. The other member nations make an annual review of any action by the United States on import quotas. The United States must furnish to these nations a report showing any modification of our restrictions, the restrictions still in effect, and the reasons why they continued to be applied. We also report to these foreign governments on any steps taken to solve the problem of agricultural surpluses.

We have just had a report of that kind from West Virginia, where the President of Mexico was assured of certain things.

The National City Bank, in its letter for June 1955, quotes the President of Australia's National Farmers Union as saying:

> By her irresponsible disposal of agricultural surpluses, the United States is flagrantly breaking the spirit of GATT.

The letter continues:

> Even more terse, the Manchester (England) Guardian pictured the United States as asking GATT for "legal permission to live in a state of sin."

I do not know, Mr. President, what other Senators think of having officials of the executive branch apologize to foreign governments for the laws passed by Congress, to help American farmers. I will not at this moment say what I think, Mr. President, but perhaps you can guess it.

Do you seriously think, Mr. President, that our farmers can carry all the burdens of production and marketing and at the same time follow all the intricate decisions made by the bureaucracy which operates behind a curtain of secrecy, and by former bureaucrats such as Mordecai Ezekiel, who staff the supernational agencies? You know how nearly impossible it is for Members of Congress to know what is going on, although that is our principal responsibility. How much can we expect of operating farmers?

Let me mention in passing, Mr. President, that in the case of nonfarm employment we are following exactly the same policy of helping competitive production. Every American who takes his capital abroad, and, protected by our tax laws, sets up production in foreign countries, is taking part of the domestic market from our farmers, but he is also taking jobs from the workers of the United States, whose prosperity should result in expansion of the farmers' domestic markets.

Industrial workers have been given short-run benefits, such as the dollar minimum wage, collective bargaining, and Government orders for their factories, but these cause the same difficulty as that caused by Government farm aid. The dollar payments increase, but the value of the dollar goes down. Farmers have paid off their mortgages with Government payments, but what of the mortgage that hangs over every family from our unpaid Government debt? That mortgage hangs over every farm family, and over all the nonfarm families who are the principal market of American farmers.

Mr. President, I see nothing but falling real income for both farmers and industrial workers, if we continue to rely on the planned economy of Mr. Wallace and Mr. Tugwell. I see nothing but tragedy for our country when the spell is broken and it is too late to escape.

Every day the gap between landowner and farmer-operator grows wider. Our concern must be with the men who work and produce, not with the financial returns for land ownership.

I understand that in the conference report on the farm bill, all such limits have been removed, so that—without lifting a hand—the great landholders in the West can obtain over $1 million from the taxpayers.

We know that, while farmer-operators are losing their markets abroad, they are also being driven from the land at home.

For 25 years government cash allotments have over-stimulated the tendencies to the use of high-cost equipment, fertilizers, and large acreage. We flog the land. Our policies exert constant pressure toward corporation farming and the hated "latifundia," the huge estates owned by absentee capital, and operated by farmers turned into hired hands.

Government payments have greatly increased the tendency toward the purchase of farmland by financial, nonfarm interests. During the potato scandal, we heard how farms in Maine were being sold by farmers to interests in Boston which had never seen a plow.

At this point I should like to make a proposal more radical than any so far offered. I have lost hope that manipulation of so-called parity prices, to reach any levels, will be of permanent benefit to the American farmer. Why? Because parity price is price control, and price control means price-controllers. Price-control machinery must, in the nature of the case, fall into the hands of the planners, the collectivists, the supernationalists. The first step on that slippery road brings us inevitably to the last step, where we are enmeshed in a web of controls, visible and invisible, which is designed to destroy the superiority of the United States in agriculture, in industry, and in war.

I have the utmost confidence that our Secretary of Agriculture wishes to avoid this web of controls over farming as much as I do, but I do not believe he can ever succeed.

Here in Congress we have worked hard to patch and repair what Henry Wallace and the collectivists set up in our Government. Our present Secretary of Agriculture is trying by means of little improvements here and there, to lead farming back toward freedom. But like an angry boil, this program grows worse every day. It is time to lance it, or the poison may spread throughout the body politic, without hope of cure.

I return, Mr. President, to my suggestion that we must separate our emergency measures and our long-term proposals. It is time for Congress to set up its own machinery for working out a truly American long-term farm program. Our only hope lies in the establishment by Congress of a congressional advisory committee, set up to make the basic studies Congress needs.

The purpose of an American farm policy is not to get so-called parity for farmers with some mythical competing class. That is the Marxian class conflict. Our purpose is to save the American family farm.

Other nations have gone down the road we are traveling. If we stop, look, and listen, I know that no American Congress will willingly choose the road to serfdom.

The family farm is the social basis for our free enterprise, our political liberty, our biological heritage, and our military strength.

The real military strength of the Romans lay in their independent farmers, even more than in their legions. When the farms decayed, Rome was dependent on mercenary armies, recruited from barbarian tribes.

It should not be the purpose of Congress to help corporation farming, or the spread of factory methods to farming. It should not be our purpose to help the city owner who buys farmland to help him avoid taxes. It should not be our purpose to do one single thing to increase the price of farmland.

The price of farmland is a cost to the farmer-operator, which reduces the net income he receives for his work.

Maturing societies must distinguish between the share of farm income which goes for enterprise, and the share which is paid for land because land ownership and land use inevitably grow more and more apart. As the older generations die, and part of the family turns to nonfarm occupations, the income from farming is drained away.

Dependence on rising prices of farmland is financial speculation, just like playing for rising prices in the stock market. The growth of population, alone, exerts a continuing upward pressure on land prices.

Nearly all the so-called remedies for farmers benefit the owner of capital invested in land, and penalize the farmer-producer.

The rising cost of American farmlands, as our society matures, means that we need a fundamental reexamination of our export policies. We need a reexamination of the relations between farming and the domestic market.

I have not mentioned the broad area of savings which could come from tax reductions.

In 1950, before the Korean war, the Federal Government collected $41 billion in taxes. Last year, it collected $69 billion. This increase of nearly $30 billion is paid either by farm families, or by nonfarm families who are their chief customers.

History is full of examples of the tragedy that overtakes the farmer-producer as a society matures, unless the greatest wisdom is used in national policies.

When the farmers of ancient Italy were ruined, the rural families which had given Rome her legions became the beggars in the forum. The farmers of the city-states of Greece had met the same fate.

England ruined her yeoman class; and there are those who date the decline of England's greatness from that weakening of the foundations.

It is time, Mr. President, that we closed the account on the 25-year cycle that began by giving our farmers emergency aid and ended by meshing them into the international agencies which now set so many of our policies.

The global planners can well reduce our farmers to becoming suppliers of commodities for a province of one world whose standard of consumption they will reduce to the lowest common denominator of the world.

We must return to that branch of political philosophy which was discarded by Rex Tugwell and Mordecai Ezekiel, and make it the corner of the temple.

Let us set up a congressional advisory commission which will gather for us the best ideas in the Nation on how to restore our family farms as the foundation of our society, on helping them maintain themselves, without Government aid, by their productive arts, by constant cost cutting, by skill in marketing, and by raising the real income of those domestic producers in nonfarm industries who should buy most of their products.

A truly effective solution of the farm problem will benefit, also, nonfarm producers and their families. It will strengthen the forces of freedom over those of collectivism. It will help extricate us from controls by our own Government and its supranational allies.

It will restore to Congress the legislative function now preempted by the bureaucracy.

It will—perhaps most desperately important of all—restore the foundation under our military strength in time of need.

HOUSE ACTION ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE FARM BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed that the House has adopted the conference report on the agricultural bill by a vote of 237 to 181, and that the conference report is being sent to the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes.

REGULATION OF WITHDRAWALS OR RESERVATIONS OF PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. BENNETT] and myself, I introduce a bill to provide for congressional authorization of withdrawals or reservations of Federal land in excess of 5,000 acres.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3613) to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, introduced by Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, this bill is being introduced as a companion bill to bills introduced into the House by Chairman ENGLE of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and other Members of the House. The House Committee has just completed some rather extensive hearings on military withdrawals, and I commend our associates in that body for making that study and introducing remedial legislation. I sincerely trust that both bodies now will expedite action on this matter.

The subject matter of this bill will come as no surprise to the Federal agencies involved, because I and the junior Senator from Utah introduced a bill—S. 531—on January 18, 1955, providing for public hearings prior to withdrawals of public lands and establishing a time limit to so-called "temporary" withdrawals. This bill has been under study by the agencies involved in withdrawals and I am sure that this agency study of S. 531 will help expedite any legislation considered on this subject.

Both bills were introduced because of the tremendous size of present and pending public-land withdrawals in the West, and because large additional withdrawals are being pressed by executive departments, especially the Department of Defense. As evidence of this continuing reservation of public lands for defense purposes, I direct your attention to the proposed withdrawal of 2,938,240 acres in the State of Nevada for Navy aerial gunnery ranges.

The area of public land withdrawn for military and other defense purposes as of June 30, 1955, totaled 17,168,843 acres, an area nearly three times as large as the State of Massachusetts. This acreage was distributed among 18 States, but 5 States—one of which is my own State of Utah—each contain in excess of 2 million acres of such reserved lands.

In view of the widespread interest in this subject among the 18 States affected, my colleague and I today submitted a request to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] that he order hearings by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on this new bill and S. 531. It is our hope that the good features of both bills can be consolidated into a final Senate bill that will prove acceptable to our colleagues in the House and expedite action on this needed legislation.

MADE IN MINNESOTA WEEK

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this week is the State of Minnesota's first Made in Minnesota Week, proclaimed by Gov. Orville L. Freeman, to be highlighted from April 11 to April 15 by the first annual Made in Minnesota International Trade Show in the Minneapolis Auditorium.

Six thousand active and enthusiastic members of the Minnesota Junior Chamber of Commerce have been responsible for this fine effort to bring to the attention of the whole Nation the remarkable advantages enjoyed by Minnesota industries and the widening opportunities for new industry in the North Star State.

Minnesota's outstanding labor force of skilled workmen, its supply of managerial talent, its great banking and credit institutions, its many advantages in terms of natural resources of land, minerals, timber, and water, its remarkable percentage of stable families owning their own homes, its lack of slum and blight areas, its advantages in scenic beauty and recreation, and the friendly welcome Minnesotans have given them have attracted many new industries to Minnesota during the past decade.

With fine rail, water, and truck transportation now being augmented by major advances in low-cost water transportation, including the 9-foot channel of the Mississippi and the prospective emergence of Duluth as an ocean port, with the completion of the Great Lakes seaway, more and more heavy industry is giving careful consideration to the possibility of establishing new plants in Minnesota.

Ingenuity is the watchword of Minnesota industry. This is clearly apparent when one looks at some of the great industries native to Minnesota—Minneapolis-Honeywell, Minneapolis Moline, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing, General Mills, and Pillsbury, to name only a few of the largest. The remarkable new taconite industry, representing the steel industry's conviction that Minnesota will continue to be a major source of iron ore when the open-pit mines of the great Mesabi Range are exhausted, is the product of Minnesota thought and tenacity and support of research.

Minnesota's steadily increasing payroll, almost three and a quarter billion dollars in 1955, is testimony to the expanding opportunities for Minnesota industry.

Minnesota is a wonderful place to work and a wonderful place to live. It is an area of opportunity and wholesome environment. I invite the attention of the whole Nation—particularly American industry—to the celebration of Made in Minnesota Week. This week, through April 15, Minnesota industry is on display. Those who come to Minnesota this week will find the usual warm and friendly welcome, but they will also find their eyes opened, thanks to the initiative and planning of the young businessmen of Minnesota, the Minnesota Jaycees.

THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE FARM BILL

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, we are all aware of the many opinions which have been expressed by persons with varying interests concerning the farm bill. There is one group, however, whose ideas should be given foremost consideration, and that group, quite logically, is made up of the farmers themselves. They are the ones most affected. They are the ones who know what should be done. Therefore, to show how many Maryland farmers feel, I read a letter addressed to me by C. E. Wise, Jr., secretary-treasurer of the Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.:

DEAR SENATOR BEALL: The Maryland Farm Bureau opposes the conference committee report on the farm bill as unsound legislation that will aggravate the present farm problem.

Provisions we object to are: (a) 90 percent fixed rigid supports for basic crops; (b) the double parity standard; (c) the mandatory three-price wheat-dumping plan; (d) the high support for noncommercial corn and feed grains; (e) the dairy support increase; (f) no control of acres diverted from quota crops.

These provisions will stimulate production and nullify the beneficial effects of the soil bank and other parts of the farm bill. As the soil bank will not be effective his year these price boosts will add much to surpluses under normal crop conditions in 1956.

Unless the objectionable features of the committee report are corrected, agriculture will fare better for the long pull under the present law. We, therefore, urge you to oppose the report in its present form.

Sincerely,

C. E. WISE, Jr.,
Secretary-Treasurer, Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.

SUGGESTED CHANGES IN THE PAROLE AND PROBATION SYSTEMS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement and ask that it be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. President, I wish at this time to call the attention of the Senate to the speech delivered yesterday by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the National Parole Conference.

I believe Mr. Hoover has called for certain badly needed changes in the parole and probation systems in this country. Present conditions where a man is arrested, evidence is presented, and a conviction is brought about, only to find that after a short time our criminal authorities are again hunting the same man for another crime—such conditions cry out for improvements.

I found the FBI's figures on the increase in sex crimes absolutely appalling—an increase in sex crimes over the past 20 years of 163 percent. And among them recently appeared a highly celebrated crime in North Dakota where the person convicted of the crime, a veteran discharged from the service as a sex deviate, had asked several times for help "before he hurt someone." Mr. Hoover makes it plain that if a person has a proven record as a sex deviate, there is an immediate responsibility to see to it that the proper authorities are notified and warned of the potential threat in their community.

The recent organized plea on the part of the women of the District of Columbia for better street lighting and an increased police protection after dark are symptomatic of this problem—a problem that exists on a nationwide scale and one that will only be solved through the vigorous action called for in Mr. Hoover's message.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement by J. Edgar Hoover may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

THE CHALLENGES OF CRIME CONTROL

(Address of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, April 10, 1956, before the National Parole Conference, Washington, D. C.)

Much has happened to all of us—and the world—since a conference similar to this one was held in Washington 17 years ago. That was in 1939. You will remember, as I do so well, that we were emerging from an era which had witnessed the overthrow of virtual gang control in community after community of our Nation. Then we had the international gangsters who attacked us and who were responsible for a Second World War and the domestic upheavals that follow all wars. We won the war—but we found we still had the problem of crime and criminals with us—a problem that has continued to grow faster than our Nation's growth.

Even though crime increased there was hope that we could do better in the postwar world than we had in the past. That hope is always with those of us who have the duty of dealing with crime and with the problem of parole and probation.

I was hopeful that after the war that steps could be taken to make the worthwhile principles of parole and probation truly effective. This is a humanitarian task. This is a vitally important work and I believe in the objective which you, who are engaged in this work, are seeking and unless you succeed, then our work too often is made ineffective. I want to make that point clear to you—because it seems it has not always been clear to some people in the past who have regarded me as an opponent of parole and probation.

I want to make it clear, too, that my criticism of the workings of parole and probation is for one reason only—to bring about more effective methods of crime control. Your objectives and my objectives can be reached only if probation and parole are worthy of the name and if law enforcement is worthy of its name. My criticism certainly is intended to be constructive for criticism designed only to destroy never helps anyone.

All of us have our dreams of achieving a goal. And to achieve a goal we must be practical. And to be practical we must speak frankly and face facts. As I see it, while progress has been made in many States and in many areas of the country—probation and parole in some areas are not worthy of the name. I say this without antagonism toward either probation or parole. The time has come for us to get together and try to find a solution to this problem which is a grave responsibility allied to law enforcement and to the rehabilitation of criminals.

As I see it, parole presupposes careful selection of those who will benefit by its application. It presupposes that those who are paroled will have careful and competent supervision. And the same principles apply to probation. I think all of us here subscribe to these principles. It is as obvious to me as it is to you that wrongdoers who have learned the error of their ways should be restored to a useful place in society and helped to recognize the values by which they can live at peace with themselves and with others.

From where I stand, parole and probation are only a part of the overall effort to achieve criminal justice. They are a part of our machinery of criminal justice which exists for only one purpose—the protection of society. This machinery fails when any part of it breaks down and leaves society unprotected. When such a breakdown occurs, then somewhere, someone has failed in his responsibility.

Society suffers when any unit of the vast machinery of criminal justice places the interest of the wrongdoer above the protection of society. Those of us who are assigned the responsibility of detecting and apprehending criminals are more and more coming to the view that our efforts, however essential, are but a temporary expedient. We arrest a wrongdoer today, present the evidence which establishes his guilt and bring about his conviction. All too frequently, within a short time thereafter, we are again hunting the same man because he has committed another crime.

Our work is only part of the answer. We know that the time-proven deterrents to crime are certainty of detection and arrest, swift prosecution, and the realization that one must pay for his law violations.

I have condemned what I regard in some prisons as a country club atmosphere. By that description, I mean prisons which permit idleness and which neither punish nor rehabilitate the wrongdoer. Fuzzy and shallow thinking which contributes to maudlin sentimentality helps no one. We frequently hear about the plight of some criminal but little or nothing about his victims or the anguish and disgrace he has brought to his own loved ones.

The press accounts of the Boston prison riot last year are a perfect illustration of the misdirected concern in some quarters for vicious criminals which is inconsistent with our duty to protect society. Much was said about the participants in this riot, and their hope for freedom, but men and nations do not deserve freedom as a handout. They must earn and guard their freedom. In the talk of freedom for these men little appeared about their criminal background and their vicious crimes or whether the general welfare of society justified their freedom or whether they had earned their freedom. It is necessary to examine only two of the cases to make my point.

One of the convicts previously had been given the benefit of both parole and probation. He has been arrested for forgery, larceny, robbery, and other crimes. He was serving a sentence of 15½ to 20 years, with a 25-year Federal sentence for bank robbery awaiting him. Another had been given the benefit of parole, probation, and conditional release. He was serving time for assault, burglary, and rape. His case was aggravated by the fact that he had committed a series of rapes and in his assaults had viciously beaten several of his victims. You cannot serve freedom on a silver platter to men like that.

One of the frequent arguments advanced for probation and parole is the overcrowding in prisons which exists today. But how valid is this argument when the population in State and Federal prisons has increased from 179,047 in 1939 to only 182,051 in 1954, an increase of only 3,000 in a 15-year period? To be sure, it is more economical to release convicts on parole or probation. But let us not put the system on the basis of the cheapest price tag. When you do, you get shoddy merchandise.

One of the most serious problems we face today in the field of crime control is that of the repeater. This problem is brought into sharp focus by looking at the background of the population in Federal prisons where in 1954 of those received under sentences of more than 1 year, 63.8 percent were repeaters. When our people check the fingerprints of arrested persons which are received in the identification division they find that 70 percent have records of previous arrests.

The only way we have at present of dealing with the repeater is to demonstrate to him that truly he can't get away with it. But this is not enough in dealing with those who are unreformed and incapable of rehabilitation without extensive and prolonged mental treatment. If I can judge from the reports which come to my desk daily from every section of the country, there is a growing concern among law enforcement officials over the increase in crimes by repeaters and those who have been improperly selected as beneficiaries of parole, probation and other forms of clemency. I am certain you are just as concerned about this as we are. Parole upon parole and probation upon probation for those who have not reformed are unreasonable and unjustified. I appreciate the fact that for every flagrant mistake in parole and probation there are scores of cases reflecting dynamic reformation and rehabilitation. What I am saying is not that parole and probation are wrong, but that ill-advised parole and probation reflect adversely upon these methods of protecting society. It is the old case of a rotten apple tainting the whole barrel.

I can best illustrate my feelings by referring to a few cases which immediately come to mind. One eastern gang of 11 responsible for a $2½ million holdup had received a total of 20 paroles and 17 probations, and one was pardoned, thereby blocking a deportation case. Another criminal had killed a policeman in 1932 and was given a life term. After the third parole, following the killing of the police officer, he was arrested burglarizing a safe. Another policeman was killed last fall by a criminal who had been paroled the previous month with a criminal record which dated back 15 years. Within the past few months, there was a nationwide manhunt for an individual who killed 6 persons following his parole less than 2 years ago. A group of parolees on a criminal spree, a little over a year ago, engaged in a gun fight with 2 policemen, and 1 of the policemen and 1 of the parolees were killed. Is not this enough to show that there is a need for improvement?

Since we established the widely publicized list of "ten most wanted fugitives" in March 1950, a total of 95 criminals has been on the list. Fifty-two had received paroles on at

least one occasion during their criminal careers. Of the 18 special agents of the FBI who have lost their lives in line of duty, 11 were killed by criminals who had previously received paroles, probation or other forms of clemency. That errors have been made and are being made in the selection of persons to benefit from parole is a proven fact and a matter of grave concern. This is not merely the problem of law enforcement officers, it is your problem also.

The mistakes in selecting the wrong person for release on parole might have been rectified with the type of supervision which the humanitarian principles of parole require. I do not say it is the fault of those who administer parole and probation. But it is the fault of those who permit these conditions to exist.

Politics, poor pay for parole and probation officers, lack of interest by city and State officials and the lack of uniform laws and practices all are involved. Parole supervision too often is a farce and exists in name only in too many cases. Those who have the most expert knowledge of parole hold that proper parole supervision requires a caseload of no more than 50 to 65 for each parole officer. When you face the facts, it is a marvel that parole succeeds as well as it does. This is particularly true when you find parole officers carrying caseloads of as many as 115. In a State where 45 parole and probation officers are required to supervise 2,800 persons on probation and 1,500 on parole it is clear that these overworked men cannot do their jobs properly. But that is only part of the picture. In addition, these 45 officers are required to make investigations in connection with granting of paroles and probation.

In one State, which boasts of an advanced parole system, maximum parole supervision requires a monthly visit to the parolee's home and place of employment. Minimum supervision requires a visit every 3 months either to the home or place of employment. It is no wonder that parole and probation fail so frequently. In one State, it is reported that 50 percent of those granted parole violate the conditions of parole. Figures vary in other States.

The picture is clear. The time has come for public indignation over the failure to give these men and women a chance to do their jobs properly. And, if it hurts some politicians—well, that is just too bad. At least, your conscience will be clear.

Justice is undermined and respect for constituted authority becomes a mockery when judges take it upon themselves to coddle hardened criminals by giving them undeserved probation. To illustrate, I refer to a case where a judge placed a criminal on probation on the charge of car theft and violation of the Federal Firearms Act. This man previously had been arrested for armed robbery and breaking and entering. For this he received a 10-year sentence in a State penitentiary. He escaped and was later arrested in a distant State. He resisted extradition on the grounds of cruel and inhuman punishment in the State penitentiary. The State made a careful investigation and subsequently the criminal's charges were disproved to the satisfaction of a Federal judge who ordered him returned. After serving 3 additional years of his sentence, he was paroled. When later arrested in a Western State with a stolen car, he pleaded guilty but leveled the same old charges of the cruelty of punishment which had already been disproved. The judge placed him on probation for 10 years and told the criminal to behave himself and he would never have to serve the balance of the term for which he was paroled because as the judge told him, he had "an umbrella over you now."

There can be no doubt that many judges are handicapped by not having complete details. Once a wrongdoer is arrested and brought before the courts, there can be no more important investigative function than to place before the judge the facts which will aid him in arriving at his conclusions as to what is best, both for society and the individual offender. We regard this as so important in our service that our various offices are under instructions to furnish all available case information to judges when so requested.

The Federal probation system does an excellent job of developing information to be submitted in its presentence reports. Likewise, some States do an outstanding job in this respect, but there are others where much improvement is sorely needed.

I want to express my deep appreciation for the splendid assistance and cooperation which our special agents are receiving from most parole and probation offices throughout the Nation. It has been a source of gratification to observe that in the past 20 years there has been a gradual improvement in the cooperation between the professional advocates of parole and probation and law-enforcement officers. It must continue to improve. The police officer on the beat, the county and State officer and the Federal investigator are primarily concerned with the protection of society just as you are—and the old frictions should be removed. Fundamentally, there should be an even closer bond of cooperation between those charged with treatment of offenders and those charged with detection and apprehension. After all, our end objective is the same.

Under our legal system there is authority to act in most instances only after a crime has been committed. Somewhere and somehow, a new authority is needed—that of prevention. Let me illustrate. A policeman was killed by a 21-year-old parolee. He had been in and out of institutions on numerous occasions, having escaped and been paroled several times. After he had killed the policeman, the parolee's father disclosed that he had made efforts to have his son's parole revoked to prevent him from becoming further involved in serious crimes.

When parents appeal to authorities, not once but time and time again, to have their son on parole committed in the public interest, it is unbelievable that someone would not take action. Yet this has happened more than once. Last December, a 20-year-old parolee kidnaped a 3-year-old girl. The parolee was an admitted sex offender who had attacked girls ranging from 8 to 13 years of age. He had been committed twice to a mental hospital for examination. Paroles granted this criminal had been violated time and again. The parents saw that their son needed help—and he knew it himself. On the day before he abducted the 3-year-old girl, this sex offender had pleaded with his parole officer to come to see him; but for some reason, the officer did not see him. Cases like this cast a shadow, not on the principle, but upon the administration of parole.

More and more, we are finding the earmarks of crime long before the final act of violence occurs. Day after day, individuals who are mentally ill are committing serious crimes. They are bringing misery, not only to themselves, their relatives and their friends, but also to other innocent men, women, and children.

There are many individuals in America with backgrounds of emotional instability where the danger signals are clear and where the individual is clearly "earmarked for crime." The time has come when some way must be found to take preventive action, and here is the proposal I hope you will consider: When a person has been convicted and sentenced to prison, the authorities today have the ability to determine in many cases whether the wrongdoer is capable of leading a law-abiding life. But when it is clear that due to mental quirks the likelihood of violence exists, then there should be some legally recognized machinery whereby such individuals can be isolated from society to receive preventive treatment.

These are days of stress and strain. Modern society is geared to a fast tempo. Pressures are heavy from all sides, thrusting vast burdens on us all. Nerves become taut, tempers frayed, minds blurred. Abnormalities appear, which if recognized in time, can be treated and perhaps lives can be spared. If action is taken, mentally sick criminals might claim no more victims but, on the other hand, they may be made into useful citizens.

The rise in sex offenses is shocking. Last year, while the total number of crimes was leveling off, rape increased 5.9 percent, and this has been the case for the past 20 years when such crimes have increased 163 percent, according to reports on crimes received from local, county, and State law-enforcement agencies. You who have devoted your lives to treatment of offenders know that there are certain types of persons who are mentally and physically ill and need to be treated as such. You also know that there are types of individuals whose prognosis for normal adjustment is so remote as to be improbable. The time has come when society can better be protected by providing some means of enforced treatment for such people. Public health authorities may legally place a family in quarantine if they have a disease which is dangerous to others. The freedom of that family is restricted for the good of the community. If this is accepted as a proper health measure, then certainly there should be a quarantine for mentally ill criminals who should be released only upon certification of competent medical authorities who can also say when the facts justify it, "This man in mentally ill and we cannot approve his release until this illness is cured. He must be kept in quarantine."

Mental illness, emotional instability, and abnormality are major problems in crime control just as certain diseases are problems in the health of a community. When official agencies receive information that a person convicted of a crime has a mental illness or abnormality which could endanger others, there should be a responsibility to advise proper law-enforcement agencies of the facts. If the case is sufficiently acute, there should be a means, with all the proper safeguards for constitutional rights, whereby treatment could be enforced—even beyond the period of actual sentence, if necessary.

If, for example, the facts are known that a person has a proven record as a sex deviate, there is also a responsibility to see to it that proper authorities are notified so that they may be warned of a potential threat to their community.

If the present trend of fiendish crimes is to be reversed, there is a need for a new attitude and a determination to prevent such acts. It is already the experience of law enforcement that perhaps as many sex crimes go unreported as are reported. If every sex offender knew that his name was on record, this in and of itself would be a powerful deterrent. If every sex offender knew there were ways and means by which he might get corrective treatment, the lives of potential victims as well as offenders and their families might be spared. A person suffering from contagious disease is removed from contact with healthy persons until the danger is past. So should the mentally ill criminal who endangers the safety of the community be treated. Law enforcement, of course, knows when an offender is placed on probation, but it seldom knows when one is placed on parole. It seems to me there is no valid reason why law enforcement officers should not know when a potential offender is released within their jurisdiction, just as health authorities should know when a typhoid carrier is around. The mere fact that a parolee knows that law enforcement has his identity could be another force of deterrence, and law enforcement could be of assistance in giving a

helping hand to make parole more workable. This should be a cooperative effort.

Doubtless some of you already are thinking of reasons why this program I have suggested cannot be done. I could give you right now a dozen reasons why it would be difficult—but it is ridiculous to say it cannot be done to the everlasting benefit of the mentally ill and the community. It can be done if we work together and if you add your pool of ideas.

We complain about high taxes, but last year crime cost every man, woman, and child in these United States $122, or a staggering estimated total of $20 billion. Perhaps this figure could become more meaningful if we realized that for every $1 spent on education, crime cost $1.46; and for every $1 which went to the churches of the Nation, $13 went to crime.

If we could but divert the waste of crime to constructive use—recruit and train the people so sorely needed in every phase of the administration of criminal justice and quarantine the mentally ill criminal until he is cured—the Nation would soon reap a marvelous profit. And there would be the added profit from a decline in sorrow, mental anguish, and outright physical suffering resulting from crime.

The challenge in crime control is a challenge to all of us here this morning. We live with it. It is the responsibility of every citizen, of course, but it is our job—it is our basic responsibility, if we do not find the answers—they will not be found. We must provide the ideas and the leadership.

And we must work together in mutual understanding—or else we fail. We must not fail.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of April 9, 1956, pages 6110–6125.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understood that we were going to have a quorum call.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It was my understanding that there would be a quorum call when the conference report was ready to be discussed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to have a quorum call before we begin the discussion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] losing his right to the floor.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative 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.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I object, at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show who is prolonging the discussion. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue the quorum call.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Morse
Beall	Green	Mundt
Bender	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott
Curtis	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Laird	Symington
Duff	Langer	Thye
Dworshak	Lehman	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Wofford
Frear	McCarthy	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the conference report now before the Senate represents a concentrated effort by the committee of conference to agree on a bill which would meet with the approval of both Houses of Congress, and which can be sent to the President as quickly as possible. The committee of conference met during the Easter recess and worked long hours. To use a colloquialism, we "sweated blood" over this conference report.

I realize that the report is not satisfactory to everyone. Nevertheless, it is a fair and workable report, and a good compromise between the Senate and House measures. I believe it embodies reasonable and realistic methods by which the sad economic plight of our farmers can be remedied, both in the months immediately ahead and in the more distant future as well.

I hope Senators will listen carefully as I explain the provisions of the conference report, how it differs from the Senate bill, and the reasons for those differences.

Mr. President, the House bill provided support at 90 percent of parity for the 1955, 1956, and 1957 crops of the basic commodities. Section 301 of the Senate amendment, by providing for setting aside 250 million bushels of corn, and increasing the set-asides for wheat and cotton, would have resulted in minimum 1956 support levels for corn, wheat, and cotton, according to the Department's estimates, of 84 percent, 85 percent, and 88 percent of parity, respectively, and under the flexible-support formula would have continued to affect the price-support levels of these commodities in future years. The conference substitute represents a compromise between these 2 provisions, in that it calls for 90-percent price support for the 1956 crop only. I should like to point out that this provision of the conference substitute does not affect the support price for tobacco, which, under existing law, is required to be supported at 90 percent of parity, or the support price for rice, which, both under the Senate amendment and the conference substitute, will be subject to a 2-price plan in 1956.

Of primary importance to our American farmers, of course, is how the conference bill will affect them pricewise as compared to the present flexible price-support program. The announced support prices for corn and wheat would be raised, respectively, from $1.40 per bushel for corn—81 percent of parity—and $1.81 per bushel for wheat—76 percent of parity—to $1.65 per bushel and $2.27 per bushel, respectively, on the basis of March 15 data and the old parity formula. Ninety percent of old parity for cotton and peanuts would be 31.81 cents per pound and 12.3 cents per pound, respectively.

The provision of the Senate amendment changing the standard grade for cotton was omitted from the conference substitute, so that middling seven-eights inch remains the standard grade and staple for price-support purposes; this change will increase the support price for each grade of cotton about 1.36 cents per pound above what it would be if the average grade and staple were used as the standard, and, of course, provided also it was based on the schedule of premiums and discounts used in 1955.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided support for milk and butterfat at between 80 and 90 percent of parity. In addition, the Senate amendment provided for the use of a parity equivalent for manufacturing milk based on the period July 1946 to December 1948. Use of this parity equivalent would have increased the support price for manufacturing milk to about $3.25 per hundredweight. In lieu of increasing the support price on a permanent basis through use of this parity equivalent, the conference substitute provides for a specific support price of $3.25 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk, and 58.6 cents per pound for butterfat for the current marketing year ending March 31, 1957. The price of 58.6 cents for butterfat is equivalent to the price of $3.25 for manufacturing milk.

The conference report retains the dual parity formula provided by the Senate amendment, but gives the Secretary until January 31, 1957, after Congress has returned next year, to submit his recommendations for an improved formula.

The Senate amendment would have required the filing of this report during the recess of Congress.

The most difficult problems faced by the conferees concerned the provisions with respect to corn and feed grains. Except for clarifying changes, the provisions with respect to corn in the commercial area the same in the conference substitute as in the Senate amendment. The feed grain provisions are substantially those of the Senate amendment in general purpose. The formula contained in the Senate amendment, however, for feed grain support prices was found to be unworkable when the support prices produced by it were examined. Since the historical pattern of feed grain prices does not follow the pattern for corn prices, a provision basing all feed grain prices at each location on corn prices at such location results in serious maladjustment of the feed grain price structure and discrimination between producers on adjoining farms who, in the past, have been accustomed to receive similar prices.

Corn is produced principally in the heavy feeding area, while feed grains are more frequently shipped to port for export, or to other areas for feeding. The conference substitute, therefore, adopts a formula designed to bring feed grain prices into proper relation with corn and with each other, and permit appropriate adjustment for location differentials. The substitute would raise the support price for corn in the noncommercial area from 75 percent of the support level in the commercial area to 85 percent of such level, and provide for support of rye, barley, oats, and grain sorghums at 5 percentage points of parity below the percentage of parity at which corn in the commercial area is supported. Thus, for 1956, corn in the commercial area will be supported at 90 percent of its parity price, established on the basis of the old parity formula; corn outside the commercial area will be supported at 85 percent of the support level in the commercial area, or 76.5 percent of parity; and rye, oats, barley, and grain sorghums will be supported at 85 percent of their respective parity prices, all of which are established on the basis of the modernized parity formula. The feed grain support prices computed in this manner bear a fair feed value relationship to corn support prices and permit appropriate adjustments to conform to the historic price structure. A savings clause in the substitute permits feed grain producers, including corn producers outside the commercial area, who do not comply with the additional price-support requirements of the bill to receive price support at the levels which would have prevailed but for the special feed grain provisions of the bill.

As provided in the Senate amendment, corn producers in the commercial area, to qualify for price support, would have to keep within their farm base acreages and, in addition, devote an acreage equal to 15 percent of their farm base for corn to either the acreage reserve for corn or the conservation reserve. The substitute makes it clear that the producer in the commercial area would have to keep within his farm base, and that land devoted to the acreage reserve would have to be devoted to the acreage reserve for corn, to qualify the producer for corn price support.

Like the Senate amendment, the substitute requires feed grain producers, in order to qualify for feed grain price support, to devote an acreage equal to 15 percent of their feed grain base acreage to the soil bank and not to plant more than 85 percent of their feed grain base acreage. For 1956 the feed grain base acreage would, as provided in the Senate amendment, be the average acreage devoted to feed grains in 1953, 1954, and 1955. However, the conference substitute includes in this requirement corn produced outside the commercial area along with other feed grains. After 1956, a national feed-grain base equal to the average acreage for 1953, 1954, and 1955 would be apportioned among States, counties, and farms in the same manner that wheat acreage allotments are now apportioned. This apportionment would be made on the basis of a 5-year moving base, so that it would take into account shifts in production.

While the Senate amendment required producers to devote acreage to the acreage reserve or conservation reserve in order to qualify for feed-grain price support, the Senate amendment did not provide for putting feed-grain acreage into the acreage reserve. The conference substitute enlarges the acreage reserve to include feed-grain acreage; and any lands put into the acreage reserve, in order to qualify the producers for feed-grain price support, would have to be put in the feed-grain acreage reserve.

The announced support prices for 1956 are $1.80 per hundredweight for grain sorghums, 59 cents per bushel for oats, $1.16 per bushel for rye, 93 cents per bushel for barley, and $1.05 per bushel for corn outside the commercial corn area. Based on parity prices for April, the support prices for 1956 under the conference report would be $2.18 per hundredweight for grain sorghums, 72 cents per bushel for oats, $1.41 per bushel for rye, $1.13 per bushel for barley, and $1.40 per bushel for corn outside the corn commercial area.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. If a producer of feed grains did not wish to comply with the provision by which he would have to cut his base acreage of feed grains by 15 percent, and place that in the soil bank, he would still be eligible to receive the 70 percent price supports we now have, would he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct, for 1956. We have included a savings clause in that connection.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the conference report provide for expecting drought years in figuring the base acreage?

Mr. ELLENDER. It does provide for adjustments in alloting feed grain base acreage after 1956. I shall comment on that.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is specifically written into the bill, I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Texas.

Another of the major decisions made by the conferees was to make the soil bank voluntary. Except in the case of corn and feed grains, price support is not conditioned upon soil-bank participation under the conference substitute. This was a matter which has been given extensive consideration throughout the period of consideration of the bill. The administration and most of the farm organizations and witnesses before the committee favored a voluntary soil bank. A mandatory provision had been included in the Senate amendment principally because of the corn and feed-grain provisions, so that the conferees would have the entire question before them. However, after careful consideration the conferees felt that while the special base-acreage provisions for corn and feed grains made a mandatory program appropriate for those commodities, a mandatory program was not suitable for the basic commodities already subject to serve acreage restrictions or to the nonbasic commodities which are not subject to any acreage restrictions, and for which insufficient data is available.

The two-price plans for wheat and rice contained in the Senate amendment have been retained in the conference substitute, with mostly minor changes, most of which are of a technical nature. In the case of wheat, the principal changes made by the conference substitute are as follows:

First. The Secretary would determine whether compliance with acreage allotments would be required as a condition of eligibility for price supports and marketing certificates—as provided in the Senate amendment—but if such compliance is required, the acreage allotments would be established in the manner now provided by law;

Second. The Secretary would be required to put a certificate program into effect if approved by producers;

Third. Producers would not be eligible for marketing certificates unless they actually planted wheat;

Fourth. The question as to whether producers desire a wheat-certificate program would be submitted at every marketing quota referendum until such a program is approved. The reason for this change is that the 1957 referendum will be held shortly after the bill is passed, and before wheat producers have had sufficient opportunity to study the plan proposed by the bill. The conferees did not want to delay the referendum or deprive producers of an opportunity to put the program into effect in 1957, but did want to preserve to the producers the opportunity to vote for the plan after they have been fully advised of its advantages.

In the case of rice, the conference substitute would, first, permit the 1956 crop to be supported at more than 55 percent of parity, since the world price at

present is about 65 percent of parity; and, second, limit rice inventory adjustment payments to the amount by which 80 percent of the parity price as of August 1, 1955, exceeds the 1956 support price. The conferees felt that this computation of adjustment payments represented a more realistic appraisal of the loss which otherwise would be suffered by persons holding rough rice on August 1, 1956, as a result of the transition to a two-price plan. The Senate amendment, it was felt, would have given them a measure of relief from a market loss which would have occurred even if the two-price plan were not put into operation.

The provisions of the Senate amendment limiting price-support loans to $100,000, acreage reserve payments to $25,000, and conservation reserve payments to $7,500, are omitted from the conference substitute. While the conferees were sympathetic to the general objective of limiting assistance to those actually in need of such assistance, these provisions did not seem to be effective for that purpose, and appeared likely to be either completely ineffective or, to the extent effective, destructive of the program. If a limitation on price support were feasible, $100,000 would probably be too high. However, since the objective of the program is to support the market price, the few producers who might be directly affected by this limitation could probably derive practically the full benefit of the support program in the market place. If, however, the volume affected by the limitation were such as to break the market price, the small producer who ordinarily does not have adequate storage facilities or, for other reasons, does not put his commodities under loan, would probably be affected in much the same way that the large producer would be affected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana may yield to me, so that I may propound a unanimous-consent request, and without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following order be entered: that during the further consideration of the conference report on H. R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956, debate on the question of agreeing to said report shall be limited to 3½ hours, to be equally divided, and controlled by the majority and minority leaders, respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at this time I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, the purpose of the soil bank is to retire lands from production, so as to alleviate the surplus and bring about better market conditions for all farmers. To the extent that limitations on participation in the soil bank would prevent farmers from putting their lands into the soil bank, the program would be adversely affected, and the benefits to be obtained from it would be decreased.

The provision of the Senate amendment requiring processors to certify as to prices paid farmers in order to participate in certain price-support and surplus-removal operations is omitted from the conference substitute. This provision would have made many beneficial programs impossible to undertake. For instance, it probably would bar any surplus-removal operation undertaken to clear the market of a prior year's production, and would bar other price-support or removal operations where the processor has no way of obtaining information as to the price paid to the producer.

The conferees also gave extensive consideration to various provisions of the Senate amendment dealing with protection for tenants and sharecroppers. The conferees were most diligent in seeking a formula which would protect both the landlord and the tenant; but in view of the many varied types of arrangements between landlords and tenants, frequently involving much more than the use of the land itself, the conferees were unable to develop a formula which would be fair in all cases. It was felt that the county committees, who are familiar with arrangements customary in their counties, with some general guidance from the Congress and the Department, would be in the best position to determine what would be fair in each case. The various provisions of the Senate amendment on this subject have therefore been consolidated into a single section of the conference substitute, under which arrangements between landlords and tenants for sharing in soil-bank payments would be subject to approval by the county committee.

The provision of the Senate amendment making forfeiture of price-support benefits a penalty for violation of soil-bank contracts was felt by the conferees to impose a penalty having little relation to the offense, since a contract violator might have raised no price-supported crops or might have sold all of them in the market place. The conference substitute, therefore, omits this penalty, and provides instead for forfeiture of all benefits under the contract—instead of just those beginning with the year in which the violation occurred—and, in addition, it provides for payment of a further penalty in the case of grazing or harvesting in violation of the contract, equal to 50 percent of the compensation otherwise payable for the year of violation.

Other changes made by the conference substitute in the soil-bank program include the following:

First. The substitute would require compliance with acreage reduction to be checked before acreage-reserve payments could be made. This would not delay acreage-reserve payments much beyond the planting season, and conforms to the Department's tentative plans for administering the act.

Second. The substitute imposes dollar limits on the acreage-reserve program for each commodity so that the total amount available could not be used entirely for a single commodity. The limit for each commodity was purposely set so that the total limitation for all commodities exceeds the total amount available for any year in order to allow for some adjustment between commodities.

Third. The substitute makes it clear that a producer putting lands devoted to tame hay or other soil-conserving crops in the conservation reserve would not be required to reduce crop production on the balance of his land.

Fourth. Participation by State and county committees in the procedure for terminating conservation reserve contracts has been provided for by the substitute so that the producer can obtain a hearing in a familiar forum before being required to resort to more formal and expensive court procedure.

Fifth. Under the substitute the Secretary would make allowances for drought and other abnormal conditions in establishing yields for the purposes of fixing acreage-reserve compensation. This will make the program more attractive to producers who, despite adversities, continue to base their decisions upon the expectation of making a crop.

Sixth. Compliance with feed-grain base acreages would be a condition of eligibility for acreage-reserve payments for other commodities or for conservation-reserve payments, after 1956, in the same manner that compliance with acreage allotments are a condition of such payments. Such compliance with feed-grain base acreage is not required for 1956 because the Department will not have the data to determine feed-grain base acreages in time to make it applicable to the 1956 program.

Seventh. The provision of the Senate amendment prohibiting leasing of Government lands for agricultural purposes was modified in accordance with suggestions received from the executive branch, which has had the problem under study for some time.

Eighth. The substitute permits Commodity Credit Corporation funds to be used until June 30, 1957, to finance soil bank operations instead of switching from corporate funds to appropriated funds on February 1 in the middle of the fiscal year, and permits Commodity Credit Corporation funds to be used after June 30, 1957, to the extent that funds have been appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation for that purpose. These changes will facilitate the operation of the program, but still preserve the control of Congress over the program through appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as

a part of my remarks a letter addressed to me, dated April 5, 1956, from the Department, signed by True D. Morse, Acting Secretary, on this subject, showing the reason why the conference agreed to make the changes suggested in the letter.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1956.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Sr.,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: I am writing to you as chairman of the conference committee on H. R. 12, to call to your attention the urgent need for a further amendment to section 221 (a) of the bill, to change from February 1, 1957, to July 1, 1957, the date for transition from CCC financing of the soil-bank program to appropriation financing.

This section, as it passed the Senate, authorizes the financing of the soil-bank program from CCC funds until February 1, 1957. It also requires the submission of a report prior to February 1, 1957, of all operations which will require the making of expenditures prior to July 1, 1957, and authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of the Soil Bank Act, including payments to CCC for costs incurred up to February 1, 1957.

We have no objection to the submission of such a report by February 1 nor to the principle that the soil bank should be financed by direct appropriations as soon as feasible, if that is the desire of Congress. Our original proposal for permanent CCC financing with subsequent appropriations to repay CCC—which was adopted in the Senate committee version of S. 3183—was based primarily on (1) the close relationship of the soil bank to CCC operations, especially the need to reduce the vast accumulation of surpluses so that price support activities can operate effectively, (2) the administrative simplification that would reult from using CCC authorities, especially at the local level, (3) the urgent time element in getting the program in operation, and (4) the ample precedents for this approach, such as the financing of the International Wheat Agreement, titles I and II of Public Law 480, the special milk program, the special brucellosis program, eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, emergency famine relief to friendly peoples, emergency feed assistance to farmers and stockmen in disaster areas, etc.

We understand that the conferees have already agreed on an amendment which would permit the use of CCC funds after February 1 provided the corporation has received funds to cover such expenditures from appropriations made to carry out the purposes of the act. This provision will be most helpful after the transition has been made to an appropriation basis by permitting the continued use of CCC authorities in administering the program.

However, we strongly urge that the transition to an appropriation basis be made on July 1, 1957—the beginning of a new fiscal year—rather than on February 1. As you know, the time element is extremely critical. If the Soil Bank is to be implemented in time to have any material effect on the planting of the 1956 crops, it must be gotten under way at the earliest possible date and immediately upon passage of the basic legislation. However, if the immediate fund availability is limited to February 1, it would cast doubt upon the availability of funds to fulfill commitments and furthermore could have the effect of suspending payments and administrative operations unless an appropriation were actually passed by February 1. It seems extremely doubtful that Congress would be able to review the report of operations, examine a budget estimate, and actually pass an appropriation during the month of January 1957, especially if the usual amount of time is required to organize committees and otherwise make the necessary internal arrangements for the operations of a new Congress.

For these reasons, we believe it imperative to change the transition date to July 1, 1957. On this basis the appropriation estimate can be handled as a part of the regular budget for the fiscal year 1958 without the disruptive effects of shifting the basis of financing in the middle of the fiscal year, and avoiding the risks of suspending the program pending the approval of an appropriation almost immediately upon the convening of the new Congress.

We are furnishing sufficient copies of this letter for your use in advising other members of the conference regarding the need for this change. Your favorable consideration of this matter will be highly appreciated and will assist greatly in the administration of the Soil Bank program.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Ninth, State game and fish agencies and the Fish and Wildlife Service are specifically included among the agencies to be utilized, and capability surveys as developed by the Soil Conservation Service are specifically included among the land use capability data to be utilized.

Tenth. The substitute specifies the date, March 15, as the date by which the Secretary's report on the conservation reserve program for the preceding year shall be transmitted to Congress.

One paragraph in the statement of managers on the part of the House may need a word of clarification. The paragraph on "Tree Seedlings" should not be taken as showing any intention to exclude State nurseries from participation as fully as private nurseries in supplying seedlings for the conservation reserve program.

The surplus disposal provision of the Senate amendment contained several provisions relating to cotton. The provision directing the Commodity Credit Corporation to encourage sales for export to reestablish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for United States cotton was omitted from the conference substitute because the corporation already has adequate authority to sell cotton for export, and should do so. The conferees were in agreement that this cotton should be sold, but were not in agreement that this provision was the proper way to accomplish such disposition. The disposition of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks should be conducted in an orderly manner that will encourage continued sales for export and discourage foreign purchasers from withholding their purchases in anticipation of occasional sale programs.

Section 303 of the conference substitute authorizes the President to enter into agreements with foreign countries to limit exports to the United States and to issue regulations to carry out such agreements. This provision was incorporated in the substitute in the light of a possible agreement being negotiated with Japan on cotton textiles, although it is applicable to all countries, and all agricultural commodities and their products.

The conference substitute retains the provision of the Senate amendment to include cotton of $1\frac{11}{16}$ inches and longer staple length in the import quota applicable to cotton having a staple length of $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches or longer, but requires administration of the quota in a manner that will permit the importation of $1\frac{11}{16}$ inches and longer cotton to conform to normal requirements for such cotton. The overall quota is 95,000 bales, and it is estimated that 16,000 bales of $1\frac{11}{16}$ inches or longer cotton came in ex quota in 1955. In the future the $1\frac{11}{16}$-inch cotton will be required to come in within the 95,000-bale limitation.

The Senate provision requiring the Commodity Credit Corporation to encourage the sale of extra long staple cotton has been confined by the conference substitute to the quantity of such cotton which the Commodity Credit Corporation has on hand, since there is no desire to require it to purchase cotton for export.

Other provisions of the conference substitute dealing with surplus disposal would:

First. Require food stamp and food stockpiling programs to be included along with the surplus disposal program required to be submitted to Congress by the Secretary;

Second. Clarify the ocean freight provision of the Senate amendment;

Third. Make the commission concerned with the industrial use of industrial products a bipartisan commission;

Fourth. Limit the amount of the supplemental section 32 funds which might be devoted to any one commodity to 50 percent of the $500 million authorized; and

Fifth. Limit the penal institution donation provision to donation of food commodities, but permit donations to be made to State corrective institutions for minors.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. May commodities be donated to penitentiaries?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. That provision has not been changed, except to limit the donations to food. I am sure that is what the Senator would like to do.

Mr. LANGER. Am I correct in understanding that donations to Federal penitentiaries can be taken care of?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. The only change we made was to add State correctional institutions for minors to the amendment which the distinguished Senator from North Dakota had inserted in the bill.

The provision of the Senate amendment exempting wheat produced for feed, food, or seed on the farm where grown from marketing penalties is omitted. The wheat quota law permits any producer to grow 15 acres of wheat without penalty. This very liberal exemption, which is not contained in the marketing quota provisions for any other commodity, has contributed heavily to excess wheat production, and the conferees felt that the still more generous provision of the Senate amendment was

unnecessary and might contribute seriously to the wheat surplus situation.

Other changes in the marketing quota and acreage allotment provisions of the Senate amendment made by the conference substitute would:

First. Permit the Secretary to apportion among small cotton farms in any State in 1956 an acreage equal to the acreage allotted in such State which he estimates will not be planted, put in the soil bank, or considered as planted. Since it is contemplated that very few cotton farmers will underplant their cotton acreage without taking advantage of the acreage reserve program, it is expected that the acreage which might be apportioned under this section would be a very small acreage. This provision of the conference substitute supplements the provision of the Senate amendment providing additional acreage for small cotton farms, effective in 1957 and 1958;

Second. The provision of the Senate amendment for additional peanut acreage allotments in certain cases in States where the acreage devoted to Virginia or Valencia type peanuts is less than 10,000 acres is omitted from the conference substitute. This provision would have given preferential treatment to the States covered by it. The Department has the authority to increase allotments for types of peanuts in short supply and has exercised this authority this year. However, this authority provides for the apportionment of any increase among all States producing the types needed.

Section 602 of the Senate amendment providing for forest products price reporting and research is omitted from the conference substitute, since there was considerable objection to it and further consideration of it appears desirable before adoption.

The provision of the Senate amendment for a survey of existing meat-grading systems was omitted since the Department has ample authority to make such a survey. Objections were raised to the provision and since it was not studied in committee, further consideration appears desirable if it is to be enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. It will take me 10 more minutes to conclude my statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 10 additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I admit that the bill agreed to in conference and which I have explained, is not perfection. It is, however, the best that could be obtained by the Senate conferees after 2 long weeks of discussions with the House managers.

I wish to say this, Mr. President: the conference bill is workable. Aside from our own experts and those from the House, we had many from the Department of Agriculture to help us write a bill that was administratively feasible. It is designed to bring immediate relief to our farmers and, I fervently believe, it will halt the drastic decline in farm income without further aggravating our surpluses.

Now, we have heard that the White House is dissatisfied with this bill. That may or may not be true. I know that in his press conference of April 4, President Eisenhower set up as his main criteria for a farm bill, one designed to do two things; help our farmers over the "long term," as he put it, and, second, "help them now."

These two tests are amply met by the conference bill.

For the "long term," to use the President's words, we have provided a soil bank, one which is designed to reduce plantings on allotted acres and cultivated acres, as well. Unplanted acres will create a scarcity. The soil-bank provisions as embodied in the conference bill are almost identical with those proposed by the President. We have vested the Secretary of Agriculture with broad and ample authority to make the soil bank work. He has sufficient leeway to do so; his discretion is extremely flexible so as to permit him to adjust requirements and participation to meet changing conditions, as he determines them.

But, Mr. President, it would be but an idle gesture for us to expect the soil bank to help farmers adequately this year. It is well into the spring; farmers have planted much of their lands. As President Eisenhower declared in his April 4 press conference:

> Now, the soil-bank portion of the program which we originally thought would help a great deal this year probably can't because it is getting too late.

That was the President's opinion as of April 4; it is now later, and it may become much later, depending on the action taken today. The prospects of the soil bank providing any effective income relief for farmers this year is so remote as to be only a cherished hope of the most ardent supporters of the plan.

Therefore, Mr. President, the choice is clear. Either we can wait another year to give our farmers much-needed relief, by depending upon the soil bank to do the job, or we can approve a method by which plummetting farm income can be arrested and substantially raised this year, by voting for the pending conference report.

I do not believe we can, in good conscience, afford to wait another year. Besides owing a duty to our farmers to see that they are not driven off their lands, we also must face the fact that another year of disastrously low farm income will threaten our whole economy, aside from agriculture.

Mr. President, to bring about this much-needed assistance this year, we have provided in the bill for 90 percent of parity price supports for 1956. We have voted to raise support levels for the basics to 90 percent of parity to tide our farmers over until such time as the soil bank, according to the President's own estimate, will take full effect. Frankly, I doubt that the soil bank will show any appreciable results until the middle of 1957, but I am willing to yield to the President's wishes and accept his prognosis in order to get a bill enacted which will pump life back into our farm economy now.

Let us face facts, Mr. President. Ninety percent of parity price supports for 1956 are not going to increase production. Contrary to Mr. Benson, and his followers, there is no conflict between the 1-year, 1-shot emergency, 90 percent of parity supports in this bill and the soil bank. Here is why:

First, by the President's own admission, the soil bank cannot be effective in 1956. Therefore, as to 1956, there can be no conflict between 90 percent of parity and the soil bank.

Second—and this is most important—90 percent of parity price supports for 1956 will not and cannot bring about any increase in production of the basic commodities.

Every basic commodity to which the 90 percent of parity price supports apply are under tight acreage allotments. By the President's own admission, much of these allotments have been and are now being planted. Thus, since the higher support levels in the conference bill cannot increase acreage, they cannot conceivably increase production.

The argument has been advanced that our present surpluses are the fault of 90 percent of parity price supports. I reiterate most emphatically that they are not; these surpluses exist because the Department of Agriculture, because our Government, called upon farmers to achieve all-out production during the Korean war. Can the farmers be blamed for that, Mr. President?

I hold in my hand a number of clippings on the subject which might be of interest at this time. For example, here is one from the New York Times of October 28, 1950, which bears the caption "Brannan Warns Farmers—They Must Produce or Face Further Controls, he says." Here is another from the October 4, 1950, edition of the Wall Street Journal entitled "Farm Crop Switch: Federal Planners Do About Face—Will Ask Bigger Output in 1951—All Curbs Off for Next Year on Cotton Planting—Talk of More Rice, Corn, Meat—Wheat Goal Is Also Lifted."

Here is another, Mr. President, from the March 20, 1951, edition of the New York Times. It is headed "1951 Crops May Fall Short of United States Needs—Outlook Is Most Disturbing In Corn, With Plantings Seen 5 Percent Below Acreage Goals."

Here is an article taken from Newsweek of October 16, 1950, entitled "Cotton Shortage." It states, in part, that Secretary of Agriculture Brannan decided last week that "there would be no controls of any kind on next year's planting. Farmers were asked to aid at a total output of 16 million bales."

Now, later, Mr. President—just this week, as a matter of fact—the magazine U. S. News & World Report noted that the 1953 crop of supported commodities had not been controlled, and that, as a result, the surpluses shot skyhigh.

Whoever may be to blame for this situation, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, there is one thing certain: Our farmers were not to blame nor can anyone blame it on 90 percent of parity price supports for the basics.

The blame rests upon those planners who declined to impose controls on the 1953 crop. The Democrats were in office in 1952, Mr. President; it was up to the Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, to determine if controls were to be imposed. That determination, it must be noted, had to be made at not later than the dates set opposite the following commodities: Cotton, October 15; corn, November 15; wheat, July 1; rice, December 31.

Thus, the issue of controls or no controls had to be decided during the year 1952, as to whether the 1953 crop would be controlled. Let me remind the Senate that the war in Korea was still in progress at that time. The truce was not signed until July 1953. Hence, during 1952, at the time when the issue of controls or no controls for the 1953 crop had to be decided, it was not known whether war and defense demands for farm commodities would slacken, or whether they would actually increase. Should a truce agreement not have been achieved—and in 1952 the Communists were still bargaining, haggling, and, I might note, threatening an expanded conflict—the prospect of an overwhelming and overnight demand for farm commodities was a distinct probability. Thus, in 1952, when the Secretary had to decide whether to impose controls, he took the prudent course. He determined that it would be better to chance the prospect of future surpluses, than to run the risk that full-scale fighting might break out again and find our country without the food and fiber necessary to prosecute the conflict to a successful conclusion.

Mr. Brannan warned this would be his course in 1950, and he was of the same opinion, I assume, in 1952. The Washington Post quotes former Secretary Brannan to this effect, in August of 1950, shortly after the Korean war broke out, under the headline, "Bumper Crop Goal of Brannan Again."

Secretary Brannan stated:

> I would rather be guilty of building up a huge surplus of agricultural products than to be blamed for a shortage of food and clothing. I have said that repeatedly; I am stronger than ever of that view now, in view of the critical world situation.

Mr. President, can any man honestly say that the Secretary of Agriculture was wrong. "Be prepared" is a motto wisely adopted by the Boy Scouts of America. It is a motto founded on wisdom. It is the keystone of our present defense program. I think the only prudent thing the Secretary could do in 1952, when the truce talks were floundering and the decision on controls had to be made, was to plan for the worst, and hope that the best would happen. That is precisely what he did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, can 90 percent of parity be blamed for this? Most emphatically not. The cry of our Government was for more production, more food and fiber: "Food and fiber will win the war," they were told.

Without controls, these farmers produced. Acting at the behest of their Government, they coaxed from their lands an abundance of food and fiber which, had the truce in Korea not been signed, could have well meant the difference between survival or annihilation of American troops battling on that bloody peninsula.

Now, however, we are being told that our farmers, in effect, should be "punished" for overproducing. We are being told that 90 percent of parity price supports are to blame for our surpluses.

If ever a Secretary of Agriculture has been guilty of politicalizing our agriculture, and misrepresenting the facts to our people, then the man who now holds that office should bear that guilt.

Besides his untrue prognostications as to what future years would bring—his optimistic predictions as to what 1953, 1954, and 1955 would bring in the way of increased farm income—Secretary Benson has not proved himself sympathetic to the administration of the farm program which was the law of the land at the time he assumed his office.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to repudiate this relentless politicalizing of our farmers' serious plight. I remind the Senate that the conference bill meets the President's criteria laid down in his April 4 press conference. I state to my colleagues, in all good faith, that the conference has done its level best; we have written a compromise bill which, if administered properly, will be of substantial and immediate assistance to our farmers.

I shall be the first to admit that it is not a rubber stamp of what Secretary Benson, in his doubtful agricultural wisdom, has determined to be best for the farmers. It is nevertheless a bill which, in the judgment of the majority of the conference committee, comes as close as is practically possible toward assuring our farmers of relief, both immediate and long-range. It is a bill the President can and should sign, and I believe he knows so. The fallacious cry raised from the panelled offices of the Secretary of Agriculture to the effect that 90 percent of parity, as written into this bill, will increase production is pure unadulterated buncombe.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the fact that the conference bill must be adopted if our farmers are to avoid the unhappy fate of economic strangulation in an economy which is bursting at the seams in other respects. If the President is a reasonable, realistic man—and I believe he is—then he will sign this bill.

When he signs it, then his next official act should be to obtain the services of one who will administer the bill in accord with the will of the Congress. It would seem to me that Mr. Benson has disqualified himself from administering this program, inasmuch as he declared, only brief hours after the conferees came into agreement, that their report was unacceptable to him. Nothing seems to be acceptable to Mr. Benson, except a continuation of the present program which has spelled disaster to many farmers.

The office of the Secretary of Agriculture needs an administrator who is in harmony with a price-support program; the farmers of our Nation who have seen their income shrink by more than $3 billion since 1952, who have watched the parity ratio plummet from 100 in 1952 to 80 as of January of 1956, deserve a Secretary of Agriculture who will administer the program enacted by Congress in a sympathetic manner.

The conference bill offers our farmers hope for increased income in 1956. It provides our President with a soil-bank program of his own choosing, which he says can be made effective in 1957, since it is a little late for it to become fully effective this year. It in no way, form, or manner involves an increase in production, since acreage allotments have already been fixed and would remain unchanged under this bill. Only income, stimulated by 90 percent of parity price supports on heavily curtailed production, would rise.

If this program is administered wisely and sympathetically, I think it can bring our farmers much relief this year, much more relief next year, and perhaps a return to full economic vigor in subsequent years. If it is placed in the hands of a Secretary who has already passed judgment upon it and found it unacceptable, then it can only bring more of the same economic disaster which has already been visited upon our farmers in such abundance.

This bill must go to the White House, Mr. President; it must be signed into law. It must be made operative as quickly as possible. It is the very least our farmers deserve.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clippings to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times of October 28, 1950]

BRANNAN WARNS FARMERS THEY MUST PRODUCE OR FACE FURTHER CONTROLS, HE SAYS

DENVER, October 27.—Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan put this issue directly to the farmer here tonight: Produce or face further controls.

"We need more meat, wool, and feed grains," Mr. Brannan said soon after arriving in his home State to help carry the Democratic campaign, "and the best way for farmers to avoid controls in time of need is to produce fully those items we require."

He admitted that our food reserves are not sufficient to feed all the world. The said, "we must give to countries such as Korea, the know-how to eventually produce their own food as well as temporary supplies."

[From the Wall Street Journal of October 4, 1950]

FARM CROP SWITCH: FEDERAL PLANNERS DO ABOUT FACE—WILL ASK BIGGER OUTPUT IN 1951—ALL CURBS OFF FOR NEXT YEAR ON COTTON PLANTING—TALK OF MORE RICE, CORN, MEAT—WHEAT GOAL IS ALSO LIFTED

(By Kenneth Scheibel)

WASHINGTON.—"About face" is the order of the day at the Agriculture Department.

After 2 years of trying to reduce crops—in a vain effort to stave off mounting surpluses

of everything from wheat and butter to tung nuts—the Agriculture Department will give farmers new, higher crop goals to aim at in 1951.

The trend was spotlighted yesterday when the Agriculture Department dropped all curbs on cotton production in 1951.

Final figures won't come out until next month when Agriculture Department officials hold their annual National Farm Outlook Conference, at which they tell State and local farm leaders what's what in the farm world for the coming year. But right now they're aiming at a 10-percent boost for most crops, while goals for some, like cotton, are being hiked as much as 50 percent or more over this year's output.

MORE ACREAGE

The switch will mean a drastic easing in the rigid acreage restrictions which were slapped on basic crops this year. In some cases, like cotton, the curbs will be dropped entirely. Meantime, farm planners are talking of boosting acreage allotments on rice and corn, to get more production. Greater wheat output next year has already been ordered by Agriculture Secretary Brannon, who ruled out previous plans to trim planting.

Why the reversal? Agriculture Department spokesmen give a variety of answers: Larger crops are needed because of the stepped-up military mobilization. They're needed to help hold down prices of food and to meet the needs of the ever-increasing population—say the planners.

GOALS FOR NEXT YEAR

Here's the Agriculture Department's 1951 goal for each of the major crops:

Wheat: Next year Secretary Brannan wants farmers to produce about 150 million more bushels of wheat than this year. That would mean about 10 billion extra loaves of bread. He's asking for a wheat crop of 1,150,000,000 bushels, compared with a little more than 1 billion bushels turned out this year.

Before the Korean war broke, Mr. Brannan planned to cut next year's wheat acreage to between 60 million and 65 million acres. Now he's asking for 72,800,000 acres.

The 1951 goal, plus 417 million bushels carried over from this year, would cover estimated exports and military needs and provide a safe reserve margin, Mr. Brannan says. Some private grain men say it may mean a burdensome surplus. The average support rate for 1951 wheat has been set at $1.99 a bushel, compared with $1.95 this year.

Cotton: In dropping all curbs on cotton output next year, Mr. Brannan urged growers to produce 16 million bales of the white fiber. That would be 60 percent more than this year's low crop which was badly hit by insect damage. It's indicated at around 9,982,000 bales. This crop, plus present carryover supplies, aren't considered enough to meet United States civilian and military needs, exports and reserves. On the basis of past average yields, farmers will have to sow 25 million to 30 million acres for 1951 if they're to produce the 16 million bales Mr. Brannan wants. They planted 20 million acres this year.

Agriculture Department budget watchers have their fingers crossed about the whole scheme. Helter-skelter production of cotton next year could ruin currently high prices. Committed now to support cotton prices at a high level in 1951, Uncle Sam might wind up owning millions of bales.

MORE CORN

Corn: Agriculture Department officials would like farmers to plant 90 million acres of corn next year, compared to this year's 84 million acres. This should produce a little more than 3,200 million bushels of the grain, against this year's crop of 3,162 million bushels.

Corn production has to remain high, the planners say, as protection against a runaway in the price of meat. The country's supply of pork chops and sirloin steaks depends on the supply of corn for feed, the experts add.

Figures for the corn crop are still tentative, and there's a good chance they'll be hiked even further. Mr. Brannan's cohorts are trying to come up with a goal that will sidestep the possibility of a glutted market and still give them enough grain to keep consumer prices of livestock, poultry, and dairy foods from climbing.

NOT ENOUGH TO GO ROUND

Meat: This energy food is one both the housewife and Federal food experts would like to see more of. "With lots of money in the public's pocketbooks, and with a growing military program, there just isn't enough to go around," say the experts. "The public is buying even the highest-priced cuts as fast as it can get its hands on them."

Farm planners would like to see steak and chop production hiked sharply. This year beef production has amounted to about 63 pounds per person. In 1951, they want to see output boosted to 65 or 66 pounds per person.

Last year pork production was about 67.6 pounds per person. This year it's expected to average about 70 pounds. And the experts are asking farmers to aim at production of between 73 and 75 pounds of pork per person in 1951.

About 8.7 pounds of veal went to each meat eater in 1949, compared with an estimated 8 pounds this year. Experts are hoping for a 1951 production figure of 9 pounds of veal per person.

A BLUE NOTE

One blue note in the meat picture is lamb. Prospects for increasing the amount of super-costly lamb chops are not so good.

Since 1942, United States sheep flocks have shrunk 50 percent and experts say the downtrend will probably continue. Farmers find easier and more lucrative ways of making a living than growing sheep. In 1949, there were only 4.1 pounds of lamb for each of us. There will be about 3.9 pounds this year, and a shade less next year, officials say.

Poultry: The experts are calling for a little more turkey and chicken on dining-room tables next year. This year poultry is being eaten at an annual rate of about 29.3 pounds per person. Next year, the prediction is for 30 pounds.

Fruit: Increased fruit production in 1951 is a must, say the Agriculture Department pundits. The short crops this year, especially of peaches, pears, and citrus fruit, brought supplies to the lowest level since 1943. With attractive prices in the offing, growers are expected to have bigger crops next year, unless they run into bad weather and plant diseases as they did this year.

Lifting of all Government curbs on United States cotton production in 1951 was expected by cotton merchants who anticipate a dangerously low supply of the staple by next spring.

The Government slashed cotton acreage this year to reduce expected surpluses but prospects for a surplus vanished when the Korean war greatly increased demand for cotton goods. At the same time the boll weevil for the second successive year is taking a heavy toll of the crop.

As a result dealers feel the 1950 cotton crop will shrink to around 9 million bales compared with the big 1949 production of 16,128,000 bales. A 9 million bale crop would not even cover domestic consumption, currently running at a rate of better than 10 million bales a year.

In addition to calling for a big crop next year the Department of Agriculture is expected to limit the volume of cotton exports to assure supplies for the domestic textile mills next year until the new crop starts moving in the second half of 1951.

Dealers estimate that if no restrictions were placed on the distribution of cotton, the carryover stock on August 1 next year could be under 1 million bales. The carryover on August 1 (start of the crop season) this year was 6,700,000 bales.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 20, 1951]

1951 CROPS MAY FALL SHORT OF UNITED STATES NEEDS—OUTLOOK IS MOST DISTURBING IN CORN, WITH PLANTINGS SEEN 5 PERCENT BELOW ACREAGE GOALS—WHEAT PROVES EXCEPTION—AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT SAYS FEARS OF LABOR SHORTAGE BALKED EXPANSION PLANS

WASHINGTON, March 19.—A Department of Agriculture report indicated today that this year's production of vital food and livestock feed crops may fall considerably short of the Nation's expanding needs under the defense program.

The outlook was most disturbing in the case of corn—the major raw material for production of meat, dairy and poultry products. These are the foods most in demand and bringing the highest prices at retail stores.

The Department said fears of a shortage of labor at harvesting time and a reluctance to plow up lands which have been taken out of cultivation and put into grass in recent years appears to be holding down plans for crop expansion.

In the case of corn, the department had urged plantings of at least 90 million acres compared with 84,370,000 planted last year. Today's report—based upon farmers' plans as of March 1—showed a prospective acreage of only 85,694,000.

PROSPECTS FOR CORN

At relatively high average yields per acre, such plantings would produce a corn crop of only 3,050,000,000 bushels. The Department has said that at least 3,590,000,000 bushels will be needed to maintain current levels of meat, dairy and poultry production.

Reserve supplies of corn are dwindling under a rapidly increasing livestock feeding program, and consequently would not be large enough to make up the possible deficit in this year's crop.

[From Newsweek of October 16, 1950]

COTTON SHORTAGE

King Cotton last week was in a parlous state—from an overdose of planning. The patient would survive, but it would take a strenuous resuscitation effort.

The trouble had its origin more than a year ago, when Congress, after a protracted debate, passed a bill authorizing the Department of Agriculture to limit cotton acreage (for price-support purposes) and impose strict marketing quotas. Those who had planted the crop over the longest period got the biggest acreage allotments, but many southern farmers, who benefited from the law, didn't use the allotments received. Following long-standing Agriculture advice, they diversified their crops, resting the land before the next cotton planting.

Result: the smallest harvest since 1946 from the smallest acreage planted to cotton since 1886. This week the Agriculture Department estimated the 1950 cotton crop at 9,869,000 bales. Officials had been confident, however, that a yield like this, backed by a stockpile of 7 million bales, would avert a shortage.

Their optimism was short lived. Consumption had already been running well ahead of production, when the Korean war and the long-range defense program upset the market. Suddenly, agriculture was faced with a demand for 16 million bales of cotton; this year's short crop and all the surplus would be needed. Last week, Secretary

Brannan, after denouncing the "unworkability" of the present law, announced the inevitable: There would be no controls of any kind on next year's planting. Farmers were asked to aim at a total output of 16 million bales. As usual, they would enjoy price supports—probably at 90 percent of parity.

First reaction from cotton growers was surprisingly gloomy. A goal of 16 million bales would require planting about 30 million growing acres. There were grave doubts that sufficient manpower, after the draft and defense plants take an increasing toll, would be available to handle that big a job.

While cotton is in the tightest position, Secretary Brannan has made or is about to make upward revisions on quotas of other major farm products. Probably, potatoes and peanuts will be the only two crops kept under rigid control. Wheat acreage for next year already has been raised 12 million, up to 72,800,000 acres; a decision on corn, due by February 1, and rice, by December 31, will undoubtedly open the gate for bigger plantings.

[From the Washington Post of August 18, 1950]

BUMPER CROPS GOAL OF BRANNAN AGAIN

Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan is shooting for another year of bumper farm production in 1951.

"I would rather be guilty of building up a huge surplus of agricultural products than to be blamed for a shortage of food and clothing," he told the Washington Post. "I have said that repeatedly. I am stronger than ever of that view now, in view of the critical world situation."

To accomplish his goal of plenty, no matter what the future may bring, Brannan is expected to:

1. Announce in a few days a liberal level of price supports for 1951 wheat, and later for the other so-called basic crops of corn, cotton, rice, peanuts and tobacco. The Agricultural Act of 1949 gives Brannan authority to reduce price supports this year from the present 90 percent of parity to 85 percent. Brannan is expected to keep wheat, at least, at the present 90 percent level. He doesn't have to announce support levels for the others for several months.

2. Set liberal acreage allotments on crops where he is required to announce Government goals.

Brannan already has fixed liberal acreage allotments for wheat for next year. This is 72.8 million acres, compared with 60,513,000 acres being harvested this year. (More than 18 percent of the acreage sown to wheat this year was abandoned.)

The proposed increase in wheat acreage is particularly striking for States surrounding the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia and West Virginia are asked to plant more wheat for 1951 harvest than ever before. Maryland is asked to plant 383,412 acres, compared with 328,000 this year and 362,000 in 1949; Virginia 508,354 acres compared with 425,000 this year and 472,000 in 1949, and West Virginia 100,943 compared with 70,000 this year and 77,000 last year.

Prospects are for a corn crop this fall only 95.8 percent of the 1949 crop. Wheat will total only 78.8 percent of last year. Oats, barley, and rye are well above last year, but beans are only 84 percent, peas 64 percent and cotton less than 69 percent of 1949.

Demands of the Armed Forces will cut into supplies, so that the bases for figuring supplies is changed since last year. The law requires that Brannan base his acreage allotments for wheat, for instance, upon a total supply—carryover plus the harvest—equal to normal domestic demands, normal export demands plus 30 percent. Brannan is expected to raise that formula considerably.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] 10 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has given a very good and an impartial explanation of the conference report. However, as one of the Senate conferees, I should like to make a few comments.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been laboring with their farm bill for some four months. It has been a daylong job, day after day. I think the bill in its present form represents one of the best pieces of farm legislation considered by Congress for many, many years. It will go a long way toward helping the farmers over the difficult post-war period in which they presently find themselves.

At the present time, farmers are receiving only 39 percent of the consumer's food dollar. Farm prices in general have sunk to approximately 80 percent of parity. In view of that situation, I am quite sure the President of the United States, who, in my opinion, has always been fair, will sign this bill. I certainly hope he will sign it.

Mr. President, I have in my hand the current issue of the U. S. News and World Report. Let me read a paragraph or two from it:

Just ahead is one more round of wage-and-price inflation, one more turn in the upward spiral that's been going on since World War II ended.

Steel wages are to go up by midyear, maybe 20 cents an hour. Steel prices then will be raised about $10 a ton to offset higher wages and other increases in costs. Freight rates are going up 7 percent. Coal wages have just taken an automatic increase. Coal prices are being marked up accordingly.

Aluminum is up. Copper prices are up. Paper prices have been marked higher. Automobile wages will rise automatically. New-car prices on models to come out later this year are likely to be higher.

The article states further that farm machinery and many other things the farmer has to buy will rise in price in the near future.

Everything the farmer has to buy will go up still further in price. That is simply another reason why the failure of the farm bill to become law would create an impossible situation for the farmers of America.

There are about four provisions of the bill which are in major controversy; 4 or 5 provisions to which I think the Secretary of Agriculture has raised objection.

The bill would extend the 90-percent price supports for basic farm commodities for 1 year. This is only a few percentage points higher than the price at which the Secretary himself has indicated he would like to set the price supports for basic farm commodities. He has indicated that he would give cotton producers a support price of 86 percent of parity for this year. He has already set corn prices at 81 percent of parity. He has indicated that the 90-percent support price should be made permanent for the tobacco producers. The producers of other basic farm commodities, with the exception of wheat, would receive price supports of 80 percent of parity, or above. I do not think, therefore, that the objection of the Secretary of Agriculture is well founded. This is only a 1-year provision.

Another important provision of the bill relates to price supports for the feed grains. Feed grains would receive mandatory support at 80 percent of parity. But in order to secure the 85-percent support, a farmer would have to reduce his acreage 15 percent and place that 15 percent acreage cut in the soil bank. After discussing the soil-bank program with farmers in the last 2 weeks, I find that this provision will do more to place land in the soil-bank program than will any other provision of the bill.

The provision will have another very healthy effect, namely, to increase the price of feed grains. At present, cash prices for barley are 70 percent of parity, oats at 73 percent of parity, rye at 59 percent of parity, and grain sorghums at 72 percent of parity. I believe most agricultural authorities in the United States have come to the conclusion that cheap grain prices are largely responsible for the low prices for hogs, beef, and other meats. One of the purposes of the soil-bank program is to improve the prices of feed grains and other farm commodities by curtailing production of these commodities. If we really want to increase the prices of feed grains, this is the best way I know of to do it. If we really want the soil-bank program to work, this is the way to do it.

Another major provision of the bill is that which affects dairy commodities. The bill would raise dairy support prices for butterfat 2.2 cents per pound. This is a reasonable increase in the support price, in view of the ever-increasing costs of operations of the dairy farmers.

Another important provision is the dual parity formula. This is the provision to which I understand the Secretary of Agriculture is most opposed. To me, it is the most important provision in the entire bill.

The modernized parity formula uses as its major factor in determining parity or a fair price the average price which the farmer received during the previous 10-year period. For example, if farm prices continued at 80 percent of parity for the next 10 years, then the 80-percent price which we now have would become the fair price 10 years from now.

For example, the 75-percent support price of 4 years ago is only one-tenth of 1 percent lower than the 80-percent support price today for dairy commodities. We are certainly moving in the wrong direction.

Business uses the favorable period of 1947 to 1949 to determine similar prices. Labor uses exactly the same period—1947 to 1949. To me, this is the most important provision in the bill. I do not know of a greater disservice that could be rendered to agriculture than to subject farmers permanently to the modernized parity formula. If we lost everything else in the bill, save that one provision, agriculture in the end would stand to gain much more. The dual parity formula has its objectionable features, to be sure. It would be far better, how-

ever, to continue this until the Department of Agriculture can develop a parity formula that will be more fair to farmers than the so-called modernized formula.

Whether there will be a domestic parity or two-price system for wheat will depend on whether two-thirds of the wheat farmers approve such a program. That is a tremendous majority. I doubt that two-thirds of the wheat farmers would approve that kind of program. I believe, however, it would be a far better program than the present flexible price-support program, which will remain in effect if the 90-percent support price program in the bill is not approved.

There are many other good provisions of the bill, which the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER] discussed in some detail a while ago.

The bill provides for a trial of the two-price system for rice. I think that is a good provision. I think that kind of program should be tried. It has been discussed for many years. It was a Republican program in the 1920's. It will be found today that a great many farmers still think it is a good idea. I believe such a program should be tried.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks on the domestic parity wheat plan some figures prepared by the Department of Agriculture.

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

The price of wheat has very little influence on the price of a loaf of bread.

In January 1948 the price of wheat was $2.81 a bushel and the national average price of a 1-pound loaf of bread then was 13.8 cents. In February this year (1956) the price of wheat averaged $1.95 and the national average price of a loaf of bread was 17.6 cents. Thus in this 7-year period, while the price of wheat was down 31 percent, the price of the loaf of bread was up 28 percent.

In February of this year, as noted above, the average price of bread was 17.6. The value of wheat in the loaf was 2.7 cents.

If the price of wheat were raised to 90 percent of parity this would add 7 mills to the value of wheat in the loaf, but it cannot be said that this would be passed on to the consumer—if you consider this fact:

In 1955, with the institution of flexible support instead of the old 90 percent, the actual value of the wheat crop (938 million bushels) was placed by the USDA at $1,867 million, whereas if the whole crop had sold at the old 90 percent of parity support level, farmers would have received $2,129 million for the 1955 wheat crop.

Thus the 1955 crop brought $262 million less than would have been the case if the crop had sold at 90 percent of parity. This difference means that wheat was 12 percent (actual value) under 90 percent of parity.

But what happened?

While wheat was down 12 percent under 90 percent, the price of bread in 1955 rose one-half cent a loaf (national average), or 3 percent.

And, while farmers did not receive the $262 million that a 90-percent price would have brought, no advantage whatever accrued to consumers of bread, actually the price of bread advanced. The supposed savings to consumers was more than lost between the farmer and the retail store counter.

This, too, is significant:

In 1914 the average hourly wage of a factory worker would buy 3.5 1-pound loaves of bread; in 1929 it would buy 6.4 loaves; in February of this year the average hourly earnings of an industrial employee would buy 11 loaves of bread.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I do not regard the bill embraced in the pending conference report as perfect, but it is certainly a vast improvement over the present law. It will help farmers greatly to stabilize their income in the future. Certainly it will not immediately give them 100 percent of parity in the market place; it will not give them all they are entitled to; but it will go a long way toward improving farm prices.

I feel that the President of the United States will sign the bill because I feel he is a reasonable man. When he considers all of the factors involved, I hope and feel sure he will sign it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. Before he starts, I understand the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] wishes to introduce a bill and to make a short statement in connection therewith, not to exceed 1 minute.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As I understand, the time consumed by the Senator from Massachusetts will not be charged to either side.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, with that understanding, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Massachusetts 1 minute.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be retained in the Secretary's office until the close of business on April 20 for the purpose of adding additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be held in the office of the Secretary, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Senate Labor Subcommittee on Railroad Retirement, it is my intention to hold hearings on this important legislation at a sufficiently early date to insure action by this Congress before it adjourns.

This bill has already received the unanimous approval of all the standard railway labor organizations, whose responsible recommendations have traditionally been given considerable weight by the Congress in determining the rate and benefit structure of their pension system.

In general, the bill contains four major provisions:

First, all benefits, with the exception of some based upon Social Security levels, are increased 15 percent. Today retired railroad workers receive benefits averaging only $104 a month. Those forced to retire by disability receive on the average only $95 a month; and the averages of the various types of survivor benefits range from $40 to no more than $62 a month. A modest increase of 15 percent is badly needed at once.

Second, to pay for these increased benefits while keeping the Railroad Retirement Fund actuarially sound, the bill would increase both the carrier and the employee contribution by 1 percent of the taxable payroll, making the total contribution of each 7¼ percent or a combined total contribution of 14½ percent of taxable payroll. The results of the latest actuarial valuation of the Railroad Retirement Account admonish against any liberalization of benefits without simultaneously providing additional revenues to defray the cost. We cannot irresponsibly vote generous benefits for those presently retired only to find in subsequent years that we have exhausted the fund to which those presently working had contributed in anticipation of their own secure retirement.

Third, the bill would ease the burden on the active railroad employees of this increased contribution rate by excluding the amount of contributions to the Railroad Retirement Account from income and wages for income-tax purposes. Such a provision is only just. Current railroad employees, who will incur immediately higher costs but no immediate benefits from this bill, will still be paying a higher effective rate of contribution than employees under social security and, of course, private noncontributory pension plans; and the loss in tax revenues to the Federal Government will be considerably less than the loss it would sustain if the system were noncontributory, enabling the carriers to charge off the entire cost as an operating expense on their corporation income tax returns. Even after the increase to 7¼ percent under this bill, the carriers—under current corporate tax rates—would be in effect actually paying only 3.48 percent of payroll while the employee—if he paid any income tax at all, and were within the 20-percent profit—would be paying at an effective rate of 5.8 percent. Employee pension contributions in England and Canada are similarly treated—and the cost of most other industrial pension plans in this Nation, being non-contributory, is entirely deductible for tax purposes.

Fourth, a technical, noncontroversial section of the bill places in the Railroad Retirement Board the authority to make disability freeze determinations for career railroad workers. This classification will facilitate administration of the present act, expedite the adjudication of claims and save administrative costs.

In closing, I should like to urge the Senate to give most careful consideration to the bill that I have introduced in the light of the pressing needs of railroad men and women all over the country for immediate relief. We must not be deterred by any dissuading voices

from keeping our eye on the main objective: that of furnishing needed relief to tens of thousands of retired railroad workers all over the country who are looking to the Congress of the United States for prompt and effective action along the modest lines proposed in this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3616) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, special disability determinations for railroad employees, and for other purposes; and to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 3 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "2.76", "2.07", and "1.38" and inserting in lieu thereof "3.18", "2.38", and "1.59", respectively.

(b) (1) So much of section 3 (e) of such act as precedes *"Provided, however"* is amended to read as follows: "(e) In the case of an individual having a current connection with the railroad industry, the minimum annuity payable shall, before any reduction pursuant to section 2 (a) 3, be whichever of the following is the least: (1) $4.76 multiplied by the number of his years of service; or (2) $79.35; or (3) his monthly compensation;".

(2) The said section 3 (e) of such act is further amended by adding the following: "For purposes of this subsection and all purposes of the Social Security Act, the Board shall have such authority to determine a 'period of disability' within the meaning of section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act, with respect to any employee who will have filed application therefor and (i) have completed 10 years of service or (ii) have been awarded an annuity, as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would have to determine such a period under such section 216 (i) if the employee would meet the requirements of clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (3) of such section by considering all his employment as an employee after 1936 to be 'employment' within the meaning of the Social Security Act, and his quarters of coverage were determined by presuming his compensation in a calendar year to have been paid in equal proportions with respect to all months in which he will have been in service as an employee in such calendar year: *Provided*, That no such period of disability shall be deemed to have begun if the employee died before July 1, 1955: *Provided, further*, That an application for an annuity filed with the Board on the basis of disability shall be deemed to be an application to determine such a period of disability, and such an application filed with the Board on or before the enactment of this proviso, shall, for the purpose of this subsection, be deemed filed after December 1954 and before July 1957: *And, provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board shall have the authority to make such determination on the basis of the records in its possession or evidence otherwise obtained by it, and a determination by the Board with respect to any employee concerning such a 'period of disability,' shall be demed a final decision of the Board determining the rights of persons under this act for purposes of section 11 hereof; and such a determination by the Board of a period of disability for an employee shall, for the purposes of section 5 (k) (2) of this act, be considered a determination of such a period for such employee by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under section 216 (i), and to meet the conditions of section 222, of the Social Security Act."

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 5 (f) (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "and 7 per centum of his or her compensation after December 31, 1946 (exclusive in both cases of compensation in excess of $300 for any month before July 1, 1954, and in the latter case in excess of $350 for any month after June 30, 1954)", and inserting in lieu thereof "7 per centum of his or her compensation paid after December 31, 1946, and prior to July 1, 1956, and 8 per centum of his or her compensation paid after June 30, 1956 (exclusive of compensation in excess of $300 for any month before July 1, 1954, and in excess of $350 for any month after June 30, 1954)."

(b) Section 5 (h) of such act is amended by striking out "$30", "$160", and "$14" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$34.50", "$184", and "$16.10", respectively.

(c) Section 5 (k) (1) of such act is amended by striking out the phrase "for the purposes of sections 203 and 216 (i) (3) of that act" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "for the purposes of section 203 and, with respect to an employee who will have completed less than 10 years of service, section 216 (i) (3) of that act."

(d) Section 5 (k) (3) of such act is amended by inserting in the first sentence after the word "service" the words ", of determinations under section 3 (e) of this act, or under section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act, of a 'period of disability' within the meaning of such section 216 (i)," and after the phrase "this section" the phrase ", section 3 (e) of this act,".

(e) Section 5 (l) (10) of such act is amended by striking out "40", "10", "$14", "$33.33", "$25", and "$13.33" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "46", "11½", "$16.10", "$38.33", "$28.75", and "$15.33", respectively.

SEC. 3. All pensions under section 6 of the Railroad Retirement Act, all joint and survivor annuities and survivor annuities deriving from joint and survivor annuities under that act awarded before July 1, 1956, and all annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 are increased by 15 percent.

SEC. 4. (a) Sections 3201, 3202 (a), 3211 and 3221 of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act are each amended by striking out "after December 31, 1954" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "after June 30, 1956", and by striking out "after 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "after June 1956."

(b) (1) Sections 3201 and 3221 of such act are each amended by striking out "6¼ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "7¼ percent."

(2) Section 3211 of such act is amended by striking out "12½ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "14½ percent."

SEC. 5. Sections 3201 and 3211 of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act are each further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amount of the tax imposed on the income of any individual by this section shall be excluded from such individual's gross income for purposes of chapter 1 and from individual's 'wages' for purposes of chapter 24."

SEC. 6. (a) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) (1) of the first section of this act and by subsection (b) of section 2 shall be effective only with respect to annuities (not including annuities to which section 3 applies) accruing for months after June 1956. The amendments made by subsection (e) of section 2 shall be effective only with respect to annuities accruing for months after June 1956 and lump-sum payments (under sec. 5 (f) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937) in the case of deaths occurring after June 1956. Section 3 shall be effective only with respect to pensions due in calendar months after July 1956 and annuities accruing for months after June 1956.

(b) The amendments made by section 4 shall be effective only with respect to compensation paid after June 30, 1956, for services rendered after such date. The amendments made by section 5 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1956, but only with respect to compensation paid after such date for services rendered after such date.

SEC. 7. Section 11 (c) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is hereby amended by inserting after the phrase "the Board", where this phrase appears the third time in that section, the following: "and expenses, tuition, and salaries of employees designated by the Board to attend courses of instructions or training at institutions whether or not conducted by the United States."

SEC. 8. The amendments made by sections 1 (b) (2) and 2 (d) hereof shall be effective with respect to annuities accruing for months after June 1955.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I had hoped Congress might pass and send to the President's desk a farm bill which would materially improve the lot of the farmers this year, and in the succeeding years would increase their income without doing violence to any agricultural group or to any class of farmers. It appears that my hopes are not to be realized.

Although the bill as it passed the Senate was bad enough, the work of the conference committee has made it worse.

As the bill now stands, it discriminates against the livestock producer, the dairyman, the fruit grower, the poultryman, and the vegetable grower. It even discriminates against a number of farmers who produce grain and who are supposed to benefit most from the bill.

The bill discriminates against the small farmer in favor of the large producer.

The conferees took from the bill provisions inserted by the Senate for the special protection of the tenant farmer.

They removed the limitations on payments which were in the bill as it passed the Senate so that now the sky is the limit on payments to the big producers.

All the small farmer can look forward to, should the bill become law, is higher costs of production and, in the case of many thousands of farmers, the eventual abandonment of their farms.

The livestock producer will find that the safeguards against mis-use of soil bank acres which were in the Senate bill have been deleted. Certainly, the deletions of such safeguards by the

conferees will do little to discourage the grazing of livestock on soil-bank land.

The cottongrower can get little comfort out of the conference report. Originally, the administration had planned a strong program to regain the domestic and foreign cotton market for the American producer. That program would be smashed by this bill. The welfare of both cotton producers and American cotton manufacturers would be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency.

Any claim that the restoration of 90 percent supports and dual parity, as agreed to by the majority of the conferees, will benefit American agriculture must be made with a disregard for the facts. Agricultural income dropped steadily for 5 years. Almost 90 percent of the drop in farm income took place when rigid supports and dual parity were in effect. All of the recovery in farm prices in recent months has taken place since flexible supports have been in effect.

Now I should like to discuss particularly 2 or 3 provisions of the conference bill.

Some assume that the wheatgrowers will be sitting pretty with the provisions of this bill, especially the domestic parity program for wheat.

A couple days ago, I received a letter from Mr. Herbert Hughes, setting forth the virtues of the domestic parity plan for wheat, as he sees them.

I have no doubt that Mr. Hughes understands the wheat business thoroughly. I understand that he is a large and very successful wheat producer, besides having other successful business interests.

It appears to me, however, that Mr. Hughes views this subject through the eyes of a large producer, and without full knowledge of what the plan he so ardently sponsors would do to the small farmer who grows only a few acres of wheat, and perhaps grows that in rotation with other crops.

I wish to quote from Mr. Hughes' letter, and to point out what some of the things which he thinks would be of benefit to large producers would do to the small wheatgrower or the family-size farm.

First, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Hughes' letter in full made a part of the RECORD, and then I shall quote excerpts from the letter.

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS,
Imperial, Nebr., April 7, 1956.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: Soon you are going to vote on a farm bill. It is important to everyone—the laborer, the businessman, and the farmer. Although I am president of the National Association of Wheat Growers, I am first a dirt farmer, doing much of my own work on an average sized farm.

Because it is so important, I hope you will consider carefully the following facts about domestic parity, the program on which wheat producers have worked for many years and in which we believe sincerely. It is supported by other segments of the wheat industry.

Domestic parity will reduce controls by abolishing the marketing quotas which have been so objectionable to farmers. Small farmers in both commercial and noncommercial areas will be able to produce wheat for feed on their own farms without the penalties which marketing quotas have required. Farmers in commercial areas will be encouraged to produce quality wheat.

The same farmers who in the past have voted on marketing quotas will vote for or against domestic parity. There will be no change in the voting procedure which has been in effect since 1939. The referendum on domestic parity will be held at the same time as the marketing quota referendum and will actually give them a choice between two systems.

The corn producer will benefit from the domestic parity program for wheat because the program will work toward a decreased supply of feed grains. Farmers who have been growing barley, oats, or sorghums on their acres diverted from wheat will gradually shift to the soil bank or back to wheat. As you may know, wheat produces a smaller quantity of feed units per acre than other grains.

Poultry and dairy farmers in feed deficit areas, like the East and Northeast, will benefit because they can then produce their own feed or purchase feed wheat produced locally at a price they can afford to pay.

The taxpayer will benefit because he will be relieved of high-level Government support of wheat prices. Wheat moving into export markets will require vastly reduced export subsidies. Wheat for the feed market will carry a very low support level.

The grain trade will benefit because the domestic parity program works toward getting Government out of the business of buying, storing, and selling wheat.

Labor and business will benefit because this program will help stabilize the income of the wheat grower at a level where he will be a good customer for the things they make and sell.

Thank you for taking the time to read what I have had to say about domestic parity. As far as the wheat grower is concerned, it is the most important part of the present farm bill. It is the only program, as we see it, that can be counted on to expand markets over the years, and increase income of producers in the market place.

I sincerely hope we will have your support for domestic parity when it comes to a vote.

Respectfully yours,
HERBERT HUGHES, *President.*

Mr. AIKEN. Now let me quote excerpts from this letter:

Domestic parity will reduce controls by abolishing the marketing quotas which have been so objectionable to farmers.

Mr. President, the so-called domestic parity plan will not reduce controls. True, it would eliminate marketing quotas. But it retains acreage allotments and substitutes domestic food quotas for marketing quotas. From the standpoint of the processor who would be required to buy certificates under this plan, controls would be greatly increased. From the standpoint of the small farmer, the controls required by this plan would be much more burdensome than those now in effect.

Again I quote from Mr. Hughes' letter:

Small farmers in both commercial and noncommercial areas will be able to produce wheat for feed on their own farms without the penalty which marketing quotas have required.

All farmers in the noncommercial wheat area are now permitted to grow wheat for use as feed without penalty. The small wheat farmer in the commercial area would be much worse off under this plan. At the present time the small wheat farmer can grow up to 15 acres of wheat, either to use as feed or to sell, without penalty. The so-called domestic parity plan abolishes this 15 acre minimum acreage protection for the small farmer.

Under subsection 379k (c) of the conference bill, the small farmer can be forced to comply with allotments as small as 1 acre—and perhaps even less—as a condition of eligibility for price support and marketing certificates. Even after he complies, the small farmer will receive marketing certificates for only about one-half of his production.

I quote again from Mr. Hughes' letter:

Farmers in commercial areas will be encouraged to produce quality wheat.

There is not one provision in the conference bill that provides any recognition for quality wheat production.

Under section 379 (c), the domestic wheat quota is to be distributed to all wheat growers on the basis of their historical production, without regard to the quality of wheat they have been growing. The man who produces wheat entirely for use as feed would be entitled to receive domestic food certificates in exactly the same proportion as the man who produces a quality wheat that is used for domestic food consumption. The result will be to tax the quality wheat producer for the benefit of the man who now produces feed wheat on a large scale.

The domestic parity plan makes no allowance for the fact that wheat is not a single commodity. There are five major classes of wheat. Some are largely used for human consumption, while others largely go into export, feed, or Commodity Credit storage.

Statistics show the percentage of production used for domestic human food is five times as high for hard red spring wheat, such as is grown in Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana, as it is for white wheat.

I ask unanimous consent to have a table on the use of wheat for domestic flour printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

1942–51 average quantity of United States wheat used for domestic flour [1]

Type of wheat	Percentage of production used as flour	Quantity used as flour (millions of bushels)
Hard Red Winter	39.7	206
Soft Red Winter	52.5	95
Hard Red Spring	61.5	134
Durum	63.2	24
White	12.0	16
Average	43.6	475

[1] Does not include 10 million bushels used for breakfast food.

Mr. AIKEN. The table shows that the percentage of hard red winter wheat used as flour is 39.7 percent; of soft red winter wheat, 52.5 percent; of hard red

spring wheat, 61.5 percent; of durum wheat, 63.2 percent; and of white wheat, 12 percent.

Yet, under this domestic parity plan for wheat, growers who now have 63 percent of their crop used for flour and milling purposes will get certificates to sell only approximately 50 percent of their crop for that purpose, and growers who now produce wheat of which only 12 percent is used for milling purposes will also get certificates entitling them to sell 50 percent of their crop for the full 100 percent parity price.

Is it any wonder that the white wheat producers of certain areas are for a plan which would classify about 50 percent of their production as domestic human food, entitled to 100 percent parity price, when the average amounts so used have been only about 12 percent?

I again quote from Mr. Hughes' letter:

The same farmers who in the past have voted on marketing quotas will vote for or against domestic parity.

This is true, but more farmers will be directly affected by the domestic parity plan. Producers with 15 acres or less have been excluded from voting on marketing quotas because of the 15-acre-quota exemption. But there is no 15-acre exemption under the domestic parity plan. All wheat producers would be affected, but only those with more than 15 acres would be allowed to vote. Over one-half of the total wheat producers in the Nation would be disfranchised. And the percentage of growers who would be entitled to vote on whatever kind of program would be set up to serve their destiny ranges from about 95 percent in the State of North Dakota to only 2 percent in the State of Wisconsin. I repeat, only two percent of the wheat growers in the State of Wisconsin would be permitted to vote on what kind of program they want.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I cannot yield, unless I have more time later.

If there is to be a referendum on this plan, equity would require that small wheat growers, whose very existence is at stake, be allowed to vote. Equity would also require that the producers of corn and other feed grains be permitted to vote since the obvious effect of this plan would be to dump wheat surpluses into the domestic feed market.

I quote again from Mr. Hughes' letter. I am quoting Mr. Hughes particularly because he is president of the National Association of Wheat Growers. Mr. Hughes says:

The corn producer will benefit from the domestic parity program for wheat because the program will work toward a decreased supply of feed grains.

He also says:

Poultry and dairy farmers in feed deficit areas, like the East and Northeast, will benefit because they can produce their own feed or purchased feed wheat produced locally at a price they can afford to pay.

He also says:

Wheat for the feed market will carry a very low support level.

These statements are patently contradictory. The feed grain producer certainly, cannot be benefited by a plan that encourages feed deficit areas to produce their own feed, or a plan that makes feed wheat available so cheaply that feed deficit areas cannot afford to buy other grains, particularly corn. The livestock, poultry, and dairy markets are national markets. Increased production of these products in any area affects all areas.

I quote again from Mr. Hughes' letter:

The grain trade will benefit.

He also says:

Labor and business will benefit.

It is the only program as we see it, that can be counted on to expand markets over the years and increase income of producers in the market place.

Mr. President, any benefits that large wheat farmers might reap as a result of this plan—and it is by no means certain that such benefits would actually materialize—would be at the expense of other farmers. This plan would mean, first, reduced income to the small wheat farmers; second, increased surpluses of feed grains; and third, lower livestock and poultry and dairy prices.

It is extremely doubtful that this plan would result in any appreciable increase in our exports of wheat. We are already meeting competition in the world market by subsidizing wheat exports and by selling wheat for foreign currencies under Public Law 480. The real effect of this proposal would be to dump surplus wheat into the domestic feed market. That could only be done at the expense of other farmers who are trying to make a living out of the production of feed grains for livestock, poultry, and dairy products.

Mr. President, on March 13, in the debate in the Senate on S. 3183, later passed as H. R. 12, a letter was placed in the RECORD to prove that the Canadian wheat growers favored the 3-price wheat plan now included in the conference report. The letter, dated March 12, was sent to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] by the same Herbert J. Hughes; and it will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, on page 4580.

I know that the Senator from Kansas inserted the letter in the RECORD in good faith. However, in a telegram which W. J. Parker, president of the Manitoba Pool Elevators, sent under date of April 10 to the Senator from Kansas, there is specific reference to the March 12 letter of Mr. Hughes; and in the telegram it is pointed out that there is a "misunderstanding between Mr. Hughes and Canadians on this matter." It is quite evident that the Canadian wheat producers are not reassured with respect to the domestic parity program, and repudiate representations that they endorse it.

Mr. President, I have already asked consent of the Senator from Kansas to insert the telegram in the RECORD. Therefore, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram from W. J. Parker to the Senator from Kansas, under date of April 10, 1956, printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference Mr. H. J. Hughes letter March 12 addressed you re two price plan wheat. Canadian farm leaders at Geneva understood Mr. Hughes information re proposed legislation was given us as matter of courtesy. Obviously on meager information given verbally by Mr. Hughes, we were not competent to assess ultimate impact of suggested legislation on our competitive position in international wheat market and no considered opinion was expressed by us. We did not understand that Mr. Hughes had been requested by Secretary Benson to seek Canadian farm leaders' opinion of proposed wheat legislation. I greatly regret the evident misunderstanding between Mr. Hughes and Canadians on this matter and trust you will appreciate our position.

W. J. PARKER,
President, Manitoba Pool Elevators.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, now I wish to refer to the two-price plan for rice. The adoption of this plan might well cost us the Cuban market. Cuba is our most important export market for rice. The plan, in effect, imposes a tax on the processing of rice for consumption in the United States and Cuba. A loophole in this bill would permit Cuba to evade this tax by buying rough rice. The plan would not work satisfactorily without the inclusion of Cuba in the primary market.

The value of the proposed certificate exceeds the tariff preference which the United States now has in the Cuban market. Even if Cuba were to increase the tariff preference on United States rice, our ricegrowers would still lose, as the increased price of rice in Cuba would stimulate increased Cuban production.

The rice plan violates our commitments under the general agreement on tariffs and trade. It is of doubtful constitutionality.

On January 15, 1956, the parity price of rough rice was $5.42 per hundredweight. The cost of 1956 marketing certificates per hundredweight of rough rice—35 percent of parity—is $1.90.

Rice shrinks about one-third in the milling process; therefore the cost of certificates would be roughly $2.50 per hundredweight of milled rice. The United States now has a tariff preference of 90 cents per hundredweight of milled rice in the Cuban market. Thus, the certificate plan would destroy our present preference in the Cuban market, and would create an artificial disadvantage of $1.60 per hundredweight of milled rice.

In the 1954–55 marketing year, Cuba took 3,391,000 hundredweight or 34 percent of our total exports of 9,848,000 hundredweight, milled basis.

The provisions in the conference report for the establishment of base acreages for small grains and mandatory supports for small grains are likely to cause trouble not only for the dairy and poultry producers of the country, who would experience a sharp increase in their production costs, but also for the producers of these grains themselves.

On page 4, paragraph (c) of subtitle A, we find this proviso:

(c) For each year in which an acreage reserve program will be in effect for corn, a farm base acreage shall be established for feed grains. For 1956, in the commercial corn-producing area, such farm base acreage for feed grains shall be the average acreage on the farm planted to grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats, for the three years 1953, 1954, and 1955; and outside the commercial corn-producing area, such farm base acreage for feed grains shall be the average acreage on the farm planted to grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, and corn, for the three years 1953, 1954, and 1955.

Going over to page 22, we find in paragraph (d) of section 408 the following:

The Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support of such feed grains (corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area, grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats) that the producer (1) except in the case of new feed grain farms, devote an acreage on the farm to either the acreage-reserve program for feed grains or the conservation-reserve program equal to 15 percent of the farm base acreage established for such feed grains under section 203 (c) hereof, and (2) not plant a total acreage of such feed grains on the farm in excess of 85 percent of such farm base acreage for feed grains.

Under the provision establishing a base acreage for feed grains, and to qualify for price supports, we find that a very substantial reduction in planning is required for the year 1956.

I have had this matter checked for certain States. There is in the rear of the Chamber a chart showing the percentage by which each State would have to reduce its planting of feed grains in order to qualify for price supports. I shall read into the RECORD some of the percentages. I find that the percentage of reduction from the 1955 planting in each of these States is as follows:

	Percent
Colorado	29
Texas	26
Oklahoma	28
Washington	40
North Dakota	27
New Mexico	35
Montana	30
Missouri	24
Idaho	25
Oregon	26

The result would be about the same in the rest of the country—a 25 to 40 percent mandatory reduction in planting in all States where feed grains are produced and where diversified farming is practiced.

So, in addition to the reduction required in order to establish a base acreage under section 203, we find that under section 408 a further reduction of 15 percent would be necessary if the producer were to get any price support at all for his crop.

For instance, in the State of Washington, in order to qualify for 85 percent of parity price support for oats—or an increase of 15 percent over the present support price as provided for in the conference report a producer of oats or barley in that State would have to reduce his acreage 40 percent. It is obvious that that would be a losing proposition for him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from California to yield additional time to me; I believe that five minutes more will be all that I shall need.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, what I am trying to point out is that, in addition to the reduction required in order to establish a base acreage under section 203, we find that under section 408 a further reduction of 15 percent is necessary if the producer is to get any price support at all for his crop.

Of course, this latter 15 percent reduction would carry some compensation in the form of soil bank payments.

What I am trying to point out is that with oats, barley, and sorghum supported at 70 percent anyway, under the present law, the increased support to 85 percent provided in this conference report would actually mean a considerable reduction in the income of the producer if he had to reduce his planting one-third in order to get an increased 15 percent in supports.

The effect of the mandatory supports for feed grains as I see it not only would mean greatly increased cost of production for the dairyman, the livestock producer, and the poultry grower, but could actually bring about reduced income for the producer of the grain himself.

Congress has now delayed this legislation so that the soil bank can hardly be effective this year. We have good farm laws on the books at the present time. They have not had much opportunity to work up until now; but since the Agricultural Act of 1954 has taken effect with the crops of 1955, we have seen a steady but gradual rise in the farm price level. It has risen quite substantially during the past 3 months. I believe this rise will continue throughout the remainder of this year, although not in a spectacular manner.

The soil bank would have helped, but with the other provisions added by the Senate and the conferees, nearly every agricultural area in the United States would be more harmed than helped by this bill.

It would be better to do the best we can with the program we now have in operation. The bill as it now stands is completely unacceptable to the administration. I shall vote against the conference report, in the interest of American agriculture, and I strongly urge all other Members of the Senate to do the same.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today I am hopeful that we are at the end of what has been a long and trying ordeal.

As we approach the final vote on the new farm bill I ask, with all sincerity, that we pause and give serious thought to what we are trying to do. In the heated debate during the past several weeks fury has replaced reason in some cases, and solutions have been fogged by side issues.

If we keep gnawing the trough there will be no water left.

There is one thing, and one thing alone, that we are setting out to do in writing new farm legislation. We are attempting to help the farmers of this Nation regain their rightful place in our overall economy.

Our farm economy is almost $3 billion a year short of what it should be. It is the responsibility of Congress to bring about conditions that will channel this much money back into the farm economy. In plain words, we must help increase farm income.

For many months now I, along with other members of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, have heard many farmers tell us what their problems are. We have heard many ideas as to how the problems could be solved.

After months of hearings and many hours and weeks of deliberation, we have a farm bill before us. I doubt if any Senator would say that it is a perfect bill. Certainly, there are many things in it that I do not like; but taken as a whole, it will help increase income on this year's crops. After all, that is what we are trying to do.

Unfortunately, I am afraid that we have spent about as much time talking about politics as the issue itself.

To put it bluntly, the effect this legislation has on the November elections is unimportant. The important thing is to get additional purchasing power into the hands of the farmers, and get it there immediately.

In all the debate I have heard on this subject my ears have become a little threadbare with all the talk about whether or not this phrase or that clause is in line with the order of the day from the White House.

Day in and day out, as I listened to debate on this legislation, I was told that this section or that provision would not meet the approval of the President. I heard that this or that would mean a veto.

In all the talk and debate it was hard to find that the administration was concerned about what would meet the needs of the farmer. Instead it has been a question of what would meet the needs of the White House.

From what I have seen and heard, one might think that we were writing a private Eisenhower bill instead of a national farm bill.

Personally, I do not know whether the President would veto the bill as it is now written. I have a strong suspicion that when the time comes he must swallow his pride and sign the bill for the sake of millions of farmers. At least, I hope so.

If the 90-percent parity provision of the bill is against the principles that guide the President, I hope he will see fit to go back to the principles on which he campaigned in 1952.

With no ifs, ands, or buts, to use his own words, he was for the principles involved in this bill in 1952. I can see no reason why the principles of 1952 will not work in 1956.

With these thoughts in mind, I sincerely believe that it is time for us to get down to brass tacks and approve the conference report immediately. Until we do, we are dilly-dallying with the economic well-being of millions of people.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in my judgment, the Senate conferees have done the very best they could. I desire to thank and congratulate our conferees. They have improved the bill as it left the Senate.

I cannot vote for the conference report, for several reasons. I think the economy of the State of Mississippi is dependent upon cotton to a greater extent than is the economy of any other State in the Union. We have had a system by which there has been continual acreage reduction. We have screamed for 90 percent of parity; but, when we consider the acreage reduction, the farmers' income has been drastically less than 90 percent of parity. Today, with acreage reduction, it stands at approximately 52 percent of parity income.

This conference report would continue that system. In my candid judgment it would destroy the American cotton industry.

There are several things which are fundamental. A few years ago the American cotton industry exported between 6 million and 8 million bales of cotton a year, and enjoyed between 50 and 60 percent of the world's export cotton market. Today that has shrunk to less than 30 percent; and if we follow the street we are now following, which is a one-way street, the acreage allotments will become less and less each year.

We have seen that, as we have had acreage reductions in the United States, foreign producers, largely financed by American capital, have expanded their acreage and have taken over markets which were formerly enjoyed by the American cotton farmer.

There is one fundamental factor which underlies the whole program, and that is that the United States Government, with the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation in excess of 7 million bales of cotton—stocks which will reach in time, in my judgment, 10 million bales—must put on an export sales program to assist the American cotton grower in regaining and expanding his share of the cotton market. Such a provision was in the bill which passed the Senate. Not by the fault of the Senate conferees, that provision was deleted from the bill.

What has happened? We have held an umbrella over foreign cotton production. The road is now open for a continuation of that acreage expansion.

It was said that an export sales program would be announced. So it was. However, an export sales program by administrative order is not as effective as an export sales program which is written into the law.

The State Department, as I have said a number of times on the floor of the Senate, is not an American agency of government; it protects and promotes the interests of foreign agriculture against the welfare of the American people. I know that since the export sales provision was stricken from the bill, the State Department has been bringing pressure against the export sales program which would reduce its effectiveness in the interest of the American farmer.

Mr. President, 5 or 6 large international cotton organizations are financing an increase in cotton production in Latin America. I am sorry to say they have more influence in the State Department than has American agriculture.

Therefore I say I do not blame the Senate conferees. They did what they could do. Nevertheless, an export sales program is fundamental to the preservation of the American cotton industry and such a provision should be in the law. It has been stricken from the bill.

I said that we were on a one-way street, that acreage allotments would get lower and lower each year, and that the American cotton industry was on the verge of collapse. We must meet foreign competition abroad; we must have the aid of the American Government, and we must meet the competition of synthetics in the United States on a quality basis.

Under the bill as agreed to in conference, foreign cotton growers will again expand their acreage. It is fundamental that we must prevent further expansion in cotton production abroad. Last year Egypt increased its acreage by 250,000 acres. India increased its acreage by 1,200,000 acres, and it has a program for a much larger acreage expansion. In the past 4 years Mexico has increased its acreage by a million acres, practically doubling its production. These increases have come about at the expense of the American cottongrower.

While we have reduced our acreage, in an attempt to keep world supplies within world demand, foreign countries, which have enjoyed the benefits of our price-support program, have increased their acreage, and have taken our markets away from us.

Let me say that while we will export about 2 million bales of cotton this year, against a normal export of about 6 million bales, half of the 2 million bales will be given away under different aid programs.

The largest market we have left is the domestic market, which amounts to about 9 million bales of cotton a year.

When we fix a price, as the bill does, at a rigid 90 percent, we hold an umbrella over the producers of synthetic fibers, and we deny the cotton producer the opportunity to compete for the domestic market in the fiber field.

Synthetic fiber producers will proceed with current and future planning for expansion under the provisions of the bill. In 1955 alone the equivalent of 978,000 bales of cotton were supplanted by the increase in rayon production. These fibers now enjoy the equivalent of 4,800,000 bales of cotton in the domestic fiber market of the United States. That is largely because the American grown cotton has been priced too high.

Beginning a year ago, and for a 3-year period, contracts were let, and there are now in production new rayon plants to the tune of $155 million. The new rayon production will, in my judgment, supplant about 2 million bales of cotton in the domestic fiber market.

What we must do in the cotton industry is to be more competitive with synthetic fibers in the United States and to be more competitive in the international market. We must have the aid and assistance of the United States Government. When there was stricken from the bill the provision for a mandatory export sales program, which would regain and recapture and expand our normal share of the world cotton market, there was stricken the provision which would be of the greatest benefit to the American cottongrower.

For these reasons, and for the reason that the price support is again linked to seven-eighths inch Middling cotton, I must vote against the conference report. The latter provision would permit the discount in the markets of the short, low-grade cotton, which is not merchantable, and which is grown largely in one congressional district in the United States. It is grown largely for the loan. It is grown largely to be sold to the United States Government. We accumulated a great surplus of such cotton, and that surplus reduced the acreage allotments in every cotton-growing State in the United States.

Mr. President, we shall have, under this bill, the same old surplus which has brought the American cotton industry to the brink of destruction. What we must realize is that acreage allotments must be based on markets, and that in the long run they will be based on markets. Acreage allotments must be based, also, upon our ability to sell a commodity which in the long run will pay. It goes without saying that farmland values will be based upon the market for farm products. So, Mr. President, the road which we must follow is a road which will expand markets and place the cotton industry upon a sound basis.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I shall cast my vote against the conference report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, after consultation with the acting majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that we may have a quorum call without the time being taken out of either side.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am going to vote for the adoption of the conference report. Personally, I feel it is imperative that farm legislation be enacted at this session of Congress. In the face of rising national income, net farm income has fallen 32 percent in the past 4 years.

Despite the strong demand for farm products, the farmer is caught in his own quicksand of surplus production. While it is true that this rather complex piece of legislation affects agriculture directly, it will also affect indirectly all segments of our Nation's economy.

The conference report before the Senate not only carries temporary relief for the farmer this year, but carries many provisions which will be of permanent benefit.

I have no doubt that every Member of this body can find some objectionable feature in the conference report bill, but even one or two or more objectionable features, in my opinion, do not warrant the rejection of this report.

The farmer expects this Congress to enact farm legislation, and this is our opportunity to do so. President Eisenhower, in a special farm message to Congress, stated:

> Although agriculture is our basic industry, farm families find their prices and incomes depressed amid the Nation's greatest prosperity.
>
> An oversupply of commodities drives down prices as mounting costs force up from below, generating a severe price-cost squeeze.
>
> Remedies are needed now, and it is up to the administration and the Congress to provide them swiftly. As we seek to go forward, we must not go back to old programs that have failed utterly to protect farm families.

This conference report provides for a 90 percent parity for this year, 1956. It creates for the first time a soil bank program which I think is not only timely but has great long-range possibilities. However, I do not see how it can be effective in getting needed financial relief into the farming areas this year.

Those of us who are familiar with farming operations realize that at this season of the year, the farmers have already made their plans for the planting and harvesting of their crops. It is for that reason that I believe there is sound justification for a loan price support program which will assure the farmers 90 percent of parity for this year. Next year the farmers will have an opportunity to make plans to place some of their acreage in the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve programs of the soil bank.

I do not believe that either rigid or flexible parity is the solution to the farm program. We have tried both. It is my opinion that we must begin to take a new look at the entire farm picture, with a view of securing for the farmer his fair share of the national income, based on domestic consumption.

This conference report provides machinery for the marketing of two of our farm commodities on a domestic parity or domestic consumption basis.

I believe the day has passed when we can expect the American farmer to buy his farm machinery, his labor, pay his taxes and pay for his utilities on a domestic price level and then even suggest that we have a farm price parity level which will make him sell his commodities at a world level market.

It is for that reason that I believe a sound program for American agriculture must be built on a commodity by commodity approach. In other words, we must fashion a weapon to meet the problems and the needs of each commodity.

Mr. President, the Senate this afternoon has an opportunity to vote for legislation which will give some temporary relief to agriculture, establish for the first time in the Nation's history a soil-bank program and provide for domestic parity on two of our important farm commodities.

The conference bill, if enacted, will give the farmer an opportunity to share in our expanding national prosperity, and, in all fairness, I do not see how we can do less.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I will yield if I have time remaining.

Mr. WELKER. I have noted with much interest the remarks of my esteemed colleague from Kansas. I know he feels, as I feel, that the farmer must be helped. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Kansas can tell me wherein the farmers of Idaho will be helped by the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CARLSON. May I have an additional minute?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the great interest the junior Senator from Idaho takes in agriculture and in legislation in behalf of the farmer.

The soil-bank program provided for in the bill has, I think, the possibility of affording long-range benefit to agriculture and to the Nation as a whole; it is a most important step.

I think the 90 percent of parity provision will provide some relief for this year. I do not think the rigid or the flexible parity program is the answer.

The program adopted provides an approach, commodity by commodity, including wheat, which I know is raised in the State of the Senator from Idaho. I am confident that this is the kind of program we shall have to establish in the Nation if we expect to improve the condition of wheat farmers on the basis of domestic production.

Mr. WELKER. I voted with the Senator from Kansas for the parity plan for wheat. I have some scruples with respect to whether or not I voted correctly. Certainly the Senator from Kansas knows the conditions in my State well enough to realize that the soil bank provision of the bill cannot and will not affect my State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional minute allotted to the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WELKER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that I may have one additional minute.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The time to be allotted to the Senator from Idaho would have to be yielded by the other side.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator from Kansas wish to comment on my statement?

Mr. CARLSON. I have no doubt that agriculture in the great State of Idaho is somewhat different from agriculture in the great Midwest areas, where mostly dry farming is carried on. At the same time, the agricultural program is practically universal. If the junior Senator from Idaho has some better suggestions, then when the opportunity presents itself, I shall vote for them. But this is the only bill before the Senate at present. That is why I am supporting it.

Mr. WELKER. I think that is why I shall have to support it; but the Senator said in his remarks that we would look the matter over. What I fear is that we may look ourselves out of business. That is the sad part of the matter.

I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I rise to speak against the conference report on H. R. 12. I voted for H. R. 12, as amended by the Senate, on final passage, because I believed there was a chance that the conference committee would present a sound, acceptable bill. This it did not do, in my opinion.

First, the Senate conferees, by agreeing to an extension of 90 percent price supports on the so-called basic commodities, have rendered the President's soil bank program ineffective for all practical purposes. In my opinion, producers, especially of wheat and cotton, simply will find it more profitable to continue and even increase their present production at the high support level rather than to place a portion of their acreage allotment land in the acreage reserve.

The reason for this is that certain fixed costs of production must be met by the producer whether all of his lands are in production or whether a portion of them are kept idle in a soil bank. Since the difference between total costs per acre and total returns per acre is much less at lower price support levels than they would be at the proposed higher support levels, farmers will be more likely to put allotment lands in the acreage reserve at lower support levels. High rigid price supports cancel any possible benefit from the soil bank program, in my opinion.

Second, unless farmers do put a substantial part of their allotment lands in the reserve, we can, at 90 percent price support, expect continued production in excess of our needs of these so-called basic commodities, especially wheat, cotton, and corn. We can also expect to

see the continued production of feed grains greatly in excess of our needs, with increasing livestock numbers and further price declines for beef cattle, hogs, poultry, eggs, and lambs.

As the President pointed out in his economic report:

> Government restrictions on acreage of several crops, notably wheat and cotton, have insufficiently curtailed production of these crops and have led to expansion of others. Huge carryovers have piled up, far beyond liberal estimates of desirable reserves. Government holdings acquired under price-support programs have kept rising, in spite of intensive and effective efforts to dispose of surpluses * * *.
>
> The production-control programs that have been operated for basic commodities, which account for [only] about one-fourth of the total income from farm marketings, have indirectly contributed to lower incomes for the producers of other important commodities. Farmers with acreage diverted from basic crops have deemed it more profitable to produce feed grains or other crops, even at lowered support prices * * *. Many have expanded their hog and beef cattle numbers to use the additional feed thus produced, adding further to the expansion induced by relatively favorable livestock prices in earlier years * * *. These factors have been largely responsible for lower prices of beef cattle and sharply lower prices of hogs in 1955, and a continued increase in production of dairy products.
>
> Unrealistic supports have * * * overstimulated production of several basic products in this country * * * (pp. 54, 56, and 57).

The large inventories of basic commodities and feed grains which the Commodity Credit Corporation has on hand can be directly traceable to the stimulus given their production by 90 percent of parity price supports.

According to the USDA's most recent release on the status of price-support operations, the CCC had in its inventories as of February 29, 1956: 846,270,626 bushels of wheat, valued at $4,309,484,973; 7,214,630 bales of upland cotton, valued at $1,317,658,448; 744,618,750 bushels of corn, valued at $1,291,422,848.

Its inventories as of the same date contained the following quantities of feed grains: 17,942,345 hundredweight of grain sorghums, valued at $53,643,952; 24,696,408 bushels of barley, valued at $36,314,441; 32,032,375 bushels of oats, valued at $27,985,658.

Such an abundant production of feed grains induced by a rigid 90-percent support program on the basics, especially wheat and cotton, the last few years not only has resulted in surpluses of these commodities, but substantial increases in livestock numbers and lower livestock prices. For example, on January 1, 1956, cattle numbers reached a new high of 97.5 million head. Hog numbers were 9 percent above those of a year earlier.

Yet, even though these so-called basics—wheat, cotton, rice, and peanuts, to mention a few—have had mandatory price supports, producers of livestock products have had to get along without price support, even though today the average prices received by them as a percentage of the parity price is lower than the basics I have mentioned. As of March 15, 1956, the producers of the following crops were getting the following supports:

Upland cotton, 90 percent of parity.
Wheat, 82 percent.
Rice, 82 percent.
Peanuts, 90 percent.

Yet, as of the same date, the producers of the following livestock were getting the following supports:

Beef cattle, only 68 percent of parity.
Calves, only 71 percent of parity.
Chickens, only 77 percent of parity.
Hogs, only 58 percent of parity.
Lambs, only 70 percent of parity.
Sheep, only 66 percent of parity.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I am speaking on very limited time, and I wished to get the whole statement in the RECORD. I shall yield at the conclusion of my statement, if I have time.

Mr. President, it should be realized that the production of these basic commodities provides farmers with only 26 percent of their net income. Yet, during the fiscal years 1932–55, the Federal Government has spent $5,632,700,000 on programs primarily for the stabilization of prices and income for basic commodities. Yet, in spite of this cost and preferential price-support treatment, 90-percent price support on the basic commodities has utterly failed to prevent net farm income from declining. As I pointed out in my minority views to the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

> High rigid supports have not facilitated adjustment of production to effective demand; and being applicable to only the basic commodities which provide commercial farmers with only 26 percent of their income, they cannot materially raise farm prices or total net farm income (p. 67).

But there is another reason, as well, why the 90 percent rigid support provision of the conference report will not raise farm income, just as price supports have not done so in the past: Namely, two-thirds of our farms, which are mostly family-type, produce so very little for sale that they cannot materially benefit from price support programs, regardless of the level of price support, be it 75, 90 or 100 percent of parity.

Mr. President, section 104 of the conference report, which eliminates the new parity formula for determining the price support level on basic commodities, will in and of itself serve to keep the support level of the basic commodities at or near 90 percent of old parity and about 100 percent of new parity. Therefore, even though at the end of 1956 the flexible support formula will again be operative, the actual support levels will reflect old parity and are likely to be above 90 percent of new parity which is now in effect for the basic commodities. For example based upon January 15 prices:

Wheat would be supported at 103 percent of new parity.

Corn would be supported at 100 percent of new parity.

Cotton would be supported at 91 percent of new parity.

So with this provision in the bill, after 1956, we can expect farmers to continue to produce wheat, corn, and cotton in excess of demand, and we can expect continued production of feed grains on acres diverted from these basic commodities. This will mean greater livestock numbers and lower livestock prices.

Mr. President, there are also other provisions of the conference report which I doubt the wisdom of enacting into law

First is section 103, which would set the support level for milk at 80 to 90 percent of parity, instead of 75 to 90 percent as at present. It seems to me that this is a move in the wrong direction, since under the support formula now in effect, the dairy situation has improved considerably since April, 1954. For example, CCC purchases of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids in 1955 were down 35 percent compared to 1954, when dairy products were supported at 90 percent of parity. Specifically, butter acquisitions were down 50 percent; cheese down 59 percent; nonfat dried milk down 15 percent.

With this new provision enacted into law, we can expect to see milk production soar, while prices and incomes decline. And we also can expect to see again those mountainous CCC inventories of butter and cheese. In 1953, if you recall, Mr. President, we had an inventory of 358.9 million pounds of butter, now only 162.3 million pounds, 3 years later. We also had 291 million pounds of cheese then, instead of 162.3 million pounds today.

I have some reservations also with respect to mandatory price supports on feed grains, and to the two-price plans on wheat and rice. For these reasons, Mr. President, I feel I must vote against adoption of the conference report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point an article entitled "Turkeys Could Provide Wheat Market," from the Utah Farm Bureau News of March 1956.

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

TURKEYS COULD PROVIDE WHEAT MARKET

One of the paradoxes facing Utah agriculture is found in the turkey, poultry, and wheat-growing enterprises.

Turkey growing in Utah in recent years has become a highly important part of the overall agricultural picture, actually bringing into the State in 1954 more money in cash sales than our wheat crop, according to USDA reports.

Total cash income from turkeys in 1954 amounted to $10,635,000, while eggs, chickens, and broilers brought $13,683,000, compared to $10,082,000 from wheat.

The paradox comes in the fact that while wheat is a natural feed for turkeys and chickens there is almost none of it being fed to turkeys and its use is rapidly diminishing in other poultry feeds.

The reason for this is that milo, which is regarded as practically equal to wheat as a poultry feed, can be purchased at a lower cost by about 60 cents per hundredweight. To the turkey, broiler, or egg producer this price differential can well be the difference between success and failure.

Studies show that the turkey industry in Utah would consume 2 million bushels of wheat annually if it could be purchased at a price equal to that being paid for milo. At

that level, wheat growers would receive approximately $1.50 per bushel for their wheat.

The present support price on wheat in Utah ranges from $1.79 to $1.91 per bushel. Under present price-support law wheat is out of reach of turkey growers pricewise. Wheatgrowers who may wish to use presently diverted acres to produce wheat for the turkey industry can do so only under severe penalties. A great many idle wheat acres might be profitably used to provide turkey feed if that could be done.

Average yield of wheat in Utah in 1955 was 19.9 bushels per acre. At that rate Utah grown turkeys could provide a market for nearly 100,000 acres of wheat.

Kansas and Texas are the major producers of milo, which has a crop yield of about equal to wheat. Kansas can grow milo on land diverted from wheat and Texas can grow milo on land diverted from cotton, wheat, peanuts, and rice, all of which are designated as basic crops.

The Utah growing season appears to be too short for milo. Utah wheatgrowers are thus placed at a greater disadvantage from diverted acres than are the producers of the basic crops in many other States.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the writer of the article points out that in Utah alone if wheat prices were such that the farmers could afford to buy it to feed turkeys, they could use 2 million bushels of wheat. The farmers cannot afford to buy wheat, but must buy other feed from Kansas and Texas, because the price of wheat is completely out of line. Yet wheat is stored in Government warehouses, and the farmers have to pay for other feed grains grown in Texas and Kansas.

As a commentary on the present matter before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Detroit Free Press of Sunday, March 25, 1956, written by Mr. James M. Haswell, of the Washington bureau staff of that newspaper, entitled "Farm Group Hits Price Supports." The article asks this question: "Is Michigan heeding argument they benefit chiefly big operators?"

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

WASHINGTON.—The belief that Michigan farmers don't profit much from price supports must be getting around. And also the fact that $75 million in grain crop loans last year went to 1,695 farm operators—out of a total of 5,375,034 farmers.

In a poll taken by Representative ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Republican, of Michigan, in central Michigan, a group of one-third of the farmers said they wanted Congress to abolish farm price supports altogether.

Roughly another third, however, favored flexible supports, and the other third came out for 90-percent supports.

But the news was in the fact that so many farmers—about 500—had swung away altogether from the price-support idea. That was a great change from polls Congressman BENTLEY has taken in other years.

The no-support thinking apparently reflects growing belief in the argument that 3 out of 4 farmers in a State like Michigan have no real stake in price supports. They don't sell the right kind of farm produce, or enough of it.

Two years ago Secretary of Agriculture Benson published a table showing that Michigan farmers obtained only 10 percent of their income from sale of price-supported grains, such as corn and wheat.

But 63 percent of their income, the Secretary showed, was lowered because of the support price on grains used to feed livestock.

At about the same time Representative CHARLES M. BROWNSON, Republican, of Indiana, began a campaign to find out exactly who benefits most from crop loans—the form that grain price supports take.

The Agriculture Department now admits that the top 1 percent of wheat borrowers got 12 percent of the wheat money in 1953—or $63 million.

One percent of the corn borrowers got $3,575,000.

Sixty-six barley borrowers got $6,364,000, an average of $96,424 each.

Altogether 1,695 borrowers—out of 5,375,034 farm operators—got $75 million in rain crop loans that year.

Last month Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, published a study of farm incomes which has had a tremendous impact on the farm debates in Congress.

WATKINS concluded that price supports don't help two-thirds of the American farmers. And these are the two-thirds most needing help.

In order to get price supports, a farmer must have something to sell, and two-thirds of the family-type farms simply do not produce for commercial sale in any significant amount, WATKINS explained.

The men who run America's biggest farms, WATKINS said, do not need unlimited price supports. They could farm at a profit without any supports, he said, and certainly they don't need the unlimited loan privileges they have now.

In 1950 for the first time the Census Bureau classified farms into economic groups. The big division was between farms producing more than $5,000 in farm goods for market annually and those producing less.

Farms in the over-$5,000 group use 60 percent of the harvested cropland; supply 74 percent of all farm production; give the families on them an average income of $5,143. There are 1,200,000 of these farms, supporting about 5 million persons.

But farms in the under-$5,000 group occupy 34.6 percent of the harvested cropland while supplying only 24 percent of farm goods sold. The average family income is only $1,741. There are 2,500,000 of these farms, supporting 10,300,000 persons.

A special study was made in Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana.

The amount of land farmed in these three States varied little over a 20-year period.

But the number of farms has shrunk steadily. Meaning that the size of the successful farming enterprises has increased.

The extremes of the farm economic scale show extreme contrasts.

As an example, farms which produce goods worth $10,000 or more a year, supply 51 percent of all farm products marketed. They bring in a quarter of all farm income. The average family income is $6,585.

But farms at the other end of the scale produce only 2.3 percent of farm marketings, and provide average family incomes of but $975 a year.

Almost 1 in 10 Michigan farms fall into this class.

Senator WATKINS argues that only top farm operators have much of a stake in farm price supports.

The rest produce so very little for sale they cannot materially benefit whether the market prices are supported at 75, 90, or 100 percent of parity, he says.

There is a need for effective price-support programs, WATKINS says. But the programs should not be of the kind which give unlimited aid to a few big producers and do not help the great bulk, the farm people.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. If I understood the Senator from Utah correctly, about 25 percent of the farm income in his State is derived from production of basic crops. Is that right?

Mr. WATKINS. No. Only about 7 percent of our crops under price supports are basic, and only 7 percent of our farm income is aided by price supports.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator. That figure is more nearly in line with the situation in Wyoming. I felt certain that our States were similar in that respect and as a matter of fact, our people are fearful that in the end this bill will hurt our farmers and ranchers more than it will help. I certainly agree that some steps should be taken to liquidate the surplus of farm commodities and I would favor the provisions of the soil bank.

Mr. WATKINS. In my State we have to have twice the number of acres for dry-land wheat in order to produce an ideal yield, for the reason that the land has to be summer fallowed and left idle for 1 year. A crop is grown only every other year. The high-price supports are detrimental to the overwhelming number of farmers in Utah, because they have to buy from the Middle West grains and feed for their livestock and poultry, such as corn and other grains, much of which they have to import from Iowa, Texas, and Kansas. So they help pay taxes to get prices up, and then they have to buy at those high prices. So they have to pay twice.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator is absolutely correct. In Wyoming about 75 percent of all our agricultural income comes from livestock, both cattle and sheep. The high-price supports on corn has militated against the livestock operator. This bill will make a bad situation much worse.

The feeders in the Corn Belt have lost considerable money feeding this year and they will undoubtedly try to buy their feeder stock at lower prices this fall. It appears now that the cattle situation may become worse as far as the grower is concerned.

Mr. WATKINS. I think the Senator is exactly right. I think that is the situation in most of the Intermountain States. We do not grow basics for market. Wheat is about the only one we grow. The kind of wheat we grow which gets a price support is millable wheat. It is the so-called Turkey Red and other varieties, high in protein content, which are used for milling. There is a very limited acreage in our State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ERVIN in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the Senator from Illinois yield 2 additional minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield the Senator from Utah 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BARRETT. I also wanted to call to the Senator's attention the fact that the conference committee has changed the provisions in the soil-bank section with reference to grazing the acres diverted from crop production. As the

Senator well knows the Senate adopted my amendment which provided that if the farmer violates the provision of his contract and permits his cattle to graze on the lands taken out of crops, that he would lose not only the benefits that he might be entitled to under the soil bank, but also any payments that he might be entitled to under the price-support program. The latter provision was eliminated entirely. In my opinion the protective provisions were weakened materially in conference.

Mr. WATKINS. I agree 100 percent with the Senator from Wyoming. That was probably the only benefit our States would have obtained from this measure, and now it has been eliminated.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Also let me point out that two-thirds of the farmers of the Nation will not obtain any substantial benefit from this program; they cannot possibly do so. This program is in the interest of the big operators, not the small farmers; and very few of the smaller family-size farms will obtain any benefit from it.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator is correct. The conference struck out the limitations inserted on the floor of the Senate whereby no individual could receive more than $100,000 in payments from one section of the bill and $50,000 limitation on another section. In fact all limitations were removed.

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct; the sky is the limit.

Mr. BARRETT. I would like to see a good constructive farm bill but it seems to me that insofar as our section of the country is concerned we have no choice but to vote against this conference report.

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct. The conference report is an economic mess, insofar as we are concerned. There are sound and helpful provisions in the bill as reported from conference, but they have been largely nullified by other provisions adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to support the conference report which has been presented to the Senate by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

First of all, let me commend the conferees for the report they have brought to us. I know that the preparation of the final conference report required a great deal of hard work and detailed effort on the part of the conferees.

Mr. President, I was pleased no end to learn of the action taken by the House of Representatives on the conference report, and of the large vote in the House of Representatives in favor of the report. That vote should indicate to the administration and to the American people that the Congress of the United States is not going to be made the victim of propaganda or political pressure.

As have others, in the days since the Senate passed the agricultural bill, I have watched the press reports, including those relating to the work of the conference committee, and also, of course, the many press reports in regard to statements issued by the Secretary of Agriculture and by some of those who are associated with him. The Secretary of Agriculture and his associates have attempted in every conceivable way to influence the conferees by propagandizing the American people and trying to set up, in connection with this agricultural bill, straw men which they could conveniently knock down.

Mr. President, I have been somewhat honored by the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has seen fit to single me out for political verbal treatment. I welcome that privilege and recognition on the part of the leading agricultural spokesman for the administration. Let me say that at any time the Secretary of Agriculture desires to have me do so, I shall be more than happy to accommodate him in debate upon agricultural matters. I suggest, however, that it might be well to debate in an agricultural area, and not within the confines of one of his selected audiences.

Mr. President, the conference report does not do all I had hoped the bill would do. For example, I had hoped that the bill as reported by the Senate committee would become the law of the land. In that bill we provided for a 2-year extension of 90 percent of parity price supports on basic commodities. We had for the dairy price-support program a formula which was somewhat different from that contained in the conference report. I was also sorry to see eliminated from the final conference report section 602 of the Agricultural Act as passed by the Senate, which related to price reporting on timber products. That particular amendment to the Senate version of the bill was one which was close to my heart, and one which I felt would do a great deal of good to our timber farmers. However, I am happy to note that section 601, which relates to the reforestation program, was sustained and kept in the conference report. At a later time I shall make it my business to try to press for action upon the price-reporting features relating to timber. It is my opinion and belief that they are very essential for our timber farmers. Our timber farmers will increase in number and in significance under the terms of the soil conservation and soil-bank program.

Mr. President, I have noted with particular interest that the administration is putting up quite a howl about the delay in the passage of the farm bill, and I have also noted with considerable interest that some of the spokesmen for the administration have seen fit to level their attack upon the junior Senator from Minnesota. Mr. President, I will place my record in behalf of farm legislation on the line against that of any administration spokesman. This administration did not have a farm program as recently as January 1 or January 15. This administration was never in favor of a soil bank; but now the administration would like to claim the soil bank as its own product. The fact of the matter is that the administration resisted the soil bank from the beginning, but now the American people would be led to believe that the soil bank was a great creation of Eisenhower and Benson. The delay—if any—is due to the lack of cooperation by the Eisenhower administration—the refusal of the administration to present a program until compelled to by action of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, one thing I can say for this administration is that it certainly knows how to reach out and capture the ideas of other persons. It is like the man on the flying trapeze—it "purloins"—with the greatest of ease.

I hesitate to digress, but I noticed that the other day Mr. Brownell came to the Congress with some ideas about civil rights—about as new as last year's calendar. In fact, the very bills the Attorney General brought to the Congress as a great, bold, new program in the field of civil rights have been before the Congress for years. I am the sponsor of these measures, yet the administration has never shown any interest in them. Of course, I am always happy when some political sinner repents and comes forward and asks to be cleansed of his political sins. I do not wish to discourage any of the erring brothers and prodigal sons who now are seeking to return home. Of course, we shall treat them with kindness, generosity, and compassion. The opportunity is at hand on this conference report on the farm bill for those who mistakenly followed the administration's misguided program to, in part, at least, reform and repent by voting for it.

When it comes to the soil bank, as early as 1936 there was legislative, permissive authority for the Department of Agriculture to enter upon an extended soil-bank operation. So there is no need for the present administration to talk about any delays. The only delay is in the mental processes and the will and the conviction of this administration. There has been plenty of delay there by the born obstructionists of the administration, who are obstinate and stubborn. They became interested in the soil bank after the Senate committee hearings, where farmer after farmer and group after group said that the soil bank was what they wanted. As I have said, thereafter the administration made its announcement in the Wall Street Journal—a fine newspaper, but one seldom read by farmers. This administration talks a great deal about peace and prosperity. I suggest to my colleagues there is about as little prosperity in the Midwest as there is peace in the Middle East. In both of these areas the administration's program has been "too little and too late" to be effective.

Mr. President, I shall support the conference report because I think it offers genuine help for the American farmer. But let it be clear, Mr. President, this administration's program offered none. The soil-bank program as endorsed by the administration was, at best, one for replacement of income, not increase of income.

The finest part of the soil bank program is its conservation-reserve feature, calling for long-term soil conservation or soil rebuilding for the arid lands and semiarid lands and marginal lands. However, it was this very section of the soil bank that the administration had the least interest in.

The acreage-reserve section relates to a number of allotted acres, and was included as an attempt on the part of the administration to bail itself out of its own mismanagement.

Mr. President, the conferees have shown great courage and wisdom, and I personally wish to express my gratitude for the job they have done.

I particularly wish to thank them for the 90 percent of parity for 1 year. I had hoped it would be 2 years, but at least we can be thankful for the fact that for 1 year the farmer will have a fighting chance to have improved income.

I wish to thank the conferees for the dairy section, which will mean so much to our dairy farmers. It provides a minimum price of $3.25 a hundredweight. We shall have to look into that section next year again, because this is only temporary relief.

I also congratulate the committee on retaining feed grains under price-support protection, and making them eligible for acreage conservation or acreage reserve benefits.

Mr. LANGER. How about butter?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from North Dakota mentions butter. I include butter and butterfat in the dairy products section.

I also wish to say that the opportunity for the two-price plan, both with respect to rice and wheat, is a forward-looking step, because it will give farmers a fair choice, on the basis of 90 percent of parity, with acreage allotments, or the alternative of a two-price system, so that when they make their choice they will have genuine alternatives. In other words, there will be some equity as between the two proposals.

Finally, in the limited time, let me say that no other piece of legislation will be before Congress this year which will be more important than this particular measure. The farmers of America, as we have stated again and again, are in trouble. The other day I read that hog prices were up. They are always up after the farmer has sold his hogs. That is good old Republican economics. The farmer has sold his fall litter. Now the packing houses have the hogs, so hog prices go up—the farmers have the reduced income.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I have one-half minute to conclude?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Every United States Senator now has an opportunity to declare himself for economic equality for American agriculture. It will do no good for us to listen to the propaganda barrage from the Department of Agriculture. That Department has been negligent in the performance of its duties. I say that if Mr. Benson cannot live with the farm bill as we pass it here tonight, he ought to resign. I say the President ought to sign it, and I think he will sign it, because I am hopeful that the President will think of the national interest, and not merely of partisan interest. If the President signs it, there is only one thing Mr. Benson can do, and that is to resign That will be two good blows for freedom, and economic justice in this country, at one fell swoop.

Mr. HUMPHREY subesquently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks on the conference report, a statement I have prepared.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

We are soon going to give our final approval to new farm legislation and send it to the President for his signature.

While the President will likely be tugged and hauled in different directions by his various advisers, particularly by those who have already got themselves pretty far out on a limb by unjustified criticism of Democratic efforts to put into the bill something which would benefit farmers this year, I, for one, am confident he will wind up by signing the measure.

Perhaps his aides should do some soul searching before pushing him too far against doing what needs to be done for agriculture.

Just to help them out as they consider his important pending decision, I wish to place at this point in the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal of March 29, 1956, headed "Rural Revolt: Liked Ike in 1952, But Plan Switch in 1956, Say Minnesota Farmers." The article is as follows:

"RURAL REVOLT: LIKED IKE IN 1952, BUT PLAN SWITCH IN 1956, SAY MINNESOTA FARMERS—PRESIDENT, NOT BENSON, GETS MOST BLAME FOR SLIDING INCOME, RISING COSTS—POLITICS AND 20-CENT HOGS

"(By Sterling E. Soderlind)

"BLUE EARTH, MINN.—'This is a real farmers' rebellion against Ike, his hired man Benson and their farm program. You bet I'm voting Democratic this fall. I never knew I would hurt myself so much when I voted Republican in 1952.'

"Richard Quaday, a hog and corn farmer near this southern Minnesota town, thus explains his defection from Republican ranks. Shocker for the GOP: Interviews with farmers in this State show that 3 of every 5 who voted for Mr. Eisenhower in 1952 now plan to switch to the Democratic candidate in November.

"The discontent of Mr. Quaday and other Minnesota farmers, which received its first political expression in the March 20 Minnesota presidential primary election, is of growing importance to both the Republican and Democratic Parties. Serious farm dissatisfaction could cost the GOP Congressional seats and electoral votes in key Midwest States in November.

"Politician, pundit views

"Politicians and pundits began arguing the meaning of the Minnesota election results even before the polls closed, Republican leaders generally attributed Senator ESTES KEFAUVER'S resounding victory over Adlai Stevenson as a slap at alleged 'dictation' and 'bossism' of the Democratic-Farm-Labor Party and its leaders, Gov. Orville Freeman and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY.

"Democrats like Senator KEFAUVER and Mr. Stevenson noted that the total Democratic vote was more than double the GOP vote, indicating, they said, an 'agrarian revolt' and 'a smashing repudiation of the present administration.' The Stevenson forces also laid their defeat to thousands of 'Kefauver Republicans,' who, according to their theory, invaded the Democratic primary to 'stop Stevenson' and embarrass D. F. L. leaders.

"Both parties are now at work checking these theories and what they portend for November. Shortly after President Eisenhower said he thought the Minnesota election should be studied to see what it means, the Republican National Committee assigned three staff members to help the State party organization analyze the vote.

"Dissatisfaction deep

"Wall Street Journal interviews with Minnesota voters this week indicate that Republican analysts will find little to be happy about in rural Minnesota. The interviews with nearly fourscore farmers show their dissatisfaction is deep, bearing out the Democrat's theory of agrarian revolt.

"'I switched over from Ike to the Democrats last October when I got as low as $9.45 a hundred for 250 hogs I marketed,' says Francis O'Neil, who farms 240 acres southwest of Blue Earth. 'I've taken a personal beating under the Republicans. As far as I'm concerned they have a mighty tough row to hoe from now on.'

"Farmer Quaday says he waited 3 years 'for Ike to make good his farm promises made right here at Kasson, Minn., in 1952. But nothing is getting better and I have eight kids to support. In 1950 I could have sold out, got a house in town and be sitting pretty. Now I couldn't even pay my debts if I sold the works.'

"Squarely on Ike

"While Secretary Benson takes much of the criticism for lower farm income, many farmers place the blame for their personal predicament squarely on the President. Says an Ortonville farmer as he unloads his hogs at the South St. Paul stockyards: 'I don't know what folks got against Mr. Benson. I wish I had a hired man that good. He does everything the boss tells him to.' The farmer who liked Ike in 1952 crossed over to KEFAUVER in the primary and will vote Democratic this fall.

"Wallace Manthei, who helps his mother run a diversified farm in Kittson County in the extreme northwest corner of Minnesota, says he will change his vote in November 'because Benson seems to think that those of us who have trouble in farming should seek employment elsewhere.' Mr. Manthei says he doesn't expect the Democrats 'will have all the answers either, but at least it will be a change.'

"The seriousness of farm discontent in Minnesota was measured in a statewide survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll taken in mid-March, but published after the election. In 'trial heat' pairings, Minnesota farmers favored Senator KEFAUVER over President Eisenhower by 52 percent to 45 percent. In the cities Ike led 56 percent to 40 percent. If they were voting today, the poll showed Ike running ahead of Stevenson, 49 percent to 43 percent among farmers, and 56 percent to 40 percent in cities.

"Farmers union view

"Edwin Christianson, president of left-leaning Minnesota Farmers Union, which has 35,000 members, termed the results a 'decisive repudiation of sliding scale farm policies.' He noted that the combined vote of 'the two candidates favoring firm, adequate farm programs vastly exceeded the combined vote of the two sliding-scale candidates.' (The Democrats polled 422,000 to the Republican's 195,000 in incomplete returns. Individual tallies were KEFAUVER, 239,000; Stevenson, 183,000; Eisenhower, 192,000; KNOWLAND, 3,000.)

"Many Republicans argue that the lower GOP vote in the Minnesota primary, in

comparison with the Democratic total, is easily explained by the fact that, since Senator KNOWLAND pulled out of the race, there was no Republican contest and little incentive for voting. Says Leonard Hall, Republican National Chairman: 'Republicans weren't in the Minnesota primary—we were on the sidewalk watching.'

"But talks with farmers over the back fence, in the feed store and along the streets of Minnesota's rural communities leave little doubt that, despite such factors, the farm revolt is real.

"And another, more surprising fact emerges from these interviews. Until now it was theorized that although some farmers might express discontent by switching their votes from Republican to Democratic Congressmen this fall and by griping about Secretary Benson their devotion to Ike remained strong. Actually, almost the opposite seems to be the case.

"Stand with Congressmen

"Minnesota farmers who plan to switch parties this fall in the presidential election show little inclination at this early date to express their dissatisfaction by voting against the three farm area Republican Congressmen. This is explained by the fact that the Minnesota congressional delegation, with the exception of one Minneapolis Representative, is nearly as outspoken against the administration's farm program as their Democratic colleagues.

"Not all of President Eisenhower's 1952 farm supporters have soured on him, of course. The President enjoys much goodwill among Minnesota farmers for ending the Korean war and bringing peace to the country.

"'I'd rather be getting half prices and peace instead of full prices and war,' remarks Ernest Frank, as he hefts a box of groceries into a truck to return to his farm near Madison Lake. 'I was for Ike in 1952, and he'll get my vote again in November.'

"When asked what it would take to keep them in the Republican ranks this fall, most farmers who plan to switch parties come up with variations on this theme: 'We have to have higher prices for what we sell and lower prices on what we buy.' Alfred Labf, a Blue Earth County farmer, says hogs would have to climb from the present 13 or 14 cents a pound to 20 cents before he would 'go for Ike again.' Farmer Quaday says he won't vote Republican again no matter what happens. 'It doesn't pay to have a short memory,' he adds.

"Why farmers prefer Estes

"Although Stevenson forces believe the Tennessean beat out Adlai on the Minnesota farm front because he outpromised their candidate, most farmers interviewed gave other reasons as to why they preferred Senator KEFAUVER.

"Comments run along these lines: 'KEFAUVER is just more of a farmers' man'; 'I can't see going for a loser like Stevenson'; and 'me and my friends feel KEFAUVER is more sincere on this farm issue.'

"Few farmers seemed to think that Senator KEFAUVER's advocacy of 100 percent of parity for low-income farmers gave him any special edge over Mr. Stevenson.

"A Mankato farm-implement dealer said the fine distinction between the two Democrats' farm policies amounted to the feeling they left in their farmer audiences. 'To most of our farmers, Stevenson seemed to be rigid on flexibles, while KEFAUVER was flexible on flexibles.'

"Undoubtedly, many Minnesota Republicans didn't vote in the primary. Yet the GOP total of 195,000 compared not too unfavorably with the total of 290,000 in 1952, considering that there was a Republican contest that year between supporters of Mr. Eisenhower and favorite son Harold Stassen. Ike's vote was a write-in, but his backers were in a contest with Stassen supporters, especially in the final days before the election.

"Republican crossovers

"Some Republican city dwellers freely admit that they took advantage of the primary law which allows voters to cross over into the opposition's primary. Since most of these city crossovers may return to their party in the general election, they are not regarded as posing a serious problem for the Republican Party such as that presented by farmers who have changed allegiance because of an issue.

"'Sure I switched over,' exclaims Eli Momsen, a salesman for a St. Paul gold-refining firm. 'I could name 20 others who did, too. No good Republican would pass up a chance to put Freeman and Humphrey in their place. Of course, I'm for Ike.'

"'I crossed over just for fun,' explains Frank W. Wilkens, a Twin Cities insurance agent. 'Stevenson was too glib, and I welcomed a chance to vote against him. Of course, I'm no KEFAUVER lover, either.'

"But such harassing-action crossovers by some urban Republicans can in no way hide the fact that a great share of the switching done in Minnesota was done by farmers and stemmed from deep dissatisfaction with the GOP. Not one farmer was found who had switched his vote just for the harassing effect.

"One Blue Earth farmer summed up the general feeling: 'I think Mr. Eisenhower needs a rest, and I believe we folks around here are going to give it to him.'"

This administration has always kept a pretty alert eye on the Wall Street Journal, so I hope its officials have not missed this significant article.

There is a new popular song out in the Midwest these days. It is called Sixteen Hogs, a parody on Sixteen Tons. Because it describes the situation in the Midwest agriculture so well, I would suggest the President's advisers try singing this tune before talking to the President about vetoing the farm bill.

To make sure that official attention is called to the words of the song entitled "Sixteen Hogs," written by Mr. Irvin Shapiro, I include them now, as follows:

"SIXTEEN HOGS

"(Parody on Sixteen Tons)

"Some people say farmin' is a life of ease,
You plant what you want and you sell what you please
But it ain't so easy when you get to town
And you find that the prices have all gone down.

"Chorus

"You raise 16 hogs and what d' you get
Another day older and deeper in debt.
Mr. Benson won't ya tell me what's happened to me
Since I gave my vote to the GOP.

"Oh Gen-ral Motors made a pile of dough
Their profits just grow and grow and grow
Their prices are the highest in history
It's good for them but it ain't for me!

"Chorus

"You raise 16 hogs and what d' you get
Another day older and deeper in debt
Mr. Benson won't ya tell me 'cause I don't know
How much lower my prices can go.

"In '52 I joined the parade
And cast my vote for the Great Crusade
But in Washington the GOP
Just couldn't remember what they promised me.

"Chorus

"You raise 16 hogs and what d' you get
Another day older and deeper in debt
Mr. Benson will you please e-lu-ci-date
What was wrong with the welfare state?

"When I was a boy I went to school
In arith-metic I learned this rule
You can't be a farmer and make a dime
If the market keeps droppin' all the time.

"Chorus

"You raise 16 hogs and what d' you get
Another day older and deeper in debt
The farmer gets less but his wife pays more
When she does her shoppin' at the grocery store."

I have just one more exhibit to offer—one which I think should be read with interest by critics of effective aid for agriculture. It is an article written by a Corning, Iowa, farmer, and is entitled "As I Am Leaving the Farm." The article was published in the Audubon (Iowa) News-Guide, in a column entitled "Corn Meal and Cobs," conducted by Elmer G. Carlson, a member of the Press Columnists of Iowa. The article reads as follows:

"CORN MEAL AND COBS

"(By Elmer G. Carlson)

"As I Am Leaving the Farm

"Today you sold out. Now the crowd has gone and you have loaded the last reluctant cow and stubborn hog out to their various destinations. As the last truckload pulls out of the driveway onto the road, you lean up against the darkened strangely silent barn and smoke thoughtfully.

"Somehow you dread going into the house; the kids, not too long home from school will be noisily asking questions about the sale; questions you don't care to answer. The whole family will be discussing the move to town; a move you hate to think about. You pull your collar a little higher around your ears and hunker down on the leeside of the barn, out of the gusty wind—to think.

"A confused jumble of thoughts run through your head. "Where did I fail? Surely not from lack of hard work." You think of the backbreaking years of toil you and your wife spent. Lack of management? Maybe you could have managed better, but you were always counted a good farmer. You loved the soil and tended it carefully; your carefully terraced fields and neat farmstead vouch for that. Your mouth twitches bitterly as you contemplate the fate of those fields. The man farming your land next year is just adding your little 160 to his already extensive holdings, and a vision of your farmstead, deserted and weed-grown flits through your mind's eye. The new operator—a firm believer in straight rows; you sadly contemplate the fate of your terraced fields and grassed waterways. Oh well, maybe all small farms have to go, that seems to be the trend now, anyway.

"About that move to town. What in the devil are you going to do? You can slop hogs and milk cows, but Omaha doesn't seem to have any demand for those skills. Also you realize that you're a heck of a lot older than you thought you were. Seems like 45 is 10 years too old to be worth a darn for anything as far as getting a job is concerned. You consider the future with a deep aching fear. You can't help it. What if I can't find a job? What will my wife and family do? How will the kids adjust themselves to town life?

"You flick the yard light on. You feel that somehow it will make the silent barn and empty lots less stark. You make the rounds closing the open doors and widely flung gates. Why? Nothing left to get out, but habit is strong.

"You look across the driveway at the crib. In the glare of the yard light, the different-colored sale bills tacked up there today

stand out strangely. There they hang, an even dozen of them, stuck up there by fellow farmers, each one bearing that pathetic hearing 'As I Am Leaving the Farm.' You gaze at those brightly colored scraps of paper. Some of the names on them are men you know, men like yourself being torn from the soil they love and have cherished, to be thrown into a gristmill of a strange and unfriendly environment. Men whose dreams and hopes withered with their crops the last couple of drouth-stricken years, and now, like you, will be walking city pavements when the bluegrass greens the hills next spring. You can't help but wonder about the bright boys; those boys whose heads are fuller of statistics rather than brains; whose answer to the farm problem is 'Let's get rid of the small inefficient farmer.' You wonder how they'd feel if they were in your shoes.

"It's getting cold—you start slowly toward the house. Under the yard light pole lies one of your bills. Your own name in big bold letters at the bottom looks coldly strange. You walk up and idly flip it over with your boot. A gust of wind whirls it and away it goes, across the driveway into the road to disappear in a cloud of dust—into the cold and windy dark.

"ELDON 'ZEKE' ROBERTS.

"CORNING, IOWA."

I urge my colleagues to read that description of a farmer's thoughts after he has gone broke and been forced to sell out at auction.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 13 minutes to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, huge agricultural surpluses have been accumulated as a result of the 90-percent price support program.

At the end of the Korean war the Commodity Credit Corporation had less than $4 billion invested in agricultural commodities. On June 30, 1954, this amount increased to $6,187,000,000. On February 28, 1955, 1 year ago, it had increased to $8,395,000,000; and on February 29, 1956, the Commodity Credit Corporation had utilized $11,521,000,000 of its borrowing authority.

If we adopt the conference report and accept 90-percent supports for another year we shall inevitably add to the accumulation of these surpluses.

On February 29, 1956, we had an inventory of 1,114,445,000 bushels of corn, at a cost of $1,864,747,000, nearly $2 billion. During 8 months of this fiscal year we have lost on corn alone more than $75 million, and the corn inventory has increased during this same period by 260 million bushels.

Today we have on hand 1,119,542,000 bushels of wheat, at a cost of nearly $3 billion. If we were to reduce both the corn and the wheat to terms of carloads we would find that we would have enough corn today, if we put it into 40-ton cars, to make a trainload of corn 4,200 miles long, or about long enough to reach from Seattle, Wash., to Miami, Fla.

Our inventory of wheat placed in freight cars would form a train long enough to reach from Los Angeles, Calif., to Portland, Maine.

And yet the advocates of the 90-percent support formula still propose that we add to that inventory.

Our cotton inventory has increased more than 5 million bales over and above the inventory 1 year ago. We now have on hand 13,797,000 bales of cotton, representing an investment of $2,385,073,000, or an increase of more than $1 billion over and above the investment a year ago.

Our normal consumption requires only about 9 million bales of cotton, so we have enough cotton, without planting any at all this year, to last us for another 15 months.

We have an inventory of $563,547,000 worth of tobacco in warehouses, or an increase of $150 million over and above the inventory 1 year ago.

We have on hand 114,107,000 pounds of butter, at a cost of $68,034,000 which is lower than the figure of a year ago. However, the reason it is lower than the figure of a year ago is that we have sold our inventory at ridiculously low prices. In the past 8 months we have sustained a loss on butter and butter products of $140,058,653. We have lost $100,344,590 on butter alone in the last 8 months. The other $40 million loss was on butter oil. That is the equivalent of a rate of $17,500,000 a month, or $4,250,000 a week, or almost $600,000 a day during the past 8 months. Yet it is now proposed to again increase the support price on butter and to increase further the inventories.

This is ridiculous. We are allowing butter to become rancid in warehouses. The only way rancid butter can be sold is to soap manufacturers. So far as the housewife is concerned, since butter has been priced out of the market, she has been buying oleo, which is manufactured by the same soap manufacturers. We have a ridiculous situation in which the housewife is giving her baby a bath with soap made with butter, and we are spreading on our bread a byproduct of the same soap manufacturers.

During the first 8 months of fiscal 1956 we have lost $662,989,011 under the Commodity Credit Corporation operations alone. This does not take into consideration any of the losses or expenditures of section 32 funds or that which has been spent under the International Wheat Agreement.

If we consider the Commodity Credit Corporation alone, and forget all the other subsidy programs, our loss for the first 8 months this fiscal year has been at the rate of $100,000 an hour.

We have on hand 103,968,000 bushels of barley, at a cost of $105,642,000. We have lost $31,431,724 on barley in the past 8 months.

On oats we have lost $11,408,732 during the same period.

On cheese we have lost $76,107,510, in order to hold up prices to the American housewife.

At the same time we have not been doing the American farmers any good by the continuous accumulation of surpluses.

If we adopt this report and thereby reestablish the rigid 90 percent supports it will mean the continued accumulation of grain in the warehouses, thereby withholding it from the markets and forcing the feeders of livestock and poultry to pay a substantial increase in the cost of feed.

Yet at the same time this group will continue to sell their product on the free market.

Their situation will be much worse then than it is today. This will bankrupt our poultry and dairy farmers in the Northeast. I now point out how this bill is a bonanza for the large absentee farmer.

The conference report has had removed from it any limitations as to the amount of payment under the soil-bank plan. I cite one example showing that if the bill is passed in its present form one individual in the Montana area, now farming approximately 340,000 acres of wheat, could put 170,000 acres into the soil bank and collect from the United States Government a check for $3,400,000—all for not farming one-half of his acreage. Then on the other half he could continue to raise wheat and sell it to the Government at an increase of 40 cents per bushel over and above what he received last year.

Another section of the bill would give him free lime and fertilizer so as to increase production on the acreage which is left.

All this is being done in the name of the small farmer.

There has also been stricken from the bill the provision which would have prevented the Department of the Interior from continuing its reclamation projects while the soil bank is in operation. We will now have one agency of the Government spending millions of dollars bringing new land into production while at the same time, under the soil-bank plan, we shall be spending hundreds of millions of dollars to take land out of production.

This is the nearest to perpetual motion that the taxpayers can get. The taxpayers are pouring $4 billion or $5 billion a year on this water wheel, and at the same time the farmers are being ground under.

In the interest of the American farmer this conference report should be rejected. Let us recognize the fact that we are unable to get a decent farm bill in an election year. Let us get the election out of the way and come back next year and see if we can get a sound farm program when the eyes of Members of Congress will be off the election.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I understood the Senator to say that the program was costing the taxpayers about $100,000 an hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator believe that high cost has some political significance? Would the Senator recommend turning the matter over to the special select committee on campaign contributions for investigation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. To approach the farm problem with the idea of putting three or four billion dollars into the hands of the American farmers in order to get their vote for either the Democratic Party or the Republican Party is an insult to their intelligence. Certainly the American farmers cannot be bought

and sold like cattle. This bill is an insult to their intelligence and integrity.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two telegrams and a letter from farm organizations in the State of Delaware opposing this bill.

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

SELBYVILLE, DEL., *April 11, 1956.*

Senator JOHN WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This organization strongly urges opposition to farm bill in its present form. Rigid price support strongly opposed by this organization.

E. BOWEN QUILLEN,
President, Eastern Shore Poultry Growers Exchange.

SELBYVILLE, DEL., *April 11, 1956.*

Senator JOHN WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge opposition to farm bill in present form. Conflicting names seem to make it unworkable and impracticable. Strongly oppose rigid price supports aspects of bill. In the interest of saving time and economy we hope you will be willing to convey our opinions on this important subject to other Members of the Congress from this area. Our organization represents every phase of the poultry industry including allied businesses, merchants, and civic leaders affected by the poultry economy of this peninsula.

RAY E. MURPHY,
President, Delmarva Poultry Industry, Inc.

DELAWARE FARM BUREAU, INC.,
Dover, Del., April 10, 1956.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: The Delaware Farm Bureau most sincerely urges you to oppose the following undesirable features of the farm bill:

1. Ninety-percent fixed supports for 1956 for basic crops.
2. Double standard parity.
3. Mandatory three-price domestic dumping plan for wheat.
4. Mandatory support of noncommercial area corn at 85 percent of commercial and increase supports from 70 percent to 85 percent parity for oats, barley, rye, and grain sorghum provided 15 percent farm base acreage for such feed grains are put into soil bank.
5. Ten cents per hundredweight increase in 1956 and 80–90 percent mandatory dairy support for 1957 and thereafter.
6. No control of diverted acres of quota crops.

These provisions would nullify the other parts of the bill which might help to adjust the agricultural plant to effective market demand. Since it is too late for the soil bank plan to be effective this year I urge you to use your influence to help Congress to develop a bill more suitable to all farmers.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely,

JAMES H. BAXTER, Jr.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there are really two objectives we are seeking to accomplish through the pending farm bill. The first objective is to lift the farm economy to a higher level, because the farmers' income is out of balance with the national income. The second objective is to effect control of production that is adding annually to the surpluses. The soil bank achieves this objective.

We have seen the farmers' income drop in the postwar years from $17,200,000,000 to a recent figure of $10,200,000,000. That is a $7 billion drop. At the same time the national economy has been rising steadily every year.

The farmer is affected by the rising national income since all the expenses of his operations are thereby increased. This is true in the case of the machines he must buy, the fuel with which to operate the machines, his taxes, as well as all the other incidental expenses which farming involves.

We must bear in mind that because of this drastic drop in the farmer's income we in Congress must try to bring his income back into proper relation with the income in other segments of the Nation's economy. How can we accomplish that? We can only accomplish it by the higher price supports that are proposed in the farm bill.

I made a motion in committee to extend 90 percent price supports for 1 year only. That motion failed. Why did some of us in committee vote for 90 percent supports for this calendar year? I have already answered this question in saying we were working to restore some of the farmer's lost income. I wish to commend the conferees for having reestablished 90 percent price supports for the calendar year 1956. They do not go beyond this year. If we do not reestablish 90 percent supports for this calendar year, wheat will go down 27 cents a bushel, come this next fall when the first applications for commodity loans are filed with the county committees. Corn will go down 18 cents a bushel. Feed grains will go down correspondingly in price to that of wheat and corn, and the farmer will again be on the merry-go-round of receiving less for everything he produces. The farmer's income will be further reduced in the face of the already drastic drop in income he has already suffered.

That is what I see if we do not approve a continuation of 90 percent supports for calendar year 1956.

I find it most unpleasant to go against my administration. I have supported President Eisenhower as strongly, I believe, as has the average Senator on the Republican side. I have supported President Eisenhower in his foreign policies. I have supported him on a great majority of his proposed domestic programs. I might mention that it was the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and I who introduced the Federal tax refund bill on gasoline used in farm equipment. We introduced that bill more than a year ago. I was delighted when it became law. I know it will afford relief to the farmer because today he is operating with gasoline, not with hay and grains, as was the case 40 years ago. The farmer's power is now derived from fuel oils and gasoline in combustion engines.

Again I stood in complete support of the administration, or the administration stood in support of me—it may be phrased whichever way one desires—on the school milk program. I introduced last year the bill to continue and expand the school milk program. My bill provided that the program should not only be continued but should be expanded as the administration recommended this year.

I also introduced a bill this year to provide additional funds for the brucellosis control program. This was also sought by the administration.

Therefore I have tried to assist my administration in every conceivable manner.

I have discussed the 90 percent provision in the report and I have done so with the thought in mind that the President would be wholly justified in signing the bill.

Now the other major objective of the bill is the proposed soil-bank program.

If we had enacted such a program 2 years ago, we would not be standing on the floor of the Senate today debating the whole question. I had a conference with the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, early in January 1954. I proposed at that time that we control the acres which would be diverted from wheat, corn, cotton, and other basics, because I knew we would never get a reduction of the farm surpluses until we reduced the number of acres harvested.

When I was unsuccessful in convincing the Secretary of Agriculture of the need for controlling the diverted acres—getting them into clover or alfalfa, or some kind of a soil-building crop—I wrote a letter to him under date of January 21, 1954. Here is the evidence of what I proposed to do in order to reduce production so that we would not add to the surpluses, which are today destroying the farmers' markets.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that my letter of January 21, 1954, to Secretary of Agriculture Benson be printed as a part of my remarks. I wish the record to be clear that I did not come only recently to the support of the soil-bank program. I have worked for such a program for a long time.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1954.

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing you to outline my views on some phases of our agricultural problem. These views, you will recall, I had indicated to you in our conference prior to the presentation of the proposed program to Congress.

One of the major problems we must recognize is that, in the main, the farmer has suffered too great a drop in his income. The prices that he receives have dropped drastically in many of the commodities and products, while his operating expenses are still on the level to which the Korean war inflation carried them, to say nothing of the higher school taxes levied on real estate and personal property, or township and county taxes. They are all up.

The machines the farmer must purchase in his normal operations are still at those inflationary price levels, likewise the repairs

on his old machinery if he be so unfortunate he cannot afford to buy the new machines. Then there is the high cost of mill feeds, commonly known as high-protein feeds, which he must purchase to supplement his homegrown feeds for his dairy operations, poultry production, or any general livestock feeding operations. How the farmer can further suffer a loss in price and still continue to pay these inflationary costs is a question that we must consider.

I am in support of certain phases of the President's recommendations, such as isolating some of the surplus, placing it in reserve in a stockpile as an assurance against some national or international catastrophe, such as a major drought could bring about.

The first step that we must take here in Congress and administratively is to demonstrate our ability to handle this surplus, whether we isolate, stockpile, or barter it off in the international field. We must show that we can do it, or it will be like a black shadow threatening or weakening our own domestic markets as well as the international market. Our number one problem is to manage this surplus.

Secondly, the farmer last fall voted and agreed to reduce his acreage of wheat planted, in order to manage the surplus in wheat. He has willingly accepted reduction in the number of acres planted to cotton and I know that the producer of corn will likewise agree to a reduction in the number of acres planted to corn. Farmers will agree to put these acres into clover, alfalfa or some type of legume crop that will be soil-building, bringing a higher fertility in the land that will give greater assurance of production in the future if the need arises. With the use of such soil-building practices, farmers would be prepared to take such surplus acres out of production entirely.

These are two essential steps—take care of present surpluses and plan to manage and govern future surpluses. When we have proved our ability in this respect we can take the necessary steps toward the question of price supports and what our price supports should be. If we are successful in the first two steps, it makes no difference what your price supports are, because you will have full parity for agriculture at the market place, but you do not have it today. If you take 90 percent support off the basics, with the exception of pork the prices would drop to the very level you reestablish. If you desire a change in production by adjustment in the price supports, what type of crop or livestock enterprise would you advocate that the producers divert to? I know we have a surplus in every category of grain or products with the exception of the pork. I believe that we don't need to encourage that by price, because pork production will be up in the coming year.

The effect of our agricultural economy is so important—it has its reflected effect not only in the smaller communities of our Nation but in industrial centers. The farmers provide a great outlet for heavy industry such as farm machinery, trucks, etc. I saw too many implement yards full of new machines last fall not to know what was happening to the farmer's purchasing power.

Mr. Secretary, I have just frankly set forth some of my thoughts as I believe I have some understanding in the field of agriculture. I am confident that we will work out an excellent, sound, administratively possible farm program, but we certainly cannot do so unless we are prepared to consider all these phases of the agricultural problem.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

Mr. THYE. If this bill fails of enactment by either a rejection of the conference report or by a Presidential veto, we shall place in jeopardy every young couple who started farming in the postwar years. Let us consider the plight of these young farm families. They bought their livestock and their machinery and their first year's feed and fuel needed for their farm operation the first year, before the first crop was harvested. They bought all their equipment at inflationary prices. They paid $300 to $400 a head for milk cows. They paid an enormous price for a tractor and for other machinery. In short, they went into debt. They are now trying to meet their financial obligations with a reduced income. They are in trouble.

If we fail these young farm families, and force them for another year to suffer the low income that the farmer has been receiving, we might well force them into a foreclosure sale before the end of the calendar year.

We shall take the heart out of that young farmer. We shall destroy every hope and every incentive he may have had. In many instances, he is the young man who fought for this country during World War II. Mr. President, I live among those people. There is a veteran farming on each side of my own farm, veterans of World War II. They married, they started farming, and they assumed financial obligations. If we permit this farm economy to remain at its present low level, it may well spell ruination for such young men.

Mr. President, the soil bank is the first realistic approach we have ever taken in bringing our production into line with our domestic needs and our export abilities. But we cannot accomplish our objective in this calendar year. The season is too far advanced. Winter wheat was seeded last fall, and much of the southern crop has been planted.

The 90 percent supports this year are a necessity. They will give the farmer time to understand and to adjust himself to the soil-bank program, and by next year we shall have not only compliance, but a reduction in the overall farm plant. We then shall find farm prices in the market place reflecting full parity, and the issue as to whether we should have flexible or fixed supports will be a forgotten one.

Mr. President, it has been asserted that the farm economy has risen under the application of flexible price supports. Nothing could be further from the truth. The price of dairy products dropped 59 cents a hundredweight for fluid milk as soon as the Secretary of Agriculture announced the reduction in price support from 90 to 75 percent. It has never risen 1 cent to the producer, from that first drop in February of 1954. In fact, the market is weaker today than it was in February of 1954.

Mr. President, we had better take a good look at the statistics. The production of dairy products is up more than 4 billion pounds since lower price supports were effected, and we are entering into a period of higher production today than we had a year ago.

Flexible price supports have not gone into effect on 1 commodity or 1 crop other than dairy products. We have not felt the effect on grain or on any of the basic crops, because they were not applied until this calendar year. They have been announced only in the past 6 months on wheat and corn. Then it was announced that wheat would drop 27 cents per bushel this calendar year and an 18-cents-a-bushel drop this calendar year in corn prices would be the result of flexible price supports. Can anyone be expected to understand and to believe the statement that the farm economy will rise under the application of flexible price supports? Nothing could be further from the fact.

It is for that reason that I ask my colleagues to think this question through with exceeding care, because, if we force a further price reduction on the producer, more especially the young couples who have not the financial means or credit to carry on under a depressed farm economy, we shall be confronted with foreclosures. This does not mean that we shall have reduced farm production, because someone with good credit and the financial means will go on producing from the land from which the young farm family was driven.

There is no program except the soil bank which will have any positive and lasting effect upon this agricultural economy of ours. We must reduce production. We can effect a reduction only by decreasing the number of acres harvested. It is for that reason that we have in the bill the best provision that has ever been incorporated into any legislation, namely, the soil bank provision. It will stop the production on acres diverted from corn, cotton, and wheat. We previously have succeeded only in diverting from production of a basic to some feed crop, the result being a greater production of feed than ever before. This feed went into livestock, poultry, and milk production. That is why we have been overburdened with milk supplies, poultry, pork, and we are now threatened with an overproduction of beef.

So, Mr. President, we must think very carefully as to whether we should reject this bill. If it is rejected, we shall be responsible for bringing on a real recession in the agricultural communities of this Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I pretend to no expert knowledge in the field of agriculture, but I am ready to accept my full responsibility in connection with this conference report. I say I pretend to no expert knowledge. I do know, however, when a matter goes in both directions at one and the same time.

As I seek to analyze the measure proposed I think of a man at home who had a balky little mule. The mule lay down on its side, and the man could not do anything with it. Not even building a fire under the little critter would do any good. After a while a veterinarian came by and said, "What is the matter, Joe? Can you not do anything with your mule?"

The man said, "No."

The veterinarian took a syringe and injected some fluid into the mule's hindquarters, and 60 seconds later the mule got up and bounded down the street.

The owner of the mule said to the veterinarian, after looking at him with a big smile like a western sunburst, "How much did that cost?"

The veterinarian said, "About 25 cents."

The man said, "Here is 75 cents. Give me two shots so I can catch that mule." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, it is said that this bill is designed to reduce acreage. That is an important thing to do. But we encumber it with every known kind of gimmick to offset whatever we have done to bring about acreage reduction. So, Mr. President, we are going in both directions at once.

I think I have a pretty fair idea of the record, and I know of no way to defend this kind of a bill. So I say to my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] that I am very glad indeed to accept my responsibility today.

If I have any time remaining, Mr. President, I should like to say a kind word about the committee and about its distinguished chairman. I can well appreciate, Mr. President, the heartbreaks and the frustrations which go into a conference of this kind. I served for 16 years at the other end of the Capitol. I know how obstinate I could be. I know how I stood on my pride as a Representative in Congress.

When all the conferees sit around the conference table, the Members of each body sharing the pride in their respective body, and the Members of each body acting according to their own lights, I can understand that it is like an irresistible force meeting an immovable object. So I feel we should congratulate the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as well as the other members of the committee of conference.

Finally, I would feel derelict in my duty if I did not raise my voice once more in behalf of the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, whose moral stamina and courage I admire very greatly. If the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] were on the floor at this time, I would pose to him the question, whether in an hour like this, when the challenges are so great, he believes former Secretary Wickard, of Indiana, might have stood up under the challenge and the force of the moment.

I have lived in the Government long enough to have served contemporaneously with Henry Wallace, of Iowa, with Claude Wickard, of Indiana, with Charlie Brannan, of Colorado, and with the able and distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], when he was Secretary of Agriculture, for whom I have great affection, and for whose discernment I have the greatest respect. But I think agriculture and the country as a whole can be grateful today that a man of courage and a well-defined sense of direction never gave in under political pressure and the verities of the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Secretary of Agriculture Benson has had an eye single to the objective he felt must be achieved in the interest of the farmers of the country.

I make this other personal allusion. I cannot always be certain, of course, what the right direction is. Experts in the board of trade have talked to me about what they thought should be in the farm bill. Members of the Grange, of the Farm Bureau, of the Farmers Union, and of the United Farmers have spoken to me on the subject. I have listened patiently to all of them. I have had as many as 150 farm representatives with me in the reception room. I have been threatened with condign political extinction if I did not vote for this measure. I have been threatened with political demise at the polls if I did not support this or that proposal. So I simply fall back on the admonition of Edmund Burke, a sometime great member of the House of Commons, when he said that, finally, he must preserve unto himself his individual judgment as a representative, and to let that judgment be fortified and dictated by the facts in the case.

From everything I see in the conference report, Mr. President, I can do no other than to oppose it, let the chips fall where they may, because I think that in one breath we are going in one direction, and in the next breath we are going in another direction. Therefore, with that kind of conflicting philosophy in a single farm bill, I have no choice except to vote against the conference report.

One final observation: The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] made what I thought was a significant statement. He said that next year we shall have to be dealing with this subject all over again. There is a confession, Mr. President, since the junior Senator from Minnesota was so active in the deliberations on the bill. There is a confession that evidently we have not contrived a durable handiwork.

So I accept my responsibility, and I shall vote against the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, so that there will be no misunderstanding about what I shall say, I am going to vote for the conference report. The reason I shall vote for the conference report is that I voted for the bill. How any Senator could have voted for the bill and then could vote against the conference report, I cannot quite understand.

Mr. President, over the last 50 years, the Government has spent billions of dollars and millions upon millions of man hours to teach the American farmer how to grow more and more and more. There is an agent in every county whose work it is to teach the farmer how to grow more. Great agricultural universities exist in every State to teach the farmer how to grow more. I am not complaining about that; I am simply being factual. That is one reason why farm production is away up. Not only is farm production away up but huge surpluses of farm commodities now exist. Likewise, the Government has spent billions of dollars—yes, I think it is in the billions—of the money of the American taxpayers—and I am not complaining about that; again I am being factual—to bring into new production hundreds of thousands of acres in the United States. The taxpayers of Indiana, Illinois, and other States have been taxed for the construction of irrigation projects in Arizona and California. The result is that California and Arizona today, if my facts are correct, produce more cotton than do any of the Southern States.

While we have been doing all these things, we have forgotten one important matter. The one thing we have completely forgotten is, To whom is the farmer going to sell his additional production? Fifty years ago there were 350 million tillable acres in the United States. Today there are still 350 million tillable acres.

Fifty years ago the production from 90 million acres was used to feed horses and mules which were necessary to cultivate the 350 million acres. Therein lies the difference between the surpluses of today and the market demand. It is the 80 million acres. Today we farmers—I am a farmer—buy our horsepower in the form of gasoline. Fifty years ago we produced it on the farm.

We have an economic problem on our hands today, not a political problem. We had better not deal with the problem in a political way. We had better handle it in an economic way.

Whether we like it or not, whether we like 90 percent, 80 percent, or 75 percent of parity—regardless of what we like—we have only one agricultural problem in America today, and that problem has arisen because we have taught and shown the farmers how to grow more than can be disposed of in the markets.

On top of that, we have lost much of our foreign market. I am not complaining about it. I am not complaining about any of these things. But we have lost much of our foreign market because we have been teaching the farmers of other countries to raise more. We have given them tractors and technical aid. Let me say, in all fairness, that the farmers of foreign lands have as much right to grow their own foodstuffs as we have.

So we find ourselves tonight in the position that the American people, Congress, the State governments, the Department of Agriculture——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator yield me a couple of minutes? That is an important subject.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. This is not a political matter; it is an economic matter.

We have huge agricultural surpluses on hand, and the capabilities of the American farmer are such that he can produce unlimited amounts of crops. I am not complaining about that; I am happy he can do so. But it will be necessary to deal with the problem now as an economic matter. We shall have to defend, protect, and help the farmer until Congress can pass a bill which has been introduced by a number of Senators, including myself, the purpose of which is to develop new industrial uses for farm products.

The farmers of America need not till all their acres simply to feed the people of America. It will be necessary to find new industrial uses for the surplus agricultural products.

I think the Senate had better accept the conference report. I do not particularly like it; but I do not know of anything better at the moment. I think it will have a tendency to create more surpluses, as a result of the 90 percent of parity price supports, but I am one who does not particularly care, because I do not think 90 percent or 80 percent of parity has too much to do with the problem. The thing which concerns me is the capacity and the capability of the American farmer to produce increasingly larger crops. He is producing, producing, and producing.

So I think the Senate had better agree to the conference report. I voted for the bill on the floor of the Senate a couple of weeks ago. If I voted for it then, why should I not vote for it now? I am one who hopes the President of the United States will sign the bill, and I think he will sign it. I do not think he has any other course, because I do not think there is any other answer at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me one additional minute?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield one more minute to the Senator. It will have to be the last.

Mr. CAPEHART. The answer to the farm problem lies in more markets and more uses for the farmer's products. A farmer's well-being cannot be increased by cutting him back. We cannot do that. We have to do the best we can for 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, 4 years, and maybe 5 years, until the Government, helping the 6 million farmers, can find in industry new uses for their products.

The problem is not a simple one. It will not be solved by the soil bank or by 90 percent of parity supports. The problem will not be solved by 80 percent of parity. The problem will be solved only when the Congress of the United States makes up its mind to appropriate $100 million or $200 million or $500 million to find new uses for farm products in industry. Then the farmer's problem will be solved. The problem will not be solved by the monkey business we are talking about tonight; but let me say there is no better way right now than what we are talking about tonight.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not know what the President of the United States will do. I do know, however, something about the rules of the United States Senate. I know something about the rules of the House of Representatives. I shall answer the question of my distinguished friend from Indiana. The bill passed the House in May 1955. It was messaged to the Senate, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That is where it lodged. When we considered the bill as reported to the Senate, we could either have killed all new farm legislation, or voted for the bill which was before the Senate. Except by passing the bill, there was no other way to get farm legislation into conference and bring back a conference report, in the hope that the difficult questions would be adjusted and there would be something we could accept. So I must familiarize my friend from Indiana with the reasons why there was an almost unanimous vote, except for 2, in the Senate. There was no other way to get the matter into conference.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I shall not yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask for a half a minute. There is only one way to get help for the American farmer, and that is to adopt the report. It is planting time in Indiana, if you please. It is planting time all over the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are not going home.

Mr. CAPEHART. But I say to the Senator that in my opinion the conference report presents as good a bill as can be had. The answer to the problem is not in the bill; the answer is in new markets and new uses for agricultural products. That is the answer.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield one-half hour to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I shall not consume that much time. First I want to say that the conference on the bill was one of the most pleasant I have ever passed through, or survived—maybe that is the better word—and since I could not go to Florida for the Easter vacation, I do not know of any more pleasant place I could have spent the time than in the conference, because it was a delightful experience to find our friends in the conference committee thoroughly bent on revising the bill so as to set forth an appealing program in this political year; it was really enjoyable to watch the situation as it developed.

Mr. President, may I say I have the utmost respect for every conferee who was there, and I have already said I enjoyed the conference; but I want to make it very plain that the bill as it comes back from conference is, in my opinion, a vastly worse bill than it was when it passed the Senate, and it was certainly bad enough at that time.

What are some of the worsenings that took place? I shall mention them as briefly as I can. The first is the 90 percent rigid price support this year for wheat, cotton, corn, and peanuts. My colleagues may recall that the Senate, by a very sizable vote of 54 to 41, voted down the 2-year extension of rigid 90 percent of parity price supports. The members of the committee will recall that in committee we had voted down, by a sizable vote, a 1-year extension because we felt that it would be obvious that in this political year we were playing politics with this vital economic question of the prosperity of the farming population of the Nation if we so extended the program.

We had two votes on this subject in committee. One was on the 1-year extension, which was defeated largely on the ground that it was too patently a political maneuver, and the other was on the 2-year extension which carried in the committee, but when it got to the floor of the Senate, was voted down by a vote of 54 to 41.

In conference we took the political course—and I say "we" without including myself as one who followed that course—of holding the Senate and the Congress up to the fair opinion of the good people of the country by the adoption of a 1-year program, which we might as well have said would expire on November 7, 1956, as to say it would expire on December 31, 1956. We put ourselves and the Congress in the position of playing superb politics with this particular economic measure, which is an unpleasant thing to look at, but that is what it is.

There is not a Member of the Senate and there is not a person in the galleries who does not know perfectly well why the 90 percent price-support provision for 1 year appears in the conference report. I regret that it appears in the conference report for that reason. Perhaps it is too much to expect that it would not appear in the conference report in a political year. It is too bad this important measure could not have come to the floor and have been debated with more deliberation last year, before the political virus, which now seems to be so potent, had infected us in the Congress of the United States. I wish we could have considered the bill without the influence of a political year being upon the Congress. I think it is not to the credit of the Congress of the United States that we have yielded thus supinely to the demand, which comes from a minority of the agricultural producers of the Nation, to insert in the bill a provision for 90 percent of parity price supports for 1 year.

The demand does come from a minority of the producers, and every Senator knows it. They all know perfectly well that the total basic crop production amounts to about 23 cents of every dollar of agricultural production, and nearly 4 cents of that 23 cents represents the production of tobacco. So between 19 and 20 cents of every dollar of agricultural production is represented in the pressure to which I regret to say the Congress has yielded. I do not think it is much of a commentary on our own good sense to yield to a minority pressure of that kind.

I have already called attention on the floor of the Senate to the fact that many agricultural industries in the United States are prosperous, and a great many of them are prosperous because they have not yielded to the inducements and blandishments of price supports, but, instead, have insisted on working out their own salvation as best they could. My own State is full of industries which want nothing of price supports. They think it would be weakening for them to receive price supports. They saw an example of that in the case of Irish potatoes when such supports were destroying the independence and income of potato producers and holding them up to the ridicule of the other producers of the Nation.

Senators who were here then—and they include most of those now present—will recall that the potato producers of Florida along with the potato producers of Louisiana and the potato producers of other States demanded that that program be ended, because they said it was not right, was costing the Government too much money, and was destroying the confidence of the people in any agricultural program, no matter how sound.

Then I come to dual parity, which is a deceptive sort of thing because it operates so differently in the case of different commodities. Let us consider how it operates in the case of wheat. For wheat, 90 percent of parity at the dual parity level means that the wheat industry will get the parity of the horse-and-buggy days of 1910 to 1914, which will mean between 96 and 97 percent by this year's standard. It so happens that the wheat industry is now as highly mechanized, if not more so, as any other industry, whereas in the period from 1910 to 1914 the wheat industry was nowhere near so highly mechanized. It happens that the wheat industry, in being able to claim the advantage of the conditions and the parity levels of the 1910–14 period, is able to claim the advantage of a gimmick which gives that industry a very great advantage over other producing industries.

Mr. President, adoption of dual parity plus the 90 percent price support provision makes for very great inequalities among our commodities, particularly in the case of wheat for this year, because on the basis of present parity levels, that will amount to 96-plus percent of parity. For the next year and the year after, it will be even worse.

I remember that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], whom I see in the Chamber at this time, sold us on the floor of the Senate—as indicated by a very considerable vote, as I recall—on the 2-price system, which really is a 3-price system, for wheat. He did so on the basis of repeating—and he repeated it in a colloquy with the Senator from Florida—that he was simply offering something which might be used, but which the Secretary of Agriculture would always have the right to decline to use if it proved not to be fair. However, instead of being brought forward in that way now, we find that that proposal comes from the conference as a mandatory one, so that if the referendum carries, the Secretary of Agriculture will no longer have the discretion which was provided in the measure as passed by the Senate, in regard to putting that program into effect or not putting it into effect, depending upon how fair it might seem to be. Instead, the conference report makes this provision mandatory. So that constitutes a material change from the bill as passed by the Senate, and a material change which I wish to state for the RECORD, and which I wish to have every Member of the Senate aware of when he casts his vote on the conference report tonight.

Mr. President, I think I should also mention another matter in reference to the wheat program, namely, the completely unfair treatment as between that to be received by the producers of hard and desirable and millable and salable kinds of wheat and the treatment for the producers of the less desirable kinds. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has already made the point—but I shall refer to it again, in passing—that it is a fact that even the area in the Far West which produces white wheat does not send to the mills, for consumption by the American people as a part of their food, more than a very small percentage of its production, approximately 20 percent; and the Senator from Vermont has pointed out that under the conference report, in connection with the three-price system for wheat, if that system is adopted, those who produce such wheat will receive exactly the same kind of certificates as the ones which will be issued to producers of highly desirable kinds of wheat, for approximately 51 percent of their entire production, and that they will be issued at 100 percent of parity at the dual rate, which will run up to approximately 107 or 108 percent, whereas the producers of the fine wheat which is desired by the millers will receive the same kind of treatment. If that is fair, then I do not know the meaning of the word "fair."

Next, Mr. President, I wish to refer to the ⅞-inch staple cotton program. A careful program was worked out by the committee, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], under which we were making a real effort again to have American cotton get into competition with cotton coming from other countries, so that American producers would have a chance to recapture their part of the export market. Likewise, under that program we were trying to get into a competitive position with synthetic fibers produced domestically. The Senator from Vermont has already ably mentioned them.

Mr. President, as a result of those three provisions of the conference report—namely, the 90 percent parity provision, dual parity, and the ⅞-inch staple standard for cotton—on which the Senate conferees have yielded to the House conferees, rather than to insist upon what the Senate wrote into the bill and what came from the Senate committee, the Senate's well laid out program is entirely destroyed. So I am quite unhappy that the benefits of an effort lasting approximately one year, in connection with which most of the elements of the cotton industry have cooperated in working for the development of a common program, have been so ruthlessly destroyed in favor of a sop in the form of a 1-year price support program at 90 percent. If there is anything fair and anything farsighted and anything statesmanlike about that kind of action, I do not know what it is, because the conference report ruthlessly destroys our well-laid-out program and our deliberate plan in the case of the great cotton industry to recapture the American share of the foreign markets and to recapture a competitive position for the synthetics produced in this country.

Mr. President, I wish to mention in particular the weak provision pertaining to the feed grains. I do not know how it will work, and I do not know that anyone else can say that he knows how it will work, but I think I know what will happen, and I wish to state it for the RECORD. I think this program for small grains will do two things which will be hurtful, instead of helpful, aside from hurting the livestock industry, to which I shall refer in a moment.

In the case of the production of corn from the commercial area, let us say, two things which I think will be done will be very hurtful to the commercial corn producers: First, I think the price level which will be created will be so tempting that we shall see Canada devoting hundreds of thousands of acres of land to the production of feed grains, rather than to the production of wheat. We have already had trouble of that sort. I call attention to the fact that the Canadian granaries are full, just as our granaries are full. Hundreds of thousands of acres of land in Canada are available for diversion from wheat production to the production of small grains. Mark my words, Mr. President: We shall see Canada claim an unusually large share of the market in the northern part of our country.

Perhaps there is a good element in that situation, at least insofar as my section of the country is concerned, but it will not be good for the commercial corn growers. I refer to my belief that we shall see the great centers of poultry production and dairy production in the South turn all the more to the production of small grains in the areas which are noncommercial areas in general, rather than to look for their mixed feeds or other feeds to the commercial areas of production. Why should not the poultry industries of Gainesville and Harrisonburg and the dairy industries in the milksheds of Atlanta and Houston and Dallas and New Orleans and the other places which occur to all of us, turn to greater production in their own communities of the small grains which can be produced there, and the production of which can be greatly enlarged there when the price level will be forced up by having the Government buy and buy and buy from the commercial corn producers; and why would it not be a good thing for producers who are further away from the commercial Corn Belt to increase their production? I suspect that we shall see much of that occur.

The fundamental difficulty in the small-grains provisions is that they cannot be added up in any way which will come out right. For instance, in the conference report the corn-producing area is arbitrarily divided into a commercial belt and a noncommercial belt. When we try to work out a formula which would adjust the other four grains to those belts, although the other four grains are not at all indigenous or peculiar or applicable to them, we are bound to have trouble, and we are bound to have a Chinese puzzle which cannot be solved. That is exactly what will happen under the small-grains program.

I see that my time is rapidly running out, and there are several other points which I should like to mention. One of them relates to the manner in which grain production affects the livestock industry, and it is not the only thing in the conference report which adversely affects the livestock industry. In conference we yielded—again I say "we" without including two of us—to the demand of the House to eliminate a provision which I thought afforded the most teeth, namely, the amendment offered by the two Senators from Wyoming, providing a penalty against anyone who grazed lands under the soil bank program. That provision was eliminated. So I can see several scythes cutting off whatever there is left in this bill of prosperity for the livestock producers. There is no way to deny it, because they are there, and he who looks should see.

There is another place where we eliminated salutary provisions. Two entire sections and a part of another section in the Senate version of the bill were designed to protect tenants and sharecroppers. It was an excellent protection. That suffered the same fate as the protection which we had written in for livestock producers. The meat of that provision was eliminated. The provision with respect to forfeiture of anything in the way of price supports was eliminated, as was the provision bringing the tenant into the picture by giving him some right to be consulted with respect to placing into the program land of which he had been the husbandman. That provision, requiring his consent and consultation with him, was eliminated from the bill, along with other portions of the Senate measure which gave full protection to the humble man in the picture.

I do not think it is too much to say that on this point the bill in its present form, as compared with the Senate bill, becomes a landlord bill instead of a fair bill in which the landlord and the tenant receive equal consideration and equal care at the hands of the Federal Government.

Another one of the provisions which was eliminated from the bill was the provision which I had offered, called the compulsion amendment. It sought to require some measure of equality of participation and sacrifice by those who went into the soil bank, so that if they accepted the very great benefits of the soil bank, and particularly the acreage reserve, they would have to place in the program land which came out of their production, and they would have to agree not to put that land into production of other crops which were price supported.

That is the very essence of fairness. It is cross compliance. It is entering into the picture now not as a part of the original program, where it ought to have been, but as an ancillary part of the soil bank program. The Senate voted for it. That provision went out in the conference. So did everything else which tended to require any sort of equitable participation and equal sacrifice by growers of a given commodity, in the very laudable soil bank program.

One further point, and I shall be through. It will be remembered that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] announced to the Senate he proposed to vote—and he did vote—for a certain provision in the bill which is about the only bad provision we finally eliminated in conference. It would have jumped up the set-aside to some ridiculous proportion. He stated that he voted for it because he thought it would bring pressure to bear on the conferees which would compel them to come back with a better surplus-disposal program. He was hoping that we would hold onto what we had by way of a better surplus-disposal program, and build from there.

However, I am sorry to have to report to the Senate that, instead of what he expected to occur, we lost even what we went to conference with.

The Senator from Vermont has already stated that there was taken out of the bill the provision under which the surplus-disposal program would have been strengthened by placing a mandate upon the Secretary of Agriculture, with sole power to make decisions with respect to which he is now hampered by interference from the State Department. I refer to decisions as to the amount or volume of the various surplus commodities which are to be handled in the surplus-disposal program.

I am sorry the Senator from New Mexico is not present to participate in the discussion, because of the fact that, instead of forcing a better surplus-disposal program, and instead of improving it, we come back from conference with a surplus-disposal program which, with the 90 percent of parity price supports and other features, will enhance surpluses, fill up more warehouses and more ships, and cause them to overhang the market with even greater harm than results from the surpluses which now hang over it. After all, we know that the crux of the entire situation is the immense surplus which hangs over our heads and destroys markets.

Mr. President, how much more time have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 7 more minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is one further thing to which I should like to refer, and that is the statement which I have often heard made by my distinguished friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who has done such a noble job in the preparation of the bill. I suspect that he is heartsick at the fate of this year of effort. I heard him say repeatedly that the high rigid price support was not adopted as an incentive to greater production, and that it did not result in greater production. I had never heard that argument seriously advanced by anyone before. So I took the pains to examine some of the measures of the wartime, and of the time which followed, to see exactly what were the words of those who had been responsible for the drafting of such legislation during wartime and in the period following, when reference was made to the high rigid price supports, and what was intended to be accomplished by them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a summary of price-support legislation.

In 1941 the sponsor of the so-called Steagall amendment filed for the House Committee, House Report 742, 77th Congress, to accompany the legislation. The report contains this language:

> Recently the Secretary of Agriculture has found it necessary to encourage farmers to increase the production of certain crops in order to obtain additional supplies for export to Great Britain during the present emergency. Under these circumstances, farmers are entitled to some assurance that after they have increased their production upon the encouragement of the Government, the increased supplies will not be allowed to depress the domestic market to a level of unreasonably low prices. In order to meet this obvious need section 4 is included in the bill for the purpose and with the intent of assuring farmers, upon being encouraged by the Secretary to increase their production of any commodity during the present emergency, that the Department of Agriculture will undertake, within the limitations of funds available, to provide through loan programs, purchase programs, and other programs for the maintenance of a price for such commodity of not less than 85 percent of the parity price therefor, or, under certain circumstances in the case of nonbasic commodities, a price comparable to not less than 85 percent of the parity price for other commodities.

Section 4 of the Act (Public Law 147, 77th Congress) reads as follows:

> Whenever during the existing emergency the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary to encourage the expansion of production of any nonbasic agricultural commodity, he shall make public announcement thereof and he shall so use the funds made available under section 3 of this act or otherwise made available to him for the disposal of agricultural commodities, through a commodity loan, purchase, or other operation, taking into account the total funds available for such purpose for all commodities, so as to support a price for the producers of any such commodity with respect to which such announcement was made of not less than 85 percent of the parity or comparable price therefor. The comparable price for any such commodity shall be determined and used by the Secretary for the purposes of this section if the production or consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for basic commodities. Any such commodity loan, purchase, or other operation which is undertaken shall be continued until the Secretary has given sufficient public announcement to permit the producers of such commodity to make a readjustment in the production of the commodity. For the purposes of this section, commodities other than cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice shall be deemed to be nonbasic commodities.

In House Report 1776, 80th Congress, filed by Congressman HOPE of Kansas, to accompany the Agriculture Act of 1948, we find the following words which are pertinent to this discussion:

The price-support programs for agricultural commodities which would be modified and continued by this bill came into being principally because of the urgent demands for increased food and fiber production to meet war and essential civilian needs. * * * These programs have been invaluable in obtaining necessary production of agricultural commodities.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot yield now because of my limited time. I regret it very much. On the 1949 Agricultural Act, the Senate committee report, which was concurred in by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and by most of the present members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reads in part as follows:

Price supports which were incentives for production became an established principle in our wartime program.

There is no question about that being the case.

I ask that all of the quoted material be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

SENATE REPORT NO. 1091

During the past decade, price supports for agricultural commodities have played important and varying roles in the economy of the country. Prior to World War II, the major purpose of the program was to support and maintain the purchasing power of the farmer at a level which would allow agriculture to play its proper part in a stable economy. During the war the price-support program was used successfully as a national defense measure by encouraging increased production of food and fiber vitally needed by ourselves and our allies. Price supports which were incentives for production became an established principle in our wartime program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I quote from another report filed by Representative SPENCE, in 1952:

In the field of agriculture, we know from experience that unless agricultural producers receive a fair price for the commodities they produce, we are not likely to have the high level production we need (p. 23, H. Rept. 2177, 82d Cong.).

Then the following statement was made by the then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan:

The Nation today is confronted by an emergency calling for high-level production. We need favorable prices and adequate price protection to provide an adequate climate favorable to high-level production.

In connection with other legislation adopted in 1952, the House committee report filed by Representative COOLEY contained the following statement:

It is the belief of the committee that the enactment of this provision—

That has to do with the 90 percent provision—

is absolutely essential to assure the Nation adequate production of these important agricultural commodities during this emergency period. * * * it is certain that the bill will add tremendously to the response that may be expected from farmers to the Government's request for high-level agricultural production.

Mr. President, it cannot be denied that in the report on each extension and in the enactment of the original Bankhead bill it was stated in reports and on the floor and in other ways, by the responsible Members of the House and of the Senate who handled the measures, that high level supports were designed to force heavy production, and that later, after they had accomplished heavy production, they had become the established principle of our Nation's agricultural economy because they had succeeded in bringing about heavy production.

The last language I wish to quote is from a report filed by my distinguished friend the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] in 1952. The statement reads as follows:

Your committee views this legislation as particularly important at this time. Farmers are being asked to achieve record production goals in 1952 and similar record production will be needed in 1953 and perhaps for several years. Without the enactment of S. 2115, large groups of producers face sharp reductions in the parity price for their product in 1954. Farmers cannot be expected to do their best productionwise unless such an adverse situation is prevented.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is another quotation from my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from North Dakota, but I shall not place it in the RECORD at this point. He has already placed it in the RECORD himself as a communication which he sent to his constituents in 1952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to make one more statement, and that is that Senators who force this kind of bill to enactment are ignoring the fact that a large part of our country does not want it, and that a great many people in our country will not stand for it. Further, the whole matter will come back to plague Senators if this bill is passed.

For instance, I have before me a poll taken of country editors throughout the United States by the American Press magazine, which is a trade journal. I ask unanimous consent to have page 12 and the top of page 13 printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. I merely read the headline: "Don't Return to Rigid Price Supports for Farmers, Country Editors Warn."

The country editors know pretty well what the sentiment of their people is, and what is good and what is bad for the commodities in their areas. That is the sentiment we are getting from that group of people.

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

DON'T RETURN TO RIGID PRICE SUPPORTS FOR FARMERS, COUNTRY EDITORS WARN

"Continue Eisenhower's flexible price-support program, or eliminate price supports altogether—but don't return to the 'rigid' price support for farmers.

"Try out the soil bank idea.

"Repeal restrictions on sale of surplus farm products to Iron Curtain countries.

"Exempt farmers from the Federal gasoline tax."

That is the concensus of opinions of the country editors of the Nation on the farm program, as revealed by a poll just completed by the American Press, based on replies received from 653 editors from all sections of the United States.

The poll also showed majority approval of the job being done by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Conducted while discussion of the farm program was at its height, the American Press poll not only asked editors to give their opinion on various proposals, but also asked for their estimate of the opinions of their readers. This second part of the survey showed considerable difference between the opinions of the editors and of their readers.

Whereas only 18 percent of editors favored a return to rigid price supports, for example, 45 percent thought their readers favored the idea of going back to the old support system. And where 61 percent of editors approved the job being done by Secretary Benson, only 31 percent thought their readers approved of his work.

The survey revealed strong opposition among editors to the whole price support idea. Many who voted for the flexible supports emphasized that they should gradually be reduced and the Government should aim at getting rid of all supports as rapidly as possible.

Many of the editors felt that price supports were simply being used by politicians to get votes and stated their belief that the idea is "un-American," that the farmer should stand on his own feet like any other businessman, and that there is no more reason to give "hand-outs" to farmers than to newspaper publishers.

Sentiment in favor of the "soil bank" idea was mild—many of the editors feeling that it is perhaps "the only way out" but not a sound answer to the basic problem of the farmer.

A good many editors who thought some kinds of supports were necessary, felt they should be restricted to small farms—or include ceilings on the amount paid out—in order to help out the family-type farmer who is having a difficult time but to avoid aiding the "factory-type" large farm which, they believe, is well able to take care of itself and which should be discouraged from adding to our surpluses of farm products.

Response to the poll was the greatest of any conducted by the American press so far, indicating a high degree of interest in and knowledge of the farm problem among the country editors. Almost 50 percent of those who received the questionnaire answered it in detail, many making extensive comments on the subjects covered.

Many suggestions were made by the editors for helping to solve the farm problem, ranging from the suggestion that we adopt the plan, explained in the Bible, of a food bank such as was set up by Joseph in Egypt, to the idea that instead of worrying about getting rid of surplus products we center our attention on doing away with surplus farmers, and find jobs for them in industry.

Many other suggestions and views on the general situation are included in the comments published in this issue. A summary of the questions and answers to the poll, broken down by geographic areas, follow:

1. (a) The soil-bank plan, proposed by President Eisenhower, to help deal with the problem of farm surpluses, calls for the Government to pay farmers a yearly rental for each acre of land taken out of production. Are you for or against such a plan?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
For	47	51	63	52	56
Against	51	47	34	48	41
No answer	2	2	3	0	3

1. (b) How do you think the majority of your readers would vote on this question?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
For	50	60	75	52	65
Against	41	34	22	39	30
No answer	9	6	3	9	5

2. (a) As for farm supports, which of the three choices below appeal to you most?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Flexible supports	44	38	55	48	48
Rigid supports	7	33	17	7	18
No supports	43	26	25	44	30
No answer	6	3	3	0	4

2. (b) How do you think the majority of your readers would vote on this question?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Flexible supports	52	24	38	54	39
Rigid supports	15	67	50	24	45
No supports	27	7	7	15	11
No answer	6	2	5	7	5

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without the time being charged to either side.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum? The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has promised to yield me 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would not the Senator prefer to have more Senators on the floor?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thought the Senator from Texas wanted to suggest the absence of a quorum just before the Senate voted on the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would suggest the absence of a quorum so that more Senators may be present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bridges	Curtis
Allott	Bush	Daniel
Barkley	Butler	Dirksen
Barrett	Capehart	Douglas
Beall	Carlson	Duff
Bender	Case, N. J.	Dworshak
Bennett	Case, S. Dak.	Eastland
Bible	Clements	Ellender
Bricker	Cotton	Ervin
Flanders	Knowland	Payne
Frear	Kuchel	Potter
Fulbright	Laird	Purtell
George	Langer	Robertson
Goldwater	Lehman	Russell
Gore	Long	Saltonstall
Green	Malone	Schoeppel
Hayden	Mansfield	Scott
Hennings	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Maine
Hickenlooper	Martin, Pa.	Smith, N. J.
Hill	McCarthy	Sparkman
Holland	McClellan	Stennis
Hruska	McNamara	Symington
Humphrey	Millikin	Thye
Jackson	Morse	Watkins
Jenner	Mundt	Welker
Johnson, Tex.	Murray	Wiley
Johnston, S. C.	Neely	Williams
Kefauver	Neuberger	Wofford
Kennedy	O'Mahoney	Young
Kerr	Pastore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I rise to support the conference report on the agricultural bill. I believe it represents a great improvement over the bill originally proposed by the Eisenhower administration and over the bill originally reported by the Senate committee. Although it does not do all that many of us would like to have done, it will have the effect, in my opinion, of improving economic conditions considerably on the farms. That I consider to be the economic problem number one of the Nation.

I am glad that in this final conference report the matter of the surplus has been separated from the general agricultural program and therefore can be handled in an orderly manner without continually depressing present farm income. The surplus should not forever be used to hold down fair treatment to the farmer, particularly the small farmer.

Under title III of this program, the Secretary, among other things, is directed to submit to Congress recommendations for any other detailed programs necessary to carry out surplus disposal, including programs for a food stamp plan. I think that we should waste no time in putting into operation a food stamp or allotment plan. I have one pending, and the Senator from Oklahome [Mr. KERR] and other Senators have similar plans pending. There is no doubt of the need both from the standpoint of moving the surplus and from the standpoint of improving the diets of many people throughout the Nation.

In my opinion there is no reason for great delay on the Secretary's part in producing such a plan.

I also trust that he will take immediate steps to comply with the spirit of the report in seeking to move the surplus in world markets. Here we have an opportunity not only to move much of our surplus but to do it in a way to improve our international relations.

Mr. President, I am delighted that under this program the 90 percent price level will be maintained. It is my hope that before long our agricultural programs will have special provisions for assisting family-type farming, and I am going to continue working for that. I believe it is essential to our future.

I want to compliment the many Members of the Senate who have worked so hard and so tirelessly in bringing about an acceptable agricultural bill over great obstacles. They have accomplished much in the face of stiff opposition from Mr. Benson and the Agriculture Department.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the senior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, of course this bill is not all that anyone wishes to have, but it is a fair bill. The compromise brought forth by the conferees, as I have endeavored to keep in close contact with it day by day, seems to me to be a reasonably fair bill. It really gives to the President his main recommendation which he submitted in his farm message, namely, his recommendation with respect to the soil bank. Already other committees of the House and the Senate have given to the President his recommendation for a reduction of 2 cents a gallon on gasoline for the farmers' machinery.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me it is a reasonably fair bill. It does not do everything everyone wants. It does not perpetuate high support prices except for the current year. Certainly, an industry which has lost from $6 billion to possibly $7½ billion since 1951, in the shrinkage of its prices, is entitled to some consideration.

It may be disturbing to some Members of the Senate that we are about to pass, I hope, this farm bill, imperfect as it may be and inadequate as it may be, as a relief program, but I dare say and I dare remind my colleagues that several million farmers are sitting near their television sets or with their ears to their radios listening to learn what the Senate will do.

It will give some heart to that vast population of farmers to learn that the Senate has followed the lead of the House this afternoon in paying some attention to the problems which confront the people who live on and operate the farms of the United States.

I hope, Mr. President, that we shall by an impressive vote confirm what our conferees have done through the laborious days they remained here during the Easter vacation in an effort to work out a reasonable farm bill for our people.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the very constructive and commendable remarks of the Senator from Georgia, [Mr. GEORGE]. As a member of the committee, I have been one of those who have been working on this bill for almost a year since we began our hearings over the countryside. I think we brought forth a very good bill when it emerged from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Perhaps in the main it was a better farm bill than is the one on which we are now to have an opportunity to vote. I do not think it is the best bill this Congress is able to write, but I believe it to be the best one we can get

during the present session of the Congress. I have been in this business long enough to appreciate the fact that we do not always reach exactly the perfect goal or objective which we seek. If we seek too hard to get a perfect objective we sometimes wind up with nothing.

I invite attention to the fact that the problem of the farmer is a serious one. It needs some immediate constructive action, and we have an opportunity by accepting this conference report, to take a long step in the right direction.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for 10 seconds?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I say that I think the Senator from Georgia contributed very greatly to this bill, and I agree with him wholeheartedly?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I think my time has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I come from a State where the going is rough, and politics is pretty even, but I am not playing politics with this bill. The Eisenhower administration did not create the present condition. They inherited it. They found it here when they assumed office. Certainly the President and our great Secretary of Agriculture have done as good and as honest a job as they could to solve the problem. I refuse to play politics on this vote. I am voting to support the President and the Secretary of Agriculture. If anyone else has ever come up with any other reasonable solution, I do not know what it is.

Ohio is an important State. It is a great agricultural State, and I believe the people of Ohio respect honesty and respect a man of integrity who inherits a problem and who is trying to do a good job in solving it.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote with the administration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to myself.

Because of the limitation of time the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] did not get an opportunity to put into the RECORD a part of an editorial from the Tampa Morning Tribune, and he has requested that I do so. I think the significant paragraph of the editorial is this:

> It just does not make sense—
>
> Speaking of the conference report.
>
> It is equivalent to ordering youngsters at a PTA carnival to engage in a hotdog-eating contest to counteract indigestion caused by prior over-indulgence.

Mr. President, Senators may honestly differ on this issue as on all other issues which come before Congress. Anyone who knows President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson can have no reservation, I believe, in the knowledge that they are vitally interested in all segments of the American economy. The President of the United States is devoted to the American people. He recognizes that what is a disadvantage to any single segment of the national economy will ultimately react upon all its segments.

It is my belief, and I think it is the very strong feeling of the administration, that the conference report which is now before the Senate will not solve the agricultural problems of the Nation but, to the contrary, will multiply them. If the administration thought the bill would do the things which those who have spoken in favor of the conference report seem to think it will do, I believe the adminstration would be favorably disposed toward the measure. But it is my judgment that the bill in the form in which it has finally come from the committee of conference is totally unacceptable to the administration, and that they believe it is unworkable from an administrative point of view.

We have our job to do. In due time the executive branch, of course, will have to assume their responsibility.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield myself an additional minute.

I hope, in the event the bill in its present form does not become the law of the land, that Congress will still proceed to develop additional agricultural legislation for the benefit of the American farmer. The bill in its present form will be, I believe, a disadvantage to the farmers of America. I believe it will be unworkable from an administrative point of view.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I support the conference report. I support the 90 percent of parity program, as I have supported it for many years. On one occasion, when I occupied the chair now occupied by the distinguished Vice President, I broke a tie vote in behalf of the 90-percent formula.

My regret is that the conference report provides for a term of only 1 year, which probably will make it necessary to thresh out the whole question again next year, to determine what sort of agricultural legislation Congress will give to the farmers of the Nation.

It has been charged this evening that the farm bill is before Congress because of politics. If it is here because of politics, it necessarily follows that it is here because of cheap politics. I do not believe that any such charge is justified. I do not believe the great Committees on Agriculture or the conferees of both Houses have brought the measure before Congress because this is a presidential year, and because they wished to curry favor with some group of the American people.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] intimated that the bill was here because the present administration inherited a farm problem from the previous administrations. Mr. President, if it had not been for the previous administrations, the Nation would still be floundering in the bankruptcy which it inherited 2 decades ago.

The bill is not political, any more than anything which is governmental is political.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not the time; I have only 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky declines to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me that our duty is plain. I do not know what the President will do with the bill. I have the greatest respect for the President of the United States. I have the greatest respect for Mr. Eisenhower as a person and as President. But I want to discharge my duty now on the floor of the Senate. Whatever the President may do will be his responsibility, and I am sure he will do whatever his conscience dictates he ought to do.

Surely we cannot vote here in fear because the President may veto the bill. If he vetoes the bill, the responsibility will be his, not ours.

Because I believe the farmers of the Nation are entitled to know when they plant their crops what their support will be when they harvest the crops I favor the 90-percent support price. I believe now it is either that or nothing.

Therefore, I shall vote for the conference report, although I agree it is imperfect. But if the conference report shall be rejected now, we cannot hope to get a better bill, or any bill at all, at the present session, and Congress will adjourn, leaving the farmers unprotected in an economy where it is claimed that while the Nation as a whole is blessed with high prices, the economy of agriculture is constantly on the decline.

Mr. President, I decline to be frightened by the fear which seems to have possessed the souls of some of our colleagues with respect to the effects of the bill. I believe that no matter how Senators voted before, whether for rigid high supports or for flexible supports, they now have the obligation to vote the conference report up or down.

I shall support the conference report with pleasure and with some regret because it does not go far enough, in my judgment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

As I see the situation at present, we must do everything we can to help the farmers of the Nation. A few short years ago, the net income of the farmers was $17.2 billion. This year it is $10 billion. Thus there has been a reduction of more than $7 billion in the net income of the farmers.

The committee of conference has tried to hold up the prices received by the farmers, in order to keep their net income from sinking even lower than it is at present.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who also was the chairman of the committee of conference, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. He worked faithfully in the endeavor to bring forth a satisfactory bill from conference. Not only that, but he worked week in and week out, month in and month out, to report the bill to the Senate in its original form. I say to him now that we have done a good job in perfecting the bill which has come from conference. I served with the Senator from Louisiana

on the Senate committee and on the committee of conference.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Senate will agree to the conference report. But before taking this vote, I remind the Senate that this is a give-and-take bill, and that this is the best possible measure that could be obtained under the circumstances.

We have moulded together the desires of the Senate and the House. We have not achieved all that the Senate desired; neither have we achieved all that the House desired. Certainly the farmers have not achieved all that they need to restore themselves to their rightful place in our Nation's economy. But I must point out that the conference report is much better for the farmers than either of the bills that passed the House and Senate.

I would have not signed the report if I did not think it was the best possible measure obtainable.

We cannot leave the farmers high and dry with no legislation, which is what we would be doing if we failed to agree to the conference report. To do this would be to leave the farmers at the mercy of the Benson Department of Agriculture and its programs, which have slid the farmers down into the muck of a depression while being surrounded by high prosperity on every hand for everyone else.

The House has agreed to the conference report by a vote of 237 to 181. To do our duty to the farmers of this country, we should and must agree to the conference report now before the Senate.

I hope the Senate will agree to the conference report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, had it been possible to enact proper legislation in time, the soil-bank provisions would undoubtedly have contributed immensely to the prosperity of American agriculture this year. However, it is now too late for the soil bank to be particularly effective this year. There have been so many unwise and unsound provisions added to the bill, including certain soil-bank provisions, that it would be a disservice to the farmers of the United States to enact the bill. It would be the kind of legislation which would destroy farm markets, both domestic and foreign, and especially markets for cotton. It would be the kind of legislation which would demoralize our agricultural economy. It would be the kind of legislation which would greatly increase the cost of production for livestock producers, dairymen, and the poultry men, without any assurance at all that the producers of feed would benefit.

If my colleagues will look at the chart in the rear of the Chamber, they will see the percentage of reduction in production which every State would have to make in order to enjoy the so-called benefits given to the producers of livestock feed under the bill.

Mr. President, we have on the books a very good law. It has not had a chance to work yet. If this bill fails to become law, as I am sure it will, the Agricultural Act of 1954 will take effect. We would see agricultural conditions improve under that act, though not nearly to the extent to which they would have improved had not the soil-bank provisions of the bill been emasculated and wrapped up in unsound provisions which are totally unacceptable to the administration.

Therefore, Mr. President, for the good of the farmers of the United States, I shall vote against the conference report, and I hope the majority of the Members of the Senate will also vote against sending this monstrosity to the White House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself the time remaining on this side.

Mr. President, because I believe it will be in the best interests of the farmers of the United States, I hope this conference report will be adopted. It was with deep regret that I read an article in the New York Times this morning explaining that the food processors have joined the Secretary of Agriculture in his lobbying to keep farm income low. I read a paragraph from the article, as follows:

> Food industry interests opened a campaign yesterday to mobilize consumer sentiment against certain features of the farm bill.
>
> They acted as a result of a telephone conversation between John Q. Adams, chairman of the board of directors of the Coordinating Committee of the Food Industries, and Secretary Benson. The committee was set up by 52 trade associations in various levels of food production, processing and distribution.

I think this article is very revealing as to the forces that are alined against the measure. It is certainly opposed by people who have little interest in the welfare of the farmer, and these people are trying to rally others to their cause.

So far as I am concerned, farm legislation will best benefit the Nation if it benefits the farmer, and not if it is designed only to help the food processors at the expense of the farmer.

This measure deserves the support of everyone who is interested in bolstering lagging farm income.

Mr. President, the bill I repeat is opposed by the food processing industry, according to the article I have just read. It is opposed by everybody except the farmers, and each Senator has a chance tonight to stand up and be counted as to whether he believes in the farmer or in the food processors and the others who have been living off the farmer.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the conference report I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Chair state the question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on H. R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. PASTORE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—50

Barkley	Hennings	Morse
Bible	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Capehart	Hill	Murray
Carlson	Humphrey	Neely
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Neuberger
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Curtis	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Daniel	Kerr	Scott
Douglas	Laird	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Ellender	Lehman	Symington
Ervin	Long	Thye
Frear	Mansfield	Welker
Fulbright	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
George	McCarthy	Wofford
Gore	McClellan	Young
Hayden	McNamara	

NAYS—35

Aiken	Dirksen	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Duff	Millikin
Barrett	Eastland	O'Mahoney
Beall	Flanders	Payne
Bender	Goldwater	Potter
Bennett	Holland	Purtell
Bricker	Hruska	Saltonstall
Bridges	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Bush	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Knowland	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Williams
Cotton	Malone	

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	Ives	Pastore
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Magnuson	Smathers
Green	Monroney	

So the conference report on H. R. 12 was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO ENFORCEMENT OF STATE STATUTES PRESCRIBING CERTAIN CRIMINAL PENALTIES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "To amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities."

At the outset, Mr. President, let me state that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has a peculiar interest in the bill because of the fact that introduction of the bill was made imperative by the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Pennsylvania against Steve Nelson. Inasmuch as the case arose in the State which is so well represented by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], he has, as I have said, great interest in this bill. However, due to the fact that the attorney general of my State, a very distinguished attorney, Mr. Louis Wyman, was selected by the National Association of Attorneys General as chief counsel to plead the case before the United States Supreme Court, I am introducing the bill, and in doing so I am joined by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], as cosponsors of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator from New Hampshire be willing to permit other Senators to join in sponsoring the bill? I should like to join as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am very happy to have the Senator from California do so. Therefore, I introduced the bill also on behalf of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire also include my name as a cosponsor of the bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, Mr. President; I also include as a cosponsor the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

I wish to provide opportunity for other Senators to join in sponsoring the bill, if they desire to do so.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I should like to be included as a cosponsor of the bill; and I am quite sure that if the Senator from New Hampshire will arrange to have the bill made available so that other Senators may join in sponsoring it there will be a considerable number of other Senators who will wish to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Ohio, and I am glad to include him as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire permit me to join in sponsoring the bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am delighted to do so.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I should also like to join in sponsoring the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Indiana, and I am glad to include his name as a cosponsor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Senator from New Hampshire request unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk until tomorrow, so that other Senators may have a chance to join in sponsoring it? I should like very much to talk to the Senator from New Hampshire about the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I request such permission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am not a judge or a great constitutional lawyer, such as some persons in the United States regard themselves as being. Nevertheless, I introduce the bill, which will have the effect of clarifying the part the several States may play in protecting themselves from subversion. I think it essential that that be done. I in no way am attempting to second-guess the Supreme Court of the United States, but this is not a matter which involves intricate legalisms. It is a matter in which the Supreme Court by a divided opinion of 6 to 3 has interpreted the intent of the framers of the Constitution. The men who framed our Constitution were not all men trained in the law. Most of them were elected servants of the people as you and I are, Mr. President. I think, therefore, that it is entirely within my province to introduce the bill, and entirely within the province of the legislative branch to enact legislation which I think is necessary in order to correct a misinterpretation of the intent of our Founding Fathers.

It seems inconceivable to me—considering, as we must, that our Federal Government is based on a grant of power from sovereign States—that they had any intention whatsoever of depriving themselves of the power to deal with attempts at subversion or attempts to overthrow the respective governments of those sovereign States.

In the course of preparing these remarks a few moments ago, it was brought to my attention that the Subversive Activities Liaison Committee of the National Association of Attorneys General, of which New Hampshire's attorney general, Mr. Louis Wyman, is vice president, has just adopted resolutions urging the enactment of amendatory legislation of this type. A meeting of these attorneys general was called today in Washington in response to widespread concern by the law-enforcement officials of the various States in regard to the situation created by the Supreme Court's decision.

Therefore I am very proud, at the request of this committee of attorneys general of the various States, and because the attorney general of my State, the vice president of that organization, has been chosen to plead the case before the Supreme Court, to introduce this bill, and I introduce it on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from California, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and myself.

The bill (S. 3617) to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Let me say that I have read the Senator's bill, and I heartily approve of it. It is along the same line as one which I have introduced today, and I should like to be a cosponsor of the Senator's bill, if he will consent to it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall be very happy and delighted to have the Senator join as a cosponsor. As I indicated earlier to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, his bill is aimed at the same objective at which my bill is aimed. I told him that I was introducing it at the request of the Association of Attorneys General. I am very happy to have the Senator join as a cosponsor, because we seek the same objective, namely, to right an injustice which has been brought about by a decision of the Supreme Court which deprives the States of the Union of the opportunity to protect themselves against subversive activities.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Let me say to the Senator that I think he is performing a great service in introducing the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator. I am happy to have him join.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I have joined with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in introducing a bill which would restore to the respective States

the right to prosecute those who would destroy the Government of the United States or of the State. The recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upholding the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania struck down the sedition statutes of the 42 States and the Territories which have them.

I firmly believe in the right of each sovereign State to have and to enforce such legislation. A study of the debate at the time the Smith Act was approved in 1940 makes clear that Congress did not wish nor intend that it should nullify State sedition laws then existing or to be passed.

Moreover, we have the assurance of the Justice Department and the FBI that the States have administered their sedition statutes in harmony with the Federal law. We know further that information gathered by individual States has been of great value to the Justice Department and the FBI.

I do not intend to criticize or quarrel with our courts, but I believe that Congress should make its intention clear by enacting the bill which has been introduced.

I believe, that each State should have the right to combat sedition within its borders. I believe each should have the right to punish not only those who seek forcible overthrow of the State but also those who would forcibly overthrow the Nation.

These matters are locked together.

No movement can overthrow by force the government of a State and make it stick, unless it also overthrows the governments of all the States and the Nation.

No movement can forcibly overthrow the Federal Government without, at the same time, overthrowing the governments of the States.

And so I join with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New Hampshire in an effort to plug the hole which the Supreme Court decision has made in the dike protecting our internal security.

REQUIREMENT THAT STATEMENTS ACCOMPANY CONFERENCE REPORTS

The Senate resumed consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House.

PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in the event that the unfinished business is disposed of tomorrow, I should like to have Senators on notice that it is planned to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1628, Senate bill 3340, a bill to transfer the functions of the Passport Office to a new agency of the Department of State, to be known as the United States Passport Service, to establish a passport service fund to finance the operations of the United States Passport Service, and for other purposes.

I also give notice that it is planned to proceed at the earliest possible date with the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill reported today.

Mr. President, there are less than a dozen bills on the calendar. I appeal to the chairmen of committees and the ranking minority members of committees to report any proposed legislation which may be ready for consideration by the Senate.

The majority leader and the minority leader are very desirous of keeping the Senate in session to act upon any necessary legislation as soon as it is reported.

I do not know that I have ever seen a calendar which had as few bills on it as the one we now have.

I expect to hold a meeting of the majority policy committee tomorrow or next day, and clear some of the bills on the calendar for consideration on the floor of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. COTTON, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. JENNER, Mr. WELKER, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. STENNIS), by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 3617) to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of the Committee on the Judiciary, was authorized to meet tomorrow during the session of the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires recognition at this time, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 12, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 11 (legislative day of April 9), 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada, vice R. Douglas Stuart.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast been our help in ages past and art our hope for years to come, we rejoice that Thou art able and willing to make our minds and hearts the dwelling place of Thy peace and power.

We pray that we may have that courageous and conquering spirit which knows how to meet and master all the mountains of doubt and difficulty, of fear and frustration, of trial and tribulation.

Grant unto us a greater feeling of sympathy for the suffering and sorrowing and make us eager to share our blessings with all Thy needy children who are finding the struggle of life so strenuous.

Direct us with Thy counsel during the deliberations and decisions of this day and may we seek to establish among all the members of the human family a happier and more peaceful relationship.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF FRANK BOYCE, 13, OF ELIZABETH CITY, N. C., 1956 WINNER OF JUNIOR CITIZENSHIP AWARD OF BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, Frank Boyce, 13, of Elizabeth City, N. C., the 1956 winner of the junior citizenship award of Boys' Clubs of America, is regarded by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wilford Boyce, as just an average American kid.

Frank, a slim lad with brown hair and brown eyes, echoes this view of his father, a truck driver and fruit-stand operator, and his mother. "I reckon I just had a lot more help than many kids," he says.

But the 13-year-old, who is modest in the extreme about his achievements, can scarcely be called "average" by most standards. Those achievements include his selection last year as top player in the Pop Warner Midget Football Conference, an honor he won in competition with 40,000 boys in 266 midget leagues across the country.

In addition, last year he was also named the most valuable baseball player in the Little League in his community. More than 100 schoolmates and fellow Boys' Club members competed in that contest.

Somehow, between his athletic activities, studies, work with the Boys' Club of Elizabeth City—785 members—and

the help he gives his father in his business, Frank is able to squeeze in the operation of a newspaper route, the arduous duties of the presidency of the Junior High School Student Council—550 members—summer-camp counseling and, for extra measure, enlistment in local campaigns of the Red Cross, March of Dimes, and other local welfare drives.

The youngster received the junior citizenship award at ceremonies in New York on April 2. During National Boys' Club Week, April 2–8, Frank was to meet a number of celebrities and was scheduled to appear on TV and radio programs commemorating the golden anniversary of Boys' Clubs in America. The organization is observing its 50th anniversary this year.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 22]

Avery	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.
Celler	Johnson, Calif.	Osmers
Dawson, Ill.	Lesinski	Powell
Dollinger, N. Y.	McDonough	Prouty
Eberharter	McVey	Scott
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Sullivan
Gordon	Mollohan	Tollefson
Grant	Nelson	Velde

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 411 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AGRICULTURAL BILL OF 1956

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1986)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Agricultural Act of 1956'.

"TITLE I—PRICE SUPPORT

"Price Support Levels on Basic Commodities

"SEC. 101. Section 101 (d) (6) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(6) Except as provided in section 402, the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 per centum of the parity price for the 1956 crop of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas'.

"Price Supports—Cottonseed and Soybeans

"SEC. 102. Title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 203. Whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported under this Act, the price of the other shall be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market.'

"Price Supports—Manufacturing Milk

"SEC. 103. The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'The price of whole milk and butterfat, respectively, shall be supported at a level not in excess of 90 per centum nor less than 80 per centum of the parity price therefor: *Provided*, That for the marketing year ending March 31, 1957, the price of milk for manufacturing purposes and the price of butterfat shall be supported at not less than $3.25 per hundredweight and 58.6 cents per pound, respectively.'

"Parity Formula

"SEC. 104. Section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (providing for a dual parity formula), is amended by striking out the following: ', as of any date during the six-year period beginning January 1, 1950.'. The Secretary shall make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula and report thereon, with specific recommendations, including drafts of necessary legislation to carry out such recommendations, to Congress not later than January 31, 1957.

"Effective Date

"SEC. 105. This title shall take effect with the 1956 crops.

"TITLE II—SOIL BANK ACT

"*Short title*

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Soil Bank Act'.

"Declaration of Policy

"SEC. 202. The Congress hereby finds that the production of excessive supplies of agricultural commodities depresses the prices and income of farm families; constitutes improper land use and brings about soil erosion, depletion of soil fertility, and too rapid release of water from lands where it falls, thereby adversely affecting the national welfare, impairing the productive facilities necessary for a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities, and endangering an adequate supply of water for agricultural and nonagricultural use; overtaxes the facilities of interstate and foreign transportation; congests terminal markets and handling and processing centers in the flow of commodities from producers to consumers; depresses prices in interstate and foreign commerce; disrupts the orderly marketing of commodities in such commerce; and otherwise affects, burdens, and obstructs interstate and foreign commerce. It is in the interest of the general welfare that the soil and water resources of the Nation be not wasted and depleted in the production of such burdensome surpluses and that interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural commodities be protected from excessive supplies. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress and the purposes of this title to protect and increase farm income, to protect the national soil, water, and forest and wildlife resources from waste and depletion, to protect interstate and foreign commerce from the burdens and obstructions which result from the utilization of farm land for the production of excessive supplies of agricultural commodities, and to provide for the conservation of such resources and an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of such agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce. To effectuate the policy of Congress and the purposes of this title programs are herein authorized to assist farmers to divert a portion of their cropland from the production of excessive supplies of agricultural commodities, and to carry out a program of soil, water, forest and wildlife conservation. The activities authorized under this title are supplementary to the acreage allotments and marketing quotas authorized under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and together with such acreage allotments and marketing quotas, constitute an overall program to prevent excessive supplies of agricultural commodities from burdening and obstructing interstate and foreign commerce.

"*Subtitle A—Acreage reserve program*

"Terms and Conditions

"SEC. 203. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized and directed to formulate and carry out an acreage reserve program for the 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops of wheat, cotton, corn produced in the commercial corn-producing area, other feed grains (corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area, grain sorghums, barley, rye and oats), peanuts, rice, flue-cured tobacco, burley tobacco, Maryland tobacco, dark air-cured tobacco, fire-cured tobacco, Virginia sun-cured tobacco, cigar binder tobacco types 51, 52, 54, and 55, and Ohio cigar filler tobacco types 42, 43, and 44, respectively (hereinafter referred to as 'the commodity'), under which producers shall be compensated for reducing their acreages of the commodity below their farm acreage allotments or their farm base acreages, whichever may be applicable. To be eligible for such compensation the producer (1) shall reduce his acreage of the commodity below his farm acreage allotment or farm base acreage, whichever may be applicable, within such limits as the Secretary may prescribe, (2) shall specifically designate the acreage so withdrawn from the production of such commodity (hereinafter referred to as the 'reserve acreage'), and (3) shall not harvest any crop from, or graze, the reserve acreage unless the Secretary, after certification by the Governor of the State in which such acreage is situated of the need for grazing on such acreage, determines that it is necessary to permit grazing thereon in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, and consents to such grazing. Reserve acreage of a commodity may include acreage whether or not planted to the production of the 1956 crop of the commodity prior to the announcement of the acreage reserve program for the 1956 crop if the crop thereon, if any, shall be plowed under or otherwise physically incorporated into the soil, or clipped, mowed, or cut to prevent maturing so that the reduction in acreage of the commodity below the acreage allotment occurs within 21 days after the enactment of this title, or by such later date as may be fixed by the Secretary. The reserve acreage shall be in addition to any acreage devoted to the conservation reserve program authorized under subtitle B of this title. The acreage reserve program may include such terms and conditions, in addi-

tion to those specifically provided for herein, including provisions relating to control of noxious weeds on the reserve acreage, as the Secretary determines are desirable to effectuate the purposes of this title and to facilitate the practical administration of the acreage reserve program.

"Before any producer is entitled to receive any compensation for participating in the acreage reserve program, he must first enter into a contract with the Secretary, which contract, in addition to such other terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary, shall contain provisions by which such producer shall agree:

"(i) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract at any stage during the time such producer has control of the farm and that such violation is of such a substantial nature as to warrant termination of the contract, to forfeit all rights to payments or grants under the contract, and to refund to the United States all payments and grants received by him thereunder.

"(ii) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract but that such violation is of such a nature as not to warrant termination of the contract, to accept such payment adjustments, forfeit such benefits, and make such refunds to the United States of payments and benefits received by him, under the contract, as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate.

"(b) (1) There is hereby established for each year for which an acreage reserve program is in effect for corn a total base acreage of corn for the commercial corn-producing area proclaimed under section 327 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, of fifty-one million acres. The total base acreage of corn for the commercial corn-producing area shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in such area on the basis of the acreage of corn in such counties during the five calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the apportionment is made (plus, in applicable years, the acreage diverted under previous agricultural adjustment, conservation, and soil bank programs), with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions, for trends in acreage during such period and for the promotion of soil-conservation practices: *Provided,* That any downward adjustment for the promotion of soil-conservation practices shall not exceed 2 per centum of the total base acreage that would otherwise be apportioned to the county. The base acreage for the county shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on the basis of past acreage of corn (planted and diverted), tillable acreage crop-rotation practices, types of soil, and topography.

"(2) This subsection (b) shall become inoperative after 1956 if in the referendum conducted pursuant to section 408 (b), producers do not vote in favor of the program provided in subsection (c) of such section.

"(c) For each year in which an acreage reserve program will be in effect for corn, a farm base acreage shall be established for feed grains. For 1956, in the commercial corn-producing area, such farm base acreage for feed grains shall be the average acreage on the farm planted to grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats, for the three years 1953, 1954, and 1955; and outside the commercial corn-producing area, such farm base acreage for feed grains shall be the average acreage on the farm planted to grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, and corn, for the three years 1953, 1954, and 1955. For 1957 and subsequent years in which an acreage reserve program will be in effect for corn, there is hereby established a total base acreage for feed grains (corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area, grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats). Such total base acreage for feed grains shall be the average acreage planted to such feed grains for the three years 1953, 1954, and 1955, adjusted to reflect any change in the commercial corn-producing area. The total base acreage of feed grains shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the States on the basis of the acreage of feed grains (planted and diverted) in such States for the five calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the apportionment is made, with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions and for trends in acreage during such perod. The base acreage of feed grains for each State, less a reserve of not to exceed 3 per centum thereof for apportionment as provided by this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties on the basis of the acreage of feed grains (planted and diverted) in such counties for the five calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the apportionment is made, with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions, for trends in acreage during such period and for the promotion of soil-conservation practices: *Provided,* That any downward adjustment for the promotion of soil-conservation practices shall not exceed 2 per centum of the total base acreage that would otherwise be apportioned to the county. The base acreage for the county shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on the basis of past acreage of feed grains (planted and diverted), tillable acreage, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography. The reserve set aside herein shall be apportioned to farms on which feed grains have not been planted for any of the crops for the three years immediately preceding the year for which the apportionment is made (such farms are hereinafter called 'new feed grain farms'). Producers shall not be eligible for compensation under the acreage reserve program for feed grains, on new feed grain farms. For purposes of this subsection, section 214, and section 408 (d) the terms 'plant' or 'planted', as used with respect to feed grains, other than corn, shall mean plant or planted for harvest as grain.

"Extent of Participation in Program

"SEC. 204. For purposes of the acreage reserve program the Secretary shall establish a national reserve acreage goal for the 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops of each commodity specified in section 203 (a). The limits within which individual farms may participate in the acreage reserve program shall be established in such manner as the Secretary determines is reasonably calculated to achieve the national reserve acreage goal and give producers a fair and equitable opportunity to participate in the acreage reserve program, taking into consideration their acreage allotments or farm base acreages, whichever may be applicable, the supply and demand conditions for different classes, grades, and qualities of the commodity, and such other factors as he deems appropriate.

"Compensation of Producers

"SEC. 205. (a) Producers shall be compensated for participating in the acreage reserve program through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary (1) in cash upon presentation by the producer or by any holder in due course or (2) at the option of the producer in the case of certificates issued with respect to grains and upon presentation by him, in grains (such grains to be valued by the Secretary at such levels as he determines will not materially impair the market price for such grain yet will, to the maximum extent practicable encourage acceptance of payment in grains in lieu of cash): *Provided,* That disposition of quantities of stocks hereunder in any one year shall be limited to not more than two-thirds of such quantities of such commodities as the Secretary determines would be a reasonable estimate of what would have been produced for marketing during such marketing year on the acreage withheld from production under the provisions of this title: *And provided further,* That such stocks shall not be released prior to the end of the normal harvesting season for the particular commodity being released. Compensation under this section shall be at such rate or rates as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable return for reducing their acreage of the commodity, taking into consideration the loss of production of the commodity on the reserve acreage, any savings in cost which result from not planting the commodity on the reserve acreage, and the incentive necessary to achieve the reserve acreage goal. The Secretary shall make an adjustment in yields for drought, flood, or other abnormal conditions in estimating the loss of production for purposes of establishing rates of compensation. The rates of payment offered under this section shall be such as to encourage producers to underplant their allotments more than one year. Commodities delivered to producers in redemption of such certificates shall not be eligible for tender to Commodity Credit Corporation under the price support program.

"(b) No compensation shall be paid to any producer for participating in the acreage reserve program for any year until the Secretary has ascertained that such producer has complied with the acreage reduction requirements of such program for such year.

"(c) The total compensation paid producers for participating in the acreage reserve program with respect to any year's crops shall not exceed $750,000,000, and with respect to any commodity for any year shall not exceed the amount shown below: Wheat, $375,000,000; cotton, $300,000,000; corn in the commercial corn-producing area, $300,000,000; other feed grains, $175,000,000; peanuts, $7,000,000; rice, $23,000,000; and tobacco, $45,000,000. The total amount available for the acreage reserve program for any year's crops shall be apportioned among the various commodities on the basis of the amounts required to achieve the reserve acreage goal for each commodity established under section 204.

"Effect on Acreage Allotments and Quotas

"SEC. 206. (a) In the future establishment of State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or base acreages under this title, reserve acreages applicable to any commodity shall be credited to the State, county, and farm as though such acreage had actually been devoted to the production of the commodity.

"(b) In applying the provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), and sections 326 (b) and 356 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7. U. S. C. 1326 (b), 1356 (g)), relating to reduction of the storage amounts of wheat and rice, the reserve acreage of the commodity on any farm shall be regarded as wheat acreage or rice acreage, as the case may be, on the farm.

"Subtitle B—Conservation reserve program

"Terms and Conditions

"SEC. 207. (a) To effectuate the purposes of this title the Secretary is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for periods of not less than three years with producers determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms covered by the contract wherein the producer shall agree:

"(1) To establish and maintain for the contract period protective vegetative cover (including but not limited to grass and trees), water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses on a specifically designated acreage of land on the farm regularly used in the production of

crops (including crops, such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage).

"(2) To devote to conserving crops or uses, or allow to remain idle, throughout the contract period an acreage of the remaining land on the farm which is not less than the acreage normally devoted only to conserving crops or uses or normally allowed to remain idle on such remaining acreage.

"(3) Not to harvest any crop from the acreage established in protective vegetative cover, excepting timber (in accordance with sound forestry management) and wildlife or other natural products of such acreage which do not increase supplies of feed for domestic animals.

"(4) Not to graze any acreage established in protective vegetative cover prior to January 1, 1959, or such later date as may be provided in the contract, except pursuant to the provisions of section 203 (a) (3) hereof; and if such acreage is grazed at the end of such period, to graze such acreage during the remainder of the period covered by the contract in accordance with sound pasture management.

"(5) Not to adopt any practice, or divert lands on the farm from conservation, woods, grazing, or other use, to any use specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice or use which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract.

"(6) (A) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract at any stage during the time such producer has control of the farm and that such violation is of such a substantial nature as to warrant termination of the contract, to forfeit all rights to payments or grants under the contract, and to refund to the United States all payments and grants received by him thereunder.

"(B) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract but that such violation is of such a nature as not to warrant termination of the contract, to accept such payment adjustments, forfeit such benefits, and make such refunds to the United States of payments and benefits received by him, under the contract, as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate.

"(7) To such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of this title and to facilitate the practical administration of the conservation reserve program, including provisions relating to control of noxious weeds.

"(b) In return for such agreement by the producer the Secretary shall agree:

"(1) To bear such part of the cost (including labor) of establishing and maintaining vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, on the designated acreage as the Secretary determines to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this title, but not to exceed a maximum amount per acre or facility prescribed by the Secretary for the county or area in which the farm is situated; and

"(2) To make an annual payment to the producer for the term of the contract upon determination that he has fulfilled the provisions of the contract entitling him to such payment. The rate or rates of the annual payment to be provided for in the contracts shall be established on such basis as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable annual return on the land established in protective vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, taking into consideration the value of the land for the production of commodities customarily grown on such kind of land in the county or area, the prevailing rates for cash rentals for similar land in the county or area, the incentive necessary to obtain contracts covering sufficient acreage for the substantial accomplishment of the purposes of the conservation reserve program, and such other factors as he deems appropriate. Such rate or rates may be determined on an individual farm basis, a county or area basis, or such other basis as the Secretary determines will facilitate the practical administration of the program.

"(c) In determining the lands in any area to be covered by contracts entered into under this section, the Secretary may use advertising and bid procedure if he determines that such action will contribute to the effective and equitable administration of the conservation reserve program.

"(d) A contract shall not be terminated under paragraph (6) of subsection (a) unless the nature of the violation is such as to defeat or substantially impair the purposes of the contract. Whenever the State committee believes that there has been a violation which would warrant termination of a contract, the producer shall be given written notice thereof by registered mail or personal service, and the producer shall, if he requests such an opportunity within thirty days after the delivery or service of such notice, be given an opportunity to show cause, in an informal proceeding before the county committee under regulations promulgated by the Secretary, why the contract should not be terminated. If the producer does not request an opportunity to show cause why the contract should not be terminated within such thirty-day period, the determination of the State committee made in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, shall be final and conclusive. If the producer within such thirty-day period requests an opportunity to show cause why the contract should not be terminated, the county committee, at the conclusion of the proceeding, shall submit a report including its recommendations, to the State committee for a determination, on the basis of such report and such other information as is available to the State committee, as to whether there has been a violation which would warrant termination of the contract. The producer shall be accorded the right, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary, to appear before the State committee in connection with the State committee's determination of the issue. The producer shall be given written notice by registered mail or personal service of the State committee's determination. If the producer feels aggrieved by such determinaton, he may obtain judicial review of such determination by filing a complaint with the United States district court for the district in which the land covered by the contract is located, within ninety days after the delivery or service of notice of such determination, requesting the court to set aside such determination. Service of process in such action shall be made in accordance with the rule for service of process upon the United States prescribed by the Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States District Courts. The copy of the summons and complaint required to be delivered to the officer or agency whose order is being attacked shall be sent to the chairman of the State committee. The action in the United States district court shall be a trial de novo to determine whether there has been a violation which would warrant termination of the contract. If the producer does not seek judicial review of the State committee's determination, within the ninety-day period allowed therefor, the State committee's determination shall be final and conclusive. The terms 'county committee' and 'State committee' as used herein refer to the county and State committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

"Conservation Reserve Goal

"SEC. 208. (a) The Secretary shall not later than February 1 of each year determine and announce the national conservation reserve goal for such year. Such goal shall be that percentage which the Secretary determines it is practicable to cover by contracts during such year of the number of acres, if any, by which (1) the acreage used for the production of agricultural commodities during the year preceding the year for which such determination is made, plus any acreage then in the acreage or conservation reserve program or retired from production as a result of acreage allotments or marketing quotas, exceeds (2) the acreage needed during the year for which such determination is made for the production of agricultural commodities for domestic consumption and export and an adequate allowance for carry-over. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this title the Secretary shall determine the national conservation acreage goal for 1956.

"(b) In distributing the national acreage goal among the various States and major crop production regions, the Secretary shall give due regard to the respective needs of the various States and regions for flood control, drought control, and other conservation benefits; the desires of producers in particular States or regions to participate in the conservation program; the diversion of acreage from crops under acreage allotments or marketing quotas; and the need to assure adequate production of agricultural commodities and products not in surplus and to discourage the production of agricultural commodities and products in surplus.

"(c) The Secretary shall transmit to the Congress on or before March 15 of each year a report of the scope of the conservation reserve program for the preceding year and the basis for participation in such program in the various States and major crop production regions of the country.

"Authorized Period of Contracts and Expenditures

"SEC. 209. (a) The Secretary is authorized to formulate and announce programs under this subtitle B and to enter into contracts thereunder with producers during the five-year period 1956–1960 to be carried out during the period ending not later than December 31, 1969, except that contracts for the establishment of tree cover may continue until December 31, 1974.

"(b) The period covered by any contract shall not exceed ten years, except that contracts for the establishment of tree cover may extend for fifteen years.

"(c) In carrying out the conservation reserve program, the Secretary shall not enter into contracts with producers which would require payments to producers, including the cost of materials and services, in excess of $450,000,000 in any calendar year.

"Termination and Modification of Contracts

"SEC. 210. (a) The Secretary may terminate any contract with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest.

"(b) The Secretary may agree to such modification of contracts previously entered into as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this title and to facilitate the practical administration of the conservation reserve program.

"Conservation Materials and Services

"SEC. 211. (a) The Secretary may purchase or produce conservation materials and services and make such materials and services available to producers under the conservation reserve program to aid them in establishing vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, under contracts authorized by this subtitle B, may reimburse any Fed-

eral, State, or local government agency for conservation materials and services furnished by such agency, and may pay expenses necessary in making such materials, and services available, including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery, application, or installation of materials and services.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in making conservation materials and services available to producers hereunder, the Secretary may make payments, in advance of determination of performance by the producers, to persons who fill purchase orders covering approved conservation materials or who render services to the Secretary in furnishing to producers approved conservation materials or services for the establishment by the producers of vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, under contracts authorized by this subtitle B. The price at which purchase orders for any conservation material or service are filled may be limited, if the Secretary determines that it is necessary in the interest of producers and the Government, to a fair price fixed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

"Effect on Other Programs

"SEC. 212. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enters into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be deemed to be decreased during the period of any contract entered into under the conservation reserve program by reason of the establishment and maintenance of vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, under such contract; and

"(2) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity in order to carry out the contract entered into under the conservation reserve program shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and base acreages under this Act.

"Geographical Applicability

"SEC. 213. This subtitle B shall apply to the continental United States, and, if the Secretary determines it to be in the national interest, to one or more of the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and as used in this subtitle B, the term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

"*Subtitle C—General provisions*

"Compliance With Acreage Allotments

"SEC. 214. No person shall be eligible for payments or compensation under this title with respect to any farm for any year in which (1) the acreage of any basic agricultural commodity other than wheat or corn on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment for the commodity under title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or (2) the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or fifteen acres, or (3) the corn acreage on the farm, in the case of a farm in the commercial corn-producing area, exceeds the farm base acreage for corn or the farm acreage allotment, whichever is in effect, or (4) the acreage planted to feed grains on the farm exceeds the farm base acreage for feed grains, except that such requirement for compliance with the farm base acreage for feed grains shall not apply for 1956. For the purpose of this section, a producer shall not be deemed to have exceeded his farm acreage allotment or farm base acreage, unless such producer knowingly exceeded such allotment or base acreage and, in the case of wheat, unless such producer knowingly exceeded the farm acreage allotment or fifteen acres, whichever is larger.

"Reapportionment Prohibited

"SEC. 215. No acreage diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments as a result of participation in the acreage reserve or conservation reserve programs shall be reapportioned or allotted to any other farm.

"Certificate of Claimant

"SEC. 216. Subject to the provisions of section 205 (b), payment or compensation authorized by this title may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has complied with all requirements for such payment and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief.

"Utilization of Local and State Committees

"SEC. 217. In administering this title in the continental United States, the Secretary shall utilize the services of local, county, and State committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

"Utilization of Other Agencies

"SEC. 218. With respect to conservation aspects of any program under this title, the Secretary shall consult with the soil-conservation districts, State foresters, State game and fish agencies, land-grant colleges, and other appropriate agencies of State governments, and with the Fish and Wildlife Service, in the formulation of program provisions at the State and county levels. The technical resources of the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, the land-grant colleges, the State foresters, State game and fish agencies, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and other appropriate technical services shall be utilized, so far as practicable, to assure coordination of conservation activities and a solid technical foundation for the program.

"Utilization of Land Use Capability Data

"SEC. 219. In administering this title the Secretary shall utilize to the fullest practicable extent land use capability data, including capability surveys as developed by the Soil Conservation Service, and shall carry forward to completion as rapidly as possible the basic land inventory of the Nation.

"Financing

"SEC. 220. (a) The Secretary is authorized to utilize the facilities, services, authorities, and funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation in discharging his functions and responsibilities under this title, including payment of costs of administration for the programs authorized under this title: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall, prior to February 1, 1957, or such earlier date as may be practicable, submit to the Congress for immediate reference to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a full program of all operations under this title which will require the making of expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958; and, after June 30, 1957, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not make any expenditures for carrying out the purposes of this title unless the Corporation has received funds to cover such expenditures from appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this title. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title, including such amounts as may be required to make payments to the Corporation for its actual costs incurred or to be incurred under this section.

"(b) All funds available for carrying out the purposes of this title shall be available for transfer to such agencies of the Federal or State governments as the Secretary may request to cooperate or assist in carrying out this title; and for technical assistance in formulating and carrying out the programs authorized by this title. The Secretary may make such payments in advance of determination of performance.

"Finality of Determinations

"SEC. 221. The facts constituting the basis for any payment or compensation, or the amount thereof, authorized to be made under this title, when officially determined in conformity with applicable regulations prescribed by the Secretary, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be reviewable by any other officer or agency of the Government. In case any producer who is entitled to any payment or compensation dies, becomes incompetent, or disappears before receiving such payment or compensation, or is succeeded by another who renders or completes the required performance, the payment or compensation shall, without regard to any other provisions of law, be made as the Secretary may determine to be fair and reasonable in all the circumstances and so provide by regulations.

"Protection of Tenants and Sharecroppers

"SEC. 222. In the formulation and administration of programs under this title, the Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including provision for sharing, on a fair and equitable basis, in payments or compensation under this title, and including such provision as may be necessary to prevent them from being forced off the farm. Applications to participate in any such program shall specify the basis on which the landlord, tenants, and sharecroppers are to share in such payments or compensation, and no contract under any such program shall be entered into unless such basis is approved by the county committee and incorporated into the contract. The standards prescribed by the Secretary for the guidance of county committees in determining whether any such basis shall be approved shall include the requirement that consideration be given to the respective contributions which would have been made by the landlord, tenants, and sharecroppers in the production of the crops which would have been produced on the acreage diverted from production under the contract and the basis on which they would have shared in such crops or the proceeds thereof.

"Penalty for Grazing or Harvesting

"SEC. 223. Any producer who knowingly and willfully grazes or harvests any crop from any acreage in violation of a contract entered into under section 203 or 207 shall be subject to a civil penalty equal to 50 per centum of the compensation payable for compliance with such contract for the year in which the violation occurs. Such penalty shall be in addition to any amounts required to be forfeited or refunded under the provisions of such contract, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States.

"Regulations

"SEC. 224. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"Production on Government Lands Prohibited

"SEC. 225. The President shall, with respect to farmlands now or hereafter owned by the Federal Government, restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of such lands for the production of price supported crops in surplus supply.

"Pooling of Conservation Reserve Land

"SEC. 226. Whenever management of family farms or optimum land use will be aided, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to permit farmers to pool their rights to participate jointly in the conservation reserve program on property other than their home farms.

"TITLE III—SURPLUS DISPOSAL

"Program of Orderly Liquidation

"SEC. 301. (a) The Commodity Credit Corporation shall, as rapidly as possible consistent with its existing authority, the operation of the price support program, and orderly liquidation, dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities held by it.

"(b) The Secretary shall submit to Congress within ninety days after the enactment of this Act detailed programs, with recommendations for any additional legislation needed to carry out such programs, (1) for the disposition of surplus commodities as required by subsection (a) above; (2) for a food stamp plan or similar program for distribution through States (including the District of Columbia, the Territories, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands) and local units of Government of future surplus production to needy persons in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, so as to prevent the accumulation of commodities in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and (3) for strategic stockpiling of foodstuffs and other agricultural products (A) inside the United States and (B) outside the United States as authorized in section 415 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954. The Secretary shall report annually on his operations under subsection (a) and such reports shall show—

"(1) the quantities of surplus commodities on hand;

"2) the methods of disposition utilized and the quantities disposed of during the preceding twelve months;

"(3) the methods of disposition to be utilized and the estimated quantities that can be disposed of during the succeeding twelve months;

"(4) a detailed program for the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities through marketing and utilization research and improvement of marketing facilities; and

"(5) recommendations for additional legislation necessary to accomplish the purposes of this section.

"Extra-Long Staple Cotton

"SEC. 302. (a) Hereafter the quota for cotton having a staple length of one and one-eighth inches or more, established September 20, 1939, pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, shall apply to the same grades and staple lengths included in the quota when such quota was initially established. Such quota shall provide for cotton having a staple length of one and eleven-sixteenths inches and longer, and shall establish dates for the quota year which will recognize and permit entry to conform to normal marketing practices and requirements for such cotton.

"(b) Beginning not later than August 1, 1956, the Commodity Credit Corporation is directed to sell for export at competitive world prices its stocks of domestically produced extra long staple cotton on hand on the date of enactment of this Act. The amount offered and the price accepted by the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be such as to dispose of such quantity in an orderly manner and within a reasonable period of time.

"Agreements Limiting Imports

"SEC. 303. The President may, whenever he determines such action appropriate, negotiate with representatives of foreign governments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the export from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products, and the President is authorized to issue regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of any such commodity, product, textiles, or textile products to carry out any such agreement. Nothing herein shall affect the authority provided under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended.

"Appropriation To Supplement Section 32 Funds

"SEC. 304. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the sum of $500,000,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32, Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612c), subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, except that up to 50 per centum of such $500,000,000 may be devoted during any fiscal year to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof.

"Transfer of Bartered Materials To Supplemental Stockpile

"SEC. 305. (a) Strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural commodities or products, unless acquired for the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U. S. C. 98–98h), or for other purposes shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U. S. C. 1704).

"(b) Strategic materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural commodities or products may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, free of duty.

"(c) In order to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for materials transferred to the supplemental stockpile there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts equal to the value of any materials so transferred. The value of any such material for the purpose of this subsection, shall be the lower of the domestic market price or the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment therein as of the date of such transfer, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"Surplus Disposal Administrator

"SEC. 306. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to appoint an agricultural surplus disposal administrator, at a salary rate of not exceeding $15,000 per annum, whose duties shall include such responsibility for activities of the Department, including those of the Commodity Credit Corporation, relating to the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities as the Secretary may direct.

"Use of Voluntary Agencies and Shipping Subsidy for Merchant Marine

"SEC. 307. That the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(a) The first sentence of section 103 (a) is amended by striking out the word 'and' following the words 'handling costs,' and by inserting immediately before the period the following: 'and, (3) all Commodity Credit Corporation funds expended for ocean freight costs authorized under title II hereof for purposes of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended'.

"(b) Section 201 is amended by striking out 'f. o. b. vessels in United States ports,'.

"(c) The first sentence of section 203 is amended to read as follows: 'Not more than $500,000,000 (including the Corporation's investment in such commodities) shall be expended for all such transfers and for other costs authorized by this title.' Section 203 is further amended by adding at the end of the section the following: 'Such transfers may include delivery f. o. b. vessels in United States ports and, upon a determination by the President that it is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title or of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, ocean freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry abroad may be paid from funds available to carry out this title on commodities transferred pursuant hereto or donated under said section 416. Funds required for ocean freight costs authorized under this title may be transferred by the Commodity Credit Corporation to such other Federal agency as may be designated by the President.'

"Commission To Recommend Legislation Providing for Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products

"SEC. 308. (a) (1) There is hereby established a bipartisan Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products (hereafter referred to as 'the Commission'). The Commission shall be composed of five members, of whom not more than three shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In making such appointments the President shall give due consideration to the interests of various segments of agriculture. One of the members so appointed shall be designated as Chairman by the President.

"(2) Members of the Commission shall be paid compensation at the rate of $50 per day and shall be reimbursed for necessary traveling and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

"(3) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of an executive director and such chemists, engineers, agriculturists, attorneys, and other assistants as it may deem necessary. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide the Commission with necessary office space, and may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any personnel of the Department of Agriculture to assist the Commission in carrying out its work.

"(4) Upon request of the Commission, any other department or agency of the Government having information or data needed by the Commission in carrying out its duties under this section, shall make such information or data available to the Commission for such purposes. The Commission shall take such steps as may be necessary to protect against unauthorized disclosure any such information or data which may be classified for security purposes.

"(5) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission in a technical or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434 or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare and present to the Congress, not later than June 15, 1957, the necessary recommendations which in its opinion will bring about the greatest practical use for industrial purposes of agricultural products not needed for human or animal consumption, including, but not limited to, use in the manufacture of rubber, industrial alcohol, motor fuels, plastics, and other products.

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum, not to exceed $150,000, as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions.

"(d) Upon submission of the recommendations referred to in subsection (b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

"(e) (1) Any bill or joint resolution embodying the recommendations presented to the Congress under subsection (b) shall, upon introduction in the Senate or House of Representatives, be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate or the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, as the case may be. Such committee shall proceed as expeditiously as possible to consider such bill or joint resolution.

"(2) This subsection is enacted by the Congress (A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, and (B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as they relate to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

"Donation to Penal and Correctional Institutions

"SEC. 309. Notwithstanding any other limitations as to the disposal of surplus commodities acquired through price support operations, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized on such terms and under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem in the public interest, and upon application, to donate food commodities acquired through price support operations to Federal penal and correctional institutions, and to State correctional institutions for minors, other than those in which food service is provided for inmates on a fee, contract, or concession basis.

"Federal Irrigation, Drainage, and Flood-Control Projects

"SEC. 310. (a) For a period of three years from the date of enactment of this Act, no agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with subsection (c) to be in surplus supply shall receive any crop loans or federal farm payments or benefits if grown on any newly irrigated or drained lands within any Federal irrigation or drainage project hereafter authorized unless such lands were used for the production of such commodity prior to the enactment of this Act.

"(b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be included, in all irrigation, drainage, or flood-control contracts entered into with respect to Federal irrigation, drainage, or flood-control projects hereafter authorized, such provisions as they may deem necessary to provide for the enforcement of the provisions of this section. For a period of three years from the date of enactment of this Act surplus crops grown on lands reclaimed by flood-control projects hereafter authorized and the lands so reclaimed shall be ineligible for any benefits under the soil-bank provisions of this Act and under price support legislation.

"(c) On or before October 1 of each year, the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and proclaim the agricultural commodities the supplies of which are in excess of estimated requirements for domestic consumption and export plus adequate reserves for emergencies. The commodities so proclaimed shall be considered to be in surplus supply for the purposes of this section during the succeeding crop year.

"(d) For the purposes of this section the term 'Federal irrigation or drainage project' means any irrigation or drainage project subject to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) in effect at the date of the adoption of this amendment and any irrigation or drainage project subject to the laws relating to irrigation and drainage administered by the Department of Agriculture or the Secretary of Agriculture.

"Processing of Donated Food Commodities

"SEC. 311. Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting before the last sentence thereof a new sentence as follows: 'In addition, in the case of food commodities disposed of under this section, the Commodity Credit Corporation may pay the cost of processing such commodities into a form suitable for home or institutional use, such processing to be accomplished through private trade facilities to the greatest extent possible.'

"TITLE IV—MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

"Extension of Surrender and Reapportionment Provisions for Wheat Acreage Allotments

"SEC. 401. Section 334 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out '1955' wherever it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof '1955, 1956, or 1957'.

"Acreage Allotments for Cotton for 1957 and 1958

"SEC. 402. Section 342 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the national marketing quota for cotton for 1957 and 1958 shall be not less than the number of bales required to provide a national acreage allotment for 1957 and 1958 equal to the national acreage allotment for 1956'.

"Cotton—Small Farm Allotments

"SEC. 403. (a) Section 344 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That there is hereby established a national acreage reserve consisting of one hundred thousand acres which shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment; and such reserve shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of their needs for additional acreage for establishing minimum farm allotments under subsection (f) (1), as determined by the Secretary without regard to State and county acreage reserves (except that the amount apportioned to Nevada shall be one thousand acres), and the additional acreage so apportioned to the State shall be apportioned to the counties on the same basis and added to the county acreage allotment for apportionment to farms pursuant to subsection (f) of this section (except that no part of such additional acreage shall be used to increase the county reserve above 15 per centum of the county allotment determined without regard to such additional acreage). Additional acreage apportioned to a State for any year under the foregoing proviso shall not be taken into account in establishing future State acreage allotments. Needs for additional acreage under the foregoing proviso and under the last proviso in subsection (e) shall be determined as though allotments were first computed without regard to subsection (f) (1).'

"(b) Section 344 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided further*, That if the additional acreage allocated to a State under the proviso in subsection (b) is less than the requirements as determined by the Secretary for establishing minimum farm allotments for the State under subsection (f) (1), the acreage reserved by the State committee under this subsection shall not be less than the smaller of (1) the remaining acreage so determined to be required for establishing minimum farm allotments or (2) 3 per centum of the State acreage allotment; and the acreage which the State committee is required to reserve under this proviso shall be allocated to counties on the basis of their needs for additional acreage for establishing minimum farm allotments under subsection (f) (1), and added to the county acreage allotment for apportionment to farms pursuant to subsection (f) of this section (except that no part of such additional acreage shall be used to increase the county reserve above 15 per centum of the county allotment determined without regard to such additional acreages).'

"(c) Section 344 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by changing paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"'(1) Insofar as such acreage is available, there shall be allotted the smaller of the following: (A) four acres; or (B) the highest number of acres planted to cotton in any year of such three-year period'.

"(d) The first sentence of section 344 (f) (6) of such Act is amended to read as follows: 'Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection, if the county committee recommends such action and the Secretary determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the county allotment among farms in the county, the remainder of the county acreage allotment (after making allotments as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection) shall be allotted to farms other than farms to which an allotment has been made under paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection so that the allotment to each farm under this paragraph together with the amount of the allotment of such farm under paragraph (1) (A) of this subsection shall be a prescribed percentage (which percentage shall be the same for all such farms in the county) of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm during the three years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, adjusted as may be necessary for abnormal conditions affecting plantings during such three-year period: *Provided*, That the county committee may in its discretion limit any farm acreage allotment established under the provisions of this paragraph for any year to an acreage not in excess of 50 per centum of the cropland on the farm, as determined pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection: *Provided further*, That any part of the county acreage allotment not apportioned under this paragraph by reason of the initial application of such 50 per centum limitation shall be added to the county acreage reserve under paragraph (3) of this subsection and shall be available for the purposes specified therein.'

"(e) The amendments made by this section shall be effective only with respect to 1957 and 1958 crops. For the 1956 crop, an acreage in each State equal to the acreage allotted in such State which the Secretary determines will not be planted, placed in the acreage reserve or conservation reserve, or considered as planted under section 377 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, may be apportioned by the Secretary among farms in such State having allotments of less than the smaller of the following: (1) four acres, or (2) the highest number of acres planted to cotton in any of the years 1953, 1954, and 1955.

"Minimum State Acreage Allotments for 1956 Rice Crop

"SEC. 404. Section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding to subsection (c) a new paragraph (5) to read as follows:

"'(5) Each of the State acreage allotments for 1956 heretofore proclaimed by the Secretary, after adding thereto any acreage apportioned to farms in the State from the reserve acreage set aside pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, shall be increased by such amount as may be necessary to provide such State with an allotment of not less than 85 per centum of its final allotment

established for 1955. Any additional acreage required to provide such minimum allotment shall be additional to the national acreage allotment. In any State having county acreage allotments for 1956, the increase in the State allotment shall be apportioned among counties in the State on the same basis as the State allotment was heretofore apportioned among the counties, but without regard to adjustments for trends in acreage.'

"Increase in Peanut Marketing Penalties

"SEC. 405. Effective beginning with the 1956 crop, section 359 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by amending the first sentence thereof to read as follows: 'The marketing of any peanuts in excess of the marketing quota for the farm on which such peanuts are produced, or the marketing of peanuts from any farm for which no acreage allotment was determined, shall be subject to a penalty at a rate equal to 75 per centum of the support price for peanuts for the marketing year (August 1–July 31).'

"Collection of Peanut Marketing Penalties

"SEC. 406. Section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding two new subsections as follows:

"'(d) The person liable for payment or collection of the penalty provided by this section shall be liable also for interest thereon at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date the penalty becomes due until the date of payment of such penalty.

"'(e) Until the amount of the penalty provided by this section is paid, a lien on the crop of peanuts with respect to which such penalty is incurred, and on any subsequent crop of peanuts subject to marketing quotas in which the person liable for payment of the penalty has an interest, shall be in effect in favor of the United States.'

"Preservation of Unused Acreage Allotments

"SEC. 407. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 376 a new section as follows:

"'Preservation of Unused Acreage Allotments

"'SEC. 377. In any case in which, during any year within the period 1956 to 1959, inclusive, for which acreage allotments are in effect for any commodity under this Act, the acreage planted to such commodity on any farm is less than the acreage allotment for such farm, the entire acreage allotment for such farm shall be considered for purposes of future farm acreage allotments to have been planted to such commodity in such year, but only if the owner or operator of such farm notifies the county committee prior to the sixtieth day preceding the beginning of the marketing year for such commodity of his desire to preserve such allotment. This section shall not be applicable in any case in which the amount of the commodity required to be stored to postpone or avoid payment of penalty has been reduced because the allotment was not fully planted. Nothing herein shall be construed to permit the allotment to any other farm of the acreage with respect to which notice is given under this section.'

"Acreage Requirements for Price Support on Corn and Other Feed Grains

"SEC. 408. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever base acreages are in effect for corn, the Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support on corn, that the producer (1) devote an acreage of cropland (tilled in normal rotation), at the option of the producer, to either the acreage reserve program for corn or the conservation reserve program, equal to 15 per centum of such producer's farm base acreage for corn, and (2) not exceed such farm base acreage for corn. Corn acreage allotments shall not be effective for the 1956 crop.

"(b) Not later than December 15, 1956, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum of producers of corn in 1956 in the commercial corn-producing area to determine whether such producers favor a price-support program as provided in subsection (c) of this section for the 1957 and subsequent crops in lieu of acreage allotments as provided in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and price support as provided in section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if two-thirds or more of the producers voting in the referendum conducted pursuant to subsection (b) hereof favor a price-support program as provided in this subsection (c), no acreage allotment of corn shall be established for the commercial corn-producing area, for any county, or for any farm, with respect to the 1957 and subsequent crops, and price support made available for such crops by Commodity Credit Corporation shall be at such level as the Secretary determines will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each year in which an acreage reserve program will be in effect for corn, the level of price support for corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area shall be 85 per centum of the level of price support for corn produced in the commercial corn-producing area, and the level of price support for each of the commodities, grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats, shall be a percentage of the parity price for each such commodity which is 5 percentage points less than the percentage of the parity price announced in advance of the planting season pursuant to section 406 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, as the level of price support for corn in the commercial corn-producing area. The Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support of such feed grains (corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area, grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats) that the producer (1) except in the case of new feed grain farms, devote an acreage on the farm to either the acreage reserve program for feed grains or the conservation reserve program equal to 15 per centum of the farm base acreage established for such feed grains under section 203 (c) hereof, and (2) not plant a total acreage of such feed grains on the farm in excess of 85 percentum of such farm base acreage for feed grains. The acreage required to be devoted to either the acreage reserve program for feed grains or the conservation reserve program as a condition of eligibility for price support for such feed grains shall be in addition to any acreage required to be devoted to either the acreage reserve program for corn or the conservation reserve program as a condition of eligibility for price support for corn produced in the commercial corn-producing area. Notwithstanding any other provision hereof, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available price support for the 1956 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats at the levels announced prior to the enactment of this subsection, and for the 1956 crop of corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area at 75 per centum of the level for corn produced in the commercial corn-producing area, to any producer who meets the requirements of eligibility therefor but who does not meet the additional requirements for price support prescribed by this subsection.

"TITLE V—PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAMS FOR WHEAT AND RICE

"SEC. 501. Title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (1) by changing the designation thereof to read as follows: 'Title III—Loans, Parity Payments, Consumer Safeguards, Marketing Quotas, and Marketing Certificates'; (2) by changing the designation of subtitle D thereof to read as follows: 'Subtitle F— Miscellaneous provisions and appropriations'; and (3) by inserting after subtitle C new subtitles D and E, as follows:

"'*Subtitle D—Domestic parity plan for wheat*

"'Legislative Findings

"'SEC. 379a. Wheat, in addition to being a basic food, is one of the great export crops of American agriculture and its production for domestic consumption and for export is essential to the maintenance of a sound national economy and to the general welfare. The movement of wheat from producer to consumer, in the form of the commodity or any of the products thereof, is preponderantly in interstate and foreign commerce. That small percentage of wheat which is produced and consumed within the confines of any State is normally commingled with, and always bears a close and intimate commercial and competitive relationship to, that quantity of such commodity which moves in interstate and foreign commerce. For this reason, any regulation of intrastate commerce in wheat is a regulation of commerce which is in competition with, or which otherwise affects, obstructs, or burdens, interstate commerce in that commodity. In order to provide an adequate and balanced flow of wheat in interstate and foreign commerce and thereby assist farmers in obtaining parity of income by marketing wheat for domestic consumption at parity prices and by increased exports at world prices, and to assure consumers an adequate and steady supply of wheat at fair prices, it is necessary to regulate all commerce in wheat in the manner provided under the marketing certificate plan set forth in this subtitle.

"'Domestic Food Quota

"'SEC. 379b. Not later than May 15 of each calendar year the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the domestic food quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year. Such domestic food quota shall be that number of bushels of wheat which the Secretary determines will be consumed as human food in the continental United States during such marketing year.

"'Apportionment of Domestic Food Quota

"'SEC. 379c. (a) The domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 1 per centum thereof for apportionment as provided in this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States on the basis of total production of wheat in each State during the ten calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for the acreage diverted under previous agricultural adjustment and conservation programs, for abnormal weather conditions and for trends in production during such period. The reserve quota set aside herein for apportionment by the Secretary shall be used to establish quotas for counties, in addition to the county quotas established under subsection (b) of this section, on the basis of the relative needs of counties for additional quota because of reclamation and other new areas coming into the production of wheat during the five calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed.

"'(b) The State domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 3 per centum thereof for apportionment as provided in subsection (c), shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in the State on the basis of the total production of wheat in each county during the ten calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed,

with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for the acreage diverted under previous agricultural adjustment and conservation programs, for abnormal weather conditions and for trends in production during such period.

"'(c) The county domestic food quota for wheat shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on which wheat has been seeded for the production of wheat during any one or more of the three calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for which the quota is proclaimed begins, on the basis of past acreage of wheat, the normal yield, crop rotation practices, type of soil, and topography. The reserve provided under subsection (b) shall be used to adjust farm quotas which the county committee determines to be inequitable on the basis of past acreage, if any, planted to wheat and the normal yield for such farm or the average of the county tillable acres, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography.

"'Marketing Certificates

"'SEC. 379d. (a) Beginning with the first crop of wheat for which a marketing certificate program is placed in effect under section 379j, the Secretary shall prepare for issuance in each county marketing certificates aggregating the amount of the county domestic food quota. Such certificates shall be issued to cooperators in an amount equal to the domestic food quota established for the farm pursuant to the applicable provisions of section 379c of this Act. The marketing certificates for a farm shall be issued to the farm operator, but the Secretary may authorize the issuance of marketing certificates to individual producers on any farm on the basis of their respective shares in the wheat crop, or the proceeds thereof, produced on the farm. The Secretary shall also issue and sell marketing certificates to processors and importers in such quantities as are required by them in order to meet the requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of section 379e. Marketing certificates shall be transferable only in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary.

"'(b) Whenever a domestic food quota is proclaimed for any marketing year pursuant to section 379b of this Act, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim for such marketing year (1) the estimated parity price, (2) the estimated farm price for wheat, and (3) the value per bushel of the marketing certificate. The value of the marketing certificate shall be equal to the amount by which the estimated parity price exceeds the estimated farm price as determined herein. The value of each marketing certificate shall be computed to the nearest cent by multiplying the value per bushel by the number of bushels thereof. Except as otherwise provided herein, the value of the certificate so determined shall remain constant and shall remain in effect throughout the marketing year for which it is issued. The proclamation required by this subsection shall be made during the month of May immediately preceding the marketing year for which such domestic food quota is proclaimed.

"'(c) The Secretary is authorized and directed through the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and sell marketing certificates issued for any marketing year at the value proclaimed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. For the purpose of facilitating the purchase and sale of certificates, the Secretary may establish and operate a pool or pools and he may also authorize public and private agencies to act as his agents, either directly or through the pool or pools. Certificates shall be valid to cover sales and importations of products made during the marketing year with respect to which they are issued and after being once used to cover such sales and importations shall be canceled by the Secretary. Any unused certificates shall be redeemed by the Secretary at the price established for such certificates.

"'Marketing Restrictions

"'SEC. 379e. (a) Beginning with the first day of the marketing year in which the first crop of wheat for which a marketing certificate program is placed in effect under section 379j would normally be marketed, and except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons engaged in the processing of wheat into food products composed wholly or partly of wheat are hereby prohibited from marketing any such product for domestic food consumption or export containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 379d of this Act have been acquired by such person. The quantity of such marketing certificates acquired shall be equivalent to the number of bushels of wheat processed into food products.

"'(b) Beginning with the first day of the marketing year in which the first crop of wheat for which a marketing certificate program is placed in effect under section 379j would normally be marketed and except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons are hereby prohibited from importing or bringing into the continental United States any food products containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 379d of this Act have been acquired by such person.

"'(c) Upon the exportation from the continental United States of any food product containing wheat, with respect to which marketing certificates as required herein have been acquired, the Secretary shall pay to the exporter an amount equal to the value of the certificates for the quantity of wheat so exported in the food product. For the purposes of this subsection, the consignor named in the bill of lading, under which the article is exported, shall be considered the exporter: *Provided, however,* That any other person may be considered to be the exporter if the consignor named in the bill of lading waives claim in favor of such other person.

"'(d) Upon the giving of a bond satisfactory to the Secretary under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe to secure the purchase of and payment for such marketing certificates as may be required, any person required to have a marketing certificate in order to market or import a food product composed wholly or partly of wheat may market or import any such commodity without having first acquired a marketing certificate.

"'(e) As used in this section, (1) the term "marketing" means the sale and the delivery of the food product composed wholly or partly of wheat, and (2) the term "food" means human food.

"'Conversion Factors

"'SEC. 379f. The Secretary shall ascertain and establish conversion factors showing the amount of wheat contained in food products processed wholly or partly from wheat. The conversion factor for any such product shall be determined upon the basis of the weight of wheat used in the processing of such product.

"'Civil Penalties

"'SEC. 379g. Any person who violates or attempts to violate, or who participates or aids in the violation of, any of the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of section 379e of this Act shall forfeit to the United States a sum equal to three times the market value, at the time of the commission of such act, of the product involved in such violation. Such forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States.

"'Adjustments in Domestic Food Quotas

"'SEC. 379h. If the Secretary has reason to believe that because of a national emergency or because of a material increase in demand for wheat, the domestic food quota for wheat should be increased or suspended, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine whether the increase or suspension is necessary in order to meet such emergency or increase in the demand for wheat. If, on the basis of such investigation, the Secretary finds that such increase or suspension is necessary, he shall immediately proclaim such finding (and if he finds an increase is necessary, the amount of the increase found by him to be necessary) and thereupon such quotas shall be increased or shall be suspended, as the case may be. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is increased under this section, each farm quota for wheat shall be increased in the same ratio and marketing certificates shall be issued therefor in accordance with section 379d of this Act. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is suspended under this section, the Secretary may redetermine the value of marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 379d of this Act.

"'Reports and Records

"'SEC. 379i. (a) The provisions of section 373 (a) of this Act shall apply to all persons, except wheat producers, who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle, except that any such person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by this section or making any false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 for each such violation.

"'(b) The provisions of section 373 (b) of the Act shall apply to all wheat farmers who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle.

"'Referendum

"'SEC. 379j. In any referendum held pursuant to section 336 of this Act on the national marketing quota proclaimed for any crop of wheat, the Secretary shall also submit on separate ballots the question whether farmers favor a marketing certificate program under this subtitle in lieu of marketing quotas under subtitle B. If more than two-thirds of the farmers voting in the referendum favor such marketing certificate program, the Secretary shall, prior to the effective date of the national marketing quota proclaimed under subtitle B, suspend the operation of such quota and place into effect a marketing certificate program for that crop and subsequent wheat crops under the provisions of this subtitle, in which event marketing quotas and acreage allotments and the provisions of title III of this Act relating thereto, except as otherwise provided in this section, shall not thereafter be in effect for wheat: *Provided,* That, whenever a marketing certificate program is in effect, the wheat marketing quota provisions and penalties shall remain in effect with respect to prior crops of wheat in the same manner as if marketing quotas were in effect for the current crop of wheat, and the Secretary may, by regulation, prescribe the method for collecting penalties on any such wheat.

"'Price Support

"'SEC. 379k. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"'(a) Whenever a wheat marketing certificate program under this subtitle is in effect, price support for wheat shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

"'(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations, price support to producers of wheat who are cooperators. The amount, terms, conditions, and extent of such price-support operations shall

be determined by the Secretary, except that the level of such support shall be determined after taking into consideration the following factors: (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which corn and other feed grains are being supported and the feed value of such grains in relation to wheat, (3) the provisions of any international agreement approved by the Congress or ratified by the Senate relating to wheat to which the United States is a party, (4) foreign trade policies of friendly wheat exporting countries, and (5) other factors affecting international trade in wheat including exchange rates and currency regulations.

"'(c) Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments may be prescribed and required by the Secretary as a condition of eligibility for price support and for the receipt of wheat marketing certificates. Acreage allotments shall be established in accordance with the provisions of subtitle B, part III of this Act.

"'(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no producer of wheat shall receive certificates for a number of bushels in excess of the number obtained by multiplying the acreage actually planted to wheat by the normal yield.

"'(e) Any farmer who is dissatisfied with his farm acreage allotment may have such acreage allotment reviewed in accordance with the procedures prescribed by sections 363 to 368, inclusive, for reviewing marketing quotas.

"'*Subtitle E—Rice certificates*

"'Legislative Findings

"'SEC. 380a. The movement of rice from producer to consumer is preponderantly in interstate and foreign commerce, and the small quantity of rice which does not move in interstate or foreign commerce affects such commerce. In order to provide an adequate and balanced flow of rice in interstate and foreign commerce and to assure consumers an adequate and steady supply of rice at fair prices it is necessary to regulate all commerce in rice in the manner provided in this subtitle. These findings are supplemental to and in addition to the findings contained in section 351 of this Act.

"'Effective Date and Termination

"'SEC. 380b. The provisions of this subtitle, unless extended by law, shall apply only to the crops of rice harvested prior to 1958, and sections 380c through 380g (c) shall not be applicable to rice harvested before 1956. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the national acreage allotment of rice for 1957 shall be not less than the national acreage allotment for 1956, including any acreage allotted under section 353 (c) (5) of this Act, and such 1957 national allotment shall be apportioned among the States in the same proportion that they shared in the total acreage allotted in 1956.

"'Rice Primary Market Quota

"'SEC. 380c. Not later than December 31 of each year, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the primary market quota for rice for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year, except that for the marketing year beginning in 1956 such determination and proclamation shall be made not later than thirty days after the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1956. The primary market quota shall be the number of hundredweights of rice (on a rough rice basis) which the Secretary determines will be consumed in the United States (including its Territories and possessions and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) or exported to Cuba, during such marketing year. In making this determination the Secretary shall consider the historical consumption in these markets of rice produced in the United States and any expected enlargement in such consumption predicated upon population trends, increased per capita consumption, and other relevant factors.

"'Apportionment of Primary Market Quota

"'SEC. 380d. (a) The primary market quota for rice shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States on the basis of the average yield per acre of rice in each State during the three years immediately preceding the year for which the quota is proclaimed (or in the case of the apportionment for 1957, during the two years preceding such year) multiplied by the acreage allotment of such State for such year. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the primary market quota for rice shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States for the marketing year beginning in 1956 on the basis of the 1955 production of rice in each State.

"'(b) The State primary market quota shall be apportioned by the Secretary among farms on the basis of the acreage allotment established for each farm multiplied by the normal yield per acre for the farm.

"'Review of Primary Market Quota

"'SEC. 380e. Notice of the primary market quota shall be mailed to the operator of the farm to which such quota applies. The farm operator may have such quota reviewed in accordance with the provisions of sections 363 to 368, inclusive, of this Act.

"'Price Support

"'SEC. 380f. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make price support available to cooperators through loans, purchases, or other operations on the 1956 crop of rice at not less than 55 per centum or more than 90 per centum of the parity price of rice as of the beginning of the marketing year and on the 1957 and subsequent crops of rice at such level, not less than 50 per centum or more than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor, as the Secretary determines will not discourage or prevent the exportation of rice produced in the United States.

"'(b) Section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, shall not apply to price support made available on rice of the 1956 and 1957 crops, but all the other provisions of such Act, to the extent not inconsistent with this subtitle, shall apply to price support operations carried out under this section.

"'Certificates

"'SEC. 380g. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall for each marketing year issue certificates to cooperators for a quantity of rice equal to the primary marketing quota for the farm for such marketing year, but not exceeding the normal yield of the acreage planted to rice on the farm. The certificate shall have the value specified in subsection (e) of this section.

"'(b) The landlord, tenants, and sharecroppers on the farm shall share in the certificates issued with respect to the farm in the same proportion as they share in the rice produced on the farm or the proceeds therefrom.

"'(c) The provisions of section 385 of this Act shall be applicable to certificates issued to producers under this section.

"'(d) The Commodity Credit Corporation shall issue and sell certificates to persons engaged in the processing of rough rice or the importing of processed rice. Each such certificate shall be sold for an amount equal to the value thereof, as specified in subsection (e) of this section.

"'(e) The value of each certificate issued under this section shall be equal to the difference between 90 per centum of the parity price of rice as of the beginning of the marketing year for which the certificate is issued and the level of price support for rice which is in effect during such marketing year, calculated to the nearest cent, multiplied by the quantity of rice for which the certificate is issued. Any certificates not used to cover the processing of rice or the importation of processed rice pursuant to sections 380k and 380l of this Act shall be redeemed by the Commodity Credit Corporation at the value thereof.

"'Inventory Adjustment Payments

"'SEC. 380h. To facilitate the transition from the price support program currently in effect to the program provided for in this subtitle, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make inventory adjustment payments to all persons owning rough rice located in the continental United States as of July 31, 1956, in amounts equal to the amount by which 80 per centum of the parity price of rice as of August 1, 1955, exceeds the support price for the 1956 crop of rice, multiplied by the quantities of such rough rice: *Provided, however,* That such payments shall not be made with respect to rice of the 1956 crop, imported rice, or rice acquired from Commodity Credit Corporation. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make payment to Commodity Credit Corporation for expenditures pursuant to this section.

"'Rice Set-Aside

"'SEC. 380i. All rough and processed rice in the inventories of Commodity Credit Corporation as of sixty days after the beginning of the 1956 marketing year, not exceeding twenty million hundredweight of rough rice or its equivalent in processed rice may be transferred to and be made a part of the commodity set-aside of rice established pursuant to section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954.

"'Exemptions

"'SEC. 380j. The provisions of this subtitle shall not apply to nonirrigated rice produced on any farm on which the acreage planted to nonirrigated rice does not exceed three acres, and the provisions of sections 380c through 380g (c) shall not apply to rice produced in Puerto Rico or Hawaii.

"'Processing Restrictions

"'SEC. 380k. (a) Each person who on or after August 1, 1956, engages in the processing of rough rice in the United States shall, upon processing any quantity of rough rice, acquire certificates issued under section 380g of this Act in an amount sufficient to cover such quantity of rough rice.

"'(b) The requirements of subsection (a) of this section shall not be applicable to the processing in Puerto Rico or Hawaii of rough rice grown in Puerto Rico or Hawaii, respectively.

"'(c) Upon the exportation from the United States to any country other than Cuba of any processed rice with respect to which certificates were acquired in accordance with the requirements of subsection (a) of this section or section 380l, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall pay to the exporter an amount equal to the value of the certificates for the rough rice equivalent of such processed rice.

"'Import Restrictions

"'SEC. 380l. Each person who, on or after August 1, 1956, imports processed rice into the United States shall acquire certificates issued under section 380g of this Act covering the rough rice equivalent of such processed rice.

"'Regulations

"'SEC. 380m. The Secretary shall prescribe regulations governing the issuance, redemption, acquisition, use, transfer, and disposition of certificates hereunder.

"'Civil Penalties

"'SEC. 380n. Any person who violates or attempts to violate, or who participates or aids in the violation of, any of the provisions of sections 380k or 380l of this Act, or regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the

enforcement of such provisions, shall forfeit to the United States a sum equal to three times the market value, at the time of the commission of such act, of the product involved in such violation. Such forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States.

" 'Reports and Records

" 'SEC. 380o. (a) The provisions of section 373 (a) of this Act shall apply to all persons, except rice producers, who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle, except that any such person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by this section or making any false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 for each such violation.

" '(b) The provisions of section 373 (b) of the Act shall apply to all rice farmers who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle.

" 'Definitions

" 'SEC. 380p. For the purposes of this sutitle—

" '(a) "cooperator" shall have the same meaning as under the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

" '(b) "processing of rough rice" means subjecting rough rice for the first time to any process which removes the husk or hull from the rice and results in the production of processed rice.

" '(c) "processed rice" means any rice from which the husk or hull has been removed and includes, but is not limited to—

" '(1) whole grain rice,

" '(2) second head milled rice,

" '(3) screenings milled rice,

" '(4) brewers milled rice,

" '(5) undermilled rice or unpolished rice,

" '(6) brown rice,

" '(7) converted rice, malekized rice or parboiled rice, and

" '(8) vitaminized rice or enriched rice.

" '(d) "United States" means the several States, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rice.

" '(e) "exporter" means the consignor named in the bill of lading under which the processed rice is exported: *Provided, however,* That any other person may be considered to be the exporter if the consignor named in the bill of lading waives his claim in favor of such other person.

" '(f) "rough rice equivalent" means the quantity of rough rice normally used (as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture) in the production of a particular quantity of processed rice, but shall not be more than one hundred pounds of rough rice for each sixty-eight pounds of processed rice.

" '(g) "import" means to enter, or withdraw from warehouse, for consumption.'

"Normal Yield for Rice

"SEC. 502. Paragraph (13) of section 301 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by (1) redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (G); and (2) striking out subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '(D) "Normal yield" for any county, in the case of rice, shall be the average yield per acre of rice for the county during the five calendar years immediately preceding the year for which such normal yield is determined, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and for trends in yields. If for any such year data are not available, or there is no actual yield, an appraised yield for such year, determined in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary, taking into consideration the yields obtained in surrounding counties during such year and the yield in years for which data are available, shall be used as the actual yield for such year.

" '(E) "Normal yield" for any farm, in the case of rice, shall be the average yield per acre of rice for the farm during the five calendar years immediately preceding the year for which such normal yield is determined, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and for trends in yields. If for any such year the data are not available or there is no actual yield, then the normal yield for the farm shall be appraised in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary, taking into consideration abnormal weather conditions, trends in yields, the normal yield for the county, the yields obtained on adjacent farms during such year and the yield in years for which data are available.

" '(F) In applying subparagraphs (D) and (E), if on account of drought, flood, insect pests, plant disease, or other uncontrollable natural cause, the yield for any year of such five-year period is less than 75 per centum of the average, 75 percentum of such average shall be substituted therefor in calculating the normal yield per acre. If, on account of abnormally favorable weather conditions, the yield for any year of such five-year period is in excess of 125 per centum of the average, 125 per centum of such average shall be substituted therefor in calculating the normal yield per acre.'

"TITLE VI—FORESTRY PROVISIONS

"Assistance to States for Tree Planting and Reforestation

"SEC. 601. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that building up and maintaining a level of timber growing stocks adequate to meet the Nation's domestic needs for a dependable future supply of industrial wood is essential to the public welfare and security; that assisting in improving and protecting the more than fifty million acres of idle non-Federal and Federal lands for this purpose would not only add to the economic strength of the Nation, but also bring increased public benefits from other values associated with forest cover; and that it is the policy of the Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture in order to encourage, promote, and assure fully adequate future resources of readily available timber should assist the States in undertaking needed programs of tree planting.

"(b) Any State forester or equivalent State official may submit to the Secretary of Agriculture a plan for forest land tree planting and reforestation for the purpose of effecting the policy hereinbefore stated.

"(c) When the Secretary of Agriculture has approved the plan, he is hereby authorized and directed to assist the State in carrying out such plan, which assistance may include giving of advice and technical assistance and furnishing financial contributions: *Provided,* That, for the non-Federal forest land tree planting and reforestation, the financial contribution expended by the Federal Government during any fiscal year to assist the State to carry out the plan shall not exceed the amount expended by the State for the same purposes during the same fiscal year, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make financial contributions on the certificate of the State official in charge of the administration of the plan as to the amount of expenditures made by the State.

"(d) In any plan that coordinates forest lands under the jurisdiction of any Federal agency other than the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture shall obtain the cooperation and assistance of the Federal agency having jurisdiction and the appropriate State forester in the approval and carrying out of the plan.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe such rules and regulations as may be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(f) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the objects of this section, such sums to remain available until expended."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

H. R. 12 passed the House on May 5, 1955. It consisted of 4 sections: (1) Establishing price supports for basic commodities at 90 percent of parity for the years 1955, 1956, and 1957; (2) establishing the support level for milk at 80 to 90 percent of parity; and (3) and (4) extending and providing additional funds for the special school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program. The Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserted an amendment consisting of 62 sections comprising some 77 printed pages. The task facing the conferees of reconciling the differences between these two measures has been substantial, particularly since some of the more complicated provisions of the Senate amendment were adopted on the floor without the opportunity for testimony and explanation which takes place in the process of committee consideration.

The committee of conference has reworked the Senate amendment section by section and the bill reported herewith is the Senate amendment with numerous changes and amendments agreed upon by the conferees. The major provisions are: (1) price-support provisions for basic commodities, cottonseed and soybeans, milk, and feed grains; (2) restoration of "dual parity" for basic commodities; (3) authority for a "soil bank" program; (4) various provisions to assist in disposal of surplus commodities including authority to donate such commodities to Federal penal institutions and State penal institutions for minors, substantial additional appropriations to supplement "Section 32" operations, and a directive to the Secretary of Agriculture to study and report promptly to Congress on other disposal programs, including a food stamp plan; (5) various provisions relating to acreage allotments and marketing quotas for commodities, chiefly designed to assist the small farm operator; (6) a domestic parity program for wheat and a "two-price" program for rice; and (7) authority for further assistance to States in forestry programs. Following is an explanation of the major provisions of the bill as reported herewith to the House.

Section 101. Price support levels on basic commodities

Establishes the support level for basic commodities at 90 percent of parity for the 1956 crop. The House bill provided support at 90 percent for 3 years. The Senate rejected the 90 percent support provisions but later significantly modified its action by adopting other provisions, including substantial additions to the "set-aside," which would have had the effect of requiring the Secretary to

establish support prices close to the 90 percent level. Under the provisions of the Senate bill it was estimated that the Secretary would have been required to support the basic commodities at the following levels for 1956; tobacco 90 percent, wheat 85 percent, cotton 88 percent, corn 84 percent, rice 90 percent on domestic consumption and not less than 55 percent on the balance, and peanuts 90 percent.

The committee of conference was agreed that falling farm prices, coupled with rising production costs, have created a crisis in farm income that may well become a catastrophe unless strong and effective action is taken to bolster farm income in 1956. Rather than adopt any of the devious devices which have been proposed for raising the level of support prices by indirection (including the set-aside which has been so strongly condemned by the Secretary of Agriculture), the committee of conference agreed that the most effective way of accomplishing this purpose is the simple and straightforward procedure adopted in the conference report of establishing price support levels for the basic commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity for 1956.

Section 102. Price supports—Cottonseed and soybeans

Requires that when the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported the price of the other of these closely related crops shall be supported at a comparable level.

Section 103. Price supports—Manufacturing milk

Establishes the support level for milk at 80 to 90 percent of parity (instead of 75 to 90 percent as provided in existing law) and further provides that for the marketing year ending March 31, 1957, the price of milk for manufacturing purposes and price of butterfat shall be supported at not less than $3.25 per hundredweight and 58.6 cents per pound, respectively. This provision replaces a complicated formula for establishing the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk which had been placed in the Senate amendment.

The price of $3.25 per hundredweight for milk for manufacturing (3.95 percent butterfat) is 85 percent of the February 15, 1956, parity equivalent for milk for manufacturing. This is 10 cents per hundredweight higher than the $3.15 support price announced by the Secretary of Agriculture on February 14, 1956. The $3.15 support price is 82 percent of the February 15, 1956, parity equivalent for milk for manufacturing.

To accomplish this 10 cent per hundredweight increase in the price of milk for manufacturing by increasing the purchase price of butter would require an increase of 2 cents per pound in the price of butter, which is equivalent to 2.4 cents per pound in the price of butterfat. Adding this 2.4 cents to the 56.2 cents announced support price for butterfat in cream would result in a support price of 58.6 cents per pound. This would be 82 percent of the parity price of butterfat in cream as compared with the February 14, 1956, announced level of 78 percent.

Although the committee amendment omits from the first sentence of section 201 (c) the words "and the products of such commodities", it does not change the present method of supporting milk and butterfat prices through "loans on, or purchases of, milk and the products of milk and butterfat" as provided in the second sentence of the subsection.

Section 104. Parity formula

Provides that the dual method of computing parity for the basic commodities (using both the old and the new parity formula) which has been in effect for the basics from 1949 until this year, is to be used henceforth. The section also recognizes the possibility of shortcomings in both of our existing methods of computing parity and directs the Secretary to make a thorough study of this subject and report thereon to Congress not later than January 31, 1957, with specific recommendations, including drafts of any necessary legislation, for the improvement of our parity system.

Section 105. Effective date

Makes all the foregoing provisions effective with 1956 crops.

TITLE II—SOIL BANK ACT (SECS. 201–227)

Title II comprises the Soil Bank Act. The provisions in the committee report are only slightly modified from those adopted by the Senate which are described in some detail in the committee report on S. 3183 (S. Rept. 1484) on pages 8 to 20. The provisions adopted by the Senate were, in turn, based upon and only slightly modified from the recommendations made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The soil-bank program authorized in title II consists of two parts: The acreage-reserve program (secs. 203 to 206) and the conservation reserve program (secs. 207 to 214). Sections 215 to 227 are general provisions applying to either or both the conservation reserve and the acreage-reserve programs.

Sections 203–206. Acreage-reserve program

The acreage-reserve program is not a soil-conservation measure but a short-term program designed to curtail production of specific commodities even below the anticipated production from allotment programs. It is authorized only for the 4 crop years 1956–59. It applies only to specified commodities: wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, most kinds of tobacco, and the feed grains (oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, and corn grown in noncommercial corn areas).

The objective of the acreage-reserve program is to induce farmers to reduce their acreages below their allotments or base acreages and to make no other use of the land so retired. The farmer who thus curtails his production will be paid an amount roughly equivalent to his anticipated return from the land had he put it to its intended purpose.

A special provision inserted in the bill by the committee will make it possible for the farmer to participate in the 1956 program even though he may already have planted his 1956 crops or may have been prevented from planting his normal crops because of adverse weather conditions. This latter provision was inserted in order to care for the condition which now exists in a vast area, particularly in the Southwest, where drought has prevented normal planting operations, and it is intended that the farmer who has not been able to plant and has not, therefore, planted will, nonetheless, be allowed to participate in the acreage reserve for 1956.

In general, the rate of payment will be approximately 50 percent of the price support for that quantity of the commodity which would normally be produced on the land placed into the acreage reserve. The specific rate of payment will, of course, vary from commodity to commodity and in different areas, but will be required to be in such amounts as will make the program attractive to farmers. Payment will be made in negotiable certificates redeemable in cash by the Commodity Credit Corporation or, in the case of grains, redeemable in grain at the option of the producer.

The committee proved that in case of unusual weather conditions resulting from either drought, flood, hail, wind, or other natural causes, the Secretary should make adjustments in calculating the normal yield for each farm. The committee was informed by representatives of the Department that the practice would be to eliminate the record of years of abnormally low production in calculating the normal yield for the farm for soil-bank-payment purposes, as well as in the calculation of acreage history of the farm for the determination of acreage allotment or farm base acreage.

The total amount which may be expended on the acreage-reserve program in any one year is $750,000,000. To assure a fair division of funds between the various commodities, the committee has also established maximums for the separate crops: Wheat, $375,000,000; corn, $300,000,000; cotton, $300,000,000; tobacco, $45,000,000; rice, $23,000,000; peanuts, $7,000,000; and feed grains, $175,000,000. The individual commodity limitations add up to more than the overall limit of $750,000,000 in order to permit adjustment of commodity programs to meet operating conditions but to not have the effect of increasing the overall limitation of $750,000,000. The conferees struck out of the Senate amendment a provision which would have limited payments to any one producer to not to exceed $25,000. Also eliminated from the Senate amendment was a provision which would have denied all price supports to a producer who did not participate in the acreage reserve.

The amount of acreage a producer will be permitted to put into the conservation reserve will vary by commodities but generally the program as tentatively formulated by the Department of Agriculture will permit farmers with small acreage allotments to put their entire allotment into the acreage reserve while those with larger allotments will be limited to a maximum percentage of their allotment. For example, a producer with a grain allotment would be permitted to put into the reserve 50 acres or 50 percent of his allotment, whichever is larger. Thus, any farmer with a grain allotment of less than 50 acres could place his entire allotment in the acreage reserve if he chose to do so. In addition, there is nothing in the legislation herewith reported which would prevent a small farmer from putting his maximum allowable acreage in the acreage reserve and then placing the balance of his land in the conservation reserve, providing regulations of the Secretary permit such action.

Preliminary and still tentative estimates of the payments per acre for the various crops or acreage put into the acreage reserve are as follows: Cotton, $48–$60; wheat, $18–$25; corn, $36–$50; rice, $60–$75; peanuts, $50–$70; tobacco, $100–$300; and feed grains, $15–$50. It should be emphasized that these figures are not only tentative, they are national average figures based upon the national average yield per acre of the various crops. The rate of payment an individual farmer can expect will be based not only upon these national average figures but upon the normal yield per acre of the land he is placing into the conservation reserve and other local factors. The two basic principles with respect to payment are: (1) That the rate of payment should generally reflect the actual net income the farmer might expect to receive from the acreage had he planted it to the allotted crop and (2) that rates of payment are to be attractive enough to encourage farmers to place substantial acreages into the acreage reserve and thereby curtail production below national allotments and marketing quotas.

At the request of the committee of conference the Department of Agriculture has made available its latest administrative memorandum on this matter, now being used as the basis for further consultation with State and county committees. The memorandum is printed herewith as appendix A.

Sections 207–214. Conservation reserve program

The conservation reserve program (secs. 207–214) is designed to take out of the production of crops and put into a conservation status on a semipermanent basis specified acreages of land. Croplands, including lands now being devoted to such soil-conserving

crops as tame hay, alfalfa, and clover, are eligible for the conservation reserve. Section 207 (a) (2) of the Senate amendment would have required a producer putting such soil-conserving croplands into the conservation reserve to increase the acreage devoted to soil-conserving crops or left idle on his remaining land to that previously devoted to soil-conserving crops or left idle on the entire farm. The conference substitute would change this to require the producer to devote to soil-conserving crops or idleness only an acreage of his remaining land equal to that previously devoted to soil-conserving crops or left idle on such remaining land. Thus a producer who normally had 100 acres of tame hay and 10 acres each of oats and barley could put 40 acres of tame hay land into the conservation reserve without being required to reduce his acreage of oats or barley. He would be required to maintain in soil-conserving crops or leave idle that acreage of his land outside the conservation reserve which had previously been devoted to soil-conserving crops or left idle (namely, 60 acres), but he would not be required to increase such acreage by reason of having put 40 acres of tame hay into the conservation reserve.

The program would be carried out on the basis of contracts entered into between the Secretary of Agriculture and the producer. Contract periods would be for not less than 3 years nor more than 10 (except for forestation areas where the period could run for 15 years). In return for the producer agreeing, among other things, not to harvest any crop nor graze the land in the conservation reserve, the Secretary would pay a large part (estimated at approximately 80 percent) of the cost of establishing conservation practices on the land and would pay thereafter an annual amount to the producer roughly equivalent to the rental value of the land.

The total amount of expenditures for the conservation program in any one year is limited to $450,000,000, including the materials and services provided to assist farmers in establishing conservation practices on the land put into the reserve. A provision in the Senate bill which would have limited payments in any year to any producer to not more than $7,500 was removed from the bill by the conference.

Sections 215–227. General provisions

Sections 215–227 contain general provisions relating to the soil-bank program. These provide: (1) No person will be eligible for soil-bank payments in any year in which he exceeds his farm-acreage allotment for any commodity; (2) a prohibition against the reapportionment to any other producer of acreage placed in the acreage reserve or conservation reserve; (3) authority for the Secretary to make payments under the program upon satisfactory proof by the producer that he has complied with his part of the contract; (4) the requirement that in carrying out the program the Secretary make use of local and state ASC committees, other appropriate state and federal agencies, and of the land use capability data developed by the Soil Conservation Service; (5) the provision that until July 1, 1957, the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used for carrying out the soil-bank program but that after that date such funds must come from regular appropriations. This provision does not limit the authority elsewhere conferred for the Secretary to make contracts under the soil-bank program for periods of more than 1 year.

Special provisions

In its endeavor to make the soil-bank program not only practical and successful from the standpoint of conservation and surplus reduction but also one which will be outstandingly fair and equitable to all who participate in it the committee of conference has made a number of changes, amendments, deletions, and additions of special provisions relating to the soil-bank program. Some of these which deserve special mention are:

Protection of tenants and sharecroppers: No single problem connected with the proposed soil bank has caused the committee more concern than that of guaranteeing adequate protection of tenants and sharecroppers under the program. Several provisions referring to tenants and sharecroppers and intended to protect their interests, while at the same time safeguarding the interests of landlords, were scattered throughout the soil-bank portion of the Senate bill. After the most careful consideration, the committee considered them inadequate to afford the protection desired. The committee tried for many hours to devise a specific formula or direction to the Secretary of Agriculture covering the landlord-tenant-sharecropper relationship which would assure by specific legal provision fair treatment of all concerned. It realizes, however, that these relationships are so different in various types of farming areas and in different geographic locations, and even from one farm to the next in the same area, that it is probably impossible to write into the law a formula for equitable sharing in benefits under the soil bank act which will work fairly in all the multitude of individual relationships of this type which exist.

After the most thorough consideration, therefore, the committee of conference reached the conclusion that the safest way to guarantee fair treatment of all participants in the soil bank program is to put into the law the general rules on which the division of benefits under this act is to be made, to require that each landlord in applying for participation in the program stipulate in detail how he proposes to share the benefits with his tenants or sharecroppers, and to require the county committee made up of farmers who are thoroughly familiar with local conditions to approve the proposed division of benefits before the farmer will be permitted to participate in the program. The stipulated and approved proposal for dividing the benefits will then be made a part of the contract and failure or refusal to carry out that provision would subject the producer to the penalties provided by the act.

Forfeiture of price supports benefits: The committee has stricken from the bill language appearing in two sections of the soil-bank title which would have authorized the Secretary to require forfeiture of all price-support benefits for violation of a soil-bank contract. This was a provision desired chiefly by livestock producers as a protection against a farmer placing land into the soil bank, receiving his payment therefor, and then using the land for grazing purposes.

The committee recognizes the problem faced by the livestock industry. Under the soil bank program, it is likely that millions of acres now in crops will be put into grass. The contract signed by the producer placing his acreage into the soil bank will prohibit the using of this land for grazing except under emergency conditions and with the permission of the Secretary of Agriculture. Recognizing both that payments for participation in the soil bank probably cannot and should not be deferred until a full year's compliance can be checked, but also that after a farmer has received his payment and the grass on his regular pastures becomes short there will be a substantial temptation to put livestock on the soil-bank acreage in violation of the contract, the committee of conference still believes that the penalty provided in the Senate bill of forfeiture of all benefits under the price support programs is unduly excessive.

Instead, it urges the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the very adequate legal provisions relating to contract violation which remain in the bill, including the additional penalty of 50 percent which was added by the conference committee, to deal quickly and effectively with violators of soil-bank contracts and not to hesitate to resort to court action to enforce the penalties provided by the bill whenever that action seems justified. In addition, administrative regulations should provide as much certainty as is possible that the contract conditions have been and will continue to be adhered to before any payment for performance is made.

Appeal of terminated contract: The committee was not satisfied with the provisions in the bill relating to the right and the procedure of appeal by a producer from a decision by the Secretary terminating a soil-bank contract. The committee has completely rewritten this provision (sec. 207 (d)). As reported herewith it provides that where the State committee believes there has been a violation which would warrant termination of contract, the producer must be given written notice thereof by registered mail, and the producer will have the right within 30 days to appear at an informal proceeding before the county ASC committee to show cause why his contract should not be terminated. At the conclusion of such hearing the county committee will submit a report to the State committee and the producer has the right to appear before the State committee in connection with its determination of the issue.

The State committee must give the producer written notice of its decision in the matter and if the producer feels aggrieved he has the right of immediate appeal to the United States district court and for a trial de novo of the issue before such court.

Voluntary participation: Stricken from the bill is section 226 of the Senate amendment which would have required participation in the soil bank as a condition of eligibility for price support. The committee felt that the soil-bank program and the regular price support program, while they supplement and complement each other, are separate and distinct programs and that no new condition of eligibility for price support (except as to those commodities for which new price support programs directly related to the soil bank are set up in the bill) should be imposed by the soil-bank program.

The soil-bank provisions require that to be eligible for payment under the program a producer must be in compliance with all acreage allotments. In addition, each of the allotment and marketing quota programs carries its own penalty for failure to comply. Removal of section 226 from the bill will make the soil bank a strictly voluntary program, as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Tree seedlings: In section 211 the Secretary is authorized to "purchase or produce" conservation materials. The word "produce" is retained in the section for the single purpose of permitting the Department of Agriculture to grow seedling trees for reforestation purposes—and then only to the extent of utilizing existing departmental nursery facilities—or to supply a definite deficiency that cannot be filled by private nurseries. It is not the intention of the committee to put the Department into the seedling producing business, but rather, that seedlings for the soil-bank program should be purchased from private sources to the full extent that such sources are capable of meeting the demand at competitive prices.

Production on Government-owned lands: Section 225 would have prohibited the leasing hereafter, or the renewal or extension of any existing lease, for the production on Government-owned lands of any agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply. As enacted by the Senate the provisions of the section would have been extremely difficult to administer and would have required of the Secretary a separate determination as to the

surplus position of each agricultural commodity.

It is the understanding of the committee that the President has received or is about to receive from a committee appointed by him the report on a thorough study of this problem with recommendations as to its solution. In place of the language in the Senate bill, therefore, the language adopted by the conferees directs the President to carry out a policy of restricting, insofar as practicable, the leasing of such lands for the production of price-supported crops in surplus supply.

TITLE III—SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Section 301. Program of orderly liquidation

Requires the Commodity Credit Corporation to use its existing authority to dispose as rapidly as possible of all stocks of agricultural commodities held by it. Requires the Secretary to submit a detailed program for such disposal and also for preventing the future accumulation of surpluses in the hands of CCC by adoption of a food-stamp plan or similar program, and also for strategic stockpiling of foodstuffs and other agricultural products both inside and outside the United States. These reports are to be made within 90 days after enactment of the act and to include specific legislative recommendations for their accomplishment.

Section 302. Extra long staple cotton

Subsection (a) as passed by the Senate provides that the existing import quota on extra long staple cotton established pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 shall, hereafter, cover the same types of cotton included in the original quota. The effect is to remove the exemption of cotton having a staple length of 1 11/16 inches and longer to bring such cotton back within the quota.

The import of cotton having a staple length of 1 11/16 inches and longer has increased from a level of about 7,000 bales in 1951 to an estimated 16,000 bales in 1955. During this same period, stocks of United States grown extra long staple have increased about 7 times. Any imports of extra long staple cotton above the established quota necessarily materially interferes with and tends to render ineffective the price-support program for United States grown extra long staple cotton.

This section was amended by the committee of conference to require that provision be made for the type of cotton being brought within the existing quota and that dates for the quota year conform to normal marketing practices. The present quota year (February 1 to January 31) conforms to the harvest and marketing season of the cotton now subject to quota control. Cotton stapling 1 11/16 inches and longer is harvested during the summer and is brought into the United States during the later summer and early fall. If the quota were filled at that time, importers of such cotton could not enter any such cotton into the United States until the next quota year. The amendment will require that appropriate provision be made so that importers of this type of cotton will have equal opportunity to import cotton within the quota.

Subsection (b) is the same as it was in the Senate bill except for a clarifying amendment. As amended, this section directs the Commodity Credit Corporation, beginning not later than August 1, 1956, to exercise its existing powers and authorities to encourage the sale for export at competitive world prices, its stocks of extra long staple cotton. These stocks currently amount to about 100,000 bales. The program directed by this section, together with the continued offering of any CCC cotton for domestic use in accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949, as amended, will enable the Commodity Credit Corporation within a relatively few years to move its stocks of this type of cotton into consumption in an orderly manner.

Section 303. Agreements limiting imports

Authorizes the President, whenever he determines such action appropriate, to negotiate with foreign countries in an effort to obtain agreements to limit the export from any such country and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity (including, as does sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, products of agricultural commodities such as flour, dairy products, textile products, and other products manufactured or processed from agricultural commodities). In order to carry out any such agreement which may be entered into, the President is authorized to issue such regulations governing the importation of such articles as may be required or appropriate to carry out the arrangements made with such countries to prevent increases in imports of such commodities or products.

This section is desirable in view of section 302, which directs the disposal of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and of the general policies of the Department of Agriculture under which surplus agricultural commodities are made available in world markets at competitive prices which are generally below domestic price levels.

Unless there is some limitation on imports of products manufactured abroad from our surpluses, the sales program may well defeat its own purpose of expanding the total market for our agricultural products. It is the belief of the committee that this objective frequently can be accomplished through friendly negotiations, rather than taking recourse in the first instance under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended. However, if it develops that the desired objective cannot be accomplished through negotiations, then it is the belief of the committee that appropriate action should be taken under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended. This section makes it clear that the authority conferred does not in any way limit or restrict the use of section 22.

Section 304. Appropriation to supplement section 32 funds

Authorizes the appropriation annually, beginning July 1, 1956, of not to exceed $500,000,000 to supplement operations under section 32, Public Law 320, 74th Congress, of which not to exceed 50 percent could be used for any one commodity or the products thereof.

Section 305. Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile

Directs the transfer to the supplemental stockpile of strategic materials acquired by CCC as the result of barter or exchange of agricultural products.

Section 306. Surplus Disposal Administrator

Authorizes the appointment of a Surplus Disposal Administrator in the Department of Agriculture at an annual salary not exceeding $15,000. It is the understanding of the committee that the Secretary now has a capable Administrator doing this job—without benefit of the title here conferred. It is the committee's hope that, with this ratification of such policy, it will be further implemented by appointment of topflight assistants to the Administrator to deal with problem commodities, specifically cotton and wheat.

Section 307. Use of voluntary agencies and shipping subsidy for merchant marine

Increases from $300,000,000 to $500,000,000 the limitation on operations under title II of Public Law 480, 83d Congress. Also authorizes the payment of ocean freight from CCC funds for commodities shipped under title II and also for commodities made available under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, if the President finds that payment of ocean freight is necessary to accomplish the purposes of these acts.

Section 308. Commission to recommend legislation providing for increased industrial use of agricultural products

Establishes a five-member bipartisan commission appointed by the President to prepare and present to Congress not later than June 15, 1957, recommendations to bring about the greatest practical use for industrial purposes of agricultural products. Authorizes appropriation of $150,000 for the expenses of the commission.

Section 309. Donation to penal and correctional institutions

Authorizes donation of surplus food commodities to Federal penal and correctional institutions and to State reformatories and other correctional institutions for minors.

Section 310. Federal irrigation, drainage, and flood-control projects

Prohibits for a period of 3 years from the date of the act, payment of "any crop loans or Federal farm payments or benefits" on any agricultural commodity declared by the Secretary to be in surplus supply if grown on any newly irrigated or newly drained lands within any Federal irrigation or drainage project hereafter authorized. It is to be emphasized that this provision applies only to projects "hereafter" authorized, continues only for a period of 3 years, and does not apply to any lands "used for the production of such commodity" before the enactment of this provision. It will not, therefore, apply to any irrigation or drainage projects on which price-supported crops are presently being grown.

Section 311. Processing of donated food commodities

Authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the cost of processing into a form suitable for home consumption commodities donated under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949. Present authority extends only to "reprocessing," which does not include such operations as the grinding of grain into meal or flour. CCC is authorized to carry out such operations now only in connection with the special relief programs authorized by Public Law 311, 84th Congress.

TITLE IV—MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Section 401. Extension of surrender and reapportionment provisions for wheat acreage allotments

Extends for the crop years 1956 and 1957 authority for the voluntary surrender and reapportionment of wheat acreage allotments.

Section 402. Acreage allotments for cotton for 1957 and 1958

Provides that the national marketing quota for cotton for the 1957 and 1958 crops shall not result in a national acreage allotment for those years smaller than the national acreage allotment for 1956.

Section 403. Cotton—small farm allotments

Establishes for the years 1957 and 1958 for cotton a special national acreage reserve of 100,000 acres to be distributed to States and counties to aid in establishing in all counties minimum farm allotments of 4 acres or the highest acreage planted on the farm in the preceding 3 years, whichever is smaller. The 100,000 acres would be in addition to the national acreage allotment and would not be taken into consideration in establishing future State acreage allotments. In addition, a provision added by the conference committee promises some relief for small farmers in 1956 by authorizing the Secretary to allot in each State acreage which is underplanted and not placed in the soil bank or considered planted by virtue of notification to the county committee, for the purpose of increasing small farm allotments in 1956 to 4 acres or the highest acreage planted in the past 3 years, whichever is smaller.

Section 404. Minimum State acreage allotments for 1956 rice crop

Provides each State with a minimum allotment of rice for 1956 equal to 85 percent of the final allotment established for such State for 1955.

Section 405. Increase in peanut marketing penalties

Beginning with the 1956 crop, establishes peanut marketing penalties at 75 percent of the support price instead of 50 percent under present provisions of law.

Section 406. Collection of peanut marketing penalties

Provides for interest at 6 percent a year on peanut marketing penalties from the date when due until the date of payment and for a lien on any crop of peanuts subject to marketing quotas in which the person liable for the payment of penalty has an interest, until the penalty is paid.

Section 407. Preservation of unused acreage allotments

Provides that beginning in 1956 any producer may underplant an acreage allotment but maintain his history as though the full allotment had been planted, if he makes proper notification to the county committee of his desire to retain his acreage history. The exception would not be granted to any farm on which no acreage of the commodity was planted for 4 successive years or if done to avoid penalties. The acreage not planted could not be reallocated to any other farm.

Sections 408 (a), (b), (c). Corn

No substantial change has been made in the provisions relating to price supports for corn as adopted on the Senate floor. The provisions in this section, together with other correlative provisions of the bill, would make corn acreage allotments inoperative for 1956 and substitute in lieu of the national acreage allotment of 43,281,000 acres a "base acreage" for corn totaling 51,000,000 acres nationally.

To become eligible for price supports under this new program, a corn producer would be required to devote an acreage equal to 15 percent of his farm base acreage for corn to the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve program. By underplanting his corn base acreage 15 percent and placing that land in the acreage reserve, the producer would become eligible for an acreage reserve payment at the corn rate. By planting not to exceed his base acreage in corn and placing an amount of land equivalent to 15 percent of that base acreage in the conservation reserve, he would become eligible for a conservation reserve payment.

Not later than December 15, 1956, the Secretary is directed to conduct a referendum among corn producers in the commercial producing area to determine whether they favor continuation of corn acreage allotments and price supports under section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, or no acreage allotments and price supports "at such level as the Secretary determines will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn." The decision reached in the referendum would be effective for 1957 and subsequent years.

Section 408 (d). Feed grains

In lieu of the provisions in the Senate bill relating to feed grains the committee of conference has set up an entirely new provision relating to price supports for feed grains and their inclusion in the soil bank program. The new program has the following major features:

(1) In noncommercial corn areas corn will be classified as a feed grain along with oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum. In commercial corn areas the feed grains will consist of the customary four small grains.

(2) A base acreage allotment for feed grains will be established for each farm. In 1956 this allotment will be the average acreage devoted to feed grains on the farm in the 3 years 1953–55. Thereafter a national base acreage allotment will be determined on the basis of the 1953–55 national acreages of these grains, and this will be allotted to States, counties, and farms in the usual manner of distributing acreage allotments. The apportionment of the county base acreage for feed grains to farms on the basis of past acreage, crop rotation, tillable acreage, type of soil, and topography would be on the basis of the same factors now provided in the establishment of individual farm wheat-acreage allotments. Under this language, any year in which the acreage for a farm is low because of abnormal weather conditions, the acreage for such year would be eliminated from the historic average since the actual acreage planted was below the acreage which would have been planted under the crop-rotation system followed on the farm.

(3) For each year in which there is an acreage reserve program in effect for corn in the commercial corn area, feed grains will be entitled to support on the following basis: Corn grown outside the commercial corn area, 85 percent of the level of price support for corn grown in the commercial area; grain sorghum, barley, rye, and oats, a percentage of the parity for each commodity which is 5 percentage points of parity less than the percentage of parity at which corn is supported in the commercial corn-producing area.

(4) In order to be eligible for such price supports on feed grains, the producer would be required to devote not less than 15 percent of his base acreage to either the acreage reserve program or the conservation reserve, and not to plant a total acreage of feed grains in excess of 85 percent of his base acreage. For 1956, however, producers may remain eligible for the price supports heretofore announced, even if they do not participate in this manner in the soil-bank program and thus become eligible for the higher level price supports provided by this section.

TITLE V—PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAMS FOR WHEAT AND RICE

Section 501. Wheat marketing certificates

This section provides for a domestic parity plan for wheat almost identical with that which has previously been approved by the House. Producers would receive 100 percent of parity for their share of the wheat crop which is domestically consumed for food and substantially the world price for the balance of their production. Stability of market prices would be assured by a low level loan rate geared primarily to the support level of feed grains and to world market conditions.

Acreage allotments may be continued, and eligibility for domestic marketing certificates would be conditioned both upon compliance with acreage allotments and upon the planting of an acreage of wheat sufficient to fill the producer's domestic quota at normal yields. If acreage allotments are prescribed, they shall be in the amounts and determined in the manner provided by title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. The plan would automatically take care of producers who do not ordinarily grow wheat for sale but rather for use as feed. Any such producers would be permitted to grow any quantity of wheat without penalty.

The program would be self-financing. Processors and importers would be required to purchase certificates for the difference between the domestic parity and the established market price of wheat processed or imported by them, and refunds would be made upon the exportation of wheat products. The amounts collected from processors and importers would offset almost identically the amounts paid to producers.

The bill provides that the new program will not go into effect at once but will be the subject of a referendum among wheat-growers whenever referendums are held in the future on marketing quotas. The first such referendum will be held early next summer. If wheat producers vote, in any such referendum, by more than two-thirds in favor of the domestic parity plan, the program will automatically go into effect in place of the present system of acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and price supports by loan and purchase programs.

Section 501. Rice—primary marketing certificates

Section 501 (which makes extensive amendments to the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended) also establishes a two-price plan for rice quite similar to that authorized for wheat. Unlike the wheat plan, which calls for a referendum, the rice program would be put into operation in 1956 but would apply only to rice harvested "prior to 1958."

Under this plan, rice producers would be given a primary market quota. Such quota would be based upon the consumption of processed rice in the United States plus the quantity exported to Cuba. The support level for rice would be established for 1956 at 55 to 90 percent of parity and thereafter at 50 to 90 percent of parity, with the Secretary being directed to establish the support price at a level which would not discourage the exportation of rice produced in the United States.

At the beginning of each marketing year rice producers would be issued certificates for the quantity of rice equal to the primary market quota for the farm. The value of such certificates would be the difference between the support level for rice and 90 percent of parity. Processors of rice in the United States would be required to acquire certificates in an amount sufficient to cover the quantity of rough rice processed. Certificates would also be required for the importation of rice. Upon the exportation of processed rice to any country other than Cuba, processors would receive a refund on an equivalent quantity of certificates. This program, like the two-price plan for wheat, would be essentially self-financing since the sale of certificates to processors would substantially cover payments to producers.

The section provides for inventory adjustments to persons owning rice in the United States on the date the program becomes effective, so that they will neither gain nor lose from the anticipated change in general market prices of rice on that date.

Section 502. Normal yield for rice

Establishes new criteria for determining the normal yield for rice for counties and farms. The calculation is to be based on a five-year period adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and trends in yield.

TITLE VI—FORESTRY PROVISIONS

Section 601. Assistance to States for tree planting and reforestation

This section authorizes additional cooperative activity between the Department of Agriculture and the States in tree planting and reforestation. Upon presentation by the proper State official the Secretary is authorized to approve a plan for tree planting and reforestation within the State and thereafter to cooperate technically and financially in such program. With respect to parts of the program carried out on non-Federal lands, the Federal financial contribution cannot exceed that of the State toward the same program. The Secretary is directed to cooperate with other Federal agencies and with the appropriate State forester in approving and carrying out such plans.

DELETIONS FROM SENATE BILL

Several sections appearing in the Senate amendment have been deleted by the committee of conference. Among them are the following:

Standard grade for cotton (sec. 103 of Senate bill)

The Senate committee bill contained a provision changing the standard grade for cotton. The committee of conference eliminated this provision from the bill. In considering these standards for cotton the committee was aware of the past practice of the Commodity Credit Corporation of refusing to make the differentials in loan values on spotted cotton which are customarily made by the cotton trade. Specifically, the trade recognizes a very wide differential in value between light and heavy spotted cotton. Most cotton buyers will at all times pay substantially more for light spots than for heavy spots. In some cases this differential amounts to as much as $15 or $20 per bale. By contrast, the CCC has consistently recognized no differential between light and heavy spots and has made their loans on all spotted cotton on the basis of heavy spots. The committee understands that the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation now have the power to make the same differential in commodity credit loans which are normally made by the cotton trade. It is the opinion of the committee that the Department should exercise this power.

Processor certificates (sec. 108 of Senate bill): This section would have required the Secretary of Agriculture to obtain from processors of agricultural commodities purchased for price support or surplus removal certificates stating that producers had received not less than the support price for the raw commodities. It would have applied to funds used "regardless of the source" and would thus have applied to section 32 operations as well as to the regular price-support programs.

Many of these operations are carried out on a bid and purchase basis under conditions where it would be virtually impossible for the processor to certify as to the price paid for the particular products being bought by the Government. It would have rendered virtually impossible most of the operations now being carried out with section 32 funds and many of the regular price-support operations.

The committee believes that the present provision of law (sec. 401 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1949) is adequate if applied with the utmost diligence by the Secretary. The committee is not certain that it has always been applied in this manner but urges that the Secretary utilize this existing authority to the fullest. In this connection, it also urges that where these operations are carried out purchases or loans not be confined to only certain grades of products but that, to the fullest extent practicable, they be made available on all usual grades.

Reestablishment of United States share of world cotton market (sec. 303 of Senate bill): Directed the Commodity Credit Corporation to use its existing powers and authorities to encourage the sales for export at competitive world prices of such quantities of cotton as well establish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for United States cotton. The volume to be sold was to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. The section further provided that export sales for foreign currency under section 102 of Public Law 480 be made at competitive world prices.

The Secretary of Agriculture already has ample authority to accomplish the purposes of section 303. Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture announced on February 28, 1956, that cotton will be sold for export after July 31, 1956, on a competitive bid basis. The committee of conference is gratified that action has been taken to inaugurate what it hopes will be a stable and consistent sales program. This section was deleted with the understanding that the Secretary of Agriculture would use such methods as are necessary to achieve the purposes of section 303 and meet his announced goal of exporting at least 5,000,000 bales of cotton annually.

Study of meat grading system (sec. 701 of Senate bill): This section was eliminated from the bill not because the conferees do not agree that the existing system and theories of meat grading require study and review, but because ample authority exists in present law for such a study by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In recent years there have been numerous questions raised about the present system of meat grading—both as it affects livestock producers and as it may affect marketing and distribution systems and consumer buying habits. The Secretary has ample authority to study and examine the meat grading system both under his general authorities and under such specific statutes as the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. The committee recognizes the value of the meat grading system and anticipates its continuation. If it can be improved, however, the Secretary should make such study as he determines necessary and suggests such changes as he finds desirable.

APPENDIX A

PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE SOIL BANK (TENTATIVE)

(Based on H. R. 12)

The season for 1956 crops is so far advanced that the acreage reserve program will not be fully effective.

I. Acreage reserve—objective: Reduction of acreage of designated crops on a voluntary basis

A. Establishment of Normal Yields to Serve as a Basis of Payment

1. Operating procedure:

(a) Use check yields during 1951–55 as a base except for wheat which will be for 1945–54 period. Adjustments will be made for abnormal years.

(b) Establish county check yields on basis of (a) above. In the case of tobacco and peanuts, actual farm yield will be used where available.

(c) County committeemen determine normal yields for community (these should weight out to county normal yields).

(d) Community committeemen may aid the county committee in establishing a normal yield rating for each farm in the community which grows the designated crops. Each such farm will be placed in one of several yield rating categories, ranging above and below the community average. Adjustment procedures may be necessary to bring farm yield into balance with county average.

(e) Individual farmers will then be invited to offer a part of their acreage of the designated crops for the acreage reserve. Such land should be equal in productivity to land used for the allotment crop on their farms. The county committee can then quote them a dollar figure per acre for typical land to be set aside for the acreage reserve for these designated crops for their farm. If the designated land is found to be below average, a lower per acre payment will be made. With the exception of the first year, farmers should indicate their intention to participate prior to planting time.

(f) No crop may be harvested or grazed from reserve acres, except that the Secretary may permit grazing under certain emergency conditions.

B. Preliminary Incentive Rates for the Acreage Reserve Program

1. Possible incentive payment rates: The extent to which these rates need to be varied according to quality, location, and other factors is still under study. (These following figures are preliminary.)

Commodity	Unit	Payments based on H. R. 12				
		Support rate [1]	Rate as percent of 1956 support			
			35	50	60	70
Wheat	Bushel	$2.27	$0.79	$1.14	$1.36	$1.59
Cotton	Pound	.3181	.1113	.1590	.1909	.2227
Rice	Hundredweight	4.90	1.71	2.45	2.94	3.43
Corn (commercial area)	Bushel	1.65	.58	.82	.99	1.14
Corn (noncommercial area)	Bushel	[2] 1.40	.49	.70	.84	.98
Oats	Bushel	.72	.25	.36	.43	.50
Barley	Bushel	1.13	.40	.56	.68	.79
Rye	Bushel	1.41	.49	.70	.85	.99
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	2.18	.76	1.09	1.31	1.53
Peanuts	Pound	.123	.043	.062	.074	.086
Tobacco:						
Flue-cured (11-14)	Pound	.482	.169	.241	.289	.337
Fire-cured (21-24)	Pound	[3] .354	.124	.177	.212	.248
Burley (31)	Pound	.472	.165	.236	.283	.330
Maryland (32)	Pound	.476	.167	.238	.286	.333
Dark air-cured (35-36)	Pound	[4] .315	.110	.158	.189	.220
Sun-cured (37)	Pound	[4] .315	.110	.158	.189	.220
Cigar types: [5]						
42-44	Pound	.230	.081	.115	.138	.161
51	Pound	.516	.181	.258	.310	.361
52	Pound	.483	.169	.242	.290	.338
54	Pound	.226	.079	.113	.136	.158
55	Pound	.290	.101	.145	.174	.203

[1] 90 percent of "old" or "new" parity, whichever is higher as of Mar. 15, 1956, except feed grains and corn in the noncommercial area.
[2] 85 percent of the rate in the commercial area or about 76.5 percent of old parity.
[3] Three-fourths of burley support rate.
[4] Two-thirds of burley support rate.
[5] Preliminary estimate as parity is computed for groups 42–44, 51–5.

2. Maximum and minimum participation:

(a) Maximum:

Grain: 50 acres or 50 percent of allotment, whichever is larger.

Cotton and peanuts: 10 acres or 50 percent of allotment, whichever is larger.

Tobacco: 5 acres or 50 percent of allotment, whichever is larger.

(b) Minimum:

Grain: 5 acres or allotment, whichever is smaller.

Cotton and peanuts: 2 acres or allotment, whichever is smaller.

Tobacco: 1 acre or allotment, whichever is smaller.

C. Participation and Cost on a National Basis (Highly Tentative)

	Acres which might come in	National average check yield per acre	Approximate cost per acre [1]	Total cost
	(*Millions*)		(*Dollars*)	(*Million dollars*)
Cotton	3-5	303 pounds	48-60	145-300
Wheat [2]	[3] 12-15	15.8 bushels	18-25	216-375
Corn [2]	4-6	44.2 bushels [4]	36.50	144-300
Other feed grains [5]	2-4	Depends on crop	15-50	75-175
Rice	.3	2,500 pounds	60-75	18-23
Peanuts	.1	900 pounds	50-70	5-7
Tobacco	.15	1,300 pounds	100-300	15-45
Total	21.4-30.55			618-1,225

[1] Based on approximately 90 percent supports and optional parity.
[2] Commercial area only.
[3] Based on both winter and spring crop.
[4] Commercial corn area yield.
[5] Oats, barley, rye, sorghum for grain, and corn in the noncommercial corn area.

The cost per acre of obtaining participation remains in doubt due to the lateness of the season and the changing provisions of the proposed legislation. Surveys previously made of payment rates required are no longer applicable due to the fact that crops are already being planted and the support rate changes.

With every day's delay, the cost of the program increases and the effectiveness decreases.

D. Terms of the "Acreage Reserve" Agreement

1. Voluntary.

2. For 1 year but with terms to encourage participation for more than 1 year.

3. "Acreage reserve" lands must be at least typical quality land for the designated crops on the farm.

4. The acreage of crops covered by the agreement must be reduced below the acreage allotment or the base acreage, whichever is applicable, by the amount of acreage placed in the "acreage reserve."

5. In the case of rented land, compensation is to be divided among interested landlords, tenants, and sharecroppers on the farms in the same proportion as they would have shared in the crop in the absence of an acreage reserve program, unless division on another basis is agreed upon by landlords and tenants and their agreement is approved by the county committee in accordance with standards prescribed by the State committee.

II. Conservation reserve—Objective: reduce the acreage of land in row crops and grains including oil seeds on a voluntary basis and divert such acreage to conservation uses

A. Conservation Reserve Incentives

1. Annual payments and terms of contract:

(a) $10 per acre, per year average for the United States for 3- to 15-year period. Rates established on basis of land productivity, agricultural value of land, and other factors. Rates are designed to encourage farmers to take out their marginal cropland.

(b) County or area rates would vary on the basis of such factors as productivity and value of farmland.

(c) Rates would be established by areas and be based on relative productivity of the land in the area. Farm rates would be established on the basis of the rating of the area in which the specified acreage placed in "conservation reserve" is located.

(d) Eligible land, depending on area, would be land which was used for the production of rotation crops including alfalfa, clover, and other tame hay during the rotation on the farm. The acreage of row crops and grains including oilseeds must be reduced by the number of acres placed on the conservation reserve and the acreage reserve.

(e) All lands placed in the "conservation reserve" must be in or placed in approved conservation uses and may be neither harvested nor grazed except that the Secretary may permit grazing under certain emergency conditions.

1. Some lands may already be in approved types of cover. These lands may be entered in a 3-year contract.

2. Where it is necessary to establish cover, the normal contract will be for 5 years. In the case of land placed in trees, the normal length of the contract will be 10 or 15 years.

3. Costs of practices would be shared, with Government paying up to 80 percent of agreed-upon costs, within maximum limitations for establishment of trees, other cover, or other practices. Due to seed limitations, practices in first year may be modified if soil is protected.

2. Eligible conservation practices and uses:

(a) Practices and rates of payment insofar as possible will be consistent with the present ACP program.

(b) Vegetative cover:

1. Prefer perennial grasses and legumes.

2. Annuals may be permitted when seeded with perennial grasses and legumes.

3. Annuals may be permitted alone when no perennial seed is available if approved practices will follow. Due to seed limitations, some latitude may be needed regarding soil protective practices during the first year.

(c) Trees:

1. Adapted forest trees.

2. Shrubs when interplanted for shelterbelt purposes.

(d) Water storage: Cost of water retention reservoirs shared.

III. Inclusion of full farms

A farmer offering to place his full farm in the "soil bank" may receive payments under the "acreage reserve" for the designated crop acres on the farm (subject to maximum) and under the "conservation reserve" at the appropriate conservation reserve rate which will normally be lower than the acreage reserve rate, for the other acres normally in row crops or grains (including oil seeds). No payment would be made on the number of acres of land normally in conservation uses or normally idle.

IV. Certificates

A. Draw them in terms of dollars.

B. Under certain conditions, to be established by the Secretary, a farmer may purchase CCC grains with his certificates.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 2 hours, at the conclusion of which the previous question on the conference report is considered as ordered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN. I have a motion to recommit, which I presume I will offer at the conclusion of the 2 hours of debate?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman during his remarks let us know what the motion to recommit is?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, but my parliamentary inquiry is, When shall I offer the motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. At the conclusion of the debate and when the Chair announces that the previous question is ordered.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House is about to consider a matter of paramount importance. It is rather unfortunate that a matter of such importance to so many people must, of necessity, be considered in an atmosphere which is intensified by partisan politics. I want to say here and now, as I have said from this well on many occasions, that I have taken great pride that the Committee on Agriculture has been almost entirely free from partisan politics during the entire time I have served on that great committee. I started service on that committee under the able leadership of that great statesman from Texas and beloved citizen, Marvin Jones. What I say about the nonpartisan approach to farm legislation applies not only for Marvin Jones but also for every other chairman of the committee under whom I have served. I know that every man on the committee is a devoted friend of the farmers of this Nation. This bill comes before you today not as a bill which was prompted by partisan politics. Ten devoted men, public servants, sat here in this Capitol Building during the entire Easter holiday and we worked every morning and every afternoon and long into the night in a diligent, careful, and cautious effort to present a bill to the House which we thought might be acceptable to you. I know that even while we were sitting here we were accused of trying to write a bill that the President of the United States could not possibly sign. That was a rather unfortunate and unfair accusation to make against men who were laboring long and hard in their efforts to draft a bill which the President of the United States could sign. So, we bring this bill here to you with a conference report and a statement which contains an analysis of the bill. To show you just how impartial and nonpartisan these 10 devoted men were when the conference report was prepared, only 2 out of the 10 refused to sign the report. One was a distinguished Republican and one was a very distinguished Democrat. Eight members signed this report—3 of them are Republicans and 5 of them are Democrats.

The bill comes here as a result of the labors of men who lifted themselves above the prejudices and passions of partisan politics. We tried to write a bill which we believe will serve all of agriculture and will serve all of the people of this great Republic. I believe that we have given to the President the type of soil bank that he asked us to give him—an entirely voluntary program. We have given to him in this bill $1,200,000,000 to implement and make effective the soil bank which he has advocated. In addition to that, we have given him $500 million to expand and to accelerate the surplus-disposal program

which has disturbed and distracted so many people. We have also given to him a special committee of five experts to study the problems of new uses and bigger and better markets for American farmers. We have given to him an Administrator of the Surplus Disposal Program, and we fixed his salary.

Now as to what is left in the bill that is objectionable: When you take into consideration the one thought that all of us know, yes, the President knows, that the downward trend in America's agriculture income is tragically leading the farmers of this Nation to the very brink of bankruptcy, we must realize that the soil bank with its $1,200,000,000 is not even intended to increase the farm income in the year 1956 nor in the year 1957. Its primary purpose is to replace farm income while we reduce our production of crops now in surplus. The only thing in this bill that will increase farm income in 1956, yes, all of the provisions here that are even calculated to increase farm income in this year, will be stricken from this bill if I understand what the motion to recommit will contain. I understand it is proposed to strike out the price support program and to give to the farmers something less than fair treatment. As I understand the motion to recommit, the leadership responsible for offering that motion, will today, here in this House, put the farmers of America on the auction block and try to buy them at the cheapest possible price. If you cannot get them for 75 percent, if you cannot get them for 80 or 85 percent, perhaps you will be willing to go to 82½ percent. Even if you go to 89.9 percent you go out and crow about a victory. What are we fussing about?

I suppose that every man in this House that understands the plight of the American farmer and the terrific impact the loss of income has and is now having upon all the farming industry of this great Nation, would naturally want to increase farm income and to change this tragic downward trend. You know and I know that the problems of agriculture are paramount to all other problems, and unless we solve the problems of plenty we are headed for trouble in the days ahead.

The farmers of America have been lambasted and vilified and ridiculed throughout the length and breadth of this Nation as no other group in our economy in all history has ever been lambasted and ridiculed. What have they done?

I need only quote from the lips of your own President when he said in this House in his message of January 9: "Today's surpluses consist of commodities produced in a volume imperitively needed in wartime but unmarketable in peacetime at the same prices and in the same quantity." Who among us could have foreseen that on July 27, 1953, there would be a cessation of hostilities out yonder in Korea? On that day when men ceased fighting, and American boys stopped dying, the American farmers were doing just what they had been persuaded to do; just what their Government called upon them to do. We were told to produce a 16-million-bale cotton crop, to have an abundant production of wheat, corn, and other vital foods; and that is what the American farmer did. Of course our fields flourished. Our crops were harvested.

Then the pipelines were closed. The shooting was over, and these commodities had to go into storage.

Then, the very next year, 1954, what did the farmers do? They did exactly what the experts in the Department of Agriculture told them to do: Drastically reduce wheat acreage by the millions of acres, drastically reduced cotton acreage, yes, by the millions. The farmers have done everything they could possibly do to bring production down in line with consumer demands.

Is that their great crime? Because they were told that food would win the war, food for freedom—yes, at a time when the ancient institutions of freedom were being threatened throughout the world. Now, is that a crime our farmers have committed for which they should be vilified and ridiculed?

Now we are told that within 3 years we have been on the brink of war 3 times. The great Secretary of State did not tell us about it. How do we know that we are not now at this hour on the brink of war? And if we are then we all know that these vital foods and fibers are actually a blessing to all mankind.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to quote the President and then say for himself that for years these surpluses that now plague us were built up as a result of the request for war production?

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly what he said on January 9.

Mr. HALLECK. Evidently the purpose of this conference report is to propose to go back to the very same sort of incentive to increase production now when there is no war going on.

Mr. COOLEY. I know that my friend from Indiana is one of the most intelligent Members of this House. I am sure he heard me say that the very minute there was a cessation of hostilities we started on this curtailed production program. And let us understand what this support program is. It is not a program just to increase production. It has always operated in a dual fashion: When we need production we offer the high support to bring about the production so as to secure for the farmer the price that he should receive and below which he should not be permitted to go; when we want to reduce acreage we offer him the same inducement if he will curtail his acreage and comply with the Secretary's program. That is the way we are using it now. Cotton acreage came down from twenty-seven or twenty-eight million to 17 million acres; wheat acreage came down from 78 million to about 55 million.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that from the year 1941 to the year 1951, a 10-year period, the six basic farm crops that were supported at 90 percent of parity during that time were considerably above 90 percent of parity? Is that right?

Mr. COOLEY. I might say that during no year from 1942 until 1953 was the general level of agricultural prices ever below 100 percent of parity.

Mr. JENSEN. In answer to that I may say, of course, that any time we have war prices go up naturally; so I am not going to give you credit however much I agree with you on this premise. So the fact is those basic crops were over 90 percent of parity all during that time on an average.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentlemen is exactly right.

Mr. JENSEN. And that has nothing to do with the surplus?

Mr. COOLEY. Not a thing.

Mr. JENSEN. The reason we established this 90-percent floor under the basic storable crops was because we were looking into the future for such a situation as now faces the American farmers?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is right.

Mr. JENSEN. And agriculture generally, to take care of the very problems that are facing us today. Now, we are asked to reduce the farmers' income when the farmer's dollar is only buying 80 cents worth of merchandise at the counter.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. I am not going along with that kind of business, not only so far as the farmers of America are concerned but so far as industry and business are concerned, especially in the breadbasket section of America. Industry is going to suffer. They are starting to suffer now. The farmer is the basis on which our whole economy operates and sooner or later we will all be in the same boat. Industry, factories, stores, everybody is going to be in the same boat with the farmer unless we take care of the farmer and see that his dollar buys 100 cents worth of merchandise at the counter.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman mentioned a moment ago that there is a floor under the acreage on cotton?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARENDS. There is a floor under the acreage on wheat?

Mr. COOLEY. What does the gentleman mean by "a floor"?

Mr. ARENDS. I mean the minimum below which that acreage can go.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. The law fixes that.

Mr. ARENDS. What about corn?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is an expert on corn.

Mr. ARENDS. There is no acreage limitation on corn. In other words, corn goes bang, bang, bang.

Mr. COOLEY. But corn has not gone bang, bang, bang. Only about 40 percent of your farmers made any effort to go bang, bang, bang.

Mr. ARENDS. I am not talking about price. I am talking about the acreage reduction.

Mr. COOLEY. I am talking about that, too.

Mr. ARENDS. It is down to 43 million acres at this time. It must keep on going down, yet the formula says we have to reduce the acreage. You cannot do that with wheat or cotton. You go to a certain point and stop, but with corn you can go just as far as you want under the present law.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is it not a fact that there is nothing compulsory about the corn program? It is simply an acreage allotment program and the farmers can accept it or not accept it. Other basic commodities accept acreage allotments and controls. Corn is not controlled.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say to the Members of the House that I am not going to undertake to discuss this complex controversial measure in any great detail.

Here are the major provisions, just the barest highlights, of the conference bill:

First. Ninety percent of parity for 1956 for cotton, wheat, corn, peanuts, and rice. Tobacco supports will continue to be maintained at 90 percent. This at a time when realized net income of farmers has dropped more than $4 billion since 1951 and is at the lowest point since 1942.

Second. Restoration of the old parity formula for those basic crops where modernized parity would bring about reduction in parity levels. At the same time a directive to the Department of Agriculture to restudy the whole subject of parity and make specific recommendations to Congress for a real improvement in our parity formula.

Third. A $1,200,000 a year soil bank in 2 parts:

(a) An acreage reserve designed to reduce acreage of wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, tobacco, and feed grains. Payments would be made to farmers to reduce their acreage of these crops below their acreage allotments or below their 3-year average in the case of feed grains. The Department's present estimates of the payments which would be made per acre for this reduction are: Tobacco, $100–300; cotton, $48–60; peanuts, $50–70; wheat, $18–25; corn, $36–50; rice, $60–75; and feed grains, $15–50. A maximum of $750 million per year could be expended on the acreage reserve for the next 4 crop years.

(b) A conservation reserve designed to remove acreage from crop production on a semipermanent basis, for which payments approximately equivalent to the rental value of the land would be made, with an annual limit of $450 million.

Fourth. The soil bank is substantially improved over the Senate version:

(a) The compulsory features have been removed;

(b) Limits have been put on the amounts which can be spent on specific crops, thus assuring an equitable distribution of funds;

(c) Some of the drastic and unfair penalties have been removed; and

(d) Far more adequate provisions have been made for the protection of tenants and sharecroppers.

Fifth. A domestic parity plan for wheat that will go into effect if wheat growers vote for such a plan by a two-thirds majority in a referendum. It will give growers 100 percent of parity for wheat consumed domestically and substantially the world market price for the balance of their production.

Sixth. A two-price plan for rice quite similar to that provided for wheat.

Seventh. The minimum support level for dairy products and milk is raised from 75 to 80 percent and the producers of manufacturing milk and butterfat are assured a fairer price proportionately by establishment of a $3.25 support price for manufacturing milk and 58.6 cents per pound for butterfat.

Eighth. For the first time a program designed to bring stability to the rapidly deteriorating feed grain situation is provided. It will cut down the acreage of feed grain and give producers support prices of 85 percent of parity if they comply with the acreage reduction.

Ninth. A somewhat similar program is provided for corn. Corn producers are given an increase of about 9 million acres in their allotments for this year but will be required to put 15 percent of their cropland into the soil bank in order to be eligible for price supports on corn.

Tenth. There are various provisions to improve the disposal of surplus commodities. One provision will make surplus foods available to Federal penal institutions and to State reformatories and institutions for minors. Another provision requires the Secretary to study the various proposals for food stamp plans and make specific recommendations to Congress within 90 days.

I propose to yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] to discuss the wheat situation, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] to discuss the corn and small grain situation, to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] to discuss the cotton section, if there are any questions to be discussed, and to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] and to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] to discuss the rice section.

Let me emphasize what the distinguished and able gentleman from Iowa just said. The people have been screaming their heads off about these vital foods and fibers in storage. It is claimed that storage is not a market place. But here are the figures that prove conclusively, and they are figures from the Secretary's own department, that when Mr. Benson went into office the price support program on the basic agricultural commodities through the Commodity Credit Corporation did not show a loss. The program showed a net profit of more than $13 million.

Where are we now? At the end of December 1952, there was a profit of $13,011,290 on the overall program for the basic crops. On potatoes, eggs, wool, and everything, we had lost slightly more than a billion dollars, but that was due to World War II and the Korean situation.

Here are the latest figures, February 29, 1956. The loss on basic commodities is $560 million. That is up to the last report.

Now, let me tell you this: In this very bill we are appropriating $500 million to give it away across the seas; not only to give it away but to pay the freight from the place of production to the seaboard and to pay the ocean charges to deliver it on foreign shores. Now, why should the gentleman complain about a $500 million loss on basic commodities taking us through World War II and into Korea and on up to last February, just a few days ago?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not correct to say that the soil bank itself will cost as much in one or maybe one and a quarter years as the entire price support program has cost in 20?

Mr. COOLEY. Why, certainly. And that is the thing that I think the House should know. We give him here in this bill $1.2 billion. He says he needs it and he wants it. Now, that is a figure that is larger than the total losses were in this program that I mentioned in 1953.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. My question deals with the overall bill. It is my understanding that the Senate bill contained a limitation upon the maximum amount of payments which could be made to any one individual. It is also my understanding that there has been a bill proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. LAIRD, before your committee for some time, setting that limitation at $25,000. Does this conference report contain any such limitation, sir; and, if not, was it considered by the conferees?

Mr. COOLEY. It was carefully considered in conference, and my recollection is the vote was unanimous to take it out, because we know that the little farmer is not the one who is piling up the surpluses or in any way responsible for them. Unless Mr. Benson, through the soil-conservation program, can induce the big operators, those who are operating mechanized farms, to take out large acreages of wheat and cotton and other surplus crops, his program will miserably fail. So, when you put in a limitation, you just restrict him in the operation of the program.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. In other words, the loan program then would be designed to extend loans and make payments to the big farmers; is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. Along with all other farmers.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, I can give you an illustration here. One company put in 7,000 bales, I believe it was, in a loan, but he took out all but about 65 bales. They paid the Government interest. People get another foolish idea about this thing. When you loan a man money on cotton and corn, it is like going to the bank to borrow. He pays the loan back and he pays the interest on it.

Now, Mr. Benson, unfortunately—and I respect the gentleman and I certainly have a high regard for his high office—does not tell the people of America that on the cotton program alone we have

made a profit of $250 million. He does not tell the people of America that on the sugar program, which is universally popular, we have made a profit of over $300 million. Oh, no; he does not tell them that. He does not tell them this, either, that we are today supporting sugar beets at more than 98 percent of parity. We are supporting wool at 106 percent of parity. Now, those crops grow in Utah. They do not grow down south in North Carolina.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If I understand the gentleman correctly, when cotton is put in for a Government loan upon which interest is paid, the cotton grower then has the choice of either paying his loan, withdrawing it from storage, or of taking the 90 percent parity price at his choice. Is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. He could take it out and sell it on the open market.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. But if he does not, he takes the 90 percent parity price?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. And the Government sells it at the best price obtainable. I just told you, even with Benson or without Benson, we still have a profit of over $200 million. Now, why should you want to take this program away from the farmer?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If he is unable to sell his crop, whether it is wheat, corn, or cotton, on the open market at a price less than the 90 percent or otherwise established parity payment, he can then go to the Government and get the amount of the 90 percent or otherwise established parity payment and turn it over to the Government; is that not correct?

Mr. COOLEY. When his note falls due—it is a nonrecourse loan—the Government takes it over, and the Government then sells it. And today the United States Government is the biggest merchant this world has ever known; and Mr. Benson is charged with the primary responsibility.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. But the Government pays him the difference between the loan and the 90 percent or otherwise established parity price; does it not?

Mr. COOLEY. No; I suggest to the gentleman that he get somebody to explain it to him; I do not have the time now.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. For example, when I, on my farm in Minnesota, would take out a loan on corn, I would get a loan, up to this previous year, of up to 90 percent of parity. Very well; if I cannot obtain more than 90 percent of parity for my corn, when that note becomes due, naturally I turn it over to the Government, deliver the corn to the Government, just satisfy the note. They do not in any way make up the difference between the loan and so-called parity.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman, a member of the committee.

Mr. DIXON. The gentleman will recall that with his permission and at my request, the Secretary of Agriculture inserted in the record a statement of the losses on high support price commodities which showed a figure of over $13 billion.

Mr. COOLEY. What is that?

Mr. DIXON. And that that $13 billion figure had been arrived at after taking into account the profits on cotton and sugar. That figure of $13 billion is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I can find it for the gentleman. That figure has never been successfully disputed.

Mr. COOLEY. Let me dispute it once and for all and nail it to the barn door right now. And I am going to do it out of the Secretary's own book. I have it right here. I gave the figures a minute ago. On the basics, the figure is $560,763,769. On the whole business that the gentleman is talking about, the figure is $2,937,445,602.

Mr. DIXON. If the gentleman will give me permission, I would like to get that statement that was submitted to the Committee on Agriculture, for the RECORD.

Mr. COOLEY. I should be glad for the gentleman to put these figures in the RECORD. I am putting these CCC audit reports in the RECORD now. These are the Secretary's figures.

Let me say something to the Members from the dairy districts. We talk about the basic program and the high support level, and so forth. Do these gentlemen know that of this loss that we are talking about here, the loss on dairy products has been over $800 million? They have not lost any money on tobacco and cotton, and they will not lose any on those crops, if the programs are properly administered. The dairy industry pretends that they have had no relief at all.

The champion of our dairy farmers, the gentleman from Minnesota, indicates he wants me to yield to him, and I yield to him at this time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, there are many factors that go into these figures of losses. One is the use of surplus milk in the school lunch program. Another one is the give-away program, which is taking place all over the world, the program under which they give away dairy products.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope the gentleman will not misunderstand me. I am not trying to charge these losses up to the American dairy farmer.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Another thing is the markdown from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity, which is also charged up to the American dairy farmer.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend that all of us appreciate his great interest in the dairy farmer. Just last week in this House we passed a bill providing for an expenditure of $75 million per year for 2 years, for milk in the school lunch program. That is $150 million. We gave them $10 million to continue the program for the rest of this year. That is $160 million. We gave them $2 million extra on the brucellosis program. That is $162 million. Then we gave them $20 million a year for the next 2 years under the brucellosis program. That runs it up to over $200 million that we have provided the dairy industry of this country, just in the last week. That is the picture we have here.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman was talking about the profits of the Government in the tobacco and cotton programs. Is it not a fact that those profits, so-called, were brought about only because of large amounts of those commodities shipped overseas in the foreign-aid program?

Mr. COOLEY. Some cotton was shipped in the foreign-aid program. But this by no stretch of the imagination could be called a subsidy to farmers. This profit in the cotton program is an actual bona fide profit, and the money is in the Treasury.

Mr. KEATING. But a large part of it was by credit from one Government Department to another?

Mr. COOLEY. No. The gentleman will find that is not right. The profit in the cotton program is real and the money is right here in the Treasury now. So is that money that came out of the sugar program.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding, for our good friends representing city districts, I should like to cite briefly the benefits that have occurred to our great consuming population during the lifetime of our farm program.

The consuming population of the United States, for a smaller percentage of their income, now eats more and better food than ever before in history. It has been in times when food was the cheapest, in relation to other values in our economy, that breadlines in the cities have been the longest.

Today the average hour's wage of a worker in industry buys more food than ever before. In 1929 the hour's wage bought only 6.4 loaves of bread. Now it buys 11 loaves. And I invite my city friends to examine these other figures on the cost of food. An hour's wage bought 1.2 pounds of round steak in 1929, now it buys 2.3 pounds; 1.5 pounds of pork chops in 1929, now 2.8 pounds; 1 pound of butter then, now 2.7 pounds; 3.9 quarts of milk then, now 8.2 quarts; 1.1 dozens of eggs then, now 3.3 dozens; 17.7 pounds of potatoes then, 35.1 pounds now, and the average hour's wage bought 1.3 pounds of bacon in 1929, and now it buys 3.6 pounds.

Our friends from the cities also will want to take note of the fact that between 1947 and 1955, farm income decreased 37.7 percent, while the hourly wage of factory workers increased 52 percent, and dividend payments jumped 71 percent.

Our farmers deserve better treatment in this great country of ours. They are entitled to share in the blessings of our free enterprise. They are entitled to a fair share in the Nation's prosperity. That is my philosophy and that is what I am fighting for here today.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not wish this opportunity go by without thanking the gentleman from North

Carolina, together with the other conferees, for what I think is as good a conference report as can be written in behalf of the farmers of the United States. Certainly this is a compromise. There are changes I would like made. But on the whole this bill means much to agriculture and again I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and his colleagues for a very difficult job well done.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman who has just spoken has said, and I hope it is true, this is not a political measure. There has been some talk otherwise. It should not be, because it is a measure that vitally affects the welfare of not only the farmers of this country but the whole United States. In that spirit we must consider this legislation.

We all want to help the farmer. We all want to see him prosper. We all want to see him get his full share of this great economy. We must further consider that there are 155 million people who also want to see this country conducted on a sane, sensible basis. We do not begrudge the farmer anything he gets because we know he works hard for it. We people who live in the cities know that a successful agriculture is essential to the country. But we do want that money spent properly. This administration believes in helping the farmer. If it were not so, we would not have this bill here today.

The basic soundness of the President's proposal is evident from the fact that, for the greater part, they are still in the conference report. They have survived the most intensive hearings, debate, and conference to which a farm bill has ever been subjected.

The conference report which is before us is a fantastic mixture of good and bad provisions in which the bad features tend to cancel out the good. It contains the soil bank much as it was proposed by the President, though delayed beyond the time when this program could be fully effective in 1956. It contains other provisions which would be self-defeating and would pile up surpluses as fast as the soil bank could pull them down.

The bill as it stands is a many splendored thing, and like the current movie of the same name, is intended as a big box-office attraction. It cannot provide farmers the help they need.

Nor do I see how the President can bring himself to sign it.

Mr. Speaker, I am assuming that every Congressman is vitally interested in givng farmers help this year. I am therefore not ready to give up hope for the passage of sound legislation. I do not believe we have yet exhausted all the possiblities of getting a good bill—a bill the President can sign—a bill that can give farmers the sound help they expect and deserve.

Proceeding from this thought, my motion to recommit H. R. 12 would instruct the House conferees to strip from the bill its self-defeating features, and to retain those provisions that will be permanently helpful to farmers.

The following features now embodied in the conference report, or in the Senate bill in the case of dairy supports, would be retained:

First. The soil bank, which is the very heart of the program, which is highly favored, and is sound. It provides for a $750 million acreage program and a $450 million conservation reserve.

Second. The increase in dairy price supports, as contained in the Senate version of H. R. 12. This will provide a more favorable base period for establishing dairy price supports.

Third. The surplus disposal section, because our goal must be to get rid of the surpluses that depressed farm income by $2 billion last year. This includes the authorization for $500 million additional for surplus removal.

Fourth. Title IV on marketing quotas and acreage allotments would be retained, except for the provision requiring mandatory price supports for feed grains. This includes no reduction in the national acreage allotment for cotton for the next 2 years and special provision for aiding small cotton farmers.

Fifth. Title VI which provides for assistance to the States in reforestation.

All of these—and they are the constructive substance of the bill—would be retained even though they fall short of perfection.

The major controversial feature of the bill is the proposed return, for 1 year, to price supports for the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. The language in my motion for recommital would delete this provision. My motion would substitute support for basic crops in 1956 at not less than 82½ percent of parity. This is the same provision which the House wrote into law for the 1955 crops.

Other provisions which are self-defeating, and which would hurt farmers far more than they would help, would be stricken. These include:

First. Dual parity, or the double standard of parity. This provision would give special treatment to four favored commodities out of about 160 on which parity is calculated. There is no justification in logic or equity for this kind of favoritism.

Under the working of the modernized parity formula, the dual parity provision would pull down the parity prices of commodities other than the four favored ones. This is not well understood. All these years farmers producing other crops, livestock, and other farm commodities have been penalized because the law gave more under the old parity to wheat, cotton, peanuts, and corn. I am afraid the provision for dual parity might even destroy the usefulness of the parity concept for any price support calculations.

Second. Mandatory price supports for feed grain would be deleted. The difficulties of establishing needed base acreages and yields would make this provision practically impossible to apply in 1956. Also higher price supports for these crops would soon pile up new and large surpluses. The provision would increase Government relations farm by farm. And it would result in sharp differences in support levels for farmers across the fence from each other.

It would increase costs to dairy, poultry, and livestock farmers. It would help hold down prices on feeder cattle, lambs, and hogs. If continued, it would tend to dry up markets for the very farmers for whom help is intended.

Congress is not wise enough to arbitrarily step in between the farmers that produce feed grains and those farmers who buy feeds—and set a fair price—with all the many geographic locations and changing supply situations. Vastly more farmers buy feed than produce feed grains to sell.

Third. The multiple-price plans for wheat and rice would be stricken. This part of the bill was written for the special benefit of large wheat and rice growers. The wheat plan would discriminate against small farmers who produce less than 15 acres of wheat—and that means two-thirds of all wheatgrowers. It would discriminate against them by denying them a vote in the wheat referendum and by giving them a lower price.

Moreover, it would hurt other farmers by forcing down the price of all other grains.

This provision would also increase the price of bread by about 2 cents a loaf. The result would fall most heavily on our low-income families who are the major users of cereal foods and against whom we must not discriminate.

I am in favor of helping wheat and rice producers, but let us continue to do so out of general tax revenues until we are very sure there is a better plan.

These most unwise and unworkable provisions of the conference report before us are the result of shooting from the hip on farm legislation, of trying to write a bill on the floor, and of bypassing the normal process of hearings on fundamental provisions.

Mr. Speaker, the season is now well advanced. Winter wheat is stretching up. Cotton and spring grains are being seeded. Farmers in the Corn Belt will soon be planting corn.

This conference report comes to us at the 11th hour. The usefulness of the soil bank for 1956 has diminished with each passing day.

The President cannot be expected to sign an unsound total bill, just to get the soil bank.

A month or two ago when there was still opportunity for making it fully effective in 1956, the enactment of the soil bank would have meant a real lift for farmers. But the soil bank now looks more and more like a program for 1957 and less and less like a program for 1956.

The Department of Agriculture will do its utmost to put a program into operation. But time is fleeting. At this late date, if a soil bank is put into effect for 1956 spring crops it would become, in substantial part, a plow-up program. And this is hardly an auspicious beginning for a soil bank.

At this late date the signing of the conference report in its present form is less likely, and in the eyes of the public, its veto would be more an act of statesmanship. The press of the country strongly support the changes suggested by the President.

We must pass a constructive bill if we want the President to sign it. And we would be unworthy of our own responsibility if we pass a bill which we know is bad, and which should not—yes, cannot—be signed.

As I have offered my motion to recommit, it incorporates, I think, all that is acceptable to the administration from the conference report. And that part which the motion incorporates is the real heart of a constructive farm program, even though it would still lack the perfection to which the President has referred. On behalf of our farmers and all the people of the United States and in behalf of sound legislation, I urge a favorable vote on my motion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. I wonder if the gentleman could give me some more time.

Mr. COOLEY. I will have to take it away from someone else. I will yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not have time to explain in detail my motion. I call attention to the fact that here we are today with 2 hours of debate and the leader in opposition to the conference report does not have time to adequately present his case. I protest against it.

I want to say in conclusion that I hope this conference report will be recommitted.

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

Mr. MARTIN. No. I do not have the time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thought perhaps I could help. I wanted to yield you my time.

Mr. COOLEY. I told the gentleman I would have to take any time away from somebody in order to give him time. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] for his generosity. I know the fine spirit which prompts it.

In conclusion, I hope that when this House gets around to voting, it will recommit this bill, will send it back to the conference committee where the conferees can once more look the bill over and make other worthy amendments which are very essential if we are to have the right type of bill for the building up of agriculture which must, of course, be the thought of all our people. This motion means that the conferees will bring back the bill without the 90 percent of parity and other features I have outlined in my motion. What is wrong with that? It would be a bill the whole country is looking for. The people of the East, the people of the West, the North and the South are all deeply involved in this bill because it means so much to them. Send it back to the committee and let that committee bring back a bill which the President of the United States can sign. This we would do if we had only the interest of the farmer at heart.

Without disclosing any confidences I am sure the President will not sign this bill. He has said that it does not meet the test of a fair bill, a bill that will help agriculture in the years ahead; a bill that will provide real security; with those views I have no doubt as to the action of the President.

As far as I personally am concerned, if this motion to recommit does not prevail I shall feel constrained to vote against the conference report.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief because I have no hope of stopping this nonpartisan stampede to kill the farmer with kindness. In this contest between the Republicans and the Democrats to see which party can make the highest bid for the farm vote, there is no serious consideration given on either side of the House to the fundamental problems of agricultural economics in a free-enterprise system.

The whole argument reflects just a confusion of schemes, each proposing to be the most expeditious way of robbing the taxpayer and putting operating capital into the hands of farmers, with which they will proceed to produce more surpluses. In voting billions to farmers, no one seems to understand that operating capital is just as important as acreage in the production of farm crops, and no one seems to believe that sound principles associated with the law of supply and demand can work in agriculture.

This concept of the present problem is probably due to the fact that the Federal Government has for much too long a time subsidized agricultural production and, thereby, created a distorted monstrosity in the form of Federal management which has almost completely divorced the agricultural economy from the free-enterprise system. Because of this past action, the problem today is very difficult. A quick return to the system where price is determined by the relation of supply to demand and where production is limited by operating capital and profit, would be disastrous. It is equally true, however, that the return to this price and profit system is desirable and inevitable.

This Congress shows no inclination to make the return by gradual reduction of subsidy, so the return is likely to come suddenly some day right here on the floor of the House when the representatives of taxpayers and consumers generally wake up to the fallacy of subsidy and kill the whole farm program in one stroke of legislation.

An equally foolish idea held by this Congress is that 13½ percent of our population can be maintained in agricultural production. Only through complete socialization can they be maintained and that would freeze them all in economic bondage and deny to farmers the benefits of progress by better methods and techniques.

Despite the copious tears shed here on the floor of the House about the poor farmer, farmers are not the poor segment of our society. Their average wealth exceeds that of any other equally large class of our society and greatly exceeds the average wealth of the city worker. City Congressmen whose districts supply most of these billions of farm-subsidy money, and who represent consumers will some day wake up to realize that their support of big farm subsidies is definitely contrary to the interests of their own districts. If you do not believe it, look up the records and see who gets the $3 billion annually which this proposed program will cost. Then, you will understand the motivation of the corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanut, and rice Congressmen.

Consumers finally pay all of the costs of taxation. And do not let anybody fool you into believing that there is anything about this farm subsidy program which makes for lower consumer prices.

Now I want to assure you that I hold no ill will toward the farmer. I grew up in the wheat country where I still have plenty of relatives, and I, myself, have been a Pennsylvania farmer for the last 35 years. I have made a lot of money in farming and have lately lost a lot. Farming, by nature, is a risk business and should stay that way.

If I thought subsidy would, in the long run, do farmers any good, I would not be so opposed to the program. But I do not want guaranteed status quo with socialistic bondage for farmers. Farmers, generally, do not want that. Yes; many of them are glad to take any money handed to them by the Federal Government, but at the same time they sincerely believe that the subsidy system is wrong and that it is not the proper function of the Federal Government to guarantee prices.

I am convinced of this thinking on the part of the farmers, and I am, as a consequence, convinced that the political importance of this problem, to either the Republicans or the Democrats, is largely in the minds of Congressmen who are running scared. Not many people behind the curtain of a voting booth are going to be diverted by bribery from voting their conscience.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE].

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to ask a question or two of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. If this bill passes there will be some interest in my section of the country, although of a very minor impact, I am sure, with reference to the conservation reserve feature of the soil bank provisions.

On page 7 of the conference report section (2) states:

> To devote to conserving crops or uses, or allow to remain idle, throughout the contract period an acreage of the remaining land on the farm which is not less than the acreage normally devoted only to conserving crops or uses or normally allowed to remain idle on such remaining acreage.

In an explanation of the bill prepared by the staff, entitled "Differences Between the Conference Substitute, the Senate Amendment and H. R. 12 as Passed by the House," I would like to read and get the gentleman's comment on paragraph No. 13, page 2, reading as follows:

> The substitute makes it clear that a producer putting in the conservation reserve lands devoted to such soil conserving crops as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers would not be

required to increase his acreage of soil conserving crops on the balance of his land, or to reduce the acreage devoted to other crops on the balance of his land. Thus, a producer putting 10 acres of tame hay land in the conservation reserve could continue to use the balance of his land in exactly the same manner as he had previously done, if he so desired.

Now, is it the understanding of the chairman, as one of the managers on the part of the House, that this explanation of this provision of the bill itself is in line with the general agreement in conference?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is entirely correct; yes.

Mr. McINTIRE. I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that this be contained in the legislative record of this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. CRETELLA].

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to follow my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING], because he talked of the impact of this report on the consumer, and that is who I am going to talk about.

The conference report on H. R. 12 although not admitted contains provisions which result in direct food taxes on consumers.

Under title V, the domestic parity plan for wheat would increase consumers' grocery bills by almost a million dollars a day. Next year's food bills would be higher by about $340 million.

This plan is really a consumer tax, which would boost the price of bread about 2 cents a loaf. Higher prices would not be on bread alone, but would hit all food products containing wheat.

Low-income consumers are more dependent on bread and other cereal foods than are the rest of our people. Thus, this provision of the bill before us would fall most heavily on families against whom we must and should not discriminate.

Similarly, the 2-price plan for rice would increase the retail price for this food by 2 cents or more per pound. Consumers would pay about $25 million more per year. And this, too, would most seriously burden our low-income families.

The people unquestionably bear the costs of any price-support program. However, the programs now in effect are financed from the general tax revenue of the Government, and thus do not discriminate especially against the people least able to bear the cost.

The special feed-grain provisions with the sharply reduced acreages required, about 20 percent below the 1955 level—not 15 percent as some people think—accompanied by high price supports is just bad business for the whole Northeast. The effects of this section of the bill will be felt in higher feed costs to the livestock producer. This will mean higher prices to the consumer.

Not only will the consumer have to pay higher prices for the livestock products but he will be levied upon as a taxpayer to pay for the loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation. In addition, it will not be long before the law requires import controls on feed grains from Canada. This will hurt our relations with our friends to the north.

This is triple jeopardy for us in the Northeast.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I find myself today in a very peculiar situation. In the 5 years that I have been a Member of this House, this is the first time that I have taken the floor against the leadership on my side of the House. In addition to that, this is the first time that I have been able to agree with some of my colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture. But, I think it is about time that we quit fighting and got on with the business of passing some kind of an agricultural bill.

Now, the soil bank proposal was advanced in January of this year. It will cost considerable money. We were told by Mr. Benson and Mr. Eisenhower, for whom I have the greatest respect, that it was a good program. I was asked to support it. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture I have supported it. I think it is a good program; at least, I think it will be a good program. If the soil bank program had been adopted in January of this year, it would have cost this year more money than 90 percent parity will cost the taxpayer. The passage of the soil bank program at this time, as far as I am personally concerned and as far as the farmers of my district are concerned, will give no benefit whatsoever during this year's crop, because it will not go into operation in time.

The proposal of the great minority leader to eliminate the two-price system for wheat, for which I have fought since 1932; the reduction of the parity price from 90 percent to 82½ percent, will eliminate every single benefit to my district as far as this year is concerned, even though the soil bank program and the acreage conservation program should turn out to be a success. If that program turns out to be a success, we will not need 90 percent of parity after this year because the soil bank program will make the cash price of commodities go above 90 percent. And that is the objective of every Member of Congress; that the time shall arrive when every farmer can sell his product in the market place at 100 percent of parity without the intervention of the Government in any respect.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is going to explain the two-price system. In the limited time allotted me I cannot undertake to do it but it is the only farm program that will not cost the taxpayer any money. I think it will work; I think it will be a good program.

Our great minority leader has said that the President of the United States will veto this bill if it is approved by the Congress in its present form. I have the highest love and respect not only for the President of the United States, but for the leader of my party. He represents all of the people of the United States. I represent 600,000 of those people. My conscience should tell me what to do. The President's conscience should tell him what to do. He represents a segment of society. I represent a segment of society. If I follow the leadership of the President to the detriment of my 600,000 people, my 600,000 people will be disfranchised as far as having a spokesman is concerned.

With that idea in mind, if the President's conscience tells him to veto this bill, I am not going to criticize him for doing that because it is his duty and responsibility, to follow the dictates of his conscience. I know President Eisenhower well enough to know that he would not ask me, as a Member of Congress, merely to accept his wishes, to the detriment of the people whom I represent here in the Congress. He is too big a man for that.

As long as I am a Member of this Congress I intend to look out for the best interests of the people of my district and the people of the United States. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture I have a duty and responsibility to the agricultural interests of the entire United States. As the Representative of the First Oklahoma District I have a duty to the farming interests of my district. Today I am discharging that duty.

For the first time, as I say, I am taking the floor in opposition to a motion that I know is going to be made by the minority leader, a man whom I admire and respect and love and whose leadership I have followed. I do that because my conscience tells me to do this and for no other reason. I do that with a heavy heart. I think his motion to recommit is a mistake. I think we should approve this conference report and send the bill down to the President.

That is the way I intend to vote.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. I thought the gentleman was going to yield me 10 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. I am sorry, but every minute of the time has been allotted. I regret it more than I can say. More than 1 hour has been allotted on the gentleman's side of the aisle.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate the gentleman's attitude, but I had arranged to yield some time to the gentleman from Wisconsin from my time, on the assumption I had 10 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. I am very sorry it happened that way. I have 5 minutes I am going to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. Maybe he can yield some time to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman will yield, I understand I am to be yielded 2 minutes. I should like to accord the gentleman my time if he will give me the opportunity.

The SPEAKER. The time is under the control of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. In view of what the gentleman from Minnesota has said, I will yield the gentleman from Indiana 2 additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have a preface. I feel positive the motion to recommit will not prevail, consequently I am glad to yield to my majority leader.

Mr. COOLEY. I yield the gentleman from Indiana 2 additional minutes, then.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank you very much.

I am equally sure the other way, may I say to my friend from Minnesota, and I think for good reason.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out, we all recognize that the farming economy is the one soft spot in the whole national economy, and we all want to do something about it. As fair-minded people we should do something about it. I am just a little afraid that as we have moved to do something, there has been too much shadowboxing and not enough attention paid to the really important factors that are involved.

There are several features in this bill, as was pointed out by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], which should be brought to quick passage in the interest of the farmers of this country, not only in their interest but in the interest of all the people of the country.

Also, the gentleman from North Carolina knows that while he has responded with his committee to many of the things that the President asked—and may I say that the President's program and his proposals submitted more than 3 months ago meet with the approval not only of the farmers but the great majority of all of our people—he has in this bill many provisions that I am sure he knows himself are not right, which he knows are opposed by the President, and which, I say on my responsibility, if they go down to the White House, should bring a veto of this measure, a veto which will be sustained.

That leads me to suggest that perhaps there has been too much maneuvering for a veto and not enough real action to get a bill that will be acceptable and really helpful to the farmers.

In respect to this motion to recommit, let me say this to many of my friends on the righthand side of the aisle. When that roll is called, a lot of people will be looking to see just how you voted on some of these proposals.

The good things that are staying in the bill have already been recounted. Now what is in this motion to recommit? The first is that it holds the 82.5 percent that we fixed the past year, so we are flexible between 82.5 and 90. But certainly the 90 percent high rigid support price was calculated to be an incentive to increased production in wartime, not increased production in peacetime. I do not care how you argue it, the war is over. We are in peacetime. If you go on and on with the high rigid 90 percent formula, you will continue to pile up surpluses that will continue to plague us and continue to depress prices. I say it is time to get away from that, for the farmer's own good.

Secondly, the motion to recommit would take out the provisions for dual parity. You had arranged in the law for the application of modernized parity and, I think, there was general agreement at that time. The time has arrived to make parity more realistic, and yet here even though you know that it is completely obnoxious to the President of the United States, you insist on putting in dual parity which, I say, should not be in the bill and it ought to go out.

Now you will be doing another thing. You bring feed grains in to increase their support price from 70 percent to 85 percent. I know where most of those feed grains are grown, and maybe some of the Members who want that increase in supports think it is going to be good for the people who produce the feed grains. I seriously doubt that. But, let me say to you, you are going to make it more difficult for the corn farmers in the Middle West who are already under pressure. If you think for a minute that the people out there are not going to take a look at how you vote on this motion to recommit, you have another guess coming. The action which you are seeking to take will pile up feed grains in surplus supply and further depress the price to the farmers.

In addition to that, you put in the bill the 2-price arrangement or the 3-price formula, or whatever it is, for wheat and for rice. There again some people say it is going to be good for the wheat farmers. But, in all likelihood the minimum you will do to the corn farmers in the Middle West with that arrangement is to provide for the dumping of up to 300 million bushels of wheat on an already depressed farm market where corn is in surplus supply.

I hope the provisions of the motion to recommit will be adopted to clean up this bill and to keep the good that is in the bill and to take out the bad—but if this bill goes down to the White House in its present form and is vetoed and the veto is sustained, then those of you who are for this arrangement will go back and explain to your wheat farmers this proposition:

Under existing law, the support price on wheat will be $1.73 a bushel and under the 82½-percent proposal, as provided for in the motion to recommit, it would be $1.97 a bushel. In my book, that is a pretty good support price for wheat.

I trust without regard to partisanship that you will support this motion to recommit because it is good for the farmers and good for the consumers of the entire Nation. So far as I am concerned, there is so much bad in the bill that if we do not do something about it by the motion to recommit, I am going to vote against the conference report and I will vote to sustain the veto of the President.

Mr. Speaker, now I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I come from a congressional district which produces more milk and cheese than any congressional district represented here today. I have enjoyed my work on the House Agriculture Committee and I agree with the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] that as members of the Committee on Agriculture, we should look at farm legislation on a nonpartisan basis. One must also look at agricultural legislation on the basis of what is best for his congressional district.

This conference report discriminates against the family-type dairy farm. The so-called basic commodities are given increases in support level of from 15 to 20 percent. The support for the so-called feed crops are increased by 17 percent. The support level for manufactured dairy products is increased by only 2.5 percent.

In addition to this, the conference report completely eliminates the Senate penalty provisions for violation of soil-bank contracts. Millions of acres will be placed in the soil bank and farmers in the areas producing basic commodities will plant this land in grasses and legumes. In order for the Wisconsin dairy farmer to be adequately protected against the diversion of this land to milk production, adequate penalty provisions were necessary to keep this land from being used for livestock and grazing. Under the conference report a producer of the so-called basic commodities can still continue to receive his price supports even though he grazes the land he has placed in the acreage reserve of the soil bank.

Milk production will be greatly increased in areas of this country outside of our historic dairyland by this conference committee action.

In addition to the objectionable features which I have already outlined as far as the dairy farmer is concerned, the conference report continues the present method of calculating the parity equivalent for manufactured milk.

The computation of the parity price at which manufactured milk is supported must be changed so that dairy farmers are assured of stability in prices. As example, $3.15 per hundredweight for manufactured milk at the beginning of 1954 was about 75 percent of parity, but now that price is approximately 83 percent of parity.

The parity equivalent for manufactured milk as now computed does not reflect a fair ratio of milk prices to farm costs. The parity equivalent for manufactured milk is based on the relationship of the price of manufactured milk to the price of all milk sold at wholesale which includes the price of class I fluid milk. During the base period of 1910–14 there was no such thing as what we know today as class I milk.

Milk used for fluid purposes in the 1910–14 period was probably inferior to present-day manufacturing milk in both quality and in the production standards or facilities required for its handling. Grade A milk as accepted in most fluid markets is a new commodity that has entered the market since 1914. The kind of milk that was produced in 1910–14 and was then sold for fluid purposes is now used almost entirely for manufacturing, a market that is also invaded by Grade A producers as a dumping ground for their surplus produced in excess of fluid needs.

In many instances, prices of fluid milk are established by Federal orders in a way that insures producers equitable incomes. At the same time, manufacturing milk prices are currently and under this conference report supported according to a "parity equivalent for manufacturing milk" that continuously declines in direct relation to rising fluid prices.

Under this conference report parity equivalent for manufacturing milk will continue to be calculated as follows:

First. The parity price of all milk sold at wholesale is computed.

Second. The relation is established between (a) the average price received by farmers for all milk sold at wholesale, and (b) the average f. o. b. plant price for milk sold for use in American cheese, evaporated milk, and butter and milk byproducts. This relation is established for the period from July 1946 through the most recent December, but when such a period exceeds 10 years for only the 10 most recent calendar years.

When fluid milk producers improve their price in relation to manufacturing milk prices, so that the margin is widened between the price of manufactured milk and the price of all milk sold at wholesale, they reduce automatically the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk the next time such parity equivalent is computed by the USDA.

This reduction is most easily illustrated by an example in which the figures are chosen for simplicity rather than by current prices and volume. In the example we will assume that 100 pounds of milk is sold, with 50 pounds going into fluid use at $4 per hundredweight and 50 pounds is sold for manufacturing at $3 per hundredweight, and 100 percent of parity is $3.50 per hundredweight for all milk sold at wholesale. In such circumstances the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk would be $3/$3.50 or 85 percent of parity for all milk sold at wholesale, and 100 percent of parity equivalent for manufacturing milk would be $3 per hundredweight.

Now we will assume that the fluid-milk price for the period is increased to $4.50. Such an increase would bring the average price of all milk sold at wholesale up to $3.75 if there is no change in utilization. If parity for all milk remains unchanged at $3.50 per hundredweight, the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk would be lowered as follows:

First. The ratio of manufactured milk to all milk would be $3/$3.75 or 80 percent.

Second. Parity equivalent for manufacturing milk would be reduced from 85.7 to 80 percent of the parity for all milk sold at wholesale.

Third. Parity equivalent for manufacturing milk would be 80 percent of $3.50, or only $2.80 instead of the $3 that existed before the increase in fluid milk prices.

In actual practice the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk was 88.5 percent of the parity price for all milk wholesale when first computed. It was later reduced to 84.1 percent, then 83.7 percent, and on January 31, 1956, it was further reduced to only 83.3 percent. The parity equivalent of 88 percent is based on the period of the first 30 months following July 1946. The parity equivalent of 83.3 percent is based on the period of July 1946 through December 1955. This reduction has occurred because a diffferent commodity, fluid milk, has been developed since the 1910–14 base period and has been classed in the same category with the ungraded milk of the earlier period, but which because it was a new and different product has been given a higher premium price in the market.

There is no reason for permitting a continuous decline in the level of the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk.

The Senate bill fixed the parity equivalent at the 88 percent of parity price as originally calculated. The conference report calls this method a complicated formula and rejects the Senate amendment which permanently establishes the parity equivalent at 88 percent. By so doing this conference report approves for future marketing years the continuing drop in the parity equivalent and also a much more complicated formula. This will result in a lower minimum dollars and cents support level on manufactured milk. For next year under the conference report the 80 percent of parity will be $3.08 on manufactured milk using the parity equivalent of 83.3 percent. However, in view of the fact that class I priced milk will receive increases during the next few months the parity equivalent will further drop and I predict that by December 31, 1956, the parity equivalent will be 82.7 percent.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is of utmost importance to a congressional district such as mine which produces its milk almost solely to be manufactured into dairy products. We need to fix the parity equivalent for manufactured milk in line with what parity should represent. This amendment should be supported by every Congressman from a dairy district. The parity equivalent must be established at the 88-percent figure and the only method we can use to insure this action is to reject the conference report and to adopt this important amendment. If this amendment is not adopted, I certainly cannot support the conference report. I cannot sit here today and cast my vote in opposition to this important provision. A vote for the conference report without the Martin amendment is a vote to reduce the minimum support level to at least $3.08 in the next marketing year and undoubtedly with the new parity equivalent calculation which will be made on December 31, a still further reduction in the minimum support level is in the making for the next marketing year.

If the Martin amendment is adopted the parity equivalent for manufactured milk will be pegged at 88 percent of parity on all milk sold at wholesale. The 80 to 90 percent support range for the next marketing year would be from $3.26 to $3.66 per hundredweight. Under the conference report the 80 to 90 percent support range would be from $3.08 to $3.47 per hundredweight based on the present 83.3 percentage parity equivalent. With the increases, however, which are currently in the making for class I milk this dollars-and-cents range will be even lower on December 31, 1956.

The position taken by the majority party in supporting this conference report today is indeed detrimental to the best interests of the Wisconsin dairy farmer. The majority party position regarding the milk producer is directly opposite to the statements made by Democrat politicians campaigning in our State. Action speaks louder than words. If this conference report is approved without the Martin amendment, it will clearly show that the majority party continues to lack a sympathetic understanding of the problems of the Wisconsin dairy farmer. Farmers in the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin receive less than 2 percent of their total cash income from agricultural commodities which have been given preferential treatment by this conference report.

I am unwilling to sell the Wisconsin family type dairy farm down the river for political expediency. The dairy farmer deserves more consideration than has been shown to him in this conference report. The dairy farmer is the forgotten man in this conference report.

I am most interested in having a farm bill in this year 1956. The President has indicated that he will sign a farm bill if it includes the provisions as outlined in the Martin amendment. If the provisions of the Martin amendment are not included, it will be vetoed. I therefore urge my colleagues, particularly from dairy districts, to vote "Aye" on the Martin motion. If this motion does not prevail, certainly we will have no other recourse but to vote against this conference report.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER], I regret to find myself in opposition to the position of the leadership of my party. I cannot say exactly the same thing he said, that this is the first time, because there have been other times, but I would say there are very few people on the Republican side of this House who have a better record for supporting the program of President Eisenhower than have I.

Of course we all have our responsibilities. The President has his. I would not feel I was doing my full responsibility to my constituents and to the country as a whole at this time if I did not do what I think is the thing that must be done if we are going to keep agriculture in this country on an even keel.

I want to begin my statement by reading a paragraph from a Department of Agriculture publication for March 1956 entitled "The Farm Income Situation."

It reads as follows:

> The farmers' realized net income in 1955 is now estimated at $10,800,000,000; down a billion dollars or 9 percent from 1954 on the basis of more complete information on farm marketings and farm production costs last year.

Now that is what has happened in 1955 as compared with 1954. 1954 was less than 1953. 1953 was less than 1952. I do not know how long this situation can continue and agriculture remain solvent in this country. But I am not going to dwell further on that question because my time is limited.

It is not the farmer alone who is being affected. In every small community, in every county seat town in the United

States, businessmen at this time are beginning to feel the pinch that is coming because of low farm prices and high farm costs.

I hold in my hand a little article that I have taken from this morning's Wall Street Journal, and I want to read a paragraph or two from that. It says:

FARM EQUIPMENT MAKERS PLAN NEW CUTBACKS IN OUTPUT AS SPRING SALES SHOW NO PICKUP—MASSEY-HARRIS ASKS WAGE CUT—HARVESTER TO SLASH PRODUCTION APRIL 30

Spring breezes are blowing cold for farm equipment and tractor producers. Advent of the farm planting season has brought no pickup in lethargic sales of this industry.

So companies are tightening belts still further after earlier production adjustments and layoffs.

Massey-Harris-Ferguson, Inc., yesterday told its nearly 800 workers at its Batavia, N. Y., plant to accept a pay cut to keep the unit operating. International Harvester Co. reports it has scheduled tractor and other farm implement production cutbacks for April 30. Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, reports a 20-percent cut in its tractor production in March, with 100 employees shifted to other departments.

Other farm equipment makers report slow sales and production cuts which are coming on top of earlier slowdowns.

The article goes on and recites how other farm implement companies are cutting back. So you see this is not something that is confined to farmers or to farming communities. It is something that is affecting the very economy of the country itself.

I do not know of anything we can do to help farmers increase their income this year except to depend upon some of the provisions of this bill. I am speaking particularly of dual parity and of the 90 percent of parity provision on basic commodities.

I am for the soil bank. I think it is a splendid idea. I think it will work out, but it will not function to any extent this year. We cannot count on any help from the soil bank except in very restricted areas. So the only way that Congress can do anything this year to stop this constant drop, drop, drop in farm income is to vote down the motion to recommit and adopt this conference report.

I have no information as to what the President will do when this bill is placed upon his desk. But I am sure that he will give consideration to every aspect of the matter and will take into account all of the facts which the conferees and the Congress had before them when the bill was passed.

I want to devote the remainder of my time, if I may, to a discussion of the domestic parity provision, which is one of the items included in this motion to recommit. I think many of you are familiar with it.

This plan is also known by other names, such as the certificate plan and the two-price system. The term "two-price system," however, is a misnomer as applied to the domestic parity plan, because under this plan all wheat would be sold on the market at one price, that is, the going market price. The principles of this plan are in successful operation in the field of dairy products under marketing agreements, and have been discussed in connection with other commodities.

Briefly, the plan and its operation may be described as follows:

First, all wheat would be sold without marketing quotas or restrictions of any kind.

Second, at the beginning of each marketing year the Secretry of Agriculture would make an estimate of the average going market price for that year. He would also announce the parity price of wheat for the year.

Third, the Secretary would estimate the probable amount of wheat which would go into domestic consumption for human food during the marketing year. This amount, which for many years has been approximately 500 million bushels, would then be allotted among the wheat farms of the Nation on substantially the same basis as acreage allotments are made now, except that in this case the acreage would be translated into bushels and the allotment to each farm would be in bushels. Each wheat farmer would receive a certificate stating the number of bushels constituting his share of the estimated domestic consumption of wheat for food.

This certificate would have a value in dollars and cents of the number of bushels which it represented multiplied by the difference between the going market price of wheat as estimated by the Secretary and full parity.

Let us assume for the sake of illustration that the number of bushels represented by this certificate is 1,000 and that the difference between the estimated price of wheat and full parity is 75 cents per bushel. In that event the certificate would have a value of $750.

WHERE WOULD THE MONEY COME FROM?

The next question is how would the farmer realize cash on this certificate and from whence would the money come? The answer to that question is that each miller or other processor of wheat will have to purchase certificates covering the total amount of wheat which he processes for domestic consumption as human food.

It will not be necessary for farmers to deal directly with millers because under the pending legislation the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized through the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and sell marketing certificates. Thus the Commodity Credit Corporation would act as a clearinghouse. Farmers would turn their certificates in to the Commodity Credit Corporation through the county agricultural stabilization committee and millers in turn would buy certificates from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The program in general would be administered by the county agricultural stabilization committees which administer other agricultural programs. The benefits which may be anticipated from this legislation are numerous and may be summarized as follows:

First. Returns to the farmer will be somewhat greater than under the present program and there is a good prospect that expanded outlets will further increase these returns in the future.

Second. Marketing quotas and penalties will be eliminated and acreage controls greatly minimized and possibly entirely eliminated in the course of time.

Third. Relief to taxpayers will be afforded through an immediate substantial reduction and eventual elimination of practically all the costs of the present program under which export subsidies and storage costs amount in the aggregate to over $400 million per year.

Fourth. To a large extent it will take the Government out of the warehousing and merchandising of wheat and in the end probably do away with such activities altogether.

Fifth. Wheat would be produced for market instead of for sale to the Government and would be sold on the basis of quality thus encouraging good farming and the production of superior varieties.

Sixth. Producers of livestock and poultry wherever situated would be able to produce wheat for feed or buy wheat at feed prices.

Seventh. There would be some expansion of wheat exports through the elimination of redtape, delays and other obstacles existing at present.

Eighth. It would result in moving wheat into its natural outlets and market channels.

Ninth. It will fit in perfectly with the soil bank proposals recently submitted by the President.

Tenth. It will return to the farmer greater freedom and control over the operation of his own farm.

The only real objection that I have heard made to this program, the only one that is substantial, is one that has been made by the producers of feed grains who have felt that perhaps it might result in increasing the supply of feed grains. In reply to that let me call attention to the fact that most of the acres we have taken out of wheat under the present program have gone into the production of feed grains. And let me call your attention to these figures very briefly. Compared with the 10-year average 1944 to 1953, we reduced wheat production by 216 million bushels in 1955. Bear that figure in mind.

But for the same period we increased feed grain production exclusive of corn and soy beans by 482 million bushels—more than twice as many bushels of feed grain were produced on those acres than went out of production of wheat. In other words, if wheat had been grown on that land and every bushel had been fed to livestock we would have fed less than half as many bushels of grain as we actually produced by transferring from wheat to other feed grains.

So if those in the Corn Belt who have a sincere belief that this may interfere with feed grain prices will only consider what has happened and is happening at this time they can see that there is no danger of increasing feed grains supplies; rather, the reverse.

But I want also to call attention to the fact that there is in the bill itself a provision which provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may establish acreage allotments on wheat. So he has it in his power to prevent such an expansion of production of wheat as will result in an increase of the total feed grain supply.

Furthermore, the Secretary has the authority to put a low loan upon wheat, and one ingredient of that is the price of corn, so that he has the authority to prevent wheat from coming into unfair competition with corn as a feed grain. There will be less feed grains produced if this proposal is adopted than have been otherwise. Furthermore, this provision does not go into effect automatically; two-thirds of the wheatgrowers voting in a referendum must vote to put it into effect.

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

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BELCHER. The statement was made a while ago by the gentleman from Connecticut that this would raise the price of food to the people of the United States. It can never raise the price of food beyond 100 percent of parity, and 100 percent of parity merely constitutes a fair price. Nothing in this bill, therefore, would ever raise the price of wheat or the price of bread beyond a fair price to the farmer. That being true, we pass tariff laws on everything else for the very purpose of guaranteeing a fair price, so I do not believe that the people of the United States expect to get their food below a fair price.

Mr. HOPE. Let me say to the gentleman, and I am glad he brought that matter up, that in the 7-year period from 1948 to 1955 wheat prices in this country went down 31 percent while the price of bread went up 28 percent. There is no correlation between the wheat price and the price of a loaf of bread.

Let me call attention also to the fact that in 1914 the average hourly wage of a factory worker would buy 3½ pound loaves of bread, in 1929 it would buy 6.1 loaves of bread and this year the average hourly earnings of the industrial employee will buy 11 loaves of bread.

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

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, the gentleman knows there has been some concern about wheat going into feed grain. Will the 90 percent provision for corn, along with the other lending provisions in the conference report for oats, barley and sorghums, offset possibly any detriment that your feed wheat might create in the feed market as against corn?

Mr. HOPE. I think it will to a very large extent.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman feel that the corn farmer is adequately protected in the conference report and in the conference bill? Of course, the corn farmer of Iowa, most of them, also raise wheat, oats, barley, and sorghums. Is it not a fact that the provisions of the conference report will greatly benefit the oats, the barley, and the sorghum farmers?

Mr. HOPE. They will. They will not only increase the price support level but they will bring about a reduction which we must have in all our feed grains if we are going to strike a balance.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House vote down the motion to recommit and adopt the conference report.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

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

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. I wanted to ask the preceding speaker why I have a handful of telegrams from bakers who are alarmed about the two-price wheat system because they say it is going to raise the price of bread.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my speech a statement by the Secretary last February made before the Committee on Agriculture, showing that the basic commodities yielded a net loss, did at that time, of $5,077,000,000 and that the losses in 1954 were three times the losses in 1953.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, testified before the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, February 17, 1955, as follows:

The aggregate realized cost of these programs for the period from 1932 through 1954 was $8,469.2 million, of which $962.5 million represents costs realized in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. The costs in 1954 were almost 3 times those realized during the fiscal year 1953.

Of the $8,469.2 million realized costs of these programs, $5,077.1 million is attributable to the basic commodities, as follows:

	Millions
Corn	$1,228.2
Cotton	1,581.4
Peanuts	163.0
Rice	35.3
Tobacco	97.0
Wheat	1,972.2
Total	5,077.1

This is a far cry from the $500 million figure just quoted as losses on the price support program. If we add to the $8,469,200,000 losses just quoted $4,238,900,000 representing a Government procurement of agricultural commodities for foreign aid programs, we arrive at the total of $12,708,100,000, which is very near the $13 billion which I quoted.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the motion made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] to recommit with instructions to the House conferees the conference report on H. R. 12. My reasons are as follows:

First. The report repeats and augments the fatal mistakes of the program in effect until 1954, which accounts for our present agricultural distress.

Second. It not only repeats but increases the incentive to further production and as a result means continued over-production and continued declines in farm income as excess production piles up in Government warehouses.

Third. It invites and hastens the tragic day of reckoning by offering a renewed and even stronger effort to completely repeal the law of supply and demand and thereby sacrifice the welfare of all of our farmers for temporary expediency.

Fourth. It renders almost inoperative the soil bank, which is the major if not the only provision in the report designed to go to the heart of all farmers' problems. In other words, the provisions of the report attempt to go in two opposite directions at the same time.

Fifth. It discriminates further in favor of the basic commodities which produce only 25 to 26 percent of the Nation's agricultural income, while at the same time the producers of many of the other agricultural commodities are far worse off than the producers of the basics. There is only one exception here, and that is the dairy industry. It, in my opinion, justifies the recommendation provided in the report because surpluses of butter and dry milk have been consumed and supply and demand appear to be in balance, at least at the present time, and possibly will continue to be so if the soil bank becomes operative and the supply of feed grains is materially reduced.

Let us consider first my last proposition; namely, that the report discriminates further in favor of the basic commodities, and that this discrimination plus the competitive effects of diverted acres from the basic commodities threaten with ruin the producers of many of the other agricultural commodities.

Now, the so-called basics which are accorded this preferential treatment are really not the basics because:

First. They do not provide farmers with the bulk of their income.

Second. They are no more fundamental, and probably not as fundamental to the maintenance of good diets and health as the nonbasics.

Third. They are not the agricultural commodities for which the consuming public is expressing the greatest demand at the meat counter, the local dairy, or the fruit and vegetable market.

As proof of my charge of rank favoritism shown the basic commodities, I call your attention to the contrasts between the percentage of parity received by the basic commodities and the average received by other commodities, as reported by the USDA under date of March 15, 1956, as follows:

First. Upland cotton receives 90 percent of parity.

Second. Wheat 82 percent of parity.

Third. Rice 82 percent of parity.

Fourth. Peanuts 90 percent of parity.

Now, compare these with the parity prices producers receive for the nonbasics:

First. Beef cattle and calves, which alone provide farmers with considerably more income than all of the basics, combined average 68 percent of parity for beef and 71 percent of parity for calves.

Second. Chickens are at 77 percent of parity;

Third. Hogs are at 58 percent of parity;

Fourth. Lambs are at 77 percent of parity;

Fifth. Sheep are at 64 percent of parity.

Mr. Speaker, section 104 of the report also eliminates the new parity formula for determining the price support level on basic commodities. It would permit the use of either old or new parity whichever would give the highest level.

This action once again means added preferential treatment for the producers of basic commodities, commodities which provide farmers with only 25 or 26 percent of total net income. Yet, we produce over 130 different agricultural commodities in this country. For example, based on January 15, 1956, figures:

First. Wheat would be supported at 103 percent of the existing new parity.

Second. Corn would be supported at 100 percent of new parity.

Third. Cotton would be supported at 91 percent of new parity.

In the second place, the report not only increases the favoritism already shown the basic commodities, but worst of all the recommendation of 90 percent of parity upon the basics will render ineffective the only part of this bill which offers any prospect of help to livestock producers. This is the soil bank, in particular the acreage reserve program.

It is extremely doubtful that producers of wheat, cotton, and corn can be induced to put acreage allotment land in the acreage reserve when they can get price support on the quantity they produce at 90 percent of parity but only, as the conference report points out, "approximately 50 percent of the price support for that quantity of the commodity which would normally be produced on the land placed in the acreage reserve"—page 37. Let me explain by pointing out the choice of alternative which Utah wheat producers would face.

Even if the dual parity feature of this conference report does not remain in the bill, the support level on wheat at old parity would be $2.14 per bushel. With an average yield of 16 bushels per acre a farmer could receive $34.24 per acre. If it cost him 80 cents per bushel to raise that 16 bushels, his total cost per acre would be $12.80. So his net return for his wheat on this acre would be $21.54.

Now, if his rate of payment for placing an acre of wheat allotment land in the acreage reserve were one-half that of the support level—$1.07 per bushel, and his average yield were 16 bushels, his payment for placing an acre in the reserve would be $17.12. This would be $5.42 less for putting an acre of land in the acreage reserve than he could get under price support at 90 percent of parity. Now it is true that even if the farmer placed an acre of land in the acreage reserve certain fixed costs would still have to be met. I have not shown that calculation here, since I do not know what portion of that 80 cents per bushel cost figure represents fixed costs. But as long as this factor is held constant, which is the case, in my example comparing the incentives a farmer has to put an acre of land in the reserve at 76 percent of parity with that at 90 percent of parity the comparison is valid.

With price support 76 percent of parity or $1.81 per bushel, as it will be for 1956, and assuming an average yield of 16 bushels to the acre, a farmer could get $28.96 per acre. His cost per acre at 80 cents per bushel would be $12.80 and his net return would be $16.16. On the other hand, if he were given an incentive of one-half the support level to put the same acre in the acreage reserve he would receive $14.48. So that although it would appear at first glance to pay a farmer to put his wheat under price support, and his per-acre return would be $1.68 more, it might not in fact actually pay him to do so, when it is realized that he still would have some fixed costs even on land placed in the acreage reserve.

Thus, it is evident because the difference between total costs per acre and total returns per acre is narrower at lower support levels than at higher levels—90 percent for example, that farmers will not put land in the reserve at higher levels when they will be more inclined to do so at lower levels. I do believe that the incentive level, however, will need to be at least 60 and maybe even 65 percent of the support level in order to induce enough participation to get 12 to 15 million acres of wheat out of production. Furthermore, I would recommend that the Secretary raise this incentive to 60 or 65 percent.

Part of my opposition to both the 90 percent rigid support level and dual parity is that they will operate to prevent participation in the acreage reserve—the only hope we have of balancing supply with the demand for basic products and of getting production of diverted acres out of feed grains.

Furthermore, the committee's statement on page 35 is tantamount to an admission that 13 years of mandatory, rigid, price supports have created "a crisis in farm income that may become a catastrophe unless strong action is taken to bolster farm income." Yet these same people would not only feed the farmer the same medicine which has resulted in a 20-percent loss of income this year due to price depressing surpluses but also would add to his dosage. At the same time they blame the Secretaries of Agriculture for the farmer's sickness and for failure to operate a law that leaders of the agriculture committees have made inoperable and attempt to make still more inoperable.

The time has come when, in the general public interest, to say nothing of the best interests of all American farmers, a majority of the Members of Congress must stop a distinguished minority of its Members, who dominate the agricultural committees and thereby the conference committees, from enacting special-interest legislation for the benefit of the producers of a few select commodities, under the guise that it is good for the entire country.

For 3½ years, this small minority of powerful defenders of 90 percent price support on 6 so-called basic commodities which provide American farmers as a whole with only 25 or 26 percent of their total net income, has prevented the adoption of a sound price support program.

I do not want to be a party to the badgering and abuse which committee leaders have heaped upon the heads of our Secretaries of Agriculture of both political persuasions merely because these leaders have the whip hand. Neither do I want to lead a crusade to bring down the wrath of the people upon the heads of the Secretaries of Agriculture because they try in all sincerity to make operable an unworkable law which they have forced them to administer. I do not want future Secretaries of Agriculture, the farmers who produce the 75 percent of our agricultural commodities, our taxpayers and all consumers whom ratification of this conference report would injure, to suffer from my transgressions.

That is why I plead with you, my colleagues, to support the motion to recommit, to be guided by principle rather than expediency and to clean this bill up and to make it workable. If we think as much of all of the farmers as we say we do we'll get them a good bill and do it now. It is within our power to do so.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I would like to know whether or not the committee of conference report authorizes a farmer to grow as much grain, particularly wheat, as he chooses to grow so long as he uses it on his own farm.

Mr. ARENDS. I think that is correct.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Without any equivocation or without any conditions, he may grow as much as he wants?

Mr. ARENDS. I understand that is right.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for giving me these 5 short minutes. That is the best he could do, I know. I wish I had an hour, because, coming from a great agricultural district, I have some understanding of the farmers' problems and of what is proposed in this legislation.

It is my belief the average Member who represents an agricultural district is trying to find a solution to the farm problem. We differ, however, as to what the solution really is. I believe there is a sincere desire on the part of the average Member representing an agricultural district to reach a decision whereby we may have a constructive bill which will benefit the farmer. It is my conviction that will not be accomplished if the conference report is adopted.

Mr. Speaker, in the years I have been in Congress I do not know a single measure that has disturbed me as much as this particular proposal before us. I am not speaking politically or in a partisan manner. I am talking solely from an economic point of view. As I mentioned on this floor before, I am not intelligent enough to vote for a Republican farmer on one side of the road as against a Democratic farmer on the other side of the road or vice versa. It just cannot be done. Either I vote for the benefit of agriculture as a whole, or I vote against the best interests of agriculture as a whole, and what I am attempting to do is to vote in the best interests of all agriculture. Accordingly I think this conference report should be sent back to the committee for further consideration.

The conference report now before us is completely self-contradictory and contains much that could hurt farmers far more than it could help them. Frankly, I do not see how the President could sign this bill if it were passed, and I do not believe he will.

It is imperative that the bad features of the bill should be deleted so that other sound and constructive provisions can bring help to farmers this year.

I came from the so-called Corn Belt. Let me speak about it specifically. The Corn Belt has inherited surplus problems that originated in wheat and cotton. Over 17 million acres diverted out of these crops have gone into oats, barley, and grain sorghums. As a result, the 1954 and 1955 production of these feed grains increased more than 800 million bushels. And what did they supplant? Eight hundred million bushels of corn, thus leading to a buildup of corn carryover and disastrously low acreage allotments for corn in the commercial corn area.

Existing legislation prescribes how corn acreage allotments must be figured. Under these requirements an allotment of 43 million acres has already been announced for 1956—down 22 percent from the planted acreage and 15 percent from the allotted acreage of last year. The Corn Belt cannot live with such severe restrictions, nor can our agricultural heartland any longer bear the brunt of surplus accumulations and acreage restrictions on wheat and cotton.

If we do not pass workable and sound legislation the situation in the Corn Belt becomes worse. That I firmly believe. Existing law prescribes how corn allotments shall be figured. Acreage allotments in subsequent years will be forced lower than the 43 million acres announced for this year, other feed grains will be taking the market and corn stocks will be further accumulated. Put that down in your book and remember it.

Remember always that corn has no minimum allotment as do wheat and cotton. I repeat, corn has no minimum allotment as do wheat and cotton. This year many farmers will be forced to plant more than their acreage allotments which means corn prices could be further depressed.

If we can improve this bill as proposed in the recommittal motion, the Corn Belt could be relieved this year of restrictions that now have become practically intolerable. Simple justice demands relief from the surplus problems of others dumped upon the Corn Belt. We must write a bill the President can sign or we automatically force on our corn farmers a corn allotment too small for them to live with.

The chief difficulty with the provision in the bill for mandatory price support on feed grain will be noncompliance—the same problem we have had on corn.

The way the program provided in this bill now before us is set up, feed grain acreage would have to be reduced sharply below 1955 levels in order for a farmer to participate. In North Dakota the cut would be 27 percent; in Iowa, 14 percent; in Washington, 40 percent; in Texas, 26 percent; in Ohio, 22 percent; in New York, 17 percent, and so on. Nationwide the cut would be 20 percent. With cuts as sharp as this many farmers would choose to stay out of the program.

The result will be that a certain percentage of the farmers would come into the program and turn their crop over to the Government. Others would stay out, and increase production.

Our 1955 experience with low participation in the corn program and low prices will be duplicated here for the other feed grains. Note, that except for 1956, these feed grain producers who do not cut their acreage sharply will not be eligible for any supports. This will hurt not help the corn producer.

In the Midwest, in order to become eligible for the higher support rate, farmers, once they find out their farm base—this cannot be done in less than a month—will have to plow under substantial acreages. The oats will have already been planted.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely urge that this conference report be recommitted for further consideration. We do not have before us a farm bill, in the true sense of the word, in that it does not solve the farmer's problem—it only complicates it and creates new problems. In my view this is not a farm bill but a mere pretense. I would say that the bill we have before us is more of a political measure than anything else.

I have been in rather intimate touch with all that has transpired during the course of the consideration of this legislation. It has been my privilege to attend the conferences at the White House on the subject and participate in the discussions.

While the President has not said categorically that he would veto this bill if, in its present form, it comes to him for approval, I am confident that he will. I am also confident that he will make certain that the farmers know why and that he will insist upon another measure.

For one, I shall urge upon the President that he explain to the people of this great country why this measure is unacceptable and why this Congress should remain in session, however long, until it deals realistically, objectively, constructively, and economically, rather than politically as here proposed in the bill before us, with the grave farm problem we have before us.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks a letter from the Illinois Agricultural Association and a telegram from the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., April 10, 1956.

In re H. R. 12.

Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ARENDS: The conference committee recommendations upon H. R. 12, in our opinion, provide very well for the interests of cotton and wheat producers but again pass a major portion of the burden for adjustments in production to the Corn Belt. This is done, notwithstanding the fact that farm income in the Corn Belt already has fallen much lower, proportionately, than farm income in these other areas.

The committee would retain the 2- or 3-price plan for wheat. Wheatgrowers would be assured 100 percent of parity for wheat produced for the domestic market. The remainder of their wheat, which is not exported, could be dumped on the domestic market as feed in competition with corn and other feed grains, which are already in surplus supply. A large portion of the existing surplus of more than 1 billion bushels of wheat, plus an estimated one-half of the future wheat production in the United States, might be sold as feed.

As further evidence of the preferential treatment of wheat and cotton growers, the law now provides a minimum of 55 million acres for wheat and H. R. 12, in effect, would provide a minimum acreage of about 17.4 million acres for cotton. Although the wheat area has diverted approximately 21 million acres out of wheat into soybeans and feed grains, and the cotton area has diverted approximately 8 million acres out of cotton into soybeans and feed grains, the committee struck from the bill the requirement that beginning with 1957 crops, in order to be eligible for price supports, producers must place a percentage of their acreage in the soil bank. The committee retained the provision fixing a 51-million-acre base for corn but with a requirement that in order to qualify for price supports the corn grower must place crop land acreage equal to at least 15 percent of the corn base in the soil bank. The Illinois Agricultural Association feels that the growers of wheat and cotton should be treated in the same manner and that the provision requiring participation in the soil bank, in order to be eligible for price supports, should be retained in the bill.

With respect to feed grains, which compete with corn, the bill would raise the support price. The increased production of soybeans and feed grains has largely occurred in the cotton and wheat areas. This would further encourage increased production of these feed grains. The bill would require the small grain grower to place an acreage equal to 15 percent of the small grain acreage in the soil bank in order to receive price supports. Thus, the Illinois farmer would be required to place an acreage equal to 15 percent of his corn base, plus an acreage equal to 15 percent of the amount usually planted in oats and other grains, in the soil bank. However, in Illinois, oats for 1956 already have been sown.

If we are realistic, we know that it is too late for the bill to be effective in Illinois this year. Small grains for the most part already have been sown. After the bill is passed, at best it will be 3 or 4 weeks before soil bank regulations can be issued and information carried down through the State and county offices to the farm level. By that time, corn will have been planted, too.

We recognize that a majority of the members of the conference committee cannot be familiar with Corn Belt problems. If the interests of the Corn Belt and Illinois are to be protected, this will have to be done on the floor. In view of the fact that the bill can have but little effect this year, we would urge that it be sent back to the conference committee with instructions to bring back a bill that is fair to all areas and particularly with instructions to include provisions which will obtain some control over diverted acres in all areas.

Sincerely,

ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
OTTO STEFFEY, *President.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 10, 1956.*

Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

There is no justification for Congress to rush through ill-considered farm legislation. To accept the conference committee report would be harmful to agriculture. It is too late for the soil bank to be effective this year.

Among the objectionable features of the bill are:

(1) Fixed price supports for the basic commodities for 1956 at 90 percent of parity.

(2) The double standard for computing parity prices.

(3) Title V, price-support program for wheat and rice.

(4) Mandatory support of noncommercial area corn and the mandatory increase in the support prices from 70 percent to 85 percent of parity for oats, barley, rye, and grain sorghums.

(5) A 10 cent per hundredweight increase in the 1956 dairy price-support level and 80 to 90 percent mandatory support for dairy products in 1957 and thereafter.

(6) Lack of control of delivered acres.

These provisions nullify other parts of the bill that might help adjust the agricultural plant to effective market demand.

The policy of fixing prices for certain farm commodities has been an important factor contributing to the development of our excess productive capacity and the present unsatisfactory farm-income situation.

One of the main objectives of the soil bank is to shrink the overexpanded agricultural plant. The conference committee report would have the effect of encouraging the production of wasteful and price-depressing surpluses.

We recommend rejection of conference report and enactment of Legislation that will actually help bring supplies in line with effective market demand.

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is unfair to both the farmer and the general taxpayer. It is a short term sop rather than a long-term solution to the ills besetting our agricultural economy. It is a political potpourri of conflicting proposals.

Every agricultural expert I have talked to blames the present drop in farm income on price-depressing surpluses. These surpluses are directly attributable to the rigid price support program that has been in effect in recent years. This bill we are asked to approve continues and in some cases expands the rigid price support theory. We are giving the farmer more of the medicine in a somewhat stronger form than that which has made him ill.

Let us take the dairy industry as an example. Two years ago, Secretary Benson lowered the price supports on dairy products as he was required to do by law. A hue and cry went up that by so doing, the Secretary was going to destroy our dairy farmers. This did not happen. Today, the dairy industry is in better shape than it has been for 3 years. Milk prices are better than they were when the Secretary lowered the support prices. And—miraculous to say—the Government does not own 1 pound of surplus butter. Yet this bill would junk that program. The dairy farmer would be returned to the straitjacket of high price supports. Surpluses would again begin to pile up as would the resentment of the city taxpayer.

The sensible feature of this legislation—the soil bank—comes too late to benefit many of our farmers. And the purpose of the soil bank—to cut production without penalizing the farmer—has been nullified by other sections of the bill which encourage more production.

The farmers need and are entitled to have sound legislation that will solve their problem on a long-term basis. They must not be at the whim of each succeeding Congress. Provisions of this bill setting high support prices on domestic feed grains benefit temporarily one type of farmer. But at the same time the livestock grower and poultry producer who must buy these feeds is penalized by having to compete with the Government for their purchase.

The continuation of the Government surplus purchase program is unfair to the farmers because it subjects them to criticism from city taxpayers that they do not deserve. Given the help proposed by the soil bank proposal and the conservation reserve, they could work out their own solution. But with this legislation, they will be again plunged into a program which has brought them to grief.

One of the few good features of the legislation as it was approved by the other body was deleted in conference. I am referring to the ceiling limits on the amount of Government purchases any single farm could receive. We are asked to approve this legislation to benefit the family farmer, yet the lion's share of the funds will go to large corporate farms that do not need any Government help. Certainly a $100,000 gross limit on the amount of Government commodity purchases any one farmer could receive would be sufficiently high to include the type of farmer we are trying to help. But this has been taken out of the bill. I can't vote for any legislation that permits the Government to turn over up to $1 million to one corporate farm from taxes collected from our working people at a basic rate of 22 percent of their income.

Let us draft good, sound farm legislation. I have confidence that this is the type of legislation our farmers want. They are tired of being a political prize auctioned off each election year by each succeeding session of Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few feeble remarks in my weak way about this situation. One protest I want to make is that I do not believe it is right to threaten the Congress of the United States with a veto by the President.

We have three distinct divisions of this Government. We started out that way and I hope we are still on that course. The leader of the minority party comes in here today and gives us to understand that if this bill is not passed as they want it there will be a veto.

I have been up against a good many scary things in my life and I have not run yet. That veto does not scare me any, because I do not think the President has anything to do with veto, for, if the papers can be relied on, Mr. Benson says he will not approve this bill, so I do not think it will ever reach the President.

I will tell you the situation we are in in North Dakota. We do not raise 1 bushel of surplus wheat, not 1 bushel, yet everybody that comes out there to talk hollers "Surplus, surplus." If they were wakened in the night suddenly, the first utterance they would make would be "Surplus," when we do not have any. We raise hard spring wheat, not soft wheat, and there never has been and there never will be a surplus of that kind of wheat.

We are limited to a half section of 41 acres to plant. Who can make a living for a family on 41 acres, no matter what the yield is?

Then this bill provides for something that I am opposed to, but the general benefits outweigh the damage. They are gong to have a soil bank. Where are they going to get the soil bank? They are going down into our little limited 41 acres and take it out of that. It just makes the future of the farmer less secure by taking away 8 acres of the 41. How many acres do you have left? Thirty-three.

I wish I had means enough and my friends had means enough to live this thing through and let you chicken feeders on the Atlantic seaboard have another depression. You want "soup lines" again. They appeal to you but commonsense and reason, apparently, do not.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, we have at least 57 different varieties of opinion on farm legislation. Major farm organizations are in disagreement, and there is also great disagreement among Members of Congress. It is very difficult even to find farmer neighbors in agreement as to the proper type of legislation that should be approved by Congress to solve the farm-surplus problem. I respect the judgment and opinions of those who do not agree with me.

The production of food in this country is vital to every person whether they live in the cities or on a farm. Therefore, food and fiber production is also vital to the entire economy and security of our country.

During my service in Congress, I have always taken the position that we need a strong and prosperous agriculture. The buying power of American farmers is essential to the men and women engaged in business, industry, and labor in all of our communities. Farmers now find themselves in a price-squeeze situation which has already had its effect upon those engaged in business and profession in our respective communities. The farmer is a good buyer when his income permits. Therefore, I am approaching the farm problem in the philosophy that we must have a strong and prosperous agriculture for the benefit of the Nation's economy.

I was a minority member of the conference committee on the farm bill. In view of falling farm prices, I sincerely feel that it is necessary to have a satisfactory farm bill enacted during the present session. A conference com-

mittee was delegated to work out a bill, and naturally, we were forced to compromise our individual positions on some issues in order to secure an agreement in the conference report which is being considered today. There are provisions in the conference report which I do not like, and if it were left to me to write a farm bill, it would suit me but there might be many others in disagreement. Other members of the conference committee were in the same position, and we therefore endeavored to compose our differences in order to work out the best kind of a farm bill under the circumstances.

I definitely feel that all farm legislation, as well as other legislative proposals, should be considered on a nonpolitical basis. I have endeavored to follow such a policy in considering the present farm bill. A political farm bill will never be of much value to American agriculture, and I hope that the time is close at hand when Congress can enact legislation, which will place agriculture on an equality basis with other segments of our economy. I signed the conference report in the spirit which I have indicated. It was the best bill that we could get out of the conference.

One impelling reason why I signed the conference report was because it contained a major portion of President Eisenhower's nine-point proposal. The keystone to the President's program created the soil bank which provides for taking tillable acres of land out of production so as to reduce surplus farm products in the United States. I am for the President's nine-point program as publicized in the newspapers.

We have been working on the farm surplus problem ever since I came to Congress. This was when we brought up the first-passed McNary-Haugen bill. At that time, I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture. The McNary-Haugen bill was never put into operation although twice passed by Congress. It dealt with the removal of surplus farm products. Some of the principles of the McNary-Haugen bill are embodied in the wheat proposal set forth in the conference report.

I feel that this program should be tried. We have tried many other schemes to get rid of surplus wheat without a great deal of success. Of course, the wars that we have been engaged in during the past 40 years have solved our surplus food problem, but I for one, do not want another war to be the solution of this important problem.

Time will not permit me to go into detail over the conference report. This report is available to all of the Members and I hope that you will study it. However, let me reiterate that we need farm legislation now and Congress should not adjourn without passing on this vital issue. I hope that the bill presented in the conference report will be agreed to.

My very distinguished and good friend, who spoke to you a few moments ago, the gentleman from Kansas, CLIFFORD HOPE, is now serving his last term in Congress. He has announced his retirement. I have served with him on the Committee on Agriculture for nearly 30 years. While we have had some differences of opinion, we have both worked for what we thought would be for the best interests of American agriculture. I regret that Mr. HOPE is leaving Congress. He has performed outstanding service during the past 30 years for his constituents and the country at large. He is, and has been, a very valuable Member of the House of Representatives—a man of integrity, a good legislator and one who has had the respect of all Members on both sides of the aisle. I am sure that all of my colleagues join with me in wishing Mr. and Mrs. Hope the best of health, happiness, and success when he leaves as a Member of the House of Representatives.

I respect the opinions of others. Although I hope that all people will agree with me, I fully recognize that I sometimes find myself in disagreement with other able Members and officials. In other words, I do not condemn or criticize those who have different opinions than mine. I vote my convictions, and that is the way it should be with all persons who have the country's interest at heart. Although there are certain provisions of the conference report with which I find myself in disagreement, I nevertheless feel that we have done a fairly good job in reaching an agreement and in bringing this conference report to the House of Representatives for a vote.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, certainly in a few minutes I cannot discuss the details of this bill. I am not complaining, for under the rules of the House under which we are operating, we have 2 hours for debate and 435 Members. It certainly is not a perfect bill, but it contains many provisions which in my opinion will help the agricultural people of this country. Some of the provisions will help some sections and not help others; however, after considering the whole bill, I think it should pass and expect to vote for it. Certainly I feel it is the best we can do at this time, for the agricultural problem is one that involves the whole Nation—consumer as well as producer—and it is not an easy matter for 435 Members of Congress from every section to come up with the perfect bill that would satisfy everybody. Any farm bill must of necessity be the result of compromise.

Several things have happened during this debate that are rather astounding to me. I have great respect for the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN]. He comes out with the statement that the greater part of the provisions of the President's bill, sent down here in January, are in this bill. Then following that the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]—and I have served with him for over 20 years during which time he has served twice as chairman of the great Committee on Agriculture and I do not know of a better student of agriculture or a more honorable man or one who thinks more seriously than does he, yet the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] certainly implied that the President has not called him in to counsel on whether or not he should veto this bill. Others in this House who would not know a potato from an acorn say definitely that the President is going to veto the bill. I simply cannot believe the President will veto this bill and leave agriculture in its present plight. I want to say this, in all seriousness, agriculture in this country is facing a very, very serious situation. We have not tried to stress it in my section of the country, but you cannot dress it up any longer. It is a depression. When hogs are selling for 12 cents a pound and other farm products just as low, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], who opposes this bill, need not be worrying about this bill. He had better be worrying about some hogs with an appetite for his Illinois corn. What does it mean to sell hogs at 12 cents per pound and corn at $1.20 per bushel, less handling charges? Why during the depression hogs were bringing 6 cents per pound and corn 80 cents; but they were dollars worth more than 100 cents to the dollar for there were not many around. Now with dollars worth about 50 cents comparatively speaking the farmer is now back to 6-cent hogs—60-cent corn, and so forth. Remember the last great depression of 1931, 1932, and 1933 started with agriculture; then spread to the cities and all other sections of the country for there was no buying power. In my opinion we should not take such chances, agriculture is entirely too important to the Nation's economy for us to do other than give the problem our best. If we cannot get everything we want, I think we should remember that a part of something is better than a whole lot of nothing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BARDEN. To my district, my State and the Nation this is not only a serious matter but very important. I know it has been regarded as serious with the Committee on Agriculture. When the distinguished minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, said he is going to beat the bushes to try to defeat this agricultural bill with his motion to recommit, I am going to tell him that he had better find a place to beat rather than in the bushes, because he is going to find some farmers there, and I want him back in this House.

Mr. MARTIN. Is the gentleman trying to help me out?

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman is in a very serious situation.

Mr. MARTIN. How is the gentleman's own Committee on Education and Labor? Is that in jeopardy in any way?

Mr. BARDEN. Oh, listen, any man who is chairman of the House Labor Committee is always in jeopardy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself to the rice provisions of this bill. It is not necessary to outline the cotton provisions. The most

significant cotton changes are known to the membership of this House. I do want to talk for a moment on domestic parity or the so-called two-price plan for rice. This legislation for rice is similar to the provisions for wheat.

The cutback in rice acreage has been drastic over the affected area in the seven States that grow rice. In 1954 there were 2,609,908 acres planted. Under this bill the acreage allotment would be 1,652,596 acres for 1956 and also for 1957 which is about a one-third cut in the short period of 2 years.

I think this House and this Congress acted wisely in keeping the cutback down to 15 percent for 1956. If that provision had not been passed the acreage would have been cut some two-thirds in the current year.

Now as to the export picture. Sales to Pakistan have totaled 3,620,000 hundredweight, and to Indonesia 5,510,000 hundredweight, a total of 9,130,000 hundredweight which were recently consummated. I want to congratulate the Department of Agriculture for pushing those deals through although it was not an easy task. It is a most valuable service to the economy of those States that grow rice.

The volume of rice grown in America amounts to only 1½ percent of the total production of rice throughout the globe.

As we move along I could explain to you some of the provisions of the two-price system for rice that are in this bill. The Secretary would proclaim the primary market quota which would amount to the consumption in America and possessions plus that in Cuba. The apportionment to the States would be on the basis of the average yield to the acre. In 1956 the average yield for 1955 would be used and in 1957 the 1956 average an acre would be the basis. Then the Secretary would apportion to the farms using normal yield on the farm under a formula that has been set up in this conference report.

The support would be 90 percent of parity for the domestic consumption plus the Cuban sales, and not to fall below 55 percent of parity on export sales in 1956. This is a 2-year program. For 1957 the export could not fall below 50 percent of parity, and the producer would obtain 90 percent of parity for rice that would be sold in this country and Cuba.

Certificates would be issued to cooperators for each producer's share of the primary marketing quota. The value of the certificates would be equal to the difference between 90 percent of parity and the level of price support which the Secretary of Agriculture had determined for the particular year, multiplied by the quantity of rice included in the certificate. The actual value of the certificate would amount to about $1.83 per hundredweight. These certificates would be negotiable and the farmer could cash them in prior to the time that his rice would be delivered to the mill.

It is estimated that under the domestic parity or two-price system on rice, the farmer would average somewhere between 78 to 83 percent of parity on the total production on his farm. The domestic consumption, plus the Territories and Cuba, would amount to about 60 percent of the total rice production. On this 60 percent, the farmer would realize 90 percent of parity.

The bill provides for inventory adjustment payments to be made to those individuals or firms who hold rice in their possession on July 31, 1956. These payments are provided so that such person or firm would not suffer a loss by virtue of purchasing the rice during the crop year of 1955 at a higher price than would be provided under the two price or domestic parity plan contained in the bill.

The bill amends the Agricultural Act of 1954 by providing a set-aside for rice. Sixty days after the new marketing year would start, the Commodity Credit Corporation would be authorized, under the rice set-aside provisions of the legislation, to transfer to the set-aside not to exceed 20 million hundredweight of rice.

This two-price system or domestic parity for rice is of vital concern to the States of California, Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Missouri. The ricegrowers in these States cannot operate their farms and continue in business under the drastic cuts that are contained in the present law. A plan to move rice consistently into export channels is essential to the well-being of the industry. It is felt that to fix the minimum support level at 55 percent of parity for 1956 and the figure of not lower than 50 percent of parity on such export sales in 1957 should encourage the movement of greater quantities into the channels of trade. These figures of 55 and 50 percent of parity do not mean that the export price would drop to such a figure; they mean that the price could not go lower than 55 percent in 1956 and 50 percent in 1957.

As the fledgling member of the conference on the part of the House, it has been a pleasure to serve with such outstanding Members of this House who have worked for the cause of American agriculture so ably and well for many years.

The conference worked long hours to bring this report to the House today. The farmer needs the relief contained in this legislation. Anxiously does he await the outcome of the vote on this proposal in both bodies of Congress, as well as whatever action that may be taken by the Chief Executive. I trust that the motion to recommit will be voted down and the conference report approved.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, just a moment ago someone displayed a handful of telegrams on the left side of the aisle saying that there was great support for this bill. Here are petitions that I received in support of this bill, and not one is from my district or from the State of North Carolina. I have never seen such interest in any measure in my life as the farmers from Minnesota and all over this country have displayed and shown in sending these enormous lists of names here to me. Here are thousands of people throughout this country urging the Members of this House to pass this bill. I only desire to call your attention to this enormous number of petitions During my entire service in Congress, I have never seen anything like this. It will, of course, be utterly impossible for me to acknowledge receipt of these thousands upon thousands of communications. I only hope that those who signed these petitions will understand and appreciate the fact that it will be impossible for me to acknowledge this grand expression of their views and interest in the work which has been done by the conference committee in trying to work out a workable bill.

I think this proves that the farm program is perhaps better understood than some of us in Congress believe.

The time will come in a few moments when the roll will be called and the vote taken. The farmers will then be able to count their true friends 1 by 1 and they will know just what has happened here in this chamber today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I must commence with the established fact that price supports for our farmers are a definite guaranty that they will receive a fair return from their labor on the farm. It is my view that the 90 percent of parity price support to the farmer is proportionately 10 percent less than what the laborer or the factory worker in the city would expect from industry. It is also 10 percent less than what any individual or corporation would expect in return for an investment in a business enterprise.

In short, all that price supports aim to do is to guarantee a minimum return for the farmers to an even lesser degree than is guaranteed to Americans in other industries.

The argument that such protection to the farmers constitutes an increase in the cost of living to the consumers is spurious. Even if it were true, I am certain that the average American consumer would not like to see any farmer lose his farm or quit producing food commodities because of insufficient income, just so that he—the consumer—can save a few pennies during the year. And that is all it amounts to, when we analyze it properly. Actually, however, it is not true that price supports increase the cost of living.

Let me illustrate this point once again, just as I have done many times in the past. A loaf of bread sells for around 16 to 18 cents, but of this amount the farmer gets only about 2½ cents for the wheat in that loaf. The percentage is so small that the price of wheat would have to be reduced by about 80 cents a bushel before it would be possible to get a 1-cent reduction in the price of a loaf of bread.

Or take the case of a cotton shirt which retails in the store for $3.95. The cotton which goes into that shirt is worth less than 24 cents, and that is what the farmer gets for it. If you re-

duce the price of cotton, you can readily see how little it would affect the price of the shirt in the store.

Now, I want to tell my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that I believe we are missing the boat on this whole question. While playing politics and maneuvering for a favorable position, we are simultaneously closing our eyes to the tremendous opportunity which we have to eradicate hunger in the world and the great potential that food surpluses have in winning friends for our side in the struggle against communism. The surpluses of agricultural commodities, which some regard as a burden or even a threat to our economy, are in reality a blessing to our people. It is God's bountiful gift to America which enables us to maintain our country as a secure and prosperous Nation. It also enables us to aid less fortunate nations by helping to alleviate hunger in every part of the world.

There is no reason, no logical or sensible explanation, why these food surpluses should rot in warehouses, on abandoned ships, and on the streets, with the additional waste of millions of dollars every day in storage fees. These surplus commodities should be loaned out, not given away outright, just as we lend money to other nations; and this is to be done under terms which are most favorable to the countries that are able to use these surpluses in order to feed hungry mouths, as well as to keep the Russian bear away from their door.

My bill, H. R. 6868, would do exactly that. The bill seeks to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to authorize the sale of agricultural commodities on credit to be repaid within 10 years of the delivery of the commodities. Public Law 480 has done it to a very limited extent.

At this time, I should like to direct your attention to an even greater potential outlet for these farm surpluses. A few weeks ago, during a series of hearings held by the House Agriculture Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, we heard a representative of the Department of Defense. I was shocked to learn that in the event of a sudden attack or other warlike catastrophe no provision was made to guarantee food supplies either to the civilian population of the United States and its territories, or the other peoples throughout the world. From past experience we know that in such event famine will strike many areas. We also know that wars have been won not only by extending the lines of defense, but perhaps no less also by extending and maintaining the food supply lines.

Last summer, when I was a member of the United States congressional delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Conference in Paris, I proposed to General Gruenther, the supreme Allied commander, that we store some of our surpluses in strategic areas throughout the world. I submitted the same proposal to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY. Both he and our distinguished colleague from Texas, the Honorable W. R. POAGE, brought up the same suggestion at a meeting of the House Agriculture Committee a few weeks ago.

I wonder if our colleagues here fully realize how important this could prove to be. In carrying through this proposal to store surpluses in strategic areas, we would practically have no surpluses to speak of. To all intents and purposes, it would almost eliminate the problem. But even more important is the fact that, in so doing, we would bolster our lines of defense throughout the world and we would strengthen our allies. This, to me, is one of the most constructive and far-reaching solutions to the farm problem. It is certainly much more preferable than seeking cutbacks in production. It is certainly much more logical than the accumulation of huge surpluses which are rotting away, while millions of people in this country subsist on inadequate diets and untold millions abroad live in constant fear of famine and starvation.

Take the case of the famine in Greece last year, or in the lower provinces in Italy earlier this year. If some of our surpluses would have been stored in that area, they could have been used the moment the emergency struck, instead of having to fly the food in limited quantities from thousands of miles away under tremendous hazards and obstacles. Let me say also that in the event of some disaster or other emergency, I would not even hesitate to feed hungry and starving peoples behind the Iron Curtain, not only as a humanitarian deed, but as the surest way of helping to remove the shackles from those oppressed and enslaved people.

I am convinced that if we pursued a policy along such lines, it would serve to remove the fear and distrust on the part of many people who unfortunately regard us as being in the same category with Russia, namely, that we are only interested in military gains and in extending colonialism over subjugated peoples, but that we are not at all interested in the preservation of the freedom and the independence of these peoples in distressed areas of the world. It would be proof positive that we are very definitely and very seriously concerned with the well-being and preservation of all human beings in any emergency, whether manmade or through natural catastrophe.

I should like to suggest another way to stimulate wider distribution of our food surpluses abroad, not only as a solution to our present surplus problem but also for the future. I propose that at an early date the United States take the initiative in arranging a large international food fair with the participation of as many countries as possible, including the food-surplus countries as well as those who have to rely on outside sources for their food supplies. These food fairs could be held annually, each time in a different country, and the main purposes would be to promote a greater exchange of food commodities, demonstrate ways to increase production and consumption, and provide a better understanding of nutrition.

Let me make it clear that I am more interested in increasing the consumption of food by raising the standards of living for needy people in our own country, as well as abroad, than in cutting back production or controlling output. Let us keep the American farmers producing. There is a crying need throughout the world for our production. Our problem is not overproduction of commodities; the problem is underconsumption of foodstuffs. That perhaps more than anything else explains the great paradox of declining farm income at a time when we are enjoying an abundance of farm products.

I believe we ought to pass this bill now under consideration, notwithstanding the fact that it is not the best bill or the most desirable bill. Nevertheless, it is a measure of relief to the farmers of this Nation, and as such I shall support it. Later on, I trust, it might be possible for us to come up with something better, something more acceptable to all concerned, if only we can permit ourselves to keep politics out of our deliberations.

Thank God, I do not have to play politics with this issue. As all of you well know, I do not have a single farm in my district in Brooklyn. I do not even have a tree in my modest city dwelling. Thank God also that I represent a district which is composed of people of various national origins from nearly every part of the world—but all of them decent, hard working and loyal Americans who only want to see this great country of ours remain united and strong, and whose great dream in life is to see the world truly at peace.

In determining our action today, let the words of John Ruskin, the famous 19th century essayist, serve as our guiding light for the future:

> Therefore when we build, let us think that we build forever. Let it not be for present delight, nor for present use alone; let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for, and let us think, as we lay stone on stone, that a time is come when these stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men will say as they look upon the labor and wrought substance of them, "See this our fathers did for us."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks on the conference report at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in considering this great farm bill, the Congress holds in its hand the remedy for one of the major economic problems which now confronts this Nation. Millions of farmers across the country are anxiously awaiting word of our action here today—and we must not fail them for their plight is tragic and their needs are urgent.

This Congress has thus far accomplished much. We have increased the minimum wage to $1 an hour in an effort to improve the welfare of the workers of this Nation. We have enacted many other items of important legislation designed to benefit various groups. But the farmers, who need immediate

aid, are still waiting—we must not let them wait any longer.

This farm bill should not be recommitted.

Our conference committee, which is composed of the leading agriculture specialists of the Congress, has reported an excellent bill which contains many features which will increase farm income and curb declining farm prices. It has been thoroughly studied and discussed by Members of both Houses and explored in great detail by the able conference committee. There is no need for further committee deliberation—but there is a definite need for immediate action.

Farmers this very minute are beginning their annual spring planting and they need to know what Congress is going to do for them this year—not next year.

If we delay here today in approving this farm bill, it probably will mean that these suffering farm families will receive no relief from Congress during this session.

I strongly urge that the House approve this measure as reported by the conference committee without further delay and in doing so the Congress will give our American farmer the type of legislation needed.

The plight of the American farmer is critical and we must not bypass them now because of political differences. The farmers of this Nation no longer discuss their problem in terms of prosperity—now, it is a question of survival.

To many of our farm families, our decision here today will be the deciding factor on whether they remain on the land they have tilled for decades—or whether they will be forced to leave their homes and farms and move to the cities where they can make a decent living.

In 1953, just a few days after Secretary Benson took office, farm parity stood at 94 percent and farm income was $12.3 billion a year. Today the parity ratio has fallen from 94 to 80—the lowest it has been in 15 years—and farm income has dropped more than a billion dollars.

In my own State of Tennessee, cash income of farmers dropped more than $30 million during 1955, and was the lowest since 1950.

A child could read these figures and come to the obvious conclusion that the situation is critical and immediate action should be taken. We have delayed too long already. The legislative process has been too extended on this measure.

It is obvious that declining price support policies, backed by the Republican Party and the Eisenhower administration, have done nothing except plunge the farmer deeper and deeper into the economic crisis which he now faces.

Forced farm sales, bankruptcies, foreclosures and tax sales have increased almost 50 percent during the past 3 years. Farm mortgage debts have increased in excess of $1 billion. The value of the farmer's property has dropped more than $10 billion. This is a far cry from the "prosperity" slogans handed out during the 1952 Presidential campaign.

The Benson manipulation of the farm problem through the flexible price support theory indeed has had a strange history.

In the fall of 1952, President Eisenhower stood in Brookings, S. Dak., a candidate for President, and wooed the farm votes of America by saying:

> The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of 90 percent parity price support, and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent parity, with the guaranty of the price support of 90.

This was before the 1952 Presidential election. As history unwound itself—this promise, as did many others—fell by the wayside and the farmer was again forgotten—his vote having been used.

Here is the way the story unfolded.

In July 1953, parity stood at 94 percent. On October 21, 1953, Secretary Benson said, "It is my belief that the major price declines are behind us." The very next month parity ratio fell to 90—this was the minimum the President promised the farmers of America in his South Dakota speech a few months before.

On June 30, 1954, Secretary Benson said that the previous month's decline in farm prices "does not indicate a general weakening in the farm price structure." The next month parity fell to 88.

On June 15, 1955, the Secretary said:

> I am confident we have seen the worst of the transition which agriculture goes through following every major war.

The next month parity stood at 86.

Today, parity stands at 80, 20 percent below the base which President Eisenhower promised the American farmer in his South Dakota speech 4 years before. The present plight of the American farmer is clear evidence of the gross deception practiced upon the farmers of America.

And to further compound the deception, we have indications that the President will veto a high price-support bill if approved by this Congress.

I am reminded of the ancient parable which goes, "Oh, when first we begin to deceive, what a tangled web we weave." And caught in this tangled web is the administration struggling to clear itself of the tentacles of Benson sliding scale price policies for the farmers of America.

But in spite of all the propaganda, the speeches, the glib sayings; the facts are that out of every dollar the housewife spends for food, the farmer receives only 42 cents, compared with 46 cents in the fall of 1952. Farm prices are going down, down, down, and this plunge will not stop until we return to the parity formula previously enjoyed by the farmer under a 20-year, well-tested, and successful farm program sponsored by the Democratic Party.

From the history of declining farm prices, can the President and his Secretary of Agriculture, in spite of the 1952 deception, rightfully conclude that a plan of flexible price supports is the answer to declining farm prices?

It is time for Democrats and Republicans in Congress alike to join hands and bounce bungling Benson from his below parity bandstand.

We have tried the flexible method and it did not get the job done. It is time we quit experimenting with the welfare of our farmers and enact legislation which will give them the relief they need and deserve.

The farmer's plight is not a laboratory case that can be examined under a microscope by the so-called farm expert scientists—it is a real and vital problem affecting the welfare of millions and the economic stability of our entire Nation. It is time we quit playing around with high sounding ideas and get down to the facts of the situation.

Our conference committee has proposed high price supports on basic commodities and a new parity formula based on modern prices. These formulas are aimed at increasing farm income and stabilizing declining farm prices.

Here are the hard, cold facts:

First. The minimum support price of wheat will be increased from $1.78 a bushel to $2.26.

Second. The minimum support price of peanuts will be increased from 10 cents a pound to 12 cents.

Third. The minimum support price of cotton will be increased from 27.6 cents a pound to 33.5.

Fourth. The minimum support price of corn will be increased from $1.30 a bushel to $1.64.

Fifth. Higher support prices will be set up for other feed grains, and quickly—now, not later.

Last year, when the Democrats proposed a soil-bank bill, as a long-range aid to agriculture, the Agriculture Department told Congress that the soil-bank proposal would not work. However, this year the same proposal is placed before Congress and President Eisenhower terms it "imperative." What I cannot figure out is why was it not imperative last year—the trend in farm prices has not changed—they are still going down, down, and down.

In any event, the measure is before us today and I believe just about everyone believes it imperative. This measure is designed to reduce surpluses and to increase farm income. It is a good proposal and to use a hackneyed phrase, "It will help stem the tide in the long pull."

It is estimated that under the acreage-reserve plan, as proposed in this bill, farmers would receive about $100 to $300 an acre for tobacco, $48 to $60 for cotton, $40 to $70 for peanuts, $18 to $25 for wheat, $36 to $50 for corn, and $60 to $75 for rice.

The two-price program for wheat, as proposed in this bill, will give the farmers themselves an opportunity to vote on a plan which they think is best. It is a Democratic proposal—and I mean that in both senses of the term.

Under provisions of this bill, cotton growers are given protection against any cut in their allotments in 1957 and 1958, below the 1956 level. The national cotton allotment this year is 17,891,000 acres. In addition, to protect small planters, a national acreage reserve of 100,000 acres would be set up for the benefit of small growers. They will further benefit because unused cotton acreage allotments within a State in any year

can be turned over to small planters to help them reach the minimum goal.

The same picture will prevail for other types of agriculture if the recommittal motion is defeated and this bill approved.

It is time the administration quit making an economic battlefield out of the American farms—the farmers deserve better. They deserve the benefits of this sound farm program, and I urge that we pass this bill without further delay.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the conference committee report submitted to this House undoubtedly represents long hours of consideration and an attempt by farm area lawmakers to find some answers to an admittedly serious economic situation in American agriculture.

However, as a representative of producers and consumers in the State of Rhode Island I must take issue with several of the major items embodied in this proposed legislation.

This bill, with its provision for high rigid Government price supports and increased incentives for surplus production, can mean only higher taxes and rising production costs for the consumers and the farmers of my district. Farmers in this section of the United States can see little benefit in a legislative proposal that would provide increased costs on the feed grains they must have in order to raise—on limited acreage—livestock, poultry, and dairy cattle. At the same time, under the three-price program advanced for wheat the cheap feed that might result to farmers in other sections of the United States—particularly in the grain belt—can only mean greater competition to us by producers not now raising poultry, dairy, and other livestock.

This bill will depress agriculture in Rhode Island. It will further aggravate misunderstandings between consumers in the metropolitan areas and producers in rural and fringe areas.

It is not easy for a Rhode Island farmer, hamstrung by this type of legislation and all the publicity connected with it to explain to a city dweller in my State that he is reaping none of the benefits but, in fact, is finding his income steadily pushed lower and lower by the ever-mounting surpluses of overproduction from other areas of this country.

As many Congressmen from the Northeastern States know, the present program, and the program now before us, while not benefiting northeastern farmers in any discernible respect, impose harmful restrictions on us. Many of our northeastern farmers would like to grow wheat on their farms to use as feed. But if they raise more than 15 acres of wheat, heavy penalties are imposed upon them even though they feed all wheat they produce on livestock on their own farms. If they fail to pay such penalty they are eventually faced with court action compelling them to pay it.

The Legislature of the State of New York recently approved—Assembly Resolution 40, March 19, 1950—a resolution memorializing the Congress to permit farmers who use for livestock or poultry feed all the wheat they produce on their farms to be permitted to do so. These farmers do not receive any benefit from the Federal farm program. They should not be penalized by it. I am disappointed that there is nothing in this conference report that would lift such restrictions.

Farmers do not want this bill; consumers can only be against it. For these reasons, I urge that the conference committee report be rejected.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to place in the RECORD the principal reasons why I must vote against acceptance of the conference report on the farm bill, H. R. 12.

That bill imposes high rigid price supports which will be a continuing incentive for overproduction which, in turn, will build up enormous surpluses, all at heavy cost to the taxpayers. Coupled with the acreage limitation scheme for controlling production, such supports produce huge payments to the few operators of very large farms and threaten to eliminate the family-operated farms. Thus, those supports, for which the Democratic leadership claims credit, enrich the large operator and squeeze the small farmer.

This costly subsidy adds heavily to the already burdensome Federal taxation imposed upon the people of the whole State of New York and particularly heavily on the residents of the 15th District of that State, which I represent.

Other provisions in H. R. 12 will increase the prices of food for everybody.

Furthermore, the large farm organizations in New York are on record, as is the nationwide Farm Bureau Federation, in opposition to the rigid price support plan.

Recently, I sent a questionnaire to 12,000 residents of my district. Nearly 2,000 answers have been received. They voted 55 to 45 that a farm subsidy program is not right in principle.

Capping all these are the authoritative and expert opinions of the President and his Secretary of Agriculture that rigid price supports are contrary to the national interest.

For all these reasons, I must vote against the bill which the conference report brings before us.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a man who came directly from the farms to Congress and as a Member of Congress representing a great agricultural district, I support the bill our conferees have brought before us. My support is not based on any belief that this bill is perfect but it is based on the conviction that it represents the best compromise possible under the circumstances. This conviction is further strengthened by the urgent need for new farm legislation for the benefit of American farmers and the rural business communities which have been so hard hit by the cost-price squeeze in our agricultural economy.

We farm Congressmen recognize, as do the Members from other segments of our Nation, that all legislation is a compromise and it is not often that we get all we want in the way of new laws. We are grateful for the good things this bill contains, and we can perfect the others as their shortcomings become evident.

Much has been said about the defects and deficiencies of this bill. Some of these criticisms are well founded, while others are based primarily upon the judgment or viewpoint of the individual voicing them. Personally, I am more vitally concerned with the good features of the bill.

The President and the Secretary of Agriculture have made the soil bank the cornerstone of any new farm program. Despite minor differences as to details, I am happy to say that all of the major farm organizations have endorsed the idea. I am also gratified that the committees developing this bill, the other body, and now the conferees have brought before us a bill containing a reasonably good soil-bank program along the basic principles of the President's recommendation.

As we stand on the threshhold of victory in this long battle for a better farm program, I am grateful for the acceptance by the President and now by the Congress of a fundamental approach to our farm problems. For me personally, this is a day to long remember as I see the Congress move toward the adoption of a program for which I have long campaigned.

What better solution could we find to our problem of temporary surpluses than a program to help our farmers divert surplus-producing acreages to a soil-building and water-conserving bank of fertility for future needs sure to come? In my judgment, it will take about 3 years for the soil bank to have its full effect on the farm commodity markets, but a beginning must be made somewhere, and that beginning is being made here today.

As most of my farm colleagues know, I began the long, uphill battle for a soil-bank program several years ago. With this problem of temporary surpluses plaguing our Nation and depressing our farm commodity markets, it seemed that some commonsense approach should be developed to overcome this serious problem.

There is nothing new about the principles of the soil bank, but there is definitely something new about the manner in which we propose to apply those time-tested principles for the benefit of our agricultural economy—indeed, for the lasting benefit of our entire economy, for it is not just the farmers who gain from better farm commodity prices.

Three years ago the idea had become so fixed in my own mind that I began discussing it with farm leaders, individual farmers, small-town businessmen, agricultural experts, and others concerned with this problem. Early in January 1954 I arranged a meeting with the Secretary of Agriculture to discuss with him the fundamental principles of the soil-bank idea. It was my thought that if the Secretary could see the wisdom of such a program we might move for its enactment by the 83d Congress that year.

Although my proposal had been enthusiastically received by all with whom it had been discussed, I knew from my experience in the Congress that support

from the administration would be essential to its enactment—and subsequent events have proven the accuracy of that opinion. We saw no real action on this until the President made the soil bank the No. 1 point in his nine-point program for agriculture as set forth in his message of January 9, 1956.

On January 28, 1954, when the Secretary of Agriculture was before my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, I again discussed with him—in very general terms—the fundamental principles of the plan and asked his opinion on it. Although no bills had yet been introduced on the subject, and, although the urgent need for such a program was already manifest, I was disappointed in the Secretary's rejection of the basic idea.

Anyone interested in the first official discussion of this proposal in the Congress will find that discussion between myself and the Secretary of Agriculture beginning on page 23 of the 1955 hearings on appropriations for agriculture.

Welcome support came from my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] who has long rendered outstanding service, both in the Congress and in prior service, to the cause of agriculture. My colleague and I, on February 2, 1954, introduced the first bills of record in the 83d Congress to authorize what I had termed a "soil bank of fertility" on acres diverted from production.

These bills were followed on February 26, 1954, by S. 3036 on the same subject by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota; and another, S. 3049, by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota on March 1, 1954. I think it most significant, Mr. Speaker, that all of the soil-bank bills introduced in the 83d Congress came from members of the congressional delegation from Minnesota. Once again, we find Minnesota and its congressional representation in the forefront in the battle for good, constructive farm legislation.

No action having been taken on these proposals by the 83d Congress, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and I again introduced our bills on January 17, 1955, and we began our campaign for support which has led to the bill we have before us today.

On May 10, 1955, I went before the House Committee on Agriculture to testify in support of the basic principles of my soil-bank bill, and I must acknowledge today that the reception given the idea by that great committee was the most encouraging development to date.

We owe a great debt of gratitude to the distinguished members of our Committee on Agriculture who have worked so long and hard to bring this bill before us today. On this, as on most farm legislation, they have set aside their partisan and other differences and have joined in the common cause of doing something constructive for agriculture and our farm people. Perhaps in no other committee of the Congress can we find the members so completely dedicated to the responsibilities of their committee.

There are many good features to this bill, and foremost among them is the soil bank.

Give us this program to bring a reasonable balance between production and consumption, back it up with an expanded program of market development, research, and extension, and I confidently predict that within a few short years this deplorable argument over the level of price supports will disappear along with the surplus. Within the framework of this proposed legislation we find necessary provisions which will advance the cause of agriculture immeasurably and bring our otherwise booming prosperity to the rural business communities of America as well as our 5 million farm families.

A new day will dawn for American agriculture when this bill becomes the law of the land. For my farmers of the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota, and the merchants and other businessmen caught in this sinking farm economy, I express my heartfelt thanks for your consideration of our needs.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret the fact that it is not possible for me to follow the leadership of my party on this bill but I shall vote against the recommittal of the conference report today because I feel the bill as worked out by the conference committee will do a better job of improving the economic condition of the farmers of the Middle West than will the bill as is proposed to be amended by the recommittal motion.

The prime purpose of this bill is to close the gap between the price the farmer is required to pay for his necessities and the price of the product he has to sell.

As was stated by President Eisenhower, the purpose of the legislation is to increase farm income. The soil-bank program, proposed by the administration is intended to reduce the burdensome surpluses and permit the law of supply and demand to improve farm income.

We are today faced with the fact that because of the lateness of the season, there can be little if any benefit to farm income this year through the soil-bank plan.

In addition it should be pointed out that farm acreages have already been determined for the 1956 crops, either they have already been planted or will be before this bill takes effect, so that reduced supports or any other price inducement will not affect the production of most corps, either up or down. All that can be done in this legislation is to improve the price of that crop which is produced.

The acreage allotments are in effect and apply to the 1956 crop. These crops cannot be increased.

The only thing this bill can hope to do is to improve the price of the crop that is produced this year on the designated acreages. The higher support prices incorporated in the bill apply to only 1 year.

During the pending year the provisions of the soil bank can be put into effect so that farm income can be maintained in the coming years with even reduced acreages.

In the meantime the wheat farmers of the Nation can pass their judgment upon the domestic parity plan, and put that into effect.

It seems to me that the best interest of agriculture and agricultural areas, as well as the economy of the entire Nation will be best served by voting down this motion to recommit and passing the bill as rewritten by the conference committee.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a suspicion in many quarters that the present farm bill is not good legislation. So-called Christmas-tree legislation in which something has been hung on for everybody is admittedly a bad approach. Why stop with the farm vote when we could include everyone—just tax with the right hand and hand it out with the left wing and hope that everyone will be happy.

Farm legislation, as we know it, began many years ago with the broad general principle of interstate regulation and much was accomplished over the years of a beneficial nature. However, logrolling and backscratching crept in, as is frequently the case, and bad legislation has resulted.

In my locality the fluid-milk producers are in a bad way and they are being squeezed out through a process of elimination. Corporation farming is encouraged through the current cost-price squeeze and the little fellows are being forced out of business. Production controls are mentioned in some quarters, but many so-called farm experts seem more concerned with the welfare of the middleman who already collects about two-thirds of the consumer dollar. The same holds true of the fruit and poultry industries. This situation is bad and I can see nothing in this bill that will alleviate the problems of the northeastern farmer. Increased consumer costs will surely result.

I hope that Congress will be called upon to produce a better farm bill and at the present session, before adjournment.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H. R. 12, not because I think it is a perfect bill, but because it offers immediate help to agriculture and a start on the long-range solution by the adoption of the administration's soil-bank program.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for any motion to recommit which in any way tends to lessen farm income this year. The motion under consideration does just that. It is this year that agriculture needs help. Since February 1951, agriculture has been caught in a serious price-cost squeeze—the farmers receiving less and less for what they sell and paying just as much as ever for what they buy. According to the Department of Agriculture, farm prices in mid-March were 26.5 percent below the record high reached in February 1951, while on the other hand the prices of the things the farmer must buy were only 2.7 percent below the record high mark reached in May 1952. This condition is not something new but started back in 1951 and gradually has been getting worse each year—in fact, parity dropped 19 percent during the last 2 years of the Truman administration. The time has come when this trend must not only be stopped but reversed. This cannot be done un-

less Congress provides the necessary legislation which will increase farm prices because it looks as though there will be no reduction in operating costs in the immediate future. Wages, taxes, profits, and all other costs are at an all-time high and it looks as though these high operating costs are with us for some time to come. This being true, there is no way that we can ease this price-cost squeeze other than by supporting higher prices for agriculture products, which the conference report on H. R. 12 is designed to do by adding $1 to $2 billion to farm income this year principally through higher price supports.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the reinstatement of the 90 percent mandatory price-support program is not to the liking of some people, but, on the other hand, if it provides the immediate help that agriculture needs we should not question the program unless we can offer a better program that will do the job and to date none has been offered.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the conference report provides for only a 1-year extension of the 90-percent support program, thereby giving Congress and the executive branch of the Government time to work out some other program that will give to the farmer 100 percent of parity to which he is entitled, and in the interim providing increased income for the farmer to ease the price-cost squeeze he is caught in.

Ever since coming to Congress, I have supported the 90-percent price-support program, not because it is the answer to the dilemma which agriculture finds itself in but because it bridges the gap in this transition period from war to peace when we are trying to reduce our stocks to a reasonable level and at the same time maintain a fair price to producer and consumer alike. It should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that our farmers are not to blame for the surplus that today is depressing farm prices and costing the taxpayer roughly a million dollars a day for storage alone. It will be recalled that it was Government itself that pleaded with our farmers during the height of the war to enlarge their plants and produce more in order that we might be able not only to feed ourselves but our allies, too. Our farmers responded patriotically and provided the food and the fiber that was so necessary to win the war, but with peace, when the battlefields were turned into wheatfields, Government failed to adjust production and continued to permit production at wartime levels, thus producing the surplus which has caused the price-cost squeeze that today threatens the stability of our greatest industry, agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot follow the reasoning of those who contend that the present surplus is the direct result of the 90-percent price support program and that a reinstatement of that program will defeat the purpose of the soil bank. The surplus was not caused by the 90-percent price support program but rather by the administration of the program in not curtailing production at the proper time. At the end of the 1952 marketing year, we had on hand 562 million bushels of wheat, 5,600,000 bales of cotton, and 769 million bushels of corn. Instead of curtailing production at that time, our farmers were urged to continue to produce without any restrictions or controls whatsoever, and by the end of the 1953 marketing year, we had 902 million bushels of wheat, 9,700,000 bales of cotton, and 920 million bushels of corn, and we have been in a serious price-cost squeeze ever since.

By reinstating the 90-percent price support program with production controls for our basic commodities (wheat and corn are the only basics grown in South Dakota), we will increase farm income immediately and by adopting the administration's soil bank program, will be tackling the long range program by taking land out of production, reducing surplus, and storing the fertility in the soil for future needs. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that both programs are needed under present circumstances—one program to give the immediate relief that agriculture needs and the other the long range program to bring production in line with demand.

During the past 3 years, steps have been taken under the 90-percent support program to curtail production. The Secretary of Agriculture has already reduced wheat acreage from 78 million acres in 1953 to 62 million acres in 1954 and to 55 million acres in 1955 and 1956, the minimum acreage under the provisions of the support program. In addition, the farmers themselves have voted quotas, which means that if they overplant their acreage allotment they are subject to stiff penalties. In addition, wheat price supports have been reduced from 90 percent of old parity, the rate for 1954 and preceding years, to 82½ percent of old parity in 1955, and 76 percent of transitional parity in 1956, and during all of this time it must be remembered that the operating expenses of the producer have remained at or close to an all-time high. Not only has our farmers' production been cut, but prices, too, and farm income, Mr. Speaker, is production times price, less cost. Industry cuts production for only one purpose; that is to maintain price. Industry never cuts production and price at the same time, and we should not expect that of agriculture, either.

There are many other provisions in the conference report worthy of mention, namely, increased supports for dairy products, mandatory supports for feed grains, retention of dual parity, a trial run on a 2-price system for wheat, $500 million authorized to supplement section 32—Public Law 320, 74th Congress—funds for the purchase of perishable commodities when necessary in order to stabilize price, and several other items, all of which are designed to bolster farm income in 1956 and to bring production in line with demand.

I cannot let this occasion pass without commenting that this body passed a farm bill on May 5, 1955, a bill which reinstated the 90-percent support program for another 3 years. It is now April 11, 1956, almost a year later, and we are just getting around to vote on the farm bill. It is well to call your attention to the timetable. May 5, 1955, H. R. 12 passed the House of Representatives and was sent to the Senate; January 9, 1956, President Eisenhower sent a special farm message to the Congress; the Senate Agriculture Committee did not report out a bill until February 10, 1956; the Senate did not start their debate on the farm bill until February 22, 1956, and did not pass the bill until March 19, 1956. On March 26, 1956, the bill went to conference and today we are voting on the conference report.

During all of this time our farmers tried to lay out their farm plans, make the necessary credit arrangements, and start operations for the 1956 crop year. They have been very severely penalized because of the failure of this Congress to take early action. Truly, the Congress is the greatest deliberative body in the world, but insofar as the farm bill is concerned, there was too much deliberation and too much inaction to assist the farmers in this most trying period. I have contended in the past that agriculture should not become a political football because it would work to the detriment of the farmer. I cannot say categorically that politics has been played with the farm bill this year, but I can say that our farmers have now made what plans they could for this year without having the slightest idea of what kind of farm program they would be operating under. To me, this is a gross injustice and if done with intent should be subjected to the most vigorous censure.

Mr. Speaker, I am definitely of the opinion that it is absolutely essential that we adopt the conference report in order to give agriculture the help it needs in 1956, as well as to start the long range program sponsored by the administration which is the provisions of the soil bank.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have carefully read House Report No. 1986, in connection with the agricultural legislation which we in the House are considering today. I have been following the deliberations of the conferees in the past several days, and only during this past week attended several farm meetings in my State of Michigan for the purpose of getting the opinion of my farm constituents in this question.

The general consensus of opinion that I learned from my farm people was that such legislation would do them little good. The average farmer in my district derives his income chiefly from dairy and livestock products. Now there is nothing in this bill for my livestock people. As a matter of fact, it is even worse than the Senate bill which at least contained adequate prohibitions against participants in the conservation reserve violating their contracts and putting livestock on the reserve acreage. If this is done to any extent, it will greatly increase livestock production and further depress prices. The Senate bill contained a provision that such a violator would forfeit all price-support benefits. However, the conference version eliminated this feature which did provide some protection to livestock producers. Therefore, I consider this bill discriminates against our livestock farmers.

The conference report also discriminates against our dairy producers. True, it does establish the support level

for manufacturing milk at between 80 and 90 percent of parity and further provides that the price of manufacturing milk and butterfat shall be supported at not less than $3.25 per hundredweight and 58.6 cents per pound, respectively. This would mean an increase in the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk from 82 to 85 percent, roughly. In dollars and cents, it would mean an approximate 2.5 percent increase to my dairy producers.

But the Senate bill established the parity price at 88 percent and also used a parity equivalent based on the 30-month period from July 1946 to December 1948. This was knocked out by the conferees. The Senate bill also made this parity increase indefinite whereas the conference version specifically limited its meager increase in dairy prices to 1 year.

I understand that section 103 of the conference version dealing with price supports for manufactured milk is acceptable to the administration. However, I regard it as discriminatory against my dairy producers and makes another reason why I cannot support the conference report.

Most of my farmers are small farmers. They are angry at seeing large farmers and large farmers in other parts of the country receiving huge payments from the Federal Government under price-support programs, sometimes extending into 6 or 7 figures. Now most of them are willing to give the soil-bank plan a fair try. But they do not want to see people making large sums of money out of the program.

The Senate bill contained language specifying that participants in the soil bank could only receive maximum payments of $25,000 under the acreage-reserve program, and $7,500 under the conservation reserve. The conference version struck both of these ceilings from the bill. I, therefore, regard this version of the agricultural bill as discriminatory not only against dairy and livestock producers, but also against small farmers in favor of large producers. This is a third reason why I am not going to support this conference version.

As far as the soil bank itself is concerned, a feature which I regard as the most desirable of the entire bill, I feel that the time is too late for it to be of any benefit to farmers this year. I know that the compromise version contains a provision that will permit farmers to participate even if he has already planted his 1956 crops. To do that, he has to plow up the crop which he has already planted. I regard such a practice as wasteful and destructive and completely inadequate. The truth of the matter is that the Congress is too late this year to help the farmer.

But the great objection to the conference version of the farm bill, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, is the proviso providing for 90 percent of parity on the basic commodities.

Michigan farmers derive less than 20 percent of their income from these so-called basic commodities. Incidentally, I recall last week at a farm meeting a farmer asked me how it is determined that a commodity is "basic." I told him that it was simply a question of politics. Now this restoration of high rigid price supports will do little to benefit our Michigan farmers. But it would hurt them in many ways: By piling up surpluses and further depressing market prices, by raising the cost of their feed grains perhaps as much as 15 percent and by continuing and increasing a system of Government controls, regimentation and interference, with which the large majority of my farmers are thoroughly disgusted and tired.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read the text of an article which I have prepared for publication in the spring issue of the Republican State National Journal which shows why rigid supports will hurt rather than help the average Michigan farmer:

POLITICAL FARM LEGISLATION

In spite of the efforts made by the Democrat Party to blame the administration for the serious farm problem, the facts tell a different story.

Farm surpluses are generally acknowledged today as being one of the principal causes behind the drop in farm prices. These surpluses came into being as a result of high, rigid price supports which were instituted during World War II to stimulate production and which were never removed even though markets shrunk considerably thereafter. The current drop in farm prices began in 1951 under the previous Democrat administration and under a high price support program which was continued until last year.

Now, after only one year of flexible supports, the Democrats can think of no better solution than to return to high supports which are responsible for the present problems which face the farmer today.

The administration soon realized that flexible supports would not alone solve the farm problem because of the overhanging surpluses that threatened to glut the market. Therefore, the soil bank plan was put forward to effect a sharp reduction in production of surplus crops and also to remove from cultivation much marginal land which came into production only because of the attraction of high supports.

The Democrat-controlled Congress has deliberately delayed action on any new farm legislation, including the soil bank plan, until it was felt certain that the time was too late for any benefits to take effect this year. Further, in spite of the President's express disapproval of any legislation embodying a return to high price supports, such a maneuver was included in the compromise farm legislation, thereby inviting a presidential veto.

The Democrat chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee even admitted that unless farm legislation was passed by the Congress before the end of March, the whole soil-bank plan and indeed all farm legislation might as well be abandoned for any good it would do the farmers in 1956.

Actually, I believe the average Michigan farmer would prefer to forego price supports if he could at the same time relieve himself from Government controls and regulation. Assuming that this is not possible at present, a system of flexible supports to level production and demand off together surely offers more than high supports.

The Democrat bill, for instance, proposed a return to supports at 90 percent of parity on wheat and corn which account for less than 20 percent of the Michigan farmer's income. Our farm people get more than half of their income from dairy and livestock production. Now there is nothing in the Democrat farm bill for livestock or livestock products. There is an increase in the price support level for dairy products, an increase which, in the case of manufactured milk, would amount to roughly 2.5 percent. But at the same time our dairy farmers were getting this small increase in their milk prices, they would be faced with other provisions of the bill which would increase the cost of their feed grains by as much as 10 percent.

I think the foregoing will show our Michigan farmers how much the Democrats know or care about their problems. This is what happens when politicians in Congress try to write farm legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that the conference report was discriminatory against the small farmer. The whole price-support system, especially high supports, definitely discriminates against him. In this connection, I want to read the text of an editorial from the April 7 issue of the Saginaw News entitled "Taxpayers Underwrite Big Farm Operators":

No one ever showed us a check for $1,292,472.25. But that was the size of the Government loan which one king-sized farm outfit drew on its 1954 wheat crop. That's the kind of money a big one-crop operator can pull down in a year without a dollar's worth of risk through this 90 percent of parity price guarantee that American taxpayers are underwriting.

The more Congress delves into the complexities of farm economics the more these fantastic inequities keep coming to light. We'll know soon, when the House-Senate conference bill is reported out, what policy is to prevail, whether the Government will encourage the family-size farm or continue to underwrite these big corporations whose fields run to the horizons with the sky the limit on the size of their guaranteed checks.

More than half of the Nation's 4,782,000 farmers get no benefit from price supports. The bulk of the money goes to the big, one-crop growers of wheat, corn, and cotton.

Considering that only 130,000 of these nearly 5 million farmers have gross incomes of $25,000 or more a year, it is plain to see who is getting the lion's share at the expense of all of us.

The average Government loan on wheat ran only $1,800 a farm. Yet 62 big outfits received more than $100,000 apiece from the Government on their 1954 crops. One big Louisiana rice grower picked up a price-support check totaling $486,725.77.

The family size farm versus the king-size farm has been debated from all angles. The economics of the thing can be turned in most any direction. Those who would build a case for protection of family farms hasten to defend the smaller unit as a way of life which has spiritual and other healthy values centered in land ownership and independence.

Business-minded Americans say big farms are a natural, desirable evolution which only prove that mass production can be brought to agriculture, that fewer and fewer people are required to produce in abundance all the food this Nation requires.

In both instances, advocates touch lightly on the extent of taxpayer subsidy required to make good their cases.

Family farms have been defined by a congressional committee as those yielding an annual income of less than $2,500. To fight for the preservation of this way of life strikes us as the defense of a livelihood hardly measuring up to what we could find pride in perpetuating.

By today's standards, that is marginal living. To subsidize those who produce little more than enough to sustain themselves is to encourage chronic dependency.

But the bigger fallacy, as we see it, is in the staggering subsidy of the big corporate farm outfits. They not only enjoy tariff protections from foreign competition; they also dare engage in huge single-crop farming because they have been guaranteed a mar-

ket for every bushel or bale they produce—at a guaranteed minimum price, cash on the barrel head.

This unrestricted overproduction has hurt agriculture, including the family-size farm, and it will continue as long as Congress makes price supports themselves an incentive of profit, rather than a cushion against a disastrous slump as was the original intent.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on at length but I do not believe I need to give additional reasons why this conference report on farm legislation is discriminatory against and damaging to our Michigan farmers and why I will vote against it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, this is an important hour. Millions of farmers have their sights on our actions of today. After 3 years of continuous income decline they are looking to us for relief.

Almost 4 years ago Republicans made campaign promises of better days for American agriculture. All have been broken. This is their last chance to come forward and deliver. This is their last chance to increase agricultural income for 1956. Hereafter it will be too late. It is this or nothing.

Much has been said about the possibility of a veto. That is the President's privilege. However, it is improper to waive the threat of a veto over this body in an attempt to influence our votes.

We were sent here by our respective constituencies. To them we are responsible. We are not responsible to the President. We are not called upon to be his rubberstamps. It is our duty to vote our own convictions. After so doing if upon passage the President vetoes this measure then the responsibility for the consequences is his, not ours.

I am for the conference report. I am supporting it because it will increase farm income this year. I am supporting it because it means a better price for farm commodities now.

I am supporting it also, Mr. Speaker, because it places a floor under the national cotton allotment for the year 1956 and 1957. Cotton farmers cannot stand further acreage reductions. I am supporting it further because it will bring some relief to the small cotton farmer through the provision providing an extra 100,000 acres for allocation among cotton farmers who have been reduced under 4 acres.

I am supporting it for other reasons. It does not reflect my views in every respect. However, it is a reasonably good compromise, as is all legislation of major importance.

The conference report is the handwork of weeks and weeks, yes, months and months, of hard labor by able legislators familiar with the problems of American farmers. We should not cast away their effort and leave our farmers to the hazard of further depressing prices.

It is time that the President, Secretary Benson and most of our Republican colleagues faced up to the situation. They are leading American agriculture right back to the position they left it in 1932.

If a farmer were to have fallen asleep 25 years ago—become sort of a modern-day Rip Van Winkle—and not awakened until 1956, there is little doubt in my mind that he would experience any difficulty in ascertaining which political party is in control of the White House, if all the facts on the current price dilemma farmers find themselves in were sufficiently laid before his eyes.

History of the 1920's and the 1929 to 1932 era is poignantly repeating itself. And farmers under the callously enforced price-depressing policies of this administration, now find themselves once again staring at the bottom of the economic barrel, worried lest that turn out to be flexible, too.

Meanwhile, the giant business organizations of this Nation under the watchful guidance of Cabinet emissaries and the resulting friendly policies of this administration are reaping record-breaking profits.

Prosperity has settled its golden mantle on General Motors, who in 1955 took in net profits of more than $1 billion, and Ford Motor Co., which according to its chairman some weeks ago looked forward to netting more in 1956 than in all the 21 years previous to World War II. Prosperity has come to them and to other segments of business, but not to the farm.

And let me interject at this point that despite the political slogans of the Republican Party, these profits did not come under an economy geared to peace, as they would like us all to believe. I would remind you that about 65 percent of our budget is still geared to a wartime economy.

Speaking of the tremendous profits that have been reported in all of the leading business journals of the Nation, I think that it should be pointed out here and now that the philosophy of this administration is deeply apparent in the paradoxical action it took of lowering the excess-profits tax to big business on the one hand and lowering price supports to farmers on the other hand.

That is the epitome of the motivating philosophy behind this administration's entire domestic program. Once again the Republican Party has proven conclusively that it is not the party of the common man. It has shown little concern for the little people of our land who produce the food and fiber this Nation consumes.

Still, even though farm prices have fallen 36 percent since 1952, we hear plaintive cries of innocence from administration officials whenever someone points an accusing finger at them and their flexible price-support plan.

They rammed it through Congress over the protests of the minority party in 1954. The Republican Party forced this flexible price-support program on farmers, which last year alone cost the people who till the soil nearly one and a half billion dollars in net income, from the year before.

Still, I have read in the papers that the administration and the Republican Party hired a high-powered advertising agency to sell Mr. Benson and the sliding scale to the American people. They have used the slick merchandising techniques, the mass-selling idea—with a Hollywood trimming—because they cannot sell either the Eisenhower farm program or Mr. Benson to the farmer on the basis of fact.

I ask in all seriousness, is this responsibility in Government? Is this the responsibility that the American people have the right to expect, regardless of which political party is in control? The answer to me is very obviously, "No."

For 3 years now, this administration has deliberately and carefully carried out a campaign to convince the American people that farmers have been wards of the Government for the past 2 decades, and that flexible supports or perhaps even a full, free market for agriculture would solve the whole thing and cleanse the supposedly black soul of the farmer.

To carry out this diabolic plan they have refrained from giving the facts on the current farm situation and the entire farm picture to the people.

During the last session of Congress, Under Secretary of Agriculture True Morse told the House Agriculture Committee that his Department did not contemplate offering further legislation in substitution of or amendatory to present legislative authority. In other words, the administration had the authority it wanted. And, it must have been assumed that the authority it had was all that was needed to bring farmers "100 percent of parity at the market place," General Eisenhower's outstanding farm promise of the 1952 campaign.

Morse's attitude, in speaking for Secretary Benson, was embodied in such pie-in-the-sky statements as "the decline has been checked," "things are looking up," and "we are moving in the right direction." In face of the mounting decline, Eisenhower, Benson, and Morse declined to accept the facts. They permitted the situation to roll on and on, down and down, without attempt to check it.

Then came October. With the roof falling in Eisenhower and Benson finally confessed that things were not going well, that farm decline was serious, and that action was demanded. They promised a new program. Oddly enough their new program will not increase farm income. Actually it will, through flexing prices and other devious methods, decrease it.

But even as late as September, only a few weeks prior to the administration's admission of farm distress, the Vice President of the United States, Mr. NIXON, was closely following the technique of refraining from giving the facts on the farm situation. In what the press had billed as a major farm address at the National Plowing Contest at Wabash, Ind., on September 17, NIXON attempted to repaint the administration's usual rosy picture for agriculture.

I wish to discuss a few of the points the Vice President made in this speech, so that we may all have a clearer picture of what this administration is up to.

In the beginning of that speech, Mr. NIXON made among other points these two: First, there is no farm depression in the United States; and second, our agriculture economy is basically sound.

I submit that the Vice President, as they say in the vernacular, was "pulling the wool over the eyes" of the American people, or at least he was trying to. No one was fooled.

If you compare the cash prices of major grain crops as of last October 15, with the average prices of the same crops back in the black year of 1933—following another Republican administration—you will find the following to be true using the same parity formula basis:

Wheat, as of last October 15, was 77 percent of parity; 70 percent in 1933. Barley was 51 percent of parity in October; 58 percent in 1933. Flaxseed was 57 percent of parity in October; 81 percent in 1933. Oats was 50 percent of parity in October; 71 percent in 1933. Rye was 43 percent of parity last October; 73 percent in 1933. Corn was 69 percent of parity in October; 68 percent in 1933.

Still I recall that another administration official not long ago told farmers that they should not expect any more. He said these prices were normal and that the prices of previous administrations were those of a dream world.

Now I ask, in view of the facts just quoted does it sound as if agriculture is basically sound? Is it basically sound when net farm income since 1951 has fallen more than $4 million, to an estimated $10.6 billion this year?

Are farmers in a financially sound position, when their net incomes drop an average of 30 percent in 4 years?

It appears to me that if Mr. NIXON had lived up to the responsibilities of his high office and discharged his duties properly, he would have told the people this is more than ample warning that flexible supports are not the answer to the farm problem and that something must be done immediately to stop the price drop that is driving farm families from their homes and from their land.

The newspapers of rural America, especially in the Midwest are increasingly running big ads, announcing that this or that farmer is selling out. They've been forced to quit because of the sliding scale—the flexible price-support program—that is seemingly more sacred to this administration than are the lives of millions of American farm families.

But, Mr. NIXON, like so many of his coworkers, is more interested in continuing the campaign to keep the administration's ruinous flexible price support law on the books than he is in giving the American people the facts on what is actually happening on the farm.

To continue on with the Vice President's speech, he made this statement:

> Let's lay one mistaken theory to rest right away. The new flexible-parity law cannot by any stretch of the imagination be held responsible for the drop in prices.

My friends, let me read these facts to you and you can draw your own conclusions.

Since 1952 this administration has dropped price-support levels on farm commodities as follows: From $1.22 a bushel on barley to 94 cents a bushel; for oats from 78 cents to 61 cents; for rye from $1.42 to $1.18; for grain sorghum from $2.38 to $1.78; for flaxseed from $3.77 to $2.91; for soybeans from $2.56 to $2.04; and cottonseed from $67 a ton to $46 a ton.

That is not to mention the drop of 15 percent of parity in dairy support prices, that Agriculture Secretary Benson decreed with full approval of President Eisenhower back on April 1, 1954. That drop from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent of parity brought about a 40 percent cut in net family income of producers of manufacturing milk.

Does this sound as if it is a stretch of the imagination to blame the farm price drop on price flexing, as this official speaking for the Eisenhower administration says it is? No one forced them to lower these farm price supports. They did it under their own volition. And they did it in full knowledge, I believe, that farm prices would drop to the support level or lower, the moment they did so.

They did it with little concern for the effects it would have on the family-sized farmers of this Nation, who helped elect a Republican President in 1952 and believed him when he made the promise of parity to farmers at Kasson, Minn., Brookings, S. Dak., and Columbia, S. C., and other places during the political campaign in the fall of 1952.

That promise to agriculture, which was so prominently displayed in banner headlines across the front pages of the Nation's press I would remind you, was repudiated in the congressional session of 1954. And who has benefited from it? No one unless it be the big food processors. Certainly not the consumer and not the farmer.

Now, if I may be permitted to read two more sentences from that major farm policy speech of the Vice President I have been referring to. He was telling the audience how the Eisenhower-Benson farm program was attacking the farm problem on two fronts, and he said:

> On the production front, a new flexible-parity formula has been adopted so that farmers will not be encouraged to grow more crops already in surplus.
>
> On the consumption front, we are finding new markets for farm products.

Surely Mr. NIXON knows that the law this administration passed is nothing new. It is the same old law the 80th Congress passed back in 1948 with the built-in double flex—one through the lowering of price supports, the other through the lowering of the parity level itself. And surely the Department of Agriculture knows that contrary to Mr. NIXON's statement, farmers seeded more acreage to uncontrolled crops last year than they did the year before. And why? To try and make up for the loss in income through price flexing, that is why.

Now on the matter of boosting consumption and opening new markets, I wish the administration would clarify this point by naming a few markets they have opened up and where consumption has risen.

May I point out, since they have not, that though they lowered price supports on milk, consumption per capita of dairy products in 1952, when supports were 90 percent of parity was 688 pounds per person and during 1955 it was about 682 pounds per person, or about the same.

Exports have dropped on wheat, also on cotton.

Does this sound like the administration is solving the consumption problem?

The farmer and the American people have been sold an empty package, a package bearing the false label of prosperity to the farmer and wrapped in the shiny promise of lower food prices to the consumer.

But the package has been opened and all we have found inside is the warped philosophy of planned scarcity that this great country of ours cast aside nearly a quarter of a century ago. We cannot live up to our responsibilities to our citizens of this country under such a policy, neither can we live up to our world responsibilities.

We as the strongest bulwark of democracy in the world cannot afford to tell the farmers of our country who comprise 13 percent of the total population that less than 4 percent of the total national income is all they have coming, and that they should not ask for more.

We have no moral right to use economic sanctions to drive farmers from the land—whether it be in the trumped up name of "efficiency" or in any other name.

Relief can come only through increased income. The administration's program will not meet the emergency. The conference report will. It should have our support.

Farmers have taken upon their shoulders one of the most important jobs in this Nation or any other nation for that matter. And that is their responsibility to produce the food that you and I and 165 million other Americans eat today. This is a responsibility that lasts 365 days of each year and with each successive year that job gets bigger. They have also produced enough to enable this country to help indigent neighbor nations in this world community and through this means stop the advancement of communism. All we have to do is use it.

Farmers have lived up to their part of the bargain. They have produced food and produced it abundantly. And they have done it without any cost-plus contracts with the Government. As a matter of fact, during World War II and the Korean war they were the only major industry that did so.

Now we must live up to our responsibilities and rid American agriculture of the inflexible thorn of flexible supports and depression level prices, that the Republicans and this administration have so mercilessly pushed into its side.

We must recognize the fact that farmers are entitled to a living standard equal with the rest of the economy and enact legislation that will return to them good prices and a fair income.

I urge you to support the conference report.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think we should frankly recognize this bill for what it is.

It is legislation designed not so much for the farmer as it is for politicians who want the farmer's vote. It is a conglomeration of gimmicks and devices to dump taxpayers' money into the hands of some segments of the farm population prior to election time. In no way can it be considered a solution for the serious prob-

lems which confront American agriculture today.

When this session began, the great question confronting the Nation was whether the Congress would forget politics and try to develop a program which looked to sound, long-range solutions for our agricultural problem or whether it would accept expedients offering only temporary relief lasting through the November elections. History will record, if this bill is passed in its present form, that Congress bowed to expediency at a time when statesmanship was never needed more.

The program submitted by the President offered hope for a long-range solution, encompassing a soil-bank plan which would have provided financial incentive for attacking the causes of agricultural surpluses. Congressional delays in the adoption of the soil bank rendered it almost useless for this crop year. Because of that fact, this bill has been loaded with every conceivable kind of gimmick to increase the price of this or that crop—with the Government paying the bill.

The net effect can only be to aggravate our basic problem of surplus production by encouraging the farmer to use every possible means to increase his output on the acres available to him. If this bill is enacted it will not solve the farm problem. It will aggravate it; it will increase it; it will make its eventual solution more difficult. This bill, in the long run, does a disservice to the farmer. I think he will eventually come to realize that—even though it is the hope of its sponsors to use it to win his support in the election this fall.

For example, the Wisconsin dairy farmer will take a careful look at the effect of this bill upon his operation.

It does offer him a 1-year increase in the support price for manufacturing milk. But for the extra 10 cents he would get over the present support price he may well be paying the most expensive price in his history.

If this bill becomes operative in its present form the Wisconsin dairy farmer will find he has been sacrificed on the altar of the sacrosanct basic crop farmer. Less than 1 percent of Wisconsin's production is in basic crops.

Under the bill, the Wisconsin dairy farmer remains on a flexible-support basis, while the so-called basic crops are put not only at mandatory 90-percent levels but get another boost under the dual parity provisions. He will find his feed costs increased not only by these provisions but by those which place feed grains under a high-level support program. He will watch the corporate farms receive huge checks because of the absence of a limitation on support payments. He will find that there is inadequate protection given to him against increased milk production from acres diverted to the soil bank.

In short, for a small and temporary increase in his milk-support price, he will exchange greatly increased production costs and an increase in competition from the basic crop areas. At the end of the marketing year, when his price reverts back to present levels, he may well be confronted with the same situation he faced when President Eisenhower took office—huge dairy surpluses in Government hands grinding his price down while high basic supports hold his cost of production up.

In the rush to take care of the basic crop areas, largely in the South, the Wisconsin farmer again gets the short end of the stick from a Democratic Congress. It is entirely in keeping with the Democrat record in Wisconsin, where the party orators bemoan the plight of the dairy farmer, while their cohorts in Congress rush through such legislation as the oleomargarine bill, fight the school milk and brucellosis-extension programs, and pass such discriminatory legislation as this.

It is all the more tragic in view of the fact that the dairy farmer's position has been improving while the worst part of his adjustment to peacetime market conditions has taken place. His feed costs are down, his milk prices are increasing, his income position is steadily improving. The effect of this bill upon the demand for his product, upon its production, upon inventory accumulation in Government hands, now improving, can only be adverse.

I shall vote against the bill as it is presently presented to us in the conference report.

A word, Mr. Speaker, about the motion to recommit that will be made by the Republican leader. Let it be noted that this motion is designed to help the dairy farmer as contrasted with the Democrat proposal which would do him injury.

The increase in the support level of manufacturing milk would be permanent, rather than temporary, and would fix a minimum level of support in excess of that provided under the conference report. The motion would also eliminate other provisions of the report which are harmful to the dairy farmer.

Mr. Speaker, a rollcall on the Republican motion to recommit will clearly show what Members are truly interested in the welfare of the dairy farmer. I shall vote for the motion.

CONFERENCE FARM BILL REQUIRES SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO ACT ON FOOD STAMP PLAN FOR DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, exactly 2 weeks ago, following Senate passage of the farm bill, I urged the conferees to bring some sense and some reason to the surplus food disposal program by adopting as part of the compromise bill a food stamp plan such as proposed in my bill, H. R. 5105. As I said then:

> This would assure getting some of the surplus to those in our country who are in need—many of them actualy hungry. Let us feed our own needy as well as the poor of other nations.
>
> We have over 5 million Americans on different forms of public-welfare assistance.

I added:

> Each one needs—actually needs some of this surplus food. These are people who do not now get enough to eat. Let us use this blessed surplus—this abundance—to help feed the hungry here at home as well as abroad.

Mr. Speaker, after I made those comments on the House floor 2 weeks ago, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture [Mr. COOLEY] graciously invited me to submit some language which could perhaps be incorporated into the conference bill to carry out my proposal. As I had said, the differences between the House bill as originally passed and the Senate version of H. R. 12 were so great that the conferees could have incorporated a specific food stamp plan as part of the disposal machinery.

I know it has been the position of some of the Members who are most expert in agricultural legislation that Secretary Benson already has full authority to establish a food stamp plan under existing law. Whether or not that is so, we all know that the Secretary has taken the flat position that a food stamp plan is not desirable. He prefers the present hit-and-miss system of distribution to the needy, a system which does not have the participation of a number of States including Missouri and which is, according to testimony by those who are participating in the program a cumbersome, ineffectual, and disproportionately expensive one for the States and localities participating.

I give this background, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is very important for us to make clear in connection with this conference bill now before us just what it is we expect the Secretary of Agriculture to do about a food stamp plan. Although the bill does not contain the language I submitted for it which would have created immediately a food stamp plan as provided for in H. R. 5105, the conference bill does provide that the Secretary of Agriculture must submit to Congress within 90 days detailed programs for distribution of surplus food under a food stamp plan or similar program to needy persons in the United States. If he does not have the authority to institute such a program, the bill requires that he submit recommendations for any additional legislation which is necessary.

MUST REPORT ON NEED FOR ANY FURTHER LEGISLATION ON FOOD STAMPS

Now as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the language of section 301 (b) does not say to the Secretary of Agriculture, "Tell us, Mr. Secretary, whether you think a food stamp plan would be a good idea." He has already told us many times that he does not like the food stamp idea—that he would rather continue the present hit-and-miss program which is not succeeding in getting this food to the people who need it. We are not asking him, then, to come back in 3 months and tell us what he has been telling us right along about a food stamp plan—that is, that he does not like it and does not want it. No; we are saying instead, "Come back in 3 months, Mr. Secretary, with a plan for the distribution of surpluses under a food stamp arrangement or similar program; and if you need more legislative authority for instituting such a program, tell us exactly how the law should be written."

It is very important, Mr. Speaker, that this distinction be made clear. The wording of the conference bill may be a little ambiguous, I do not know. I do know that the Secretary of Agriculture

and his people have been so bitterly opposed to the food stamp idea—preferring to give food abroad in preference to the needy in this country—that if there is any loophole at all in this wording, I am afraid they will seize it to avoid carrying out the congressional intent on a food stamp plan.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I feel it necessary to have this statement in the RECORD in connection with the conference bill. As the sponsor of the food-stamp plan, I am hopeful that the language now in the conference bill will be effective in carrying out the congressional intent of having our surplus disposal program so broadened and so improved through "a food-stamp plan or similar program" for distribution through States and local units of Government of future surplus production "to needy persons in the United States, its Territories, and possessions," as to assure not only the prevention of future surpluses but also the distribution of this food to our needy.

SECTION 301 (B) REQUIRES ACTION PROGRAMS

Title III, surplus disposal, in this bill, calling for a program of orderly liquidation of surplus stocks, requires that the Commodity Credit Corporation, as rapidly as possible consistent with its existing authority, and consistent with the price-support program, and consistent with orderly liquidation, shall dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities held by it. That is section 301 (a).

Section 301 (b) says that the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress within 90 days detailed programs—not just suggestions or possibilities or alternatives, but detailed programs—with recommendations for any additional legislation needed to carry out such programs for the disposition of surpluses as required by section 301 (a) and for a food stamp plan or similar program for distribution through the States and local units of Government of future surplus production to needy persons. The rest of that section 301 (b) makes it clear that what Congress is asking is for action programs. The Secretary is ordered, in other words, to tell us in 3 months not what he might possibly do but what he is going to do in disposing of this surplus, including disposition under a food stamp plan or similar program for getting this food to the needy in the United States.

While I am sorry that the conferees did not take the language I submitted to establish an immediate food stamp plan with specific procedures outlined, nevertheless I am glad they accepted my plea to provide in this bill for the food-stamp idea.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this country, by and large, are fair minded. They want to do the right thing. They do not want the Government, or anybody to do anything for them to which they are not justly entitled. The thing that disturbs the farmers, more than anything is the fact that while industry, business, labor, and other segments are making gains and profits, the farmers are slipping back. Mind you, he does not complain that other groups are making gains. He just does not understand why he is not in position to hold his own in our economy.

It is difficult for the farmer to understand why the big steel companies, for example are expanding and making more profits than ever—even increasing the price of steel, while he is required to take lower prices for his product.

Farmers really don't want "handouts" from their Government. They do read, however, in newspapers that manufacturing companies receive favors by way of tax incentives for building equipment for the defense of our country. He feels his product, food and fiber, are also essential to the defense of our country. Neither does the farmer object to good wages. He is for it. He does feel he is entitled to somewhere a parity price for his product compared with what he is required to pay for the things he needs to buy. He also hears that steamship lines are provided with subsidies, although not designated by that name.

The farmer observes the stock market is flourishing on the New York Exchange, and higher than in the past. But not so of the livestock market.

It is a little difficult to explain that while railroad stocks are higher and utility costs are more, and stocks cost more, both guaranteed a fair profit by reason of rate charges—and to which they find no fault. They just do not feel they are receiving a fair share of the Nation's income.

According to the USDA report, since 1945 the farmer's share of the consumer's retail food dollar has declined from 55 cents in 1945 to 41 cents in 1955. There are many examples. Some time ago when wheat was selling for $2.80 per bushel, a 1 pound loaf of bread sold for 14 cents. While wheat is selling this year for $2.15 per bushel, a similar loaf sells for 18 cents.

According to a report from the Department of Agriculture, the income of farmers last year was reduced by $1 billion. The average income was reduced from $913 to $860. The income of nonfarmers was more than double this amount. Included in the farm income was consumption of farm products, use of home and other sources.

Mr. Speaker, this statement is not made to indicate in any way that the farmer is griping. Not at all. I do think the farmer has, too many times, been misunderstood. In too many cases he has been unduly criticized. He feels, and rightly so, that he should have a price for his product in the market place on a comparable basis of what he is required to pay for the things he needs to buy. Surely there should be nothing unreasonable about that.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under the procedure being followed by the House today, there is no way to adequately discuss the proposed new farm bill. I think it appropriate, however, to place in the RECORD a few observations.

One might assume from listening to the debate that about everything in the final draft of the new farm bill now before us is either awfully bad or practically perfect, depending upon the point of view of the Members who have addressed us. The truth is that neither the bill, itself, nor the substitute is all bad or all good. We are confronted with limited choices. We can vote for the bill as represented by the conference report before us; we can vote for the substitute; or we can vote against any bill at all.

The final draft of the bill represents a compromise among the conferees. Everybody knows, or should know, that if this bill becomes the law, it will not produce complete satisfaction among the farmers themselves or among the people. There will be many shortcomings and drawbacks. We are dealing with a difficult and almost insoluble problem. We just have to do the best we can under the circumstances as they exist at the moment. Under these circumstances, I am voting for the bill.

I have in mind many unanswered questions about the pending farm measure, now in final form.

What kind of a soil bank payment will there be to cotton farmers and feed grain farmers who have not been able to make a crop in recent years because of drought?

How fair and equitable will the base acreage figures be for feed grain growers? How will the allotments be determined?

What will be the soil bank position insofar as payments per acre are concerned, of cotton farmers who have had a succession of failures because of drought?

Will abnormal weather conditions be adequately taken into consideration in line with the provision on this subject which is contained in the bill?

How adequate are the provisions in regard to the disposition of farm surpluses?

What will be the division of soil bank payments between landlords and tenants?

When will there be an opportunity to extend beyond the 1-year period the 90 percent of parity support program?

These, and many other questions remain unanswered.

The soil bank plan, while theoretically very sound and attractive, presents a fertile field for friction, abuse, and dissatisfaction among farmers. The whole question is to a considerable extent a matter of administration. The success or failure of the new farm bill will depend to a very, very great extent upon how it is administered, how it is run by the Department of Agriculture. If the program is to work at all, the officials of the Department must approach the problem of administration in a spirit of good will and with a determination to find ways of making the program work rather than finding ways to make the program fail.

Again I say, it should be perfectly obvious that the measure before us today is not the final answer to the problems of agriculture. We must face up to the fact that the compromise measure was in part hastily drawn. We can already foresee inadequacies and others will develop. There are going to be a lot of heartaches and troubles ahead. We must have a sympathetic administration of the program and further efforts must be made to modify the whole farm program, the object being to help the farmer secure a more workable and

effective program and a more adequate income.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the move that is being made here this afternoon to recommit this bill to conference is ill advised. It should be defeated and I predict it will be defeated.

That the Secretary of Agriculture could prevail upon Republican leaders in the House to offer a motion to cut price supports from 90 percent to 82½ percent on corn and other commodities while making a deal to support cotton at 86 to 87 percent, and while supporting wool and sugar at 100 percent or better, is almost beyond belief. It is my belief that the farmers of the Middle West are entitled to at least some of the consideration that is given those in Utah, the Rocky Mountain region, and the South.

I am not satisfied with every provision of the conference report, especially the possibility that wheat may come into competition with corn as a feed grain, but I am convinced that the good that can come from this legislation outweighs that which may prove unsatisfactory.

It is estimated in some quarters that the move to establish 82½ percent of parity could result in a loss of some $2 billion in gross farm income. There can be no doubt that a cut from 90 to 82½ percent of parity will result in a substantial loss. Whatever the amount it would mean that the farmer was again and deliberately being short-changed. I have no intention of being a party to any such deal.

I trust that the Senate will take immediate action to approve the conference report, and that President Eisenhower will promptly sign the bill into law.

It has been suggested by the Republican leadership in the House that Mr. Eisenhower may veto this bill if enacted. If he does so he must then assume the responsibility for no farm legislation this year.

I hope that next year Congress will give consideration to a revival of the principles of the old McNary-Haugen bill and enact permanent legislation that will assure farmers a minimum of their full costs of production, paid in the market places, and with controls upon marketings rather than acres.

The farm problem has been and still is a political football. It is time to stop offering the farmers panaceas and place this great and vital industry on a footing with all other industries.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, during the 13 years I have been privileged to represent the agricultural area of western Oklahoma, I have kept in close touch with the needs of the farmers. I have farmed myself, and I have served 6 years on the House Agriculture Committee. I have just returned from making an extensive tour of the 23 counties in my district, the Sixth Congressional District of Oklahoma, and I would like to make a few remarks as to the needs and problems of the farmers in our western Oklahoma area.

Our farmers in western Oklahoma have serious doubt as to the value, this year, of the Benson soil-bank plan. Many of the farmers feel that grasslands should be included in this program. However, the vast majority of farmers in the area are for 90 percent of parity.

What we need in Oklahoma is a program that would provide larger allotments to insure economic farm operating units for families. Many of the farmers feel that the allotment should be on a bushel and bale basis and should be increased according to the size of the family.

Our farmers also feel that the loan basis of cotton should not be changed but should be left at ⅞-inch Middling white; that grain sorghum price supports should be as great as price supports on corn; that wheat price supports in Oklahoma should be equivalent to durum wheat price supports in the North; that price supports should be placed on mung beans, castor beans and soybeans; that the peanut allotment should be increased; and that farmers who have had their land in alfalfa a number of years should be allowed to have a cotton or wheat allotment when the alfalfa dies out and has to be plowed under.

Our western Oklahoma farmers are diversified farmers generally speaking. They feel that farmers should be allowed to plant cotton land to wheat and wheat land to cotton in instances where drought, pests, or weather conditions make it impossible to plant wheat or cotton, as the case may be, while the other crop could be planted.

We have had a serious drought in western Oklahoma and need considerable assistance in the form of loans and low-interest rates; assistance in eradicating pests such as greenbugs, bollworms, aphids, wheat lice, army worms, cut worms, web spiders, grasshoppers, and so forth; and better prices for farm commodities.

Our farmers feel that there should be an adjustment in allotments for drought-stricken areas such as western Oklahoma. They also want a better crop insurance program.

Instead of building a big dam in Egypt, the farmers feel that the administration should increase the soil conservation program and Agricultural Conservation Service practices, such as terracing, contouring, the building of ponds, the growing of green manure crops, and so forth; and should enact more upstream flood control measures similar to the Sandstone project on the Washita.

Most of the farmers I am privileged to represent feel that the spread between the producer and consumer is much too great. The price the farmer receives for his products continually decreases, while the price of everything he buys or uses increases.

In view of the fact that our small businesses in western Oklahoma are dependent upon the farm situation and farm income, many of these small businesses find themselves in need of loans. National income is always seven times that of the farm income and anything which adversely affects farm income will adversely affect small business, labor, and eventually large business.

The farmers feel that they should be entitled to make an adjustment on their income tax every 5 years and feel that the exemption for each dependent should be increased to $1,000.

There has been considerable talk about surpluses. If the administration had tried as hard to sell surplus commodities in the last 3½ years as it has in the last 3½ weeks, there would be no surplus. Furthermore, the administration has failed to give sufficient consideration to the possibility of nationwide drought. It has failed to give sufficient consideration to the possibility of an emergency such as war. In this respect, the international situation does not look very healthy on about a half dozen fronts. The administration has failed to give sufficient consideration to the possibility of increased need on the part of countries with whom we could trade surpluses for strategic materials. It has also failed to use as much of the surplus as should be used to supply the aged and needy people at home.

Before we become too critical of the surplus situation, we should reread some of the verses of the Bible wherein the country was overtaken by pestilence and suffered 7 years of drought. We should bear this in mind. The Lord has blessed us with a bountiful supply and this supply should be considered a blessing and not a curse.

The general public in western Oklahoma feels that regulation should not be promulgated from Washington, but that any program should be administered by local committees familiar with local conditions. The farmers feel that Benson has erred in prejudicing the so-called consumer public of the cities against the farmers when the truth of the matter is that the farmers are the greatest per capita consumer group. Our farmers, laborers, and businessmen in western Oklahoma feel that the buying of pork—half of which was gravy—from the big packers at 65 cents a pound—when the farmers were only given about 12 cents a pound for that pork—by Secretary Benson, was not only unjust and unfair both to the farmer and the taxpayer, but was simply ridiculous.

Most of the farmers feel that Secretary Benson should be replaced.

To make matters worse for the farmer, the administration is now making an all-out effort to increase REA rates in violation of sacred contracts and against the sound advice of the directors of the various REA co-ops, against the advice of REA co-op board members, and against the advice of Members of Congress. This will place more hardship upon the farmers.

I will vote with the Democratic leadership for this conference agreement. I will vote for it in view of the fact that it does contain the 90 percent of parity feature and even though I doubt the value of the Benson soil-bank plan. Furthermore, it is my sincere belief that the President will not veto this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, although I am not completely satisfied with all of the provisions contained in H. R. 12, I support the Senate and House conferees and I shall vote for adoption of the conference report. In view of the muddied waters in which Congress has been forced to consider our complex agricultural problem, I believe the conferees should be commended

for their efforts in drafting a compromise bill at this time.

Frankly speaking, I am amazed that the conferees were able to do as well as they did with the bill. All things considered, I am further astonished that we are even able to vote on a farm bill at this time. I am astounded because of the conditions under which the proposed bill has been formulated and debated in Congress.

I am astounded because in the course of the last 3 years a considerable volume and variety of political dust has been thrown into the eyes of farmers, consumers, the general public, and Members of Congress. During the last 3 years we have had the privilege of watching a cleverly conceived program of calculated confusion.

The first part of the confusion program was marked by an operation designed to pit consumers against farmers on the subject of Government-owned surpluses. The second phase of operation confusion was to array farmers against labor by blaming workers for declining farm income.

Secretary Benson has skillfully worked both sides of the street in order to create confusion in the minds of farmers, consumers, and the general public. I presume it was intended that some of the confusion should be transmitted by constituents to Members of Congress. I suspect some of the confusion has brushed off on us and thus made it more difficult to consider objectively the present farm bill, H. R. 12.

There is one fact about which we cannot be confused as we consider H. R. 12. This fact cannot be distorted or obscured by political dust. The fact I refer to is that net realized farm income has been declining for some time. Net realized farm income has declined at a time when the income of every other group in the economy has increased to a greater or lesser degree.

In the last 3 years alone net realized farm income has declined 20 percent—or a total of $3.3 billion. Cold statistics show—without dispute—that farmers have been financially hurt; and contrary to the opinion of some people farmers are still hurting. Present USDA forecasts indicate farm income will drop again this year.

It is this grim economic picture of farm income that provides me with my basic reason for voting for H. R. 12. As we now consider the farm bill, I cannot help but recall that 2 years ago the administration and its spokesmen in Congress rushed through—with great speed—another type of aid bill. The bill I refer to contained a provision to give some of our wealthier citizens tax relief on income derived from dividends.

Two years ago the administration took care of the coupon clippers in a hurry. It was hip, hip, and hurrah and the bill was through. The main argument for giving tax relief to the coupon clippers was that this group needed investment money to stimulate our economy. When it comes to farmers, however, the administration is both stubborn and reluctant to act with the same speed and concern. Does the administration feel that farmers do not need income or investment money? Sometimes I feel that the administration does think such is the case.

Specifically speaking, H. R. 12 contains two items of interest to dairy farmers. The first item raises the minimum level of support prices for whole milk and butterfat from the existing minimum level of 75 percent to 80 percent of parity. The maximum support level is still pegged at 90 percent.

The second item in H. R. 12 provides for supporting manufacturing milk at $3.25 per hundredweight and butterfat at $58.6 cents for the market year ending March 31, 1957. The $3.25 per hundredweight support price in H. R. 12 for manufacturing milk—3.95 percent butterfat—is 85 percent of parity as compared to the February 15, 1956, parity equivalent for manufacturing milk. The $3.25 figure is 10 cents higher than the $3.15 support price announced by Secretary Benson on February 14, 1956.

The 58.6 cents a pound support price on butterfat in H. R. 12 is 2.4 cents above the 56.2 cents figure for butterfat in cream announced on February 14, 1956, by Secretary Benson. The 58.6 cent figure works out to 82 percent of parity compared with the announced level of 78 percent on February 14.

H. R. 12, therefore, does represent some improvement on price supports for dairy products. The increased price support for manufacturing milk is for a period of 1 year, the same period as increased price supports for basic commodities.

Dairy farmers have suffered a decline in income during the last 3 years the same as other farmers. Incidentally, since April 1, 1954, dairy price supports have been flexed down to the lowest level by order of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Wisconsin farmers have been particularly hard hit in the last 3 years. National net farm income declined 20 percent in these 3 years as compared to a 30 percent decline in net farm income for Wisconsin. In 1952 total net realized farm income in Wisconsin was $526,100,000. In 1953—the first year in office of the present administration—net realized farm income in Wisconsin was $453,600,000. This represents a decline of $72.5 million over the previous year.

Wisconsin farmers wound up the year of 1954 with another drop in net income. In 1954 net realized farm income in Wisconsin was $402,700,000. The 1954 drop over 1953 farm income for Wisconsin amounted to $50.9 million.

Official USDA statistics on Wisconsin's 1955 net farm income are not available at this time. However, I have employed the same formula used by the USDA in computing its estimates. On the basis of this calculation it appears that Wisconsin's net farm income dropped another $25 million to $35 million in 1955.

The 3-year total drop in net farm income for Wisconsin ranges from $148.4 million to $158.4 million. This sum of money was not spent with our Main Street merchants because the farmers did not have it to spend.

I wonder how concerned the administration would be if 148,000 coupon clippers had each suffered a $1,000 income cut over the last 3 years. On the basis of the administration's past record, I am sure it would be very much concerned. Perhaps the administration would throw another dividend tax-relief bill in the hopper.

Aside from the income factor, the Nation's dairy farmers have been hurt in another way during the last 3 years. On January 1, 1952, the value of the Nation's dairy herds was $5.8 billion. On January 1, 1956, the value of dairy herds was $3.2 billion. This means that dairy farmers have $2.6 billion less collateral to offer when they go to banks and other lending agencies to borrow money.

Dairy farmers in Wisconsin are obviously not buying Cadillacs—and, for that matter, they have never been able to buy Cadillacs.

Earlier I mentioned that a great deal of political dust had been thrown into the eyes of consumers, farmers, and the general public on the farm problem. Some of the political dust has been blown up on the subject of agricultural surpluses.

At this point I wish to keep the record straight on the amount of dairy surpluses inherited by the present administration. On January 19, 1953—which was the last day in office for the former administration—the total value of dairy surpluses held by Commodity Credit Corporation was $34,627,000. This proves conclusively that the present administration did not inherit huge and unwieldly stocks of dairy surpluses.

Secretary Benson constantly declares in his speeches that the present agricultural surpluses are the result of programs inaugurated under laws passed by the previous administration. The former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles Brannan, operated his Department with the same laws.

Mr. Brannan did not spend as much time as Secretary Benson has in talking about surpluses. In numerous speeches—from coast to coast and border to border—Secretary Benson has plaintively talked about surpluses. Perhaps the reason that the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, did not talk so much about surpluses was that the United States Department of Agriculture spent more time on marketing and disposing surpluses.

H. R. 12 contains provisions for a soil bank program—a program that the administration discovered early this year and has adopted with a fanfare of publicity. This is interesting because last year I was one of several Members of Congress introducing a soil bank bill.

Last year the soil bank bill did not appeal to the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration. Since last year the administration has had a change of heart and mind. The administration's change of mind was publicly made obvious when thousands of dollars were spent late in February by the National Republican senatorial and congressional committees for newspaper, radio, and TV advertising.

In the Ninth Wisconsin District—which I represent—approximately $1,600

was spent for newspaper ads and from $500 to $1,000 on radio advertising.

The ad in Successful Farming cost $8,000. I do not know how much the advertising blitz cost in other districts, but I imagine this ad program cost at least $250,000. This is the first time to my knowledge that a political party ever engaged in lobbying while Congress was in session.

The ads furnished more political dust over the farm problem. For example, the ads led farmers to believe that if Congress passed the soil bank bill by spring planting time hundreds of millions of dollars would be paid out to farmers. This was a deceptive appeal because no explanation was made that this would not be additional income to recoup previous declines in income. The ads did not inform farmers that the payments would only be replacement income for participating in the soil bank program.

In the 9th Wisconsin district the ads were clearly deceptive in that farmers in my district can only participate to a limited degree in the proposed soil bank program. Farmers in the 9th District of Wisconsin do not raise much in the way of basic crops; therefore they are not able to participate in the acreage reserve program.

The only place where farmers in my district can participate in the soil bank program is under the conservation reserve feature—and even that participation would be on small scale. The ad, then, was clearly political dust in the Ninth Wisconsin District—and on the basis of the limited returns sent to my office I believe farmers in my district recognized it as such.

We are told now through the medium of press conferences that the administration is opposed to H. R. 12 because it is a bad bill. Last year the administration opposed the soil-bank program. This year the same administration includes the soil bank plan in its nine-point farm program. Another item in the administration's nine-point farm program that it did not favor in the past was the gas tax refund for farmers on farm consumed gasoline.

I am beginning to wonder just how reliable the administration's judgment is on farm legislation. Is there any reason to assume that the administration's judgment is any better with respect to H. R. 12? When will the administration realize that the farm situation is critical and that it requires something more concrete and positive than newspaper ads?

I believe the farm situation is critical, and that is why I am supporting H. R. 12.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the conference report on H. R. 12, and I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture who served on the conference committee and who have worked so faithfully to give to us the chance to vote for a measure that I believe will be helpful to the farmers of America. It is needless for me to stress here the points with which all of us are so familiar. We all realize that the farmer's income has been steadily dropping and that this year the total net farmer income will probably be only $10.5 billion. We also realize the fact that the farmers cannot be expected to go it alone and must have the continuing patient concern of Government, because all other segments of the economy are organized. The farmer is faced with spiraling costs and he pays more and more for what he buys, but gets less and less for what he sells. We are familiar with the fact that this year the farmer will get only 39 cents of the consumer's dollar and that fact represents to me what is probably the most important single problem facing the farmer. That is, how can he get a fair share of the consumer's dollar?

I used to think that when farm commodities were in great abundance, you could expect the farmer not to get very much for his product and that the consumer would get a break in the market and the costs for farm commodities would be decreased. This is not true, however, and in my own district, the Eighth District of Florida, last year when our farmers could not give watermelons away for week after week, the price continued to be 5 cents a pound in the market here in Washington. That is one reason, Mr. Speaker, I have consistently voted for 90 percent price supports on the basic commodities, for section 32 funds to help livestock producers and the producers of vegetables and other perishable commodities, and for our various marketing agreements which have proved to be so helpful to our farmers. These programs, I sincerely believe, are fair also to the consumer. If I had the time, I could present a most convincing case to show that although the storage costs on our farm commodities which are in surplus represent, naturally, an expense to the taxpayer, that in the overall picture the presence of this surplus offsets a scarcity scare, decreases speculation, and, in my humble opinion, is responsible for saving the consumer many billions of dollars each year. I should like to refer again, as I did last year, to the coffee scarcity scare when the consumers in America in just a few short months had to spend approximately a billion and a half dollars more for coffee because, I think chiefly, the speculators took advantage of the scarcity scare.

I shall not discuss anymore at length the philosophy of the farm program, but I want to repeat again my appreciation for the conferees who have worked so effectively to give us this chance to help the farmers of America.

I should like to stress again that in this conference report that we are considering, we return to the 90-percent price supports on the basic crops and we permit an authorization of an annual appropriation of $500 million to supplement operations under section 32 which helps farmers who produce perishable crops and, in fact, I think in these two programs we find opportunities for aid to each type of farmer in America. I believe these programs give us the only practical opportunity that is afforded us to give the farmer a fair share of the consumer's dollar and yet, at the same time, to be fair to the consumer. I repeat again this great problem of the farmer getting a fair share of the consumer's dollar is to me the most urgent problem facing the friends of farmers today.

The Soil Bank Act is divided into two parts: the acreage-reserve program and the conservation-reserve program. The acreage-reserve program is designed to curtail production of specified commodities even below the anticipated production from allotment programs. It applies to wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, most kinds of tobacco and the feed grains—oats, rye, barley, grains, sorghums, and corn grown in noncommercial corn areas. This program is to last for only 4 crop years, including the present 1956 crop. The objective of this program is to induce farmers to reduce their acreage below their allotments or base acreages and to make no other use of the land so retired. I am particularly pleased that the small farmers, those with small acreage allotments, may have a chance to put all their allotment into the acreage reserve, while those with larger allotments will be limited to a maximum percentage of their allotment. I am particularly concerned with the plight of the small farmers of America because I believe in the Jeffersonian concept of the desirability of land ownership. I believe in preserving the family-type farm in America because it is as necessary to preserve our Republic as any other unit in this great country of ours. I am pleased that I have the honor at the present time to be a member of the Small Farm Committee, which is a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture.

I regret that the conferees struck out of the Senate amendment the provision which would have limited payments to any one producer not to exceed $25,000. I believe that the great emphasis on our farm program should be help to the small size farm. I am particularly pleased that the conference report makes special provision in case of unusual weather conditions resulting from drought, flood, hail, wind, or other natural causes. I have just returned from my Eighth District of Florida and conditions are alarmingly similar to Dust Bowl conditions in the Far West. We have been without normal rainfall for 2 years and our tobacco and other crops are in danger of total destruction. I feel that not only should these unusual weather conditions be taken into consideration in granting more favorable terms to our farmers, but that also all redtape administrative rulings should be resolved in favor of the farmer whenever there is the slightest question of a doubt. In my own district there are 6,000 flue-cured farmers whose very livelihood is dependent on flue-cured tobacco. They should be permitted the maximum of leeway in carrying out combination of allotments in order to provide for irrigation and to make it possible for some of them to cooperate and make a cash crop that is so essential to them. All of our farmers, our livestock producers, our vegetable producers, I repeat, should be

granted the very maximum of consideration now in the face of drought conditions prevailing in my part of the country, as well as in other sections and also in light of the depressed farm income which is common throughout the Nation.

I am pleased that the conferees have taken out the Senate amendment which would have denied all price supports to a producer who did not participate in the acreage reserve. I think we should stress to our farmers this fact. I have always believed in voluntary compliance, but, of course, I know we all realize that there are other provisions in our agricultural laws which protect farmers who live up to their obligations as against some few who might not desire to do so.

The conservation-reserve program is the other part of the soil-bank program and is designed to take out of production of crops and put into a conservation state on a semipermanent basis certain acreages of land. This program may be participated in by all farmers. The acreage-reserve program applies only to specified commodities but the conservation program is an overall opportunity for farmers of America. This program would be for a period of not less than 3 years nor more than 10, except for forest areas where the period could run for 15 years. I regret in this program also that a provision in the Senate bill which would have limited payments in any year to any producer to not more than $7,500 was removed. I feel again that this limitation of payment is most desirable. The conservation reserve, it should be emphasized, is also a voluntary program and there is no required participation as a condition of eligibility for price support. I think this is most desirable and I want to commend the conference committee for doing this, but at the same time recognizing the particular problem that faces our livestock producers. Under the soil-bank program it is likely that millions of acres now in crops will be put into grass. Although the contract signed by the producer placing his acreage into the soil bank will prohibit the using of land for grazing except under emergency conditions and with the permission of the Secretary of Agriculture, it is most important that the Secretary of Agriculture utilizes what I consider to be adequate legal provision relating to contract violation which remain in the bill and which I think will help our livestock producers. We must be very careful in our farm program not to legislate for one segment of the farm economy and against the other. I think that we have in this bill an opportunity to vote for all segments of our agricultural economy as well as for the consumer. I think each year that the soil-bank program is in operation we should be very careful to check and double check the problems of livestock producers to see that those participating in the soil-bank program are not competing with the livestock producers as a result of the program. I promise my wholehearted concern to this program and my determination to try in every way possible to help our livestock producers solve this problem.

The participation of our farmers in the soil-bank program in both the acreage reserve portion and the conservation reserve portion will depend, of course, on a proper incentive. In the case of the acreage reserve, depending on varying conditions, a farmer will be given from $100 to $300 an acre to cut out a portion of his tobacco crop, he will be given from $48 to $60 an acre on cotton and from $50 to $70 an acre on peanuts. I think the Secretary of Agriculture will have to be as liberal as the law permits in order to provide the inducement for farmers to participate in the soil-bank program. I am pleased that the conference report will permit farmers who already have planted their crops to participate in the acreage reserve program by plowing up these crops. I want to refer again to the severe drought conditions prevailing in my district and in many parts of the country. It is entirely possible that if we proceed now with full speed ahead many of our farmers will find help in this trying period that they are facing.

The conference report in authorizing an appropriation of $500 million annually for section 32 funds proves again, I think, that we are interested in all of our farmers. Many of our people do not realize that these section 32 funds are a tremendous help to those who are interested in perishable commodities. In an address that I delivered to the House last year, I pointed out that actually up to that time more money had been spent from section 32 funds to help the producers of perishable commodities than had been spent on price support programs for the basic commodities.

Other excellent provisions of the conference report include the establishing of a commission to recommend legislation providing for increased industrial use of agricultural products, the donation to penal and correctional institutions from our surplus food supplies, the prohibition of the use of Federal irrigation, draining and flood-control projects for a period of 3 years to produce surplus crops, the authorization of a more liberal policy in the processing of donated food commodities, the establishment of a special national acreage reserve of a hundred thousand acres of cotton to help particularly our small farmers, a forestry program which I think will be particularly helpful to my section of Florida where industry is based largely on the pine tree, and other provisions that I shall not enumerate.

Full speed ahead, Mr. Speaker. Let us approve this conference report and tell the farmers of America that we have not deserted them. Time is of the essence. Let no man be guilty of a delay which will mean more misery and despair to farmers of America.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, we are all agreed that farm income and farm prices must be raised. The valiant work of our farm-bill conferees has given Members of this body an opportunity to put more money in the farmers' pockets—and to do it immediately.

We have a chance to place major crops back under 90-percent-of-parity price supports and to peg milk prices at a 10-cent increase per hundredweight over present levels. All in all, we can stiffen price props under 10 different farm commodities.

I do not see how any Member who has at heart the welfare of the American farmer can vote against this conference report. In fact, I do not see how any Member who has at heart the welfare of the American worker or the American businessman can vote against it. Farm prosperity is the foundation of prosperity for us all.

Mr. Speaker, the net income of the American farmer has gone down $3 billion since the Republicans came into office. It fell a cool billion dollars last year.

DAIRY LOSSES STAGGERING

The American dairy industry has lost almost a billion dollars since April 1, 1954, when Secretary of Agriculture Benson dropped dairy price supports from 90 to 75 percent of parity. Milk producers in my State of Idaho have lost $14 million since that fateful April Fool's Day. Milk producers in a single creamery in my home county—the Dairymen's Co-op Creamery of Boise Valley—have lost almost $2 million in 21 months.

On top of the loss in milk income, Idaho dairy cows have decreased in value approximately $75 a head. This means an additional loss of about $18 million to our dairy farmers—a staggering loss for one group in one small State.

SURPLUSES GO UP UNDER GOP

You have all heard the argument that reducing the support level on farm commodities, and particularly on dairy products, would reduce production. Many of us thought it would never work, and now we know it will not.

As prices dropped, farmers had to produce more to meet their obligations. Thus, lower flexible price supports have not only hit farmers in their pocketbooks, but have helped build up the surpluses about which the Republican administration constantly complains.

Nearly all of the farm surpluses have accumulated since the Republicans took office. For example, there is 61 times as much butter stored in Government warehouses today as there was in 1952. There is 11 times as much barley in storage, 3 times as much corn, 2½ times as much wheat, almost 5 times as much oats, and 3 times as many soybeans.

At the time Mr. Benson dropped dairy price supports it was forecast that lower milk prices would mean increased milk consumption. This argument has been exploded. Although milk production has increased 3 billion pounds in the last 2 years, the per capita milk consumption has gone up less than 1 percent.

IDAHO FARM PRICES SAGGING

Mr. Speaker, people on Idaho's family-size farms are literally being pressed to the wall by prices they have to take for their products today. Let me read you some of these prices compared to those our Idaho farmers were receiving in

January 1953, when the Republicans took the helm in Washington:

	Unit	Inauguration (Jan. 15, 1953)	Now (Feb. 15, 1956)
Wheat	Bushel	$1.94	$1.83
Rye	do	1.70	1.20
Corn	do	1.80	1.55
Oats	do	.92	.66
Barley	do	1.34	.88
Potatoes	do	1.45	.85
Beans, dry, edible	Hundredweight	7.90	5.70
Milk	do	4.40	3.55
Hogs	do	18.80	12.60
Beef cattle	do	20.10	12.90
Veal calves	do	21.90	16.50
Milk cows	Per head	230.00	155.00
Eggs	Dozen	.490	.350

No wonder farm real estate mortgage debt is up 29 percent over last year, and the number of farm loans has increased 9 percent.

FARMERS CAUGHT IN SQUEEZE

Farmers in Idaho and elsewhere are caught in a gigantic squeeze between falling farm prices and high costs of production and family living expenses. Parity—which measures the relationship between farm prices and costs—has fallen to a 14-year low.

With average per capita farm income at $865 as against a national average for nonfarm people of $1,913, it is easy to see what is happening to farm buying power. Nearly one-third of the total farm income comes from nonfarm sources. Some member of the family has to work off the farm to keep the family on the farm. It is not suprising that a million farmers left their farms last year.

If the Republican flexible price support program had helped the consumer there might be some excuse for it. But we all know that food prices in retail stores have changed very little. And it is an unhappy fact that the farmer is getting an even smaller share of the consumer's food dollar than he was before price supports were lowered. At inauguration time in 1953, the farmer got about 47 cents out of each consumer's dollar; today he gets only 38 cents.

In many instances, there is absolutely no relationship between what the farmer gets and the consumer pays. Ten years ago when wheat was bringing $3 a bushel, bread cost approximately 13 cents a pound. Today, wheat brings $2 a bushel, yet a pound loaf of bread costs about 18 cents.

During the past year the price of live hogs has dropped 38 percent. Yet pork chops have dropped only 14 cents a pound.

If the drop in farm prices is not helping the consumer, who is it helping? Well, we know for one thing there has been a rise in the profits of many food processors. Meat packers, for example, have showed a big income gain.

WHO IS BEING SUBSIDIZED?

Twenty years of farm price supports under the Democrats, with basic crops supported at 90 to over 100 percent of parity, cost about a billion dollars. The bulk of this loss was on nonbasics.

In the 2½ years under the Republicans, with flexible, or lower, price supports in effect during part of that time, our price-support program has cost us over $1½ billion—or more than it cost during 20 Democratic years.

Everybody admits that our farm price-support program has been expensive. But it has never reached more than a fraction of the payments made to industry to enable it to reconvert after the war. A subsidy study prepared by the House Agriculture Committee, which was published in January 1954, showed that business had received almost 40 times as much in subsidies as agriculture had.

SOIL BANK IS TOO SLOW

The Eisenhower administration paid little attention to the farmer's plight until someone in the White House got a 1956 calendar and remembered this is election year. Then they trotted out the soil bank to rescue the farmer with cash payments, and they spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on newspaper ads and radio announcements to urge Congress to vote for these payments before planting time. The fact that the Republican administration turned down two soil bank bills by Democratic Congressmen last year makes many of us wonder whether the Republicans are more concerned with the harvesting of crops or the harvesting of votes.

I think all of us agree that the soil bank has merit as a long-range panacea for some of our farm ills—but the emergency is here and now.

The only new proposal the administration has made this year to help the farmer is to exempt fuel used on the farms from Federal gasoline tax. I was happy to support this bill. I cannot resist pointing out, however, that this proposal also came in a leap year—when the Republicans became strangely liberal. The administration actually opposed this same proposal a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, last session—May 3, 1955—I spoke and voted in favor of a bill to increase dairy supports and to replace flexible price supports with firm 90-percent-of-parity supports on basic commodities. As we all know, the House passed that bill, but the Senate took no action. A year has rolled by and the American farmer is in deeper trouble. His trouble is spreading to others.

THE PRESTON STORY

Mr. Speaker, one of the best arguments for passing this bill lies in what has happened in Secretary of Agriculture Benson's native town, Preston, Idaho. Secretary Benson was born a couple of miles from Preston, which is the Franklin County seat, and grew up there. He later served as county agricultural agent.

Preston is a typical southeastern Idaho community of about 3,500 people. It is surrounded by highly diversified farms which raise wheat, sugar beets, vegetables, feed, cattle, hogs, poultry, and is a dairying center. The business houses depend almost entirely upon farm trade for their existence.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years 9 major businesses have failed in Preston, a department store, 2 large grocery stores, 2 hardware stores, an automobile agency selling a low-priced popular car, an electronics shop, a sweet shop, and a cafe. The city dads are so worried they have taken out the parking meters in an effort to get the farm folks to come to town and shop.

The Federal Land Bank in Preston reports they did a land office business last year—making the largest number of loans in their history, with an enormous increase in mortgages on family-sized farms.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening in Preston, Idaho, is happening in farm communities throughout the Nation. And we all know that when farm buying power goes down, business failures soar and unemployment lines form. A farm recession is like an octopus—it reaches out and drags us all in.

Again I repeat—with net farm income down $3 billion since 1952, and with small business failures up, there is not a single Member of this body who can afford to vote for less than 90 percent of parity—and it should be 100 percent.

The Preston story is like a scarecrow in the field—a warning to both the Congress and the administration.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, like nearly every other Member of the House who represents a substantial agricultural district, I have followed the developments on H. R. 12 through this House in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, and more recently the deliberation by the other body of Congress, both in the Agriculture Committee and when it was on the floor for amendment and debate. Also through the members of the conference committee I have kept abreast of the deliberations of the House and the Senate conferees in formulating the conference report now before the House.

I do not take the position that it is by any means a perfect bill, nor that it is a complete answer to the many agricultural problems existing in northeast Kansas. I do feel, however, that it offers the best possible opportunity for improving the agricultural economy in my district, and I am going to vote for the adoption of the conference report.

On the matter of parity, my colleagues from the Middle Western States are familiar with the provisions of H. R. 9861, which I recently introduced providing for what is known as a graduated parity on the basic agricultural commodities. I firmly believe that legislation providing for graduated parity as proposed in H. R. 9861, or others similar to it, would be for the best interests of the overall agricultural economy. I also believe that such provision is economically sound and I will continue to support such legislation. I further feel that such parity provision carries more of the benefit to the individual farmer than does rigid 90-percent parity, and at the same time incorporates the advantages of flexible parity now in effect by reducing the incentive on high production. I do feel, however, that supplemental income is mandatory for agriculture in 1956, and the provisions of the conference report now before us appears to be the only alternative.

I further feel that the conference report is remiss in not taking into account the voluntary reduction of basic crops that has taken place, especially on the smaller farms. This has had the effect of lower basic allotments than would normally have occurred, and which have been further reduced in view of our recent surpluses. On the small farms the resulting allotments have become so low that it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain a sound economic farm unit. Continuing on this basis of allotments, we are penalizing the farmers who have adopted good farming practices and favoring the operator who continued to keep every acre possible planted to a cereal crop.

On the matter of domestic parity for wheat, I am willing to present the matter to the farmers for their approval as provided in this conference report, but I seriously question that it will work to the advantage of the First District of Kansas if it is approved by referendum.

Although the $100,000 limitation placed in the bill by the Senate on the amount of a commodity credit loan available to any one operator was not realistic, at least it was a step in the right direction. I regret this deletion was made by the conference committee, as it appears evident to me the program over the years has been most favorable to the big operator at the expense of the family-size farm. In my opinion the maximum commodity credit loan should not have exceeded $50,000, and more probably $25,000 would have been a realistic limitation.

As stated before, however, I am going to vote for the passage of the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], vice chairman of our great committee.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The bill as it passed the Senate contained what is known as the Chavez amendment which would increase the acreage of growers of Valencia and Virginia peanuts. The report makes no mention of it but I know that the amendment was deleted by the conferees. I have been advised as to the reasons for it. Will the gentleman please tell the House for the record the thinking of the conferees in eliminating that particular amendment?

Mr. POAGE. The conferees understood, and we do understand, that the Secretary has that power now. The general law gives him the right to add acreage any time if there is a shortage of any type of peanuts. That includes the Valencia. He has a right to increase the acreage of Valencias any time he wants to.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. There is a shortage of Valencia peanuts and Virginia peanuts at the present time. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to try to clear up 1 or 2 misunderstandings that seem to have arisen in the course of this debate. There has been a great deal of discussion here about what we are trying to accomplish. It seems that there is considerable misunderstanding of what we are trying to accomplish by this legislation.

We are endeavoring in this bill to give some type of aid to our farmers. We are not trying in this bill primarily to reduce Government expenditures although we want to reduce Government expenditures everywhere we can. We are with this bill trying to pass a measure to help the farmers of America. You cannot help the farmers of America simply by taking some more of their land out of cultivation, even though you pay them for the loss they sustain on the land that you take out of production because that merely leaves the farmers where they were financially.

If you have nothing but the soil bank, if you have nothing in the bill except what the motion to recommit would leave in the bill, you will, it is true, have a provision in for the expenditure of $1,200 million that is the cost of the soil bank, but it will not be $1,200 million of added income to farmers. It will be $1,200 million of replacement of money that you have taken away from the farmers. So if you simply pass this motion to recommit you will burden the taxpayers with that amount of additional taxes, new and additional over and above what we have already. You may, it is true, use this money to pay the farmer for the crops he was unable to produce because of placing his land in the soil bank, but you have added nothing to farm income. The only way you can help the farmers is to add to their income. This conference report as it stands adds to their income. The motion to recommit would add nothing.

There is this misunderstanding about whom we are trying to help. The conferees want to help the farmers. As to the motion to recommit, I do not know whom it will help. It will not help the taxpayers. It will add more than a billion dollars to their burden. It alone will not help the farmers. It will spend more tax money but it will not put more money in the farmers' pockets.

Then there was the implication that this bill did nothing to reduce surpluses. Actually, for the first time in our farm history we have a bill brought before us that has an effective way of reducing the production of corn and feed grains. As the gentleman representing the minority told you, the corn farmers have not complied in the past. Why? Because it was not to their financial interest to stay within their acreage allotments. They are just like everybody else. They do the thing they consider to their own interest. Under this bill the corn farmer is going to get paid if he complies with his allotments, not only for putting his land in the soil bank but also he is assured 90 percent of parity price support on his corn in return for his acreage reduction. I think he will reduce his production because he will decide it is profitable to do so.

And what about the feed grain farmer? He has got to reduce his acreage by 15 percent in order to get anything under this bill. This feed grain farmer that we were told about who has been producing a surplus unquestionably is going to have some inducement to reduce his acreage in feed grains. This is the first time we have ever offered him any such inducement. On the other hand, if we should vote to reject this conference report and accept the motion by the gentleman from Massachusetts, we would have absolutely nothing to encourage anybody to reduce his feed grain acreage. Thus at the same time we are giving the farmers of America hope of a fair price. We are giving to the taxpayers of America hope that we will have a better balance in our production. By this bill we offer something to the farmer for reducing, and that is the way to get reduction, that is, the way we ought to get reduction is to offer your farmer something which is to his advantage to reduce, and that is what this bill does. This is what we have so often overlooked. We have said "Go on and reduce and get nothing in return." That is unfair. This bill tries to correct that.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that in the past we have always been able to secure reductions when we have been willing to give the farmer a reasonable return for making reductions, but when we have reduced our support prices we have found we did not get those reductions in production. When the present Secretary of Agriculture became Secretary there was a net profit of $13 million in the price-support account of six basic commodities. Today we have lower supports but there is a loss of more than half a billion on these same commodities. He reduced the support on dairy products, and he sustained a loss of $830 million on dairy products within the past 3 years.

In other words, the lesson of history is clear. If you want to assure that we will bring a balance of production and demand, provide for our farmers a reasonable return on what you allow them to grow, and you can get that balance. We have done it throughout the years in the past. When we ignore that fundamental law of human nature and attempt to require the farmer to reduce without giving him anything in return, we then get more, not less, production. The farmer has no recourse in the face of falling prices except to increase his volume of production or face a lower standard of living.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. LOVRE. I want to commend the gentleman and all the conferees for a job well done.

May I ask the gentleman this question? Is it not true that today, with the average hourly rate of pay for labor, you can buy more food than at any other time in the history of our country?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly true. And it is also true that when these gentlemen talk about raising the price of bread because perchance we are trying to give the wheat farmer a livelihood they say nothing of the fact that the price of wheat has dropped approximately one-third in the last 10 years and the price of bread has gone up by just about the same figure. Surely there has

been little relation between the farmer's price and the consumer's price.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the House knows that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has been in the forefront of the fight for agriculture all these years. I want to say, too, that anybody who votes for the motion to recommit here today will be voting to take away $2 billion at least in gross income to the American farmer. And if they do that, let them vote their own conscience.

Mr. POAGE. They will indeed be voting to take away somewhere around $2 billion of income to the American farmer and at the same time adding the $1,200 million of additional cost to the taxpayers without any compensating return to the farmers of America. It is just bad arithmetic; it is just bad public policy to try to do that sort of thing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time, 4 minutes, to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as one who does not have a farm in his district I think I can view this proposed legislation and other farm legislation from a purely objective angle. I see 165 million Americans. I see a great Nation consisting of 48 States, north, east, south, and west, with their diverse problems, but all Americans and all interested in the national interest and in the welfare of our country and our people.

I know that the history of depressions of the past 150 years has shown that they start first when there is a depressed financial condition among our farmers and in our agricultural communities. I know that when we find our farmers depressed economically, no matter how plentiful positions may be in the factories and in the cities, it is only a matter of a year or 2 years when the reduced purchasing power of the farmers has an effect upon the worker in the factory, the result being unemployment and economic distress in the cities.

We cannot separate the farmers from the workers nor the workers from the farmers. Anyone who makes such an appeal engages in what I have termed heretofore economic bigotry, arraying American against American because of a difference of residence, so far as the sections of our country are concerned; arraying Americans against Americans because of their economic income, arraying Americans toiling on the soil against those who toil in the factory.

We have one national economy. We are not going to solve the farm problem by reducing the wages of the workers in the factory. This is an overall picture. The man who lives in the city and the man who works in the factory may not realize it, but his security of employment is linked up with the economic prosperity of our farmers and the farmer's economic prosperity is linked up with the security of position of the worker in the factory and in the city.

The decline in the farm income during the past 3 or 4 years is a grave problem not only to the farmer but to our economy as a whole. We know that during the last 3 or 4 years there has been a decline of at least $1 billion a year in the net income of our agricultural community. I know as a student of depressions in our country that that is not a healthy sign. I know it is only a matter of time when there will be a catchup in the cities. I know as a matter of national policy we have to do something to keep a dynamic agriculture. I know that the farmer buys in a protected market and sells his agricultural surpluses in an unprotected market.

I recognize and I support, as do other Members, proper protection for our industries, but proper protection for them has an effect upon our agricultural community. Speaking for myself, I recognize the fact that in this day and era, with our intense economic system and with distance eliminated in the world through the rapidity of travel, there must be some compensating considerations to our farmers in order for America to keep an active and dynamic agriculture.

This bill is not perfect, no, but under the circumstances as I see them, it is about the best bill the House conferees could produce and bring to this body. I hope the motion to recommit will be defeated and the conference report agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of April 9, the previous question on the conference report is considered as ordered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARTIN moves to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the following:

1. Amend section 101 by striking "90 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "not less than 82½ percent."

2. Amend section 103 to read:

"The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at not less than 80 percent nor more than 90 percent of the parity price therefor using a parity equivalent for manufacturing milk based on the 30-month period July 1946 to December 1948, both inclusive'."

3. Strike section 104.

4. Strike subsection (d) of section 408.

5. Strike all of title V.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Since the motion to recommit applies to several titles and sections of the bill, is it possible under the rules of the House to get a separate vote on the various amendments that seek to strike certain matter from the bill?

The SPEAKER. A motion to recommit is not subject to division.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from North Carolina in that request.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 238, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—181

Adair	Frelinghuysen	Ostertag
Alger	Fulton	Patterson
Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Pelly
Allen, Ill.	Gubser	Philbin
Arends	Gwinn	Phillips
Ashley	Hale	Pillion
Auchincloss	Haley	Poff
Ayres	Halleck	Prouty
Baker	Hand	Quigley
Baldwin	Harden	Radwan
Bass, N. H.	Harrison, Nebr.	Ray
Bates	Harvey	Reece, Tenn.
Baumhart	Hayworth	Reed, N. Y.
Beamer	Henderson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Becker	Herlong	Riehlman
Bentley	Heselton	Robsion, Ky.
Betts	Hess	Rogers, Mass.
Boland	Hiestand	Sadlak
Bolton, Frances P.	Hill	St. George
	Hillings	Saylor
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hinshaw	Schenck
	Hoffman, Ill.	Scherer
Bosch	Hoffman, Mich.	Schwengel
Bow	Holmes	Scrivner
Bray	Holt	Scudder
Brown, Ohio	Hosmer	Seely-Brown
Brownson	Hyde	Sheehan
Broyhill	Jackson	Short
Budge	James	Siler
Bush	Jenkins	Simpson, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.	Johansen	Simpson, Pa.
Canfield	Judd	Smith, Wis.
Carrigg	Kean	Taber
Cederberg	Kearney	Taylor
Chenoweth	Kearns	Teague, Calif.
Chiperfield	Keating	Thompson, Mich.
Church	Kilburn	
Clevenger	King, Pa.	Thomson, Wyo.
Cole	Knox	Udall
Corbett	Laird	Utt
Coudert	Latham	Van Pelt
Cramer	Lipscomb	Van Zandt
Cretella	McConnell	Velde
Crumpacker	McCulloch	Vorys
Cunningham	McDonough	Vursell
Curtis, Mass.	McGregor	Wainwright
Curtis, Mo.	McIntire	Westland
Dague	Macdonald	Wharton
Davis, Wis.	Mack, Ill.	Widnall
Dawson, Utah	Mack, Wash.	Wigglesworth
Derounian	Mailliard	Williams, N. J.
Devereux	Martin	Williams, N. Y.
Dixon	Mason	Wilson, Calif.
Dondero	Meader	Wilson, Ind.
Donohue	Merrow	Withrow
Dorn, N. Y.	Miller, Md.	Wolcott
Ellsworth	Miller, N. Y.	Wolverton
Fenton	Minshall	Yates
Fino	Morano	Young
Fjare	Mumma	Younger
Fogarty	Nicholson	
Ford	Norblad	

NAYS—238

Abbitt	Bennett, Fla.	Cannon
Abernethy	Bennett, Mich.	Carlyle
Addonizio	Berry	Carnahan
Albert	Blatnik	Celler
Alexander	Blitch	Chase
Andersen, H. Carl	Boggs	Chatham
	Bolling	Chelf
Andresen, August H.	Bonner	Christopher
	Bowler	Chudoff
Andrews	Boykin	Clark
Anfuso	Boyle	Colmer
Ashmore	Brooks, La.	Cooley
Aspinall	Brooks, Tex.	Coon
Avery	Brown, Ga.	Cooper
Bailey	Buckley	Davidson
Barden	Burdick	Davis, Ga.
Barrett	Burleson	Davis, Tenn.
Bass, Tenn.	Burnside	Dawson, Ill.
Belcher	Byrd	Deane
Bell	Byrne, Pa.	Delaney

Dempsey
Denton
Dies
Diggs
Dingell
Dodd
Dollinger
Dolliver
Donovan
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
George
Granahan
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gross
Hagen
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Healey
Hébert
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Holtzman
Hope
Horan
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Karsten
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knutson
Krueger
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
LeCompte
Lesinski
Long
Lovre
McCarthy
McCormack
McDowell
McMillan
Machrowicz
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Metcalf
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Perkins
Pfost
Pilcher
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Rains
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Talle
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Tuck
Tumulty
Vanik
Vinson
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Winstead
Wright
Zablocki
Zelenko

NOT VOTING—14

Gamble
Gentry
Gordon
Grant
Johnson, Calif.
McVey
Miller, Calif.
Mollohan
Nelson
O'Hara, Minn.
Osmers
Powell
Scott
Tollefson

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnson of California for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Tollefson against.

Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Grant against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. McVey for, with Mr. Mollohan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gentry with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. COUDERT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 237, nays 181, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—237

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Avery
Bailey
Baker
Barden
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Baumhart
Beamer
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Bolling
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Bowler
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Budge
Burdick
Burleson
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Celler
Chase
Chatham
Chelf
Chenoweth
Christopher
Chudoff
Colmer
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Cunningham
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Dempsey
Denton
Dies
Diggs
Dingell
Dollinger
Dolliver
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Edmondson
Elliott
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Garmatz
Gathings
George
Granahan
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gross
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hayworth
Healey
Henderson
Hill
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Hope
Horan
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Karsten
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Keogh
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knutson
Krueger
Landrum
Lanham
Lankford
LeCompte
Lesinski
Long
Lovre
McCarthy
McCormack
McDowell
McMillan
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Metcalf
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Passman
Patman
Perkins
Pfost
Pilcher
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Quigley
Rabaut
Rains
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Schenck
Schwengel
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Sisk
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Springer
Steed
Sullivan
Talle
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Tuck
Tumulty
Vanik
Vinson
Watts
Weaver
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—181

Alger
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Arends
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baldwin
Bass, N. H.
Bates
Becker
Bentley
Betts
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bosch
Brownson
Broyhill
Burnside
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carrigg
Cederberg
Chiperfield
Church
Clark
Clevenger
Cole
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cretella
Crumpacker
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Delaney
Derounian
Devereux
Dixon
Dodd
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Ellsworth
Engle
Fallon
Fascell
Fenton
Fino
Fjare
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gary
Gavin
Gubser
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Haley
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Harrison, Va.
Hébert
Herlong
Heselton
Hess
Hiestand
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Hosmer
Hyde
Jackson
James
Johansen
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kelly, N. Y.
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Knox
Laird
Lane
Latham
Lipscomb
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McIntire
Macdonald
Mack, Wash.
Mailliard
Martin
Mason
Meader
Merrow
Miller, N. Y.
Minshall
Morano
Mumma
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Neill
Ostertag
Patterson
Pelly
Philbin
Phillips
Pillion
Poff
Prouty
Radwan
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Robeson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Scherer
Scrivener
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Sheehan
Short
Siler
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Staggers
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, Mich.
Thomson, Wyo.
Udall
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Walter
Westland
Wharton
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. J.
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Calif.
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Yates
Young
Younger

NOT VOTING—15

Gamble
Gentry
Gordon
Grant
Johnson, Calif.
McVey
Miller, Calif.
Mollohan
Nelson
O'Hara, Minn.
Osmers
Powell
Richards
Scott
Tollefson

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Johnson of California against.

Mr. Tollefson for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. Grant for, with Mr. Osmers against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. McVey against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gentry with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. SHORT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOMEN'S PREFERENCES IN HOMES

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, no mere man, at least none of my acquaintance, has the temerity to state unequivocally that he is fully acquainted with the thought processes of woman. One of our colleagues, less timorous than

most and certainly more vocal, indicates that what women think, particularly with regard to the choice of a home they wish to occupy, is "silly and useless."

Many things women are: frugal, imaginative, perceptive, sometimes stubborn, and loquacious. They are not, as a gender, silly or useless, nor are the benefits we have all enjoyed as fruits of the feminine thought processes.

I commend Housing Administrator Cole for venturing into the uncharted thought processes of women's preferences in homes, and admire his courage. This is said with no thought of levity as I sincerely believe that a conclave of 100 women, as is contemplated in the program of a Women's Housing Congress, will be of substantial benefit to all concerned.

The housing industry groups, dependent upon Government for direction and stimulation of their commodities, are, with Government, in turn dependent upon consumer choice for a healthy economy. You build for the market, or you fail. Women exercise an influence upon the housing market far beyond their numbers.

That the planned Women's Congress on Housing will be of assistance to the Government agencies concerned is buttressed by the recent statement by FHA Commissioner Norman P. Mason, who said:

> We ought to know what they (women) are thinking * * * the housewives and homemakers are a proper part of this picture.

Commissioner Mason recites the virtues of special advisory groups currently operating throughout the country who advise FHA on portions of housing programs and says:

> We will study carefully all the recommendations suggested by this group. FHA officials plan to attend all the sessions of the Women's Congress on Housing.

I accept the sagacity and, above all, the courage of Messrs. Cole and Mason in this new venture in home-consumer-choice exploration in preference to the press releases of opposition to the idea distributed by those with no experience in the housing field.

INTEREST INCOME EARNED ON GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which will remove from tax-exempt status, under Federal income tax law, the interest income earned on governmental obligations of which proceeds are used to finance private business enterprises.

In recent years there has been an increase in the use by governmental units of their special financial advantages in order to attract new industries and business enterprises. This practice has made it possible in some cases for private firms to obtain funds for new construction at interest rates of 2 percent instead of the market rate of approximately 4 percent. State governments, of course, may do as they wish about taxation. What is involved here is the use of a Federal tax advantage, given as an aid to governmental units for the conduct of traditional governmental functions, as a device to give special economic advantages in one area or State. Federal tax exemption on interest earned by bonds issued for industrial and business development makes it possible for State and local governments to give such special advantages to particular businesses and industries. The advantages resulting from this special tax exemption can be just as economically destructive as the imposition of discriminatory taxes.

Section 274 of H. R. 8300, 83d Congress, which passed the House in 1954, contained a provision which indirectly attempted to get at this abuse. The section was not accepted by the Senate and was not agreed to in conference. The House, however, had approved the provision which would have disallowed as a deductible item for income tax purposes rent paid for facilities provided to private businesses through the issuance of tax-exempt governmental securities.

Passage of this legislation would be in keeping with congressional responsibilities in interstate commerce. No State may apply a tariff or other trade restriction to the products of another State. The granting of special financial advantages, in effect a subsidy from exempted Federal tax revenue, does comparable damage to commerce and industry in other States.

This point was recognized and stated clearly in a recent decision of the Florida Supreme Court, in the case of State against Town of North Miami, in these words:

> The financing of private enterprise by means of public funds is entirely foreign to a proper concept of our constitutional system.

The passage of the bill would prevent unchecked and irresponsible bidding among communities for plants and business establishments. It would prevent the development of financial crises such as have developed in some areas as a result of unwise or premature establishment of specially favored businesses. Some of these communities have found themselves obligated to continue subsidies to favored industries at the expense of other taxpayers, including established industries which are not given special preferential treatment. Because of an increased need for public services—police protection, schools, roads, et cetera—resulting from the establishment of the new subsidized industry, fiscal needs of local governmental units have greatly increased without a corresponding increase in the tax base, or available revenue. In these cases essential services must be foregone, or the revenue must be raised through increasingly oppressive and regressive taxes.

This bill would affect only artificial and special inducement, resulting from the indirect use of Federal tax law, in order to attract industry or business. Sound relocation decisions based upon markets, raw materials, power, labor supply, and other economic considerations would not be affected.

Passage of this bill would help to insure economically sound relocations and expansions of business and industry, or permanent benefit to the economy of the Nation and of the localities directly involved.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have permission to sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION FOR THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9893, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a brief statement. When general debate is concluded I will ask that section 101 be read for amendment, then move that the Committee rise.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, as we are about to continue consideration of a bill involving the national defense of our country and involving at the same time the lives of every American citizen of all backgrounds and colors, it would seem appropriate and important to comment on a most unfortunate and dastardly action which took place last night.

Nat "King" Cole, a Negro singer and pianist of renowned and outstanding talent, an American who has brought not only acclaim to himself but outstanding recognition for our country all over the world, was brutally attacked, knocked to the floor without provocation, by a small group of white men. Fortunately, Mr. Cole, who is one of my constitutents, was not seriously injured and before going to the hospital for treatment returned to the stage where he had been giving a

concert before 4,000 persons in Birmingham, Ala., and was given a rousing ovation by the entire audience. The action of these true Americans, an entirely white audience, was the best possible answer to those who still adhere to violence and bodily attack in order to display their emotions. The ovation lasted for nearly 10 minutes and it is most fortunate that it was able to take place, for it contrasts well with the dignified, orderly actions of those of the Negro race in another mass action, the bus boycott in the nearby city of Montgomery, Ala.

Thus both white people and Negro people, all American citizens, displayed an example for all of us to remember, to be proud of, and to remain with us as we approach problems which arouse deep emotions and about which individuals differ strongly and sincerely.

Four men have been arrested and are held in custody to answer for their actions in the dastardly attack upon Mr. Cole. I have every confidence that local authority will deal fairly and justly with these individuals. I hope that the ovation accorded Mr. Cole may wipe the memory of this incident from his mind and may encourage him to continue to place before his fellow citizens his unmatched talents. Under any circumstances, we will add to our appreciation our admiration for his courage.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. VINSON] and the other members of that committee in accepting and offering the amendment relating to certain new language relating to SAGE which amendment reads as follows:

SEC. 303. Section 1 of the act of March 30, 1949 (ch. 41, 50 U. S. C. 491), is amended by the addition of the following:

"The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to procure communication services required for the semiautomatic ground environment system. No contract for such services may be for a period of more than 10 years from the date communication services are first furnished under such contract. The aggregate contingent liability of the Government under the termination provisions of all contracts authorized hereunder may not exceed a total of $222 million and no termination payment shall be final until audited and approved by the General Accounting Office which shall have access to such carrier records and accounts as it may deem necessary for the purpose. In procuring such services, the Secretary of the Air Force shall utilize to the fullest extent the facilities and capabilities of communication common carriers, including cooperatives, within their respective service areas. Negotiations with communication common carriers, including cooperatives, and representation in proceedings involving such carriers before Federal and State regulatory bodies where such negotiations or proceedings involve contracts authorized by this paragraph shall be in accordance with the provisions of section 201 of the act of June 30, 1949, as amended (40 U. S. C. A. 481)."

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NEEDS IN ONE PACKAGE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, this is a substantial package.

The grand total of all authorities for military public works recommended by the Committee on Armed Services, reaches a figure of $2,156,730,000.

It is moderate, however, in the light of the overall defense appropriation of $35 billion requested by the President in January.

Even this latter sum is a small price to pay in order to protect our national security and to assist in the defense of the free world.

Our sole reservation may be that we are not spending enough to maintain our lead in airpower, and to accelerate the development of guided missiles.

As for military public works, I am happy to note that the committee, in its own words "is aware of the great need for family housing by all of the military services." And that "It is the view of the committee that it has a direct responsibility for the provision of family housing for military personnel."

This might appear to be a trifling matter, at first glance.

How can houses defend us?

When the need is for superbombs and long-range planes and aircraft carriers and so many big items of military hardware.

In answer to this, I would emphasize the human element.

The officers and the noncommissioned ranks who devote their lives to the Armed Forces, are the very heart of our defense. We rely upon their skill, experience, and devotion to duty, for an alert, well-trained Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. In fact, we rely upon their knowledge and advice in order to keep our Nation ahead in weapons development, and in the ability to employ them effectively when necessary.

The enemy is not only interested in our arms and equipment.

He also evaluates the morale of our professional soldiers.

Are they being compensated for the sacrifices they are making?

Do their families have the accommodations and the oportunities enjoyed by the average civilians?

When a career member of our military forces is transferred to a new duty assignment either in the United States or overseas, he oftentimes finds difficulty in securing suitable accommodations for his family convenient to his post or station.

There has been some dissatisfaction on this point.

It is good that H. R. 9893 has made a start toward the solution of this problem by authorizing the construction of 3,740 family units both here and abroad. This is a small beginning and a small part of the total military construction program—amounting to $80 million in round figures—but it is an acknowledgment of an obligation that has been neglected for too long. This consideration for family-housing needs will improve the morale of our professional soldiers, and will serve to make a career in the Armed Forces more attractive to young men who will thus be able to have their wives and children near them no matter where they may be stationed.

The amendment to the National Housing Act by Congress last year will help, but even when complemented by the construction of military housing recommended by this bill, a large deficit in accommodations will remain.

As the American Legion observed:

The largest portion of the housing in the proposed program is to satisfy Air Force requirements. The major single need by the Air Force for such housing is at aircraft control and warning sites. These sites are, in practically all instances, located in inaccessible areas throughout the country. Normal community support facilities are either nonexistent or inadequate.

As a whole, H. R. 9893 serves to meet the needs of our military plant and facilities. Generally speaking, it may be regarded as a minimum program. While we may take exceptions to an item here or there, this legislation for national security deserves prompt and impressive support.

The Congress will retain its control under subsection (c) of section 408, requiring semiannual reports to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House regarding military public works which may be urgently needed. In this manner, the committee can exercise surveillance over authority, which might otherwise be susceptible to extravagance or abuse.

It is essential to authorize the construction outlined in H. R. 9893, in order for the Armed Forces of the United States to keep their facilities up to date and ready for any emergency.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, there is one provision in this legislation to which I must disagree with the committee. My disagreement places me in a very unenviable position, primarily because almost universally I support the action taken by this committee under the leadership of the distinguished chairman and the distinguished minority leader.

Furthermore, in the main I believe my distinguished colleague the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON] and I have agreed on most legislation. However, based on the facts as I have been able to determine them, it is my clear duty to disagree with the committee and with my colleague from Michigan.

I disagree for two reasons: First, if the action taken by the committee is sustained, it will cost the Treasury of the United States a minimum of $5,188,950 more; secondly, if the action of the committee is sustained, there will be at least a 1-year delay in the construction of an an essential jet base in the State of Michigan.

The authority for those two categorical statements is the Secretary of the Air Force. I have before me a letter addressed to me dated March 21, 1956, from

the Honorable Donald A. Quarles, Secretary of the Air Force. I will quote from this letter, in part, the pertinent portions. They are as follows:

The design and acquisition of land at Kalkaska Air Force Base are sufficiently complete to commence the immediate construction of the SAGE project and to permit construction of the runway to begin in July 1956. In addition, this is the only site in the area that can become operational in time to meet an urgent air-defense requirement both for the air base and the SAGE project.

In other words, according to the Secretary of the Air Force, if the Air Force is not permitted to construct this base at Kalkaska, there will be a delay of at least a year. Yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services indicated in his remarks that there was an urgent need for the immediate construction of this base. If the base is not constructed, there will be a gap in our continental defenses. It seems to me it would be unwise for the Congress, under these circumstances, to take action which would delay the construction of this base at least a year.

Secondly, on the question of economy, the Secretary of the Air Force says this:

This site can be developed and operated with less expense than any other site that has been considered within the area of requirement.

I would like to point out where the additional cost will be developed. First, I would like to say this: This problem, or this controversy, has been a long and sordid one. I would be the very first to agree that many people are to blame. There may be some committees which are to blame in this controversy, including my own committee, but when we reach a certain point we have got to wipe out the past record and do what we can to remedy the situation as economically as possible and as quickly as possible.

Last July, the Air Force, after being precluded from going to the one site that they first wanted, by action of the Committee on Armed Services; and secondly, being precluded from going to another site which they wanted, by action of the Committee on Appropriations, selected the Kalkaska site. At that time the Air Force got letters from the chairman of the four pertinent committees in the House and Senate authorizing construction at Kalkaska. I shall read these letters in chronological order.

First, on July 28, 1955, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, said this in a letter addressed to the Honorable Harold E. Talbott.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This committee has no objection to the Air Force proceeding with the immediate construction of an airbase at the so-called Kalkaska site in Michigan as requested in Mr. Garlock's letter of July 28, 1955. It should be understood that funds can be made available from the appropriation for "Military construction, Air Force," in the amount previously justified and appropriated for an airbase in the Traverse City area.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

On July 29, 1955, Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, wrote this letter to the Honorable Lyle S. Garlock, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force:

DEAR MR. GARLOCK: I have your letter of July 28, 1955, in which you indicate that it is the intention of the Air Force to establish the Traverse City area base at Kalkaska, Mich.

I am gratified that final selection of this base has been made, since I know of its importance to our Air Defense Command.

You request that this committee give its approval for the development of the airbase at the Kalkaska site. This request is somewhat of a surprise to me, since I assume that the site selected is in the Traverse City area and this being so, this committee has no further function to perform or approval to give. The only remaining matter which would come within the cognizance of this committee would be the acquisition of the land necessary for the base, and I would expect that a project covering this land acquisition will in time be submitted to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

On August 4, 1955, Senator CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, wrote to the Honorable Charles E. Wilson as follows:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Senate Appropriations Committee has this day approved reprograming requests of the Departments of the Army and Air Force for military construction items as submitted and testified to by the Departments concerned.

I omit one paragraph that is of no consequence here.

In addition, the committee has approved the development of the Kalkaska, Mich., Air Force Base, for which funds have been previously appropriated for a similar project in this general area.

Very sincerely yours,

CARL HAYDEN.

Then on August 11, 1955, Senator JOHN STENNIS, chairman, Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction, wrote to the Honorable Lyle S. Garlock the following:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Chairman RUSSELL has referred to the Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction your letter of July 28, 1955, regarding the development of a new airbase in the Traverse City, Mich., area.

As you know, the authorization for this base is designated as "Traverse City area, Mich." It appeals that this authorization is broad enough to support a location at any of the sites mentioned in your letter. The Senate Armed Services Committee was not responsible for the two previous changes in the proposed location of this base and, thus, has not had an opportunity fully to evaluate the comparative merits of the proposed sites.

Then it goes on to say in effect, that "This committee approves the Kalkaska selection."

Following the receipt of those four letters from the responsible chairmen of the pertinent committees, the Air Force in good faith went ahead to initiate construction at Kalkaska.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am wondering if the gentleman will state the purpose of the introduction of those letters which are, after all, in the nature perhaps of public official correspondence, but private letters from chairmen of committees to the Secretary of the Air Force. Are we to conclude that this means that the recipients of those letters cleared them for release here today; or what is the situation in which they are brought to the House floor?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois that these letters are included in the published hearings of the Committee on Armed Services on H. R. 8625 and H. R. 9893, beginning at page 6759.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am very glad to have the gentleman clarify that and give the page and reference number.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I desire to call the Committee's attention to the fact that in the letter, which I wrote with a great deal of care, you will note nowhere that I approve the selection. There is not a line in it where I approve this particular site.

Mr. FORD. I believe the only fair assumption the Air Force could have was that with this letter and the other three they had the authority to proceed to spend funds in the Kalkaska area.

Mr. VINSON. They have authority any place within the Traverse City area that meets the requirement of the statute, but you will not find one letter in my communication where I approve this particular site. I was surprised that they communicated with me because I went under the assumption that they were following the law to put it in that area. That is all I was concerned with.

Mr. FORD. The facts are, of course, that the Kalkaska site was within the area.

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. FORD. The Air Force in good faith proceeded to invest funds in the site at Kalkaska.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is it not true, however, that in a communication from the distinguished gentleman from Georgia to the Secretary of the Air Force he pointed out very definitely that whatever site was selected they would have to come back for approval by the Committee on Armed Services? Therefore they had no right, in my judgment, to expend any funds, as far as the acquisition of land was concerned, or the preparation of land in any way, without having had that prior approval.

Mr. FORD. The facts are that the site at Kalkaska requires the acquisition of no land other than that which is donated. The land that was acquired by the Air Force from the State of Michigan, the Michigan Conservation Commission, 7,100 acres, was given to the Air Force for the compensation of $1. The good citizens of the Traverse City area went out and raised public funds to the extent of $84,000 by private subscription to purchase the additional 1,000 acres which are necessary. That money has

been raised. All or most of the land has been acquired. So the Air Force does not have to put out 1 penny for the acquisition of 8,100 acres in the Kalkaska area. The net result is that there did not have to be any approval of the expenditure of funds for land.

Mr. VINSON. I concur with the statement the gentleman has made. If there had been a purchase it would have had to be cleared, but having been donated it did not have to be cleared.

The gentleman stated a moment ago that he found the difference in the cost to be $5 million. When the Committee on Armed Services went into this matter a few weeks ago we heard the testimony of Mr. Ferry. This is a question I asked him:

> What is the difference in cost between the Manistee site and Kalkaska site?
>
> Mr. FERRY. About $250,000. In first cost.

I am going to put all this in the RECORD. I want this Committee to know all the facts. We have a good case to stand on.

He said:

> The difference is brought about by the cost of the land lines which are used to connect up the SAGE installation into our defense network. The annual charges at Kalkaska are $1,040,000, as compared with $1,500,000 a year, a saving of almost a half a million dollars a year in land-line costs.

That is the only difference in the cost, so Mr. Ferry advised the committee a few weeks ago.

When my time comes, I am going to put his testimony in the RECORD.

Mr. FORD. If I may go on to explain how the difference of $5,188,000 is developed, I will give the figures as submitted to me at my request by the Air Force, and I think I can rely on their accuracy. These in turn are accurate.

Mr. VINSON. Well, this is an Assistant Secretary. I assume when he was testifying before the committee he was just as accurate from the facts that he had as the officers who sent the information to the gentleman. Of course I recognize that whenever you call for figures down there in the Department you always get confused and confounded. It all depends on who makes up the figures.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. I have been listening rather intently to the discussion, but I am somewhat confused. What was the intent of these letters that you quoted? Were they written for the purpose of either approving or disapproving this particular project?

Mr. FORD. The letters I have quoted were written to the Secretary of the Air Force for the purpose of clarifying his authority to go ahead and initiate construction. The Air Force had written to the respective chairmen requesting authority to proceed at Kalkaska. The letters were written in reply giving such authority and as a result of the receipt of these letters construction was initiated.

Mr. MARSHALL. But there was nothing in any of these letters that disapproved this project.

Mr. FORD. Certainly nothing that I saw in them disapproved the initiation of construction at Kalkaska.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. BECKER. I want to ask the gentleman when he can tell us what is going to be the difference in these figures.

Mr. FORD. I will do so right away.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is making an excellent statement and one in which I associate myself with him.

Mr. Chairman, like the rest of my colleagues from Michigan, I have been greatly distressed and concerned over this unfortunate controversy regarding the location of an Air Force jet interceptor base in northwestern Michigan.

My own congressional district is not in the slightest way involved over the location of this base. My only consideration, therefore, is of fixing on a final location which is best for the national defense and security of this country. My second consideration is to have this base built efficiently at least cost to the taxpayer.

I understand that controversy rages around several locations and that from a standpoint of military security, 2 or 3 would be of equal value. The dispute seems, however, to center between the so-called Kalkaska location and one near Manistee. I further understand that the Kalkaska site was already selected and that preliminary work to the extent of approximately $500,000 has already been spent here. This has included the clearing of a large amount of valuable timberland.

I also understand that the Air Force has recommended construction at Kalkaska and that annual operating costs at this location are about $460,000 less than at Manistee. From a standpoint of economy, therefore, there should be no doubt in anyone's mind where the best location lies.

Mr. Chairman, the average Michigan citizen does not care particularly where this base is to be built. He is, however, sick of this eternal bickering that has gone on in this matter for the past many months. He wants an airbase built with the best location from the standpoint of national security that is feasible and at the least possible cost that is consonant with national defense. And then he wants his Representatives in Congress to stop this quarreling and get down to other business of national importance. We have other things to do here besides deciding on the location of one airbase.

I have heard that certain part-time residents of the Kalkaska area have objected on the grounds of property damage, noise, and other inconveniences. No doubt it is alarming to have jet planes fly over your cottage at night and at low altitudes. But I wonder if our summer vacationer would rather hear the sound of Communist jets in the skies over his head. As far as I am concerned, I believe that anyone in that situation ought to say a little prayer of thanks to the good Lord that American boys are piloting those planes. I think he ought to be grateful that our own pilots are upstairs there watching over his freedom and the freedom of all of us.

Mr. Chairman, in the absence of compelling arguments and facts in favor of the Manistee site, I intend to vote for the Kalkaska location.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is making an excellent statement too, and I think more people should hear it. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Michigan not withhold his point of no quorum? We are going to debate this considerably under the 5-minute rule tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This is very, very vital to Michigan.

Mr. VINSON. We are going to have a full debate on that under the five-minute rule. We are merely trying to conclude the general debate today, and I am going to ask that at least an hour under the 5-minute rule be devoted to this particular item.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know, but we always get cut off on that 5-minute rule.

Mr. VINSON. No, the gentleman will not be cut off. I trust the gentleman will not insist on his point of order at this time. Let us finish the debate this afternoon, and I assure him that we will have ample time to debate this question tomorrow. There are several Members who want to speak—the gentlewoman wants to speak, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX]. You, yourself, probably want to speak and I want to speak. Let us try to finish the general debate this afternoon and tomorrow we will have a full debate on this and settle it once and for all. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ALGER HISS AT PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I address the House today because of an article appearing in the Newark Star-Ledger, on page 1, headed "Princeton Poll Backs Hiss Talk." Excerpting the article, it reads:

> Undergraduates and faculty members of traditionally conservative Princeton Univer-

sity are overwhelmingly in favor of permitting convicted perjurer Alger Hiss to speak here April 26, a straw poll on the campus indicated today.

The former State Department official, jailed 5 years ago for perjury in his witness stand denial of passing secret documents to confessed Communist spy Whittaker Chambers, was invited to Princeton by the American Whig-Cliosophic Society, undergraduate political science and debate organization.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this article in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. The article contains criticism by Mr. Livingston T. Merchant and was voiced in a telegram which said that "Hiss' appearance would do lasting and irreparable damage to Princeton."

The article further contains various quotations from this institution on the part of various undergraduates who back the society invitation to Hiss by a 10-to-1 ratio.

For example, such comments as this on the Hiss invitation from students is typical:

"I'd like to have a look at Al Capone, too."

"He served his time, didn't he?" one student asked. "Is that not the all-American way?" another one said.

Typical faculty comment on Hiss' invitation included history professor Eric Goldman's reply:

"Undergraduates, though conservative, are eager to prove that Princeton is genuinely free."

Mr. Speaker, it seems rather strange that a university dedicated to higher learning, a university which has made a record of patriotism and contribution to our country should now have this group of "diaper Dans" invite Alger Hiss to lecture who, while convicted of perjury, is nonetheless conceded to be one of the foremost betrayers in American history. It is inconceivable that the comic book Ciceros extending the invitation should contemplate that they could invite this enemy of our country to their campus, there to honor him. The Hiss inviters in the society, if judged by their actions and comments in the Hiss matter must be so completely bereft of ability that a stuttering sword swallower, with the dagger handle caught in his throat, could talk better. A deaf mute twisting his fingers could outrepartee them. One cannot understand why they have announced the topic that Hiss will discuss, Geneva; the ghost of Yalta returning to haunt another would-be Yalta. Like Mephistopheles, reviving Forest.

Dr. Goldman tells us this, the students feel, prove Princeton is genuinely free. Free from what? Free from good sense? Free from intelligence? Free from a decent regard for the deaths of the Princeton alumni who died on the battlefields of the world to insure that Princeton would continue to train students in loyalty to our country.

If Hiss is to be a proper subject for invitation to Princeton, particularly before so-called American debating society, one wonders how this logic will dictate the selection of future guests. Perhaps there will be a step further and someone may urge a department of treachery set up in the university to be commanded by Alger Hiss himself. If Hiss were going to talk at Princeton and say anything worth while, it would seem the proper subject of his talk should be "How I Betrayed Dead Princeton Alumni Who Died Fighting for Princeton and America." It is there I concede the talk might have been something worth while for the students. But for a man whom we know to be the agent of an enemy power to be invited before an American university to promote the enemy's power and make an attack upon us calls for some explanation.

One wonders if there has not been some discrimination in the handling of the traitor Benedict Arnold. Benedict Arnold betrayed us to Britain, but I feel that if we are to be betrayed to anyone I would prefer being betrayed to Christian Britain rather than to atheistic communism.

Are we to have a posthumous LLD. awarded to Benedict Arnold so he may get equal treatment with Mr. Hiss? Or are we to discriminate only in favor of the 20th century Arnolds and ignore the Revolution betrayer? Such is the observations prompted by the logic of the Hiss inviters.

It seems to me it is time for Princeton University to wake up and see whether or not they have permitted these Katzenjammer commissar fans to put the university in an embarrassing position.

I would hope that Dr. Dodd, the president of the university, would put these kindergarten Ciceros over his knee and there paddle their Red aspirations.

It might be argued that they are free to invite anybody they want to. In that case we are free to speak our minds on the subject, too, with the hope they would invite someone like Chairman Walter of our Committee on Un-American Activities. Why do they not invite him up to their debating society? Perhaps they could learn something.

Why is it that some universities must go out of their way to invite men who have demonstrated a total lack of regard for our Nation? It seems to me that there is a little poison ivy creeping into the Ivy League; and I would hope that the vast body of the Princeton alumni, many of whom fought for our country, many of whom are in the uniformed service of our country today, many of whom have contributed to the founding of this Nation and to its saving—I would hope that in the cloistered halls of this university that at this time my voice could be heard in a loud congressional "Boo", and a loud American hiss spelled "S-S-S-" on this occasion, and I would like to give them a great American "bird" for this absolute disregard of the proprieties in connection with this case.

Hiss has no place in any American university except as an exhibit of what not to be for any loyal American student, or as exhibit 1 in the gallery of traitors.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I, certainly, as the Representative of the district in which Princeton University is located would, were I a member of that society, have voted against the action; I certainly hold no brief for a convicted perjurer for whom I have the utmost contempt. But I must say that it occurs to me that if we are to have the things which all of us fought for and all of us say of the Constitution of the United States and of the body of laws enacted under it, that we would subscribe to what Mr. Voltaire said some years ago: That he might never agree but that he would fight to the death for a man's right to speak. I am not sure that the Whig Society of Princeton University is having Mr. Hiss there for any purpose other than to make an exhibition of him.

Mr. TUMULTY. He is speaking on the subject of Geneva.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would not attend and I doubt if many people in my district would attend; but the university has every right, and the students have every right, whether their judgment is good or bad—and I think it is bad in this case—to invite anyone to address them. We can learn things that way that we certainly are not going to learn by keeping out of our universities, newspapers, and press people with whom we disagree.

Now I reiterate very carefully my personal opposition to Mr. Hiss and everything he stands for. I do think that the university, being one of our great universities, should be absolutely free to decide how it can best serve the Nation. I would not presume to be a censor of its actions.

Mr. TUMULTY. I disagree thoroughly with the gentleman. I do not agree that a university is serving this country properly when it invites a man convicted, in effect, of betraying the country, a man who has advanced the cause of the destruction of this country, down before a debating society consisting of these young men to speak on a matter in which our own country is involved, to wit, the Geneva Conference, where Mr. Hiss will carry on the Soviet line. If you are going to carry your logic to a conclusion, they might also invite men like Sepp Dietrich, the Nazi murderer of our troops at the Malmedy massacre, or the head of the Soviet secret police, on the theory, however depraved they are they have a right to appear at a private university and espouse their depravity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, the university must realize that freedom involves responsibility. If the university is going to proceed on this idea of the unlimited right of the enemies of our country to be invited to places where they can do the most damage, we will not have a country for very long. I understand the gentleman's desire, representing the district in which the university

is located, to defend its position. But I am not attacking the university. That university has a long and distinguished record. I am attacking the judgment of whoever is responsible for this foolish idea of inviting Hiss there. How many American lives were lost because of Hiss' actions is unknown. There is American blood on his hands, surely, as there is blood on the hands of Khrushchev, Dietrich and a lot of others. An American university is no place for these enemies of democracy to peddle their wares.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not hear what the gentleman said previously, but I can go along with what he has just stated. It seems to me that the gentleman's point is if there was a real successful chicken thief or sheep thief around, it would be all right to have him talk to the boys and girls in the public schools along that line.

Mr. TUMULTY. Or take a man out of the death house and have him tell how he strangled grandma, and do that before the debating society. It is foolishness. It is absolutely absurd to permit those who would destroy our country this absolute liberty. There is no such absolute liberty, however. Man has a duty to perform. You might as well have the individuals who shot up Congress come in and give us a lecture on foreign policy here in the House of Representatives, and then have the gentlemen who were shot express their views, on the theory we are all free to do as we please, say as we please regardless of consequences.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand it, the gentleman is not saying that the university has not a right to do this. The gentleman is questioning their judgment?

Mr. TUMULTY. Exactly. They have the physical freedom to commit hari kari, but the moral law prohibits that. They may do very many foolish things. I am free to talk about other people going on a diet, but it would be rather foolish for me to give a lecture on how to lose weight. Yet they are bringing down a man to lecture who has spent 3 or 4 years in the penitentiary for perjury because they could not get him on treason. They are bringing him down to this ivied hallowed tower draping him with respectability again and having him speak on Geneva and our foreign policy, something in which our country is actively engaged. If Hiss is going down there to promote the Soviet cause, and we may have to send our boys to be shot by the Soviet Union, I think that is just plain crazy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In view of his experience, would it not be better to have him talk on prison life, or, at least, on something about his policies that he advocated before he went to prison?

Mr. TUMULTY. I think that would be an excellent topic. At least, to me he could give some secrets that might be very interesting.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They would be helpful.

Mr. TUMULTY. I think if he gave us a discussion on what goes on in labyrinthine mind whose twisted reasoning begets the traitor, that might be an interesting topic.

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

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I suggest, being one of the architects of the United Nations, that he lecture on the subject of the great good the United Nations has accomplished.

Mr. TUMULTY. Yes. He might tell us, in answer to the gentleman, why the United Nations did not put in its charter the recognition of God as the lawgiver.

Mr. GROSS. And why only 16 out of 60 nations furnished any troops over in Korea.

Mr. TUMULTY. Also he might tell us why Stalin killed his wife. He might have been in on that secret, too.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey who believes these various characters have a right to lecture in our universities.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is precisely why I asked the gentleman to yield. Perhaps he misunderstood.

Mr. TUMULTY. Perhaps I did misunderstand.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I said that I, as an individual, would not have invited Hiss, but I will defend the right of others to do so.

Mr. TUMULTY. Would you want the Nazi, Sepp Dietrich, to talk at Princeton?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do not see what harm it would do to have Dietrich talk there. I do not see what harm it does when you know what a person is. No debating society will ever be able to cloak Alger Hiss, and no American could ever cloak him with respectability. I feel that very strongly.

Mr. TUMULTY. Then, Benedict Arnold should have been returned after the Revolution to discuss his betrayal, and to lecture in the universities on the Colonies and the motherland.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I feel equally strongly it is the right of the university, within the confines of its own judgment, whether good or bad, to invite anyone to address them.

Mr. TUMULTY. I disagree with the gentleman. The university is supposed to know something. They are supposed to be training our young men. I do not know what kind of training they are getting at Princeton these days. I assume it is good training. But, if this is an example of it, I am glad I did not go there. I am glad I went to Fordham and Seton Hall.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TUMULTY. I am always glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I understood the gentleman, to whom you have just yielded, I understood him as being of the opinion that what Hiss would talk about was not very good, and if that is so, why expose these people to it? Why do you not bring in somebody who has a bad cold or itch or something?

Mr. TUMULTY. I wonder if Princeton would bring in Senator McCarthy. Do you feel that Senator McCarthy should be brought in?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I believe Senator McCarthy or the gentleman from New Jersey or the distinguished gentleman from Michigan would be welcome to discuss any subject at all.

Mr. TUMULTY. I am afraid I would be out of Princeton's class. I fear I would be too heavy to handle easily.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Oh, I think they would enjoy the gentleman very much.

Mr. TUMULTY. I would be very glad to debate the entire debating society, plus Dr. Dodds, right after a heavy lunch.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. And they may be able to conjure up a real match for you. I remember when the gentleman debated with some of them, when they were in the World Federation movement.

Mr. TUMULTY. Yes, and I was very happy to defeat them, too.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. And I respected your right to do it at that time, just as I respect your right to criticize them today.

Mr. TUMULTY. I just think the university ought to have a better sense of responsibility. Incidentally, Princeton, I understand, when the Buchman movement was in its first stages, was banned from the campus by Dr. Hibben then Princeton president. But, I doubt very much that Princeton would be willing to extend an invitation to Nazi Dietrich. I would not be willing to have him come to this shore. I would like to deal with him as he did with some of our boys. We Americans have learned one thing; we are not going to win any cold or hot war by giving the enemies of our country the velvet cloth treatment, by opening up our doors, and neither by the striped pants treatment. Let Hiss go back and examine his conscience and see if he cannot tell us some of the secrets he has in it. Hiss has not shown any penitence yet. He will be advancing the cause of atheistic communism, the cause of the worst enemy of civilization and Christianity in the history of the world, when he lectures on Geneva at Princeton. I say that he should not be permitted there. That is my judgment. If I were Dr. Dodds, I would pick him up by the scruff of the neck and throw him out personally. I would be very happy to do that. I am not arguing that Dr. Dodds need do that. I simply say that the doctor ought to act, and if the doctor does act, I think he will save Princeton a great deal of embarassment.

I think freedom has a responsibility attached to it. I cannot yell fire in this House today and get away with it. I do not think that I would want to bring an arson bug in here to give us a talk on how to set fire to the House of Representatives. I think that would be silly, ridiculous.

I think Old Nassau will be called Old Nausea, if Hiss is allowed to talk there. I say that with all due respect for the university.

Let us have some respect for those who love our country. On the other hand, it seems to me that the competition is to see who is going to sell us out first, in some quarters.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would like to say that I am certain that Princeton University has, during its wonderful history, invited many, many more people whom the gentleman would favor and who were great and wonderful citizens of the world, to speak there, than it has persons with whom he would disagree.

Mr. TUMULTY. I think Princeton University has done that. I think Princeton University is a wonderful university. I think it is being made the victim of some Katzenjammer Kids prank by this society. But Dr. Goldman, a member of their faculty, says, according to the Ledger, that the Hiss invitation proves that Princeton is "genuinely free." In other words, to be "genuinely free," we must invite traitors in to advance the Communist line. Under that logic, this House to prove it is genuinely free would have to invite in Hiss himself to tell us about Geneva. That is the logic. Of course, I know that logic and Princeton University perhaps are not very closely related, in this instance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, what I am driving at is this: Over in Russia they do not do things this way. There is one lesson we can learn from them. They do not parade their traitors around and honor them. I do not say that we should do what they are doing and shoot everybody who disagrees with us. I do not advocate that we should prevent an expression of an honest difference of opinion. An honest difference of opinion, such as has been evidenced in this House just now is welcome. We should welcome all opinions. But where a man has betrayed his trust in a high public position, where the evidence discloses that he has been dealing with the enemies of this Nation, and he has served a sentence for violation of the law—for him to be invited to a university and given the opportunity to talk on the foreign policy of our Government which he betrayed in order to prove that we are free, is the height of absurdity. If we follow that logic then every hate monger, every anti-Christian, every anti-Semite, would be given access to our universites; because, if you did not let them in, then it would prove that you were not free. That is completely and totally wrong thinking. There is no reason for it at all. If the university cannot control its students, in matters of this kind, if the university cannot tell a little student debating society what to do then I submit that the university must bear the criticism.

I do not intend to cast reflection on the great cultural contributions which Princeton has made to our country. But I note that our revolutionary fathers never invited Benedict Arnold to come back and take him on a lecture tour, take him to Fanueil Hall to tell them about foreign policy between the Colonies and England. I have failed to note in my readings that any of the great betrayers of history were taken around to give advice to the betrayed.

This is the first time in history when men seem to feel that they must be supine to those who have betrayed them. It seems to me that if a man is a traitor, the least we can do is to ignore him. You do not even have to imprison him. I simply say do not start taking him around on the academic circuit, because then some egghead will get up and say, "Let us give him a degree—Doctor of Betrayers," because he would not be equal to the man who was debating with him, because the man debating with him has a degree. To be full and equal give betrayer and betrayed equal treatment. Someone will want to give him a mortar board also.

I think it is all the result of the comic-book age. Too many people have been reading Dick Tracy, instead of early American history. Too many university professors have been hiding comic books behind their heavy tomes, and reading them instead. This would never happen in any other part of the world. I did not see Britain urging Burgess and McLean to come back and lecture to the House of Commons or Oxford on how they ran out on the Empire, and other foreign policy matters. I have not read that. I have not read about the Irish looking for anybody who betrayed them to come back and lecture on Irish freedom. This seems to be the only country in the world where this kind of looney business goes on. I do not know. I just get up and say that I think it is terrible.

I suppose someone will want Peron to come up here. They threw him out of the hotel. They may want him lecturing at Princeton, on the theory that he should be heard. It gets to the point, I guess, where if you do not have a criminal record you would not be allowed to lecture at all. If you have not been in jail, maybe you ought not to be heard. That is the way I would conclude.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman is quite right when he says Princeton is Republican. It is 3 to 1 Republican. I am not trying to protect anything but my version of freedom of speech.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want the words taken down. If you say these people he is describing are Republicans, that is a reflection on this side of the House. That is not right.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will provide the gentleman with a registry list.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think he ought to withdraw that charge. That is worse than anything the Republicans have ever been accused of saying about the Democratic Party. You have given us a terrible picture of those fellows up there. I think you are right about that. I do not think it is fair to the Republican Party to say they are Republicans.

[From the Newark Star-Ledger]

PRINCETON POLL BACKS HISS TALK

PRINCETON, April 10. Undergraduates and faculty members of traditionally conservative Princeton University are overwhelmingly in favor of permitting convicted perjurer Alger Hiss to speak here April 26, a straw poll on the campus indicated today.

The former State Department official, jailed five years ago for perjury in his witness stand denial of passing secret documents to confessed Communist spy Whittaker Chambers, was invited to Princeton by the American Whig-Cliosophic Society, undergraduate political science and debate organization.

Meanwhile, a high-ranking member of the United States State Department tonight urged one Princeton debating group to reconsider its plans.

Livingston T. Merchant, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, said in a telegram that Hiss' appearance "would do lasting and irreparable damage to Princeton." Merchant is a Princeton alumnus, class of 1926.

Hiss, who will be making his first public address since his period of probation expired recently is scheduled to discuss last summer's Geneva Summit Conference.

Although university officials have been besieged by an undisclosed number of influential alumni protesting the Hiss appearance, undergraduates back the society by a 10-to-1 ratio.

Of 149 undergraduates questioned in the poll, 135 were in favor of Hiss' appearance and only 14 were against the scheduled speech.

The ratio of faculty members questioned in the poll was even more predominantly in favor of the Hiss appearance. Twenty faculty members were questioned, and 19 of them supported the student stand.

The poll's question—Do you think Alger Hiss should be allowed to speak on campus?—brought a small proportion of outspoken criticism against the society's invitation to Hiss, however.

DISSENTS HEARD

Several of the dissenting undergraduates said they thought the invitation to Hiss would do the university's name no good in the public eye.

"Besides, I couldn't be sure anything he said would be the truth," one dissenter added.

But the typical undergraduate response was quickly affirmative, although indicating that most of the students were curious rather than sympathetic.

Their answers ranged from "A ridiculous question—of course he should be allowed," to "I'd like to have a look at Al Capone, too."

"He served his time, didn't he?" one student asked.

"Isn't that the all-American way?" another said.

SOME CHANGE VOTE

A small number of dissenters polled admitted they thought Hiss had been convicted for Communist Party membership, and changed their minds when told he was jailed on a perjury charge.

A polling of faculty opinion showed an even heavier agreement with the invitation to Hiss.

Typical faculty comment included history professor Eric Goldman's reply:

"Undergraduates here, though conservative, are eager to prove that Princeton is genuinely free."

The Dairy Princetonian, undergraduate newspaper, has withheld editorial comment

until the university makes an official statement tomorrow concerning alumni reaction.

President Harold W. Dodds said Monday that the university will not interfere with the scheduled Hiss speech because "we think it unwise now to take the responsibility for the decision out of the hands of the student organization."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN), for the remainder of the week, on account of a death in his family.

Mr. CHENOWETH, for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 60 minutes, on April 12.

Mr. TUMULTY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MASON, for 15 minutes on Monday next, on the subject of the Supreme Court against States rights.

Mr. BOYLE, for 1 hour, on Monday, April 16.

Mr. PATMAN, for 15 minutes, on tomorrow, to revise and extend his remarks and include therein certain extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIGLEY, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ZELENKO.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and include an address delivered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. GWINN in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. DAVIDSON in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES in two instances and to include copies of news letters.

Mr. METCALF, the remarks he will make on H. R. 9893 and to include a letter and an editorial.

Mr. METCALF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois on the death of Peter D. Broom.

Mr. KEATING (at the request of Mr. YOUNG) and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 12, 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:

1734. A letter from the Chairman, the United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting the 11th Semiannual Report of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, dated March 1956, pursuant to section 603 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 376); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1735. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting the amendments to the Rules of Criminal Procedure for the United States District Courts, by direction of the Supreme Court and pursuant to the act of June 25, 1948 (ch. 645 (62 Stat. 683), as amended by the act of May 24, 1949, ch. 139, sec. 59 (63 Stat. 98), title 18, U. S. C. 3771) (H. Doc. No. 377); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 10412. A bill to amend the act for the Protection of Walruses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 10413. A bill to extend for 2 years the Advisory Committee on Weather Control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10414. A bill to amend section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 to permit certain high-school teachers to perform their obligated period of active duty for training during summer vacation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10415. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of South Dakota for National Guard purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 10416. A bill to provide for certain adjustments with respect to wages paid to Mexican agricultural workers for work performed during the cotton harvest of 1955; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10417. A bill to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10418. A bill to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 10419. A bill to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 10420. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 10421. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 10422. A bill to amend section 459 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 10423. A bill to provide for the conveyance of 15 acres of land more or less within the Garza-Little Elm project to the city of Lewisville, Tex., for sewage disposal purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 10424. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the excise tax on television receivers capable of receiving 50 or more ultra high frequency television channels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 10425. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 10426. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 10427. A bill to strengthen the civil rights statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 10428. A bill to strengthen the civil rights statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 10429. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to permit a veteran pursuing education and training thereunder to make a change of program, not otherwise authorized, if he is unable to continue the pursuit of his current program because of physical or mental disability or other compelling personal reasons; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 10430. A bill for the purpose of constructing at the Dunseith, N. Dak., port of entry Federal facilities for the Bureau of Customs and Immigration and Naturalization Service; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 10431. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of certain governmental obligations and of the interest on such obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 10432. A bill to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Administrator to pay travel expenses and per diem allowances to trainees in attendance at the National Civil Defense Staff College, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10433. A bill to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 10434. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10435. A bill to strengthen the civil rights statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee (by request):

H. R. 10436. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of

1954, as amended, to provide nonoccupational group major medical expense insurance for Federal employees and their dependents and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 10437. A bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10438. A bill to provide that in determining annual income of a widow or child of a veteran for the purpose of establishing eligibility for pension, amounts spent in the year of death of the veteran for his burial shall be excluded from income for that year; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10439. A bill to simplify and make more nearly uniform the laws governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 10440. A bill to provide for the construction of a superhighway between Frederick, Md., and Charleston, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 10441. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to restrict application to insurance which has been in effect 6 months at the time benefits are sought under such act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10442. A bill to amend section 504 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to refuse to appraise residential property which is not subject to construction supervision by qualified personnel; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 10443. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10444. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10445. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10446. 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.

H. R. 10447. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 10448. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to require the owners of civil aircraft to be financially responsible for damages arising out of the operation of such aircraft for which they are liable; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. J. Res. 601. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Con. Res. 229. Concurrent resolution to conduct an investigation covering attempts on the part of the United Nations to organize a world government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 464. Resolution authorizing a reprint of House Document No. 367, 81st Congress, 1st session, on Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin Streams, Calif.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 465. Resolution to provide for the adjustment of the trust fund account in the Office of the Sergeant at Arms; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress with respect to the passage of H. R. 8836, being an act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act to authorize appropriation for continuing the construction of highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally refererd as follows:

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. R. 10449. A bill for the relief of Loredana Ramaioli Kaczoroski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 10450. A bill for the relief of Mr. Fouzi (Victor) M. Hindaly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 10451. A bill for the relief of Kan Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 10452. A bill for the relief of Renee Renauld Claire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 10453. A bill for the relief of Panorea Panos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 10454. A bill for the relief of Rafael Portugal-Cabrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 10455. A bill for the relief of Boris F. Navratil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 10456. A bill for the relief of William H. Vosburgh; 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:

866. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Sigurd Wisness and other residents of Fargo, N. Dak., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

867. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Clinton County Central Labor Union, Lock Haven, Pa., in opposition to the enactment of H. R. 5550, United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

868. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of W. C. Cooper and 19 other residents of Marshalltown, Iowa, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

869. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of 45 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Carroll, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

870. Also, petition of 45 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars, New Plymouth, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

871. Also, petition of 80 employees of the Ohio Boys' Industrial School, Lancaster, Ohio, who are ex-servicemen from World War I and II, and the Korean conflict, urging that favorable consideration be given to the passage of the veterans' security bill, known as H. R. 7886; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

872. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of VFW post, of Centerville, Iowa, urging the adoption of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

873. Also, petition of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Diagonal, Iowa, urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

874. By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of residents of Taunton, Mass., requesting separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

875. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Verner J. Libell and 90 other residents of North Lincoln County, Oreg., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

876. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. Vern Werle, and other citizens of Webster County, Mo., protesting alcoholic beverage advertising on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

877. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Conference of Southeastern Wisconsin Taxpayer Organizations meeting in Kenosha on March 20, 1956, urging Congress not to interfere in local school financial problems, specifically in the direction of extending financial assistance for school construction or general operations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

878. Also, resolution adopted by the Conference of Southeastern Wisconsin Taxpayer Organizations assembled in Kenosha, Wis., on March 20, 1956, urging Congress to adopt and enforce a policy against unnecessary Federal operation of business enterprises in competition with private business as outlined in S. 1003 or similar legislation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

879. Also, resolution of the Building Service Employees Local No. 168, at Kenosha, Wis., on March 27, 1956, in support of a bold, long-range program for highway construction with the cost responsibility spread equally upon the population of the country; to the Committee on Public Works.

880. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Leta Little, Smiths Creek, Mich., and 30 others for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

881. Also, petition of John B. Roth, Vassar, Mich., and 12 others for separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Heritage of Old Age Should Not Be Despair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter:

THE HERITAGE OF OLD AGE SHOULD NOT BE DESPAIR—NEWSLETTER No. 179

APRIL 9, 1956.

DEAR FRIEND: The fastest growing population group in our country consists of the men and women age 65 and over. Today there are 13½ million of them. With 1,000 more joining their ranks daily, their number is expected to increase to 20 million by 1975.

For some of them the golden years are the culmination of a rich, rewarding life. They view advancing age with a dignity and charm like that of President John Quincy Adams, who was congratulated on his 81st birthday by a friend who asked: "How is John Quincy Adams today?"

"Quite well, thank you," Adams replied. "John Quincy Adams is quite well. But the house in which he lives is becoming quite dilapidated. Time and the seasons have nearly destroyed it. It is tottering on its foundations and the roof is worn quite thin. Yes, the old tenement is becoming quite uninhabitable and I fear that John Quincy Adams will have to move out of it soon. But he himself is quite well, thank you, quite well."

For most elderly people, however, advancing years bring increased burdens. A recent study by the reliable Twentieth Century Fund reveals that nearly three-fourths of those aged 65 and over either have no income of their own or earn less than $1,000 per year. But this deplorable lack of sufficient funds represents only one aspect of their difficulties. The Council of State Governments reports that they are particularly subject, as well, to unequal opportunity for employment; inferior housing; separation from family and friends; widowhood for more than half the women; inadequate medical care; lack of hospital insurance just when chronic diseases hit; hospitalization in mental institutions because of insufficient nursing homes and rehabilitation facilities; spiritual deterioration because of belief that the community is no longer interested in them. The list is long, the impact heavy.

What is the Federal Government doing to help them? Unfortunately, not very much. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is supposed to be concerned with their plight, has attacked the matter with all the ferocity and speed of a snail. Last year Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby appeared before the Appropriations Committee and admitted the Federal Government was 10 years behind in its work on behalf of older persons. Yet she requested a budget of only $65,000 to deal with the enormous task. We hoped for a more sympathetic attitude when Secretary Folsom appeared this year, but there was none. The Secretary said he wanted the same budget and to continue with the same system of using a small general staff and leaving to agencies such as the Social Security Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and the Department of Labor the responsibility for developing adequate programs to cope with the problem. This was the arrangement which brought sharp criticism by the Appropriations Committee upon the Department for its indifference to the needs of older persons, and the demand that substantial progress be made during the next year. But if the committee expects any improvements after having voted the same inadequate budget, it is indulging in wishful thinking. What is needed is a Bureau of Older Persons established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to help the States make an intensive effort in the field of aging and to coordinate their activities.

A few days ago President Eisenhower announced that he was creating a National Council on Aging whose members would be made up of representatives from each of the agencies now dealing with problems affecting older persons. What this means is that the President has now given a name and status to the present hit-or-miss, decentralized system. Apparently, the same policy of postponement, of drift without direction, is going to continue.

One feels about the President's action the same as Sir Harry Lauder's caddy must have felt after having completed 18 holes of golf with him on a bitterly cold day. The caddy had done a fine job. After paying him the regular fee, Lauder slipped something into the caddy's hand saying: "That's for a glass of hot whiskey, lad." The caddy opened his hand. There in his palm was a lump of sugar.

Almost a century ago Benjamin Disraeli wrote in one of his novels: "Let us hope that the heritage of old age is not despair." That is still our hope.

Your friend,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

Joint Disarmament and the Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech I recently made concerning mutual reduction of 15 percent in the arms budget of the United States and the Soviet Union with part of the savings to be allocated to the joint foreign aid program administered by the United Nations.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER AT JEFFERSON-JACKSON DINNER OF YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE, MARCH 10, 1956

As we meet here tonight, the representatives of the world's great powers are gathering in London to prepare for the resumption of disarmament talks which have a life-or-death significance for our Nation and for all nations.

The peace-loving peoples of the free world are looking to the United States for responsible leadership in breaking a 10-year-old deadlock on reduction of armament which must be resolved if our way of life is to survive.

I fervently pray that our country's representatives will be inspired to display true leadership when they face up to the Russians during the coming crucial meetings.

It is high time that this Nation began using the weapons of resourcefulness and imagination and initiative in dealing with the Communists.

They are weapons far more powerful than the hydrogen bomb.

They are the only diplomatic weapons with which we can persuade the Russians or maneuver them into joining us in our clearly demonstrated determination to limit the weapons of destruction which are as pressing a burden upon the Russian people as they are upon our own.

I have been a frequent critic of the Eisenhower administration because it has come forward with no plan for disarmament until a few days ago—although Secretary Dulles says that he has reason to believe that the Russians would like some relief from their great burden of armaments.

Harold Stassen is in charge of creating a disarmament plan. He has tried hard to carry out his assignment. But he cannot get the members of the Eisenhower team to agree with him. On one thing, Secretary Dulles disagrees. On another, Secretary of Defense Wilson disagrees. There are varying degrees of disagreement throughout the rest of the administration.

If we had a President other than President Eisenhower, he would have made a decision by now between the opposing forces on the team. But President Eisenhower insists that only unanimous agreements be brought to him. This is the same policy which he has applied with unhappy effect to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The result is that despite the peace offensive of the Soviet Union, the United States is unable to start one of its own.

Our allies are growing restive because of our inaction. It is damaging our prestige in such United Nations gatherings as the forthcoming talks in London. It is eating away at our leadership of free world forces. Yet the team can make no decision and the President will not.

I said earlier that I am a frequent critic of this administration.

I have reason to be—both as a Democrat and as an American.

But I am not so partisan a critic that I will not recognize even a small modicum of inspiration when the administration finally bestirs itself into action rather than merely abiding by its familiar and melancholy waltz pattern of following while the Russians lead.

I think President Eisenhower's letter earlier this week to Russian Premier Bulganin, proposing to negotiate on reductions in the level of nuclear and conventional armaments was a step in that direction.

Like all of you, I was pleased by the Russian Premier's preliminary reaction, which was a grudging concession that the Eisenhower proposal was—and I quote—"good."

I do not think the Eisenhower proposal goes far enough. But if it has elicited this initial Soviet response, then it might provide the basis for fruitful negotiations across the conference tables in London.

Last summer, leaders of this administration went to the "summit" at Geneva full of hope and little more. They returned with nothing but bruised feelings. Their hopes were dashed by Soviet hostility and vastly superior Soviet diplomacy. As a result, we suffered a major defeat in the eyes of the world.

This time the hope must be balanced by a full quota of stern determination to persuade the Soviets that they have nothing to gain by obstructionist behavior. This time, the hope must be supported by positive programs, so skillfully conceived that for the Russians to spurn our honest offers to halt the arms race would hand them a major defeat in the eyes of the world.

But I wonder if the administration's representatives are going to London so armed to meet the Russians?

I refer you to a front page story in yesterday's New York Times, which reported that Harold Stassen was flying to London today with—and I quote—"a new set of disarmament proposals in his briefcase with a suitcase full of hope."

I don't like the comparative weight of his baggage, do you? I wish Mr. Stassen well on his mission, but I was rather disturbed when the New York Times reported a news conference held by Mr. Stassen in these terms—and again I quote:

"The accent was on his hopes, rather than on the substance of the proposals he planned to put before the United Nations Subcommittee on Disarmament when it's so far fruitless negotiations are resumed in London March 19."

Are we in for another summit disaster?

Is Mr. Stassen, who tries hard enough to wage peace, going to be forced to stuff rejected and inadequate proposals back into his briefcase because the "team" simply lacks the spark needed to create disarmament programs calculated to capture the imagination of peace-loving peoples throughout the world?

Will Mr. Stassen come home with his suitcase barren of hope because the "team" simply can't agree on a program so expertly contructed that the Russians cannot reject it without serious loss of face—particularly in the uncommitted areas of the world where they have seized the initiative from us?

My friends, if ever this Nation needed a change in leadership, the time is now. However, under our democratic processes, that change will not come before next November. But it will come!

In the meantime, November is eight months away. And eight months can be an eternity in the fast-moving world of today. The time to achieve a reduction of armaments is during the next few weeks in London.

One of my chief complaints about this administration is that it has failed to take hold of proposals previously made which offer great hope of achieving peace. I am thinking particularly of a far-sighted proposal by the late Senator Brian McMahon which should be given fresh consideration at this critical moment in history.

The administration is also duty-bound to give careful consideration to fresh programs—whatever their origin and even if they stem from Democratic sources.

The administration has long acted as if it considered the conduct of our international relations its own special preserve. This has been particulary true in the field of armament reduction. Well, it's high time it put the conduct of our foreign relations on a truly bipartisan basis—as we Democrats did.

I have a plan to propose to the Eisenhower administration which would, I believe, put a powerful brake upon the arms race—and, at the same time, help us to meet the new and insistent Soviet challenge of nonviolent expansion in the Middle and the Far East.

I offer it to the administration in a completely unpartisan spirit. Indeed, if the administration accepts this plan, and actively strives to put it into operation, it can become one of the proudest plants in the GOP campaign platform.

And if it succeeds, every Democrat will give this administration credit for a major achievement in helping to secure the peace we Democrats so earnestly desire.

The plan is simple.

I call upon President Eisenhower to instruct our representatives in London to propose that Russia join us in an immediate and mutual reduction of armament expenditures by 15 percent.

Coupled with this proposal, and to be made a binding portion of the arms reduction agreement, would be the condition that one-third of the amount saved will then be put into a pool for economic aid to underdeveloped areas.

This joint point 4 program should be administered by the United Nations in such a manner that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States could individually claim the credit for its successes or be blamed for its failures.

In this manner, the Russians will be prevented from making the sort of inroads in the underdeveloped areas which their propaganda drive is now accomplishing in the Far East.

And—who knows?—perhaps a joint endeavor of this nature, administered impartially by the United Nations and combining a reduction in the tools of war with an increase in the tools of economic self-sufficiency for a third of the world, might constitute our first real advance toward peace in 10 years.

In order to extend the greatest benefits of the program to the underdeveloped nations, the first act in its implementation should be the calling a U. N. sponsored economic conference to permit the underdeveloped nations to determine the most lasting long-term benefits from the sizable economic resources which the mutual cut in armament expenditures would provide.

If the Russians refuse to go along with these proposals, they will not only stand condemned in the eyes of the world as foes of arms reduction and peace but—more important, the peoples of the underdeveloped nations will see them stripped of their pretenses and exposed as aggressors who dangle offers of economic aid only for propaganda purposes.

If they are forced to go along with us, then they will help us to accomplish a task for which there is an urgent need in terms of humanity and which will serve our own democratic purposes by strengthening the defenses of the recipient nations against the economic chaos on which communism thrives.

I do not wish to bore you with figures, but let us examine briefly what the allocation of one-third of the savings in arms would mean to whole populations in other parts of the world whose major concern is keeping 1 day away from hunger:

Our budget for arms is roughly $35 billion. Although a sizable portion of the Soviet outlay for arms is concealed in other expenditures such as heavy industry, all available intelligence indicates that Soviet expenditures approximate our own.

Simple arithmetic shows that this plan would funnel approximately $3 billion into a fund to further freedom and prosperity among the new nations of the world who are struggling desperately to achieve self-sufficiency.

Surely this is a plan in keeping with the forward-looking traditions of the Democratic Party, the party which created the Marshall plan, NATO, and point 4.

I am the first to admit that the implementation of this program presents obvious administrative problems. But, for the love of humanity, let us not permit paper problems to stand in the way of creating a new force for good in the world.

From our purely domestic viewpoint this plan has the merit of offering a reduction in the income taxes paid by the average American. With one-third of the savings going to assist young nations in need of help, the other two-thirds could be lopped from our national budget and passed along to the taxpayer who needs relief most—the little fellow.

Importance as they are, however, it is not with reductions in income taxes that I am concerned most.

The question of peace and war is the most crucial of our times. Not only is our own safety involved but the safety of all men everywhere.

Civilization as we know it, and even life itself, may hang in the balance.

The balance has been going against us under this administration.

Let us swing that balance our way and win world opinion through concrete proposals designed to relieve international tensions, improve the economic conditions of the nations, and take the peace propaganda offensive away from the Russians.

I think the plan I have outlined constitutes one such proposal. I commend it to your attention and to the attention of this administration with a warning that time is running out and the time for action is now.

The Congress and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "The Congress and the Constitution," which I recently made on the radio.

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

THE CONGRESS AND THE CONSTITUTION

There is one fundamental idea which underlies the structure of our governmental machinery—the unwavering distrust of a strong Executive, be he President, King, Prime Minister, or Governor. The Federal Constitution, as well as the constitutions of the 48 States, contain specific limitations on the powers of their Chief Executive, including limited succession, confirmation of executive nominations, removal of executive officials, restraints on spending, and others.

It is, of course, natural that this should be so. The colonists who tore away from England had had enough of strong executives, of autocratic kings and autocratic governors.

When independence was established, they worked to design a government in which the Executive would be under the control of the people. Their success is visible in the Constitution.

They made the Executive subject to the watchfulness and the will of Congress, subject thereby, to the will of the people. Congress was established as the eyes, ears, and the voice of the people. It performs the noblest function of government; that of making the laws. The function of the Executive is to put those laws into effect exactly as Congress wrote them. Nothing more.

Examination of the Constitution will reveal how carefully the Founding Fathers spelled out the differences between the authority of the people and those of the President. The decisions of the President are always limited by the higher tribunal

of the Congress, but decisions of the Congress—within the Constitution, are final.

The Congress has the conclusive power to pass laws. The President may veto legislation, but his veto is never final. It can be overturned by a two-thirds majority of the Congress and that decision is final.

The President has the power to grant pardons and reprieves. But that power does not include pardon of impeachment which is a decision of the Congress.

The Constitution provides that the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, but he cannot use those Armed Forces in war, except by the action of Congress. The power to declare war is vested, exclusively, in Congress. Again we see that the decisions of policy are those of Congress—the management or administration of those decisions are the President's.

The President negotiates treaties and foreign agreements, but any treaty so concluded is worthless unless two-thirds of the Senate consents to their enactment.

The President can nominate officials and judges, but his power to appoint them depends upon the consent of the Senate.

The complete dependence of the Executive on the approval of the Congress is inherent in the fact that the Congress controls the power of the purse—the raising and spending of funds. Without money, no Executive can operate and without congressional action there is no money.

Finally, we see the intention of the Founding Fathers, to make Congress the supreme authority, in the provision for impeachment. The Congress can remove, by impeachment, any civil official or Federal judge. Why the Congress can, by impeachment, remove the President, himself. But there is no parallel authority to remove Members of Congress. No one can remove a Member of the Congress during his elected term of office. Why? Because he represents the people, and in this land, the people reign supreme over the affairs of Government.

It is for these reasons that Alexander Hamilton, in the Federalist papers, speaks eloquently of the "superior weight and influence of the legislative body in a free government." It is upon this superior weight that a free government must rest. Once the balance of influence shifts to the Executive, free government has set foot upon the road of self-destruction.

Yet, that road has already been set upon by our Nation. We are, in fact, well on our way toward its end. The Executive has become superior to the Congress in weight and influence.

As the affairs of the Nation became more numerous and life more complex, there began a trend toward increasing the scope of the Executive. Today, actually, it is the Executive, as represented by the person of the President, who wields virtually all of the power of government. The Congress has helped increase the Presidential power by a direct abdication of its functions.

We have a growing body of laws which vest tremendous powers in the hands of the President, or some Presidential appointee. I recall that in the recent farm bill before the Senate, there were over 20 instances of the delegation of congressional power to the Secretary of Agriculture, including such vital functions as the determination of how much money shall be spent under the various farm-support and soil-bank programs.

A second source of increasing Presidential power is open usurpation. Usurpation was effective because the Congress failed to exercise its powers, especially its powers to remove officers who tried to operate above the law. The recent example of a President making war in Korea without asking for congressional consent, is an example of autocratic Executive power in this country.

When such an act is committed, the Congress has a clear obligation to assert its authority. To declare war is constitutionally the power of Congress alone. Any other method of making war is, therefore, clearly unconstitutional. A President who thus violated the Constitution violated his oath of office to uphold and preserve it. Congress had the power and the duty to act. It did not act and thus another of its powers slipped into the hands of the Executive.

Why is it that Congress has allowed this state of affairs to come about and then to continue? I think the answer is rather simple. The voters, the people for whom the Congress speaks, have been indifferent. We have concentrated increasingly at election time on the Presidency. That has been the star of the whole show, with the congressional candidates all too often playing a secondary role. Yet it is the Congress that makes the laws upon which the Presidency operates.

Perhaps the increasing power of the President is largely due to the changed attitude of the people as a whole. We look now to the Federal Government for the solution of most of our problems, problems which traditionally have been met by the State and local governments, or private initiative. The President is symbolic of the Federal Government as an entity, whereas the Member of Congress represents, first of all, his constituency back home.

A continued weakening of that congressional authority will have as its inevitable result the creation of an all-powerful Executive. In other words, a system of dictatorship.

What is the answer? Because Congress is in your hands as the voting public, so is the answer. The election of a Congress, determined to protect the traditional constitutional concept of Congress and Executive, will automatically restore the balance of power.

We know, from experience, that an aroused Congress is the best defense against the encroachment of Executive power. Even in these times, when the Executive power had reach its high point, Congress, once aroused, has shown the power it can wield.

Twenty years ago a powerful Chief Executive, one who had what many considered a rubberstamp Congress, attempted to destroy the judicial authority of the United States by packing the Supreme Court. No one expected anything but consent from the Congress. Yet a small handful of determined Constitutionalists refused to accept this emasculation of the Constitution. They decided to fight out the issue on the floor of Congress. When the battle was over, a very surprised President found that he had been defeated.

We have seen more recent struggles between President and Congress. Another President took it upon himself to decide the assignment of troops to any part of the globe at his whims. The Congress again took issue and there ensued one of the great historic debates in our history. The result was a reassertion of the right to declare war only by the will of Congress.

When the Internal Security Act of 1950 was passed, it was vetoed by the President and all authority and propaganda of the executive branch of Government was mobilized to make that veto stick. But an aroused Congress, determined to protect the security of the Nation, set aside the veto. The story is the same with the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

In these glorious flashes of reasserted congressional authority, we can see the potential salvation of our Republic. Only the Congress has the constitutional force to oppose Executive dictation, to force a return to limited Presidential power.

But Congress will do the job only if those who make up its membership are dedicated to that cause. Weak, compromising men, men who prefer that the Presidency have both authority and responsibility, will never be able to do that job.

The answer, therefore, lies with the Congress. Those who believe in the traditional constitutional form of government for this land must concentrate their effort on the election of a constitutional Congress. Each Member of Congress is an important link in that chain.

In the selection of candidates to run for Congress in either party, you, as the individual voter, must do everything possible to assure the nomination of candidates unequivocally dedicated to the preservation of constitutional American government.

In your district, a few hundred votes may assure victory to the side of constitutional government, whereas, millions of votes are needed in a nationwide election.

Important as the Presidency is, the restraints Congress can place upon the Chief Executive can render harmless attempts to usurp power.

So, I say to you, make certain that no one is elected in your district who does not adhere to constitutionalism, that no one is elected who believes in globalism, in oneworldism, in unlimited authority for the President. If you do your part, the victory will be ours.

Americans Will Not For Long Remain Immoral and Economically Ridiculous Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the House what I said in a speech before the Freedom Club in Los Angeles, Calif., on March 22, 1956, so am repeating for the RECORD what I said then:

AMERICANS WILL NOT FOR LONG REMAIN IMMORAL AND ECONOMICALLY RIDICULOUS TOO

Why do we continue to tolerate the pretense that politicians in Washington have any right or power to take our private incomes and manage them better than we can for ourselves? Slavery for a long time was tolerated because it was claimed by Government to be best for the slaves. In the same way, and for the same reason, our Government now manages our corn, wheat, cotton, rice, butter, cheese, dry milk, tobacco, peanuts, etc., or one-third of our agriculture. It is a mess. Those products are losing markets, having to reduce acreage; consumption is falling and prices are unstable. Government housing at half rent, tax exempt, is an outrage on the taxpayers and just as bad on the Government tenants. Government socialized power, like TVA, and irrigation projects at taxpayers' expense everywhere are blights on the people who take the money. Our foreign aid, now up to $60 billion, or $1,500 per American family on the average, does not satisfy the Socialist governments to whom it is paid. They want it doubled. The political party or parties out of power scold us for financing the parties in power and keeping them out. Imagine how mad all Americans would be if Great Britain had spent $3 billion or $4 billion to help Harry Truman stay in power and keep the Republicans out. They've got too much sense to do that.

So, Government robbing of Peter to pay Paul weakens Peter and demoralizes Paul. It has bought us no friends.

The very idea that our Government should pretend to have the right to seize such powers

was utterly repugnant to us for 140 years. It was thought impossible because we had a contract with our Government specifically prohibiting all this. We so feared the inevitable evil tendencies of Government that we drastically limited its functions to its only legitimate sphere, namely, the protection of life and property, keeping law and order. Then to make doubly sure, we had the politicians chained to these proper and limited functions. We specified in 1789 what Congress could tax and spend. We limited the function and taxing and spending power of our cities and counties and States, too. Fortunately, we have kept and enforced those limitations, and as a result we have not gone Socialist, with few exceptions, in our cities, counties, and States. Our socialism, viz: converting private property into public or Government owned and operated property, is confined almost entirely to Washington. We breed our Socialists and Communists there.

After 25 years of infiltration, especially of one of the old parties in power, Congress is unable to repeal and wipe off the books the socialism we've already got. If we fail to somehow wipe it off the books completely we must go on. For we must be all socialized or all free. There can be no coexistence—half Socialist, half free. We can't even be one-quarter or one-tenth Socialist and remain static at that point. For obviously if we socialize corn every living thing that consumes corn must ultimately be socialized. Farmers can't buy Government owned and controlled corn and sell beef, pork, milk, and eggs in a free market. The farmers can't get enough for their products on a free market to buy Government-owned corn boosted far above the free market level. So, Government must give each buyer a subsidy so he can buy subsidized Government corn.

The burden of taxes on 40 million families is $10 billion, or an average of $250 per year on every family to pay the costs of the socialization already mentioned. Still more groups are asking to be brought under new areas of socialization. Indeed, every socialized area makes the socialization of all areas related to it inevitable. For example, you hear the people cry out under our present burden, saying, "After we pay our taxes we haven't enough left to pay for the care of our sick, our aged, the education of our children, etc."

So, Mr. KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, introduces the Kelley bill providing for Federal aid and control of education on a vast scale. It has already passed the House Committee on Education by a vote of 21 to 9. It will likely come before the whole House for action at this session.

It proposes to take by force from the taxpayers $400 million a year for each of the next 4 fiscal years, a total of $1,600 million, and redistribute that largesse to some of the States at the expense of others for classroom construction. It's all done without taxpayers' consent. They are not permitted to vote on the question. Six industrial States in the North and West, viz: New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, and California will be compelled to put up 57.6 percent of the total tax moneys and get back but 35.7 percent of the benefits as grants for classroom construction in those States.

Whereas Mississippi will get eight classrooms for every one it pays for.

You may ask how can this redistribution of wealth go on and on as it has been going for so many years. Why do the people take it without a fight? The answer is that it is done by the cleverest kind of government deception and organized votes of pressure groups. The individual, unorganized voter is made to feel helpless. In order to arouse the people to write their Congressmen they are told by the government propaganda machine for example that we have a dreadful shortage of classrooms and teachers. The people are made to feel inadequate for their responsibilities; unable to meet the cost. The Federal Government must. Washington is held out as the source of money and mercy and concern for the people. Washington admits that people used to manage themselves but asserts they can't any more.

It should be obvious that no Central Government can know what the total needs for classrooms are in 57,000 separate school districts. Only each local school district can know what its needs are. If it pays for them itself all the needs will be at one figure. If some far-off giveaway Federal aid for free government is to pay for them, the needs will be at least doubled. The United States Office of Education survey of such needs got just such a result. It asked the superintendents of schools, "What are your new classroom needs, assuming, of course, that the Federal Government may pay for them or a part of them?" The answers showing the needs that came back to Washington were fantastic. The report of the Federal Government showed that there was not a single State in the Union on present tax structures that could pay for all the classrooms the professionals said were needed. Bear in mind, not a single school board or taxpayers' group or parents' group or citizens' group who are going to pay for the school buildings somehow, sometime, was consulted. The professionals scrapped a large part of our present school buildings as unfit. You should have seen the needs for new gymnasiums, auditoriums, cafeterias, and extracurricular facilities that showed up.

It was on just such shoddy, strictly professional, one-sided Government reporting that the President was asked to announce to the country that it needed 370,000 classrooms. Hardly a week went by before the Office of Education had to scale down the number by nearly half. While the Government was wrangling, the school districts were themselves building their own schools.

We have a legitimate area for Government functions. All others are illegitimate. Those illegitimate functions I hate as much as anyone.

There is just one legitimate area, and only one, where the Central Government is honorable, and indeed admirable, and, on the whole, honest. That area has to do with the defense of the people's rights and property, the maintenance of law and order, and the sacrifice having to do with national defense.

These are not legitimate functions of Government merely because the Constitution or the contract with Government says so. They are proper functions because the moral and natural law made them so, long before the Constitution. They are in the nature of things. The individual has the same rights and powers with the same limitations imposed on him by the moral and natural law. He can use force to defend himself and his property. And that's the only time he can use force on another person without his consent. He can transfer that right and power to Government as his agent. And since all rights and powers come from the Creator to the individual, he can convey no different or higher right or power to Government than he himself possesses.

Even if people should vote by a majority to give more power to Government than they themselves possess as individuals, the transfer would be no good. When Satan offered to Jesus, in the hour of His greatest temptation, the powers and privileges of the kingdoms of the world, Jesus rejected them utterly. Satan had no such power as he pretended to have to transfer to Jesus. He had simply assumed to have an immoral and illegal power over the people which he had no right to convey.

When the Government goes beyond that restricted area which is the only natural and moral area possible for Government to occupy, then without exception it becomes dishonorable, full of misrepresentation and corruption. It exploits the people to do special favors for special groups in return for their votes. It pretends to be able to manage people and their property better than they can manage for themselves. It attempts to play God in the lives of the people.

It is beginning to dawn upon us that using the force of Government to take other people's property to do good according to Government's notion of what is good is all dead wrong. The fact that the whole world is morally wrong by taking people's private property and making it Government owned emphasizes the extent of the world collapse of morals. And, of course, what is morally wrong is contrary to the laws of God. The world violates them with contempt. When Government violates the laws of God by doing what no individual can morally do, then it is just as guilty of wrong as the individual would be guilty. What we have been doing has always been regarded economically wrong. It is indeed both economically and morally wrong.

For example, a lot of our old neighbors, some of our children, fell in love with the mountains and deserts of the great West. They knew before they went West that there was no water in the deserts. They went anyway. They never dreamed of tapping every eastern family $25 for every billion dollars needed for water. Yet when they organized themselves into political groups they said to their Congressmen, "You go back there and take $25 on the average from every family in the East, or we will not reelect you to Congress." So, the Congressmen have done very well. They have already collected about $150 from each family, or about $6 billion altogether for that purpose.

As another example of the immoral and ridiculous, take a look at TVA in Tennessee. That was our first planting of a Socialist rose in a patch of weeds, otherwise called the free economy. All competition was killed off for its benefit. The rose has had to be artificially fed ever since 1922. And the feeding has cost us in recent years $190 million per year, a total of over $2 billion. That is another $50 per family Government has outrageously presumed to have the power to take from us. It sells power below cost so that 110,000 families heat their houses with electricity at your expense. TVA never can earn a surplus at such rates to build new facilities for a growing population. And Government can never raise the rates and keep the votes of the people. There will always be a shortage of power so long as TVA has to depend on Congress for its life. Industry won't move into Tennessee because they can't depend on Congress to continue to carry such a weakling. Congress can't depend on itself either in that regard. TVA doesn't pay a dime toward the national defense—it's exempt from all taxes. It has been a blight on the State of Tennessee. It has constantly fallen behind all the other 11 southeastern private power-producing States in agricultural products, in manufacturing, in retail sales, in growth of new business, in postal receipts. All this is in accordance to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States survey in 1953.

On all of our Socialist projects above described, the Government spends $10 billion annually, and loses most of it. That's $250 annually per family. And it's growing much worse. There is no restraint or reversal of the trend in sight.

Clearly the President can't stop it. When he runs for reelection this fall, he will be met by a committee at nearly every State line asking, one after the other, "How much, Mr. President, will you take from others to give to us for more power this year?" The President must say, "Well, boys, you've been getting along with about $190 million a year for a good many years. I guess we can't drop below that on this election year."

Then come the corn boys. And at the next State line the wheat boys. And the water boys; the irrigation boys.

On his way home the big city boys say, "How much, Mr. President, will you take from those awful corn boys to give us Government houses, tax exempt, at half rent? How much for Federal aid to education? How much for health and hospitalization? And how much, Mr. President, for our cousins and our uncles and our aunts abroad?" So, 1956 will turn out to be not an election year for a great statesman but the 25th anniversary of the great auction of the people's rights and their property in return for votes. The continued transformation by force of more and more private property into public ownership for the benefit of special groups is leading to our total political corruption.

Congress certainly can't stop it. Congress has tried and failed.

One day the corn boys, the stalwarts from Illinois, appeared in the House and said, "Our consciences hurt. We've got to reduce taxes. We don't dare go back home for election until we throw some group out of the public feed trough. Where shall we start. Which one shall we choose for confession of a sin and the sacrifice?" Which group of voters would you throw out if you were running for Congress on election year? It would have been a beautiful and encouraging thing if the corn boys from Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska had marched down to the Well of the House and sacrificed corn. But it never dawned upon them to do so. They have been feeding on billions of dollars for 17 or 18 years, so that by now they feel that they have a vested right to continue to feed on the public. Their commodity is basic. If they should quit taking subsidies from the people that might cause such a shock as to seriously affect the whole economy. No, sir; we can't have that. You know we have $8 billion worth of surplus corn, wheat, and other commodities in cribs and bins, molding and wasting away. That's $200 per family.

So, corn decided to pick on peanuts for the sacrifice. Peanuts were such a very natural selection. Few losses of Republican votes were involved. The Illinois boys led off with two days of debate. "Why," they said, "this country could get along if we never grew another peanut. They are sort of indigestible anyway."

By this time the Members from Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, and Texas were so furious and their wit so sharp, that they made the corn boys ashamed and they frightened all the other little groups feeding at the public trough. When the vote was taken it was 228 to 170 to keep peanuts in the trough with all the rest and forget the whole business of restoring the free economy and constitutional government.

Apples and other commodities were greatly encouraged. They said, "Why, we're basic commodities. An apple a day keeps the doctor away. We must have our subsidies too." And so it goes on and on.

We are now in somewhat the same position as that of our ancestors just prior to 1789. We, the people, must, as they did then, reassert and redefine, so that even the Supreme Court can't misinterpret, the constitutional limitations on the functions of government. The taxing and spending powers of Congress must be limited again. We must first of all correct the dreadful mistake made in 1913, called the 16th amendment, which gave unlimited power to Congress to tax and spend. We must chain the politicians, as Jefferson said, to the limitations of the Constitution so they can't break away from them.

California would be a good State to lead off now as Virginia and Massachusetts were in the beginning. Many groups are forming, like the Campaign for the 48 States, the American Coalition of Patriot Societies, For America, We the People, to support the Reed-Dirksen amendment to the Constitution. It limits Congress to a top income tax, both corporate and individual, of 25 percent. The tax would start at nothing and go no higher than 25 percent, except in case of war or national emergency. Federal estate and gift taxes would be abolished. Estates should be a special source of taxes for State and local governments, instead of being liquidated by the Federal Government.

This amendment would reduce the spending powers of Congress by about $10 billion, almost exactly what our present socialism costs. It would dry up on our books our socialism which we can't or won't repeal. It would starve out our Socialists and Communists who must continue to breed faster than we can investigate them unless we quit completely operating our own socialism on which they feed.

The proposed 23d amendment would wipe off our books at once 7 or 8 hundred illegitimate Government enterprises. They cover everything from housing, electric-power projects, irrigation, crop subsidies, down to coffee roasting, representing $50 billion, or $1,250 taken per family. This amendment is a California product, proposed 11 years ago by the American Progress Foundation, 6413 Franklin Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. It is now being actively advocated before the State legislatures. Illinois has passed it, others will do so soon, we hope. It's a perfectly splendid idea. So good that I was especially proud to propose it to the House of Representatives. It provides: "The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution."

There should be adopted the Byrd-Bridges amendment. It will force Congress to stay in session each year until they have balanced the budget. Congress must not spend any more than they are willing to tax the people to pay currently, except, of course, in case of war. That will stop increasing the debt and operating on borrowed money for current expenses.

The Reed-Walter amendment clarifies the Constitution and makes it possible for the States to amend the Constitution by initiating amendments themselves. The Constitution intended that they should have that power to amend.

These amendments should be presented to the State legislatures for action. When 32 of the States send identical resolutions to amend to Congress, Congress must resubmit them to the States. When ratified by 36 of the States, the amendments forthwith become a part of the Constitution.

Thus we can limit the Federal Government's power to tax and spend, just as our local political subdivisions are limited.

Then if we should elect a Socialist President, as we may, he could do no special damage in carrying off our property and violating our rights without limitations.

We should thus be able to look forward possibly to another 150 years of freedom.

The States reserved to themselves the power to amend the Constitution. They defined the powers of the Federal Government in 1789 just as they may redefine and clarify them now. We should by such amendments release again the inventive, productive, creative, even the atomic, energy which lies in the individual mind and heart alone. Government is never creative, or productive except as it protects the creative and productive powers of free men. It can only use force on mankind. We should, by these constitutional measures, take off our backs the unbearable burdens of our incredible Government that has broken out of bounds. It has illegally and immorally seized power over us. We have unwittingly permitted it to grow upon us.

We should make of ourselves a true example of freedom again in the world. It does not exist today. Thus we might hope to repeat the contribution which we made in the past against the police states of the world. Thus we could hope to reestablish peace at home and in the world.

Israel: A Brief History of Recent Arab-Israel Relations and Suggestions for a Lessening of Tensions and Restoring the Balance of Power in the Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the privilege of inserting in the RECORD the excellent address made by our colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire, the Honorable CHESTER E. MERROW, on Sunday evening, April 8, before the Jewish National Fund, Third Seder Celebration in Lakewood, N. J., which is in the district I have the honor to represent. It is a speech containing much wisdom and sound judgment and is a constructive contribution to the problems facing our country in the Near East.

The Third Seder Committee of the Jewish National Fund is headed by Irving L. Kantor who has done an outstanding job in administering his responsibilities. The Third Seder under his leadership has contributed more per capita to the Jewish National Fund than any other comparable community in the United States and this is certainly something to be proud of. Such an achievement does not happen by chance but is the result of outstanding leadership, devotion to duty, and the cooperation of everyone who is interested. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that cooperation is not forthcoming unless there is respect and confidence in the leadership.

Mr. Robert J. Novins, the chairman of the United Jewish Appeal of the Toms River, N. J., community of Jewish farmers, also has contributed much in this undertaking. It is a great privilege for me to represent in the Congress these fine Americans and I am very grateful to my colleague, Congressman MERROW, in meeting with them and bringing to them the wisdom of his experience.

Mr. MERROW's address follows.

TENSION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

The United States is much concerned with the tense situation that exists throughout the Mediterranean area. This section has always played an important role in the history of the world, and today, with the problems in North Africa, the striving for self-determination in Cyprus and the struggle by the young State of Israel to maintain its security, the Mediterranean holds the spotlight in international affairs. It is fervently hoped that satisfactory solutions to these problems may speedily be found. These issues must be resolved so that a general holocaust will not be loosed in this section of the world.

I welcome the opportunity to be here today to speak about one of the critical situations in the Mediterranean area, namely the re-

lationship between Israel and the surrounding Arab States. Since the United States wholeheartedly backed the formation of the State of Israel in accordance with our traditions of freedom and self-determination, we are deeply interested and gravely concerned with the tension that exists in the Middle East. We are resolved that the state shall not be overrun or destroyed, and we seek a peaceful solution to the controversy existing between Israel and the Arab States.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ISRAEL

On May 15, 1948, the new State of Israel was proclaimed an independent nation—a sovereign unit in the ranks of the world powers. Israel was established by a United Nations resolution, vigorously supported by the United States. The Declaration of Independence read by David Ben-Gurion pledged that, "The State of Israel will be based on the precept of liberty, justice, and peace, taught by the Hebrew prophets." Israel is the youngest democracy, and as such, is the great hope of freedom in the Middle East.

Israel has been an energetic and valuable member of the United Nations and has contributed greatly to the development and the success of this organization. I had the privilege of serving as a delegate on the United States Delegation to the 10th General Assembly from September 20 to December 20, 1955, and can attest personally to the valuable and statesmanlike contribution of Israel to the United Nations. Therefore, it is not only the United States which is interested in the welfare of this state, but the United Nations is deeply concerned since Israel was formed under United Nations' aegis.

Faced with weighty internal problems inherent to nationhood, Israel also had to deal externally with problems of far greater moment. The tiny nation found herself wedged between the Mediterranean Sea and unfriendly Arab nations whose harassing border incursions and warlike utterances and actions compelled her to divert a large part of her resources from economic development to the defense of her frontiers. Even though this had to be done in the interest of self-preservation, there has been great economic development in the state of Israel.

On various occasions I have visited the country and have found that the progress is tremendous. It is a modern democratic state, in an area that is much in need of development and democracy. To compound the difficulty, Communist arms and technicians are being supplied to Egypt and to Syria, creating a grave menace to the national survival of the State of Israel. In view of this worsening situation, we will do well to turn our attention to a reexamination of Arab-Israeli relations and the role of the United States in the Middle East.

FIGHT FOR SURVIVAL

At the end of World War II, the centuries-old dream of the Jews for a national homeland came true. Directly after the proclamation of the State of Israel by the United Nations, the states bordering on Israel engaged in open warfare against her. The United Nations immediately began an investigation of the matter, but it was not until many bloody exchanges had occurred and nearly a year of strife had taken place that any reasonable arrangement was found to terminate the bloodshed. On February 24, 1949, an armistice agreement was signed by the interested parties and a momentary truce was instituted. But it was only a reprieve, for the hostile forays of the Arab nations have continued unabatedly from that date to the present time.

It would appear that the enemies of Israel are determined to destroy the tiny state and obliterate her from the Middle Eastern map. The Arab States have steadfastly refused to accept the new State of Israel as a reality and refuse to sit down at the peace conference table with her. This acceptance and conference should and must be forthcoming before the present difficulties can be resolved.

The United Nations has established the state and under no circumstances will we or the other powers allow Israel to be destroyed. Antagonistic groups within the bordering nations continue to boycott, infiltrate and sabotage Israel. At the present moment, Egypt, in making a bid for Arabian leadership in the Eastern Mediterranean, is attempting to use the northern frontier countries of the Baghdad Pact as its principal target.

The Baghdad Pact includes Britain, Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Pakistan. The Baghdad powers are scheduled to meet in Tehran from April 16 to April 20. Deputy Under Secretary of State, Mr. Loy Henderson, will be an observer at this meeting. It is felt that the United States must put its weight behind this pact lest under the pressure of Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Syria, together with the agitation of the Soviet Union, the pact may disintegrate and then the way would be paved for penetration by the Soviet Union in the Middle East. It is unfortunate that Col. Gamal Nassar, Egyptian Premier who apparently is the main instigator of the opposition to Israel, has served notice on all that the Arabs will not hesitate in using force, even though it may automatically mean war.

BORDER DISPUTES IN 1955

Last summer the Middle Eastern crisis was further aggravated by operations by the Arabs in sporadic forays across Israeli frontiers. Attacks were met with counterattacks, terminating in an interchange of accusations and flagrant truce term violations by all parties. When the United Nations truce commission's investigation was completed, the Security Council held seven meetings between March 4 and April 19, 1955. The decision of the Security Council on March 29, 1955, was a condemnation of Israel's attack on Egyptian forces. The basis of this action was that the United States and the other world powers said the attack was in the nature of a reprisal—a premeditated act. They felt that the fact that Israel's borders had been harassed for months by Egyptian raids and infiltrators was not adequate justification.

TRIPARTITE DECLARATION OF 1950

The Tripartite Declaration of 1950, entered into between the United States, Great Britain, and France, recognized "that the Arab States and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purpose of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole."

The declaration also stated: "The three governments take this opportunity of declaring their deep interest in and their desire to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the area and their unalterable opposition to the use of force or threat of force between any of the states in that area. The three governments, should they find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation."

ANTI-ISRAEL BROADCASTS

By the middle of the summer, the official radio mouthpiece of the Government of Egypt, Saut el Arab, had increased its anti-Israel barrage of slander and vituperation, with such statements as the following: "We cannot always remain in a state of war with Israel. We are therefore compelled to mobilize all Arab potential to exterminate her finally. Therefore let us plant in the hearts of the younger generation a hatred of Israel."

This sort of emotional nationalistic fervor can only lead to further misunderstanding and tension, with the passions rising in an ever ascending crescendo toward war and disaster.

SECRETARY DULLES' SPEECH ON AUGUST 26, 1955

Hoping to break this deadlock which has formed in the Near East, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on August 26 devoted a major policy speech before the Council on Foreign Relations to the problem of how this stalemate might be broken. His proposals were among the most constructive efforts brought forth to stabilize the situation. He suggested that there be compensation for the 900,000 Palestinian refugees by Israel to be financed by an international loan, participated in substantially by the United States. The Secretary stated that security could be assured "only by collective measures which commit decisive power to the deterring of aggression." Mr. Dulles stated that, "President Eisenhower has authorized me to say that, given a solution of the other related problems, he would recommend that the United States join in formal treaty engagements to prevent or thwart any effort by either side to alter by force the boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbors. I hope that other countries would be willing to join in such a security guaranty, and that it would be sponsored by the United Nations." The Secretary of State pointed out that the existing boundary lines were established by the armistice agreements of 1949. He said that the drawing of permanent boundaries is a difficult task and that the lines fixed by the armistice agreements of 1949 were not designed to be permanent in every respect. He reaffirmed the willingness of the United States to help in reaching a solution to the boundary problem and other matters.

Israel's reaction to this was favorable, of course, but its leaders felt it was only one step toward resolving the dilemma. They pointed out that Israel had always been ready to make peace with the Arabs and offer concessions on the resettlement and compensation of refugees as part of a general peace settlement. However, they insisted that the fact of a united Arab front pledged to destroy Israel as a sovereign state left them no choice but to make Israel stronger militarily and to strengthen its ties with other areas. Israel maintained that if there had been any genuine attempts by the Arab groups to compromise or diminish their intransigent attitude, she would be open to negotiation and suggestions. But Israel could see no such change in the Arab attitude forthcoming.

In July 1955, for example, David Ben-Gurion offered to meet with Premier Gamal Nasser "or any other Egyptian statesman who is ready to meet with me in order to consider ways and means of improving relations between Israel and the Arab States." No reply was made to this, but within the month armed bands of Egyptians were making deep raids into Israeli territory, west and north of the Gaza demarcation line. It has been obvious that from the Arab point of view the war was not over—after all, only an armistice had been agreed to, they argued. It is no wonder that Israel feels that she must do all she can to balance the military strength the Arabs are acquiring from the Communists.

On February 6, 1956, several Republican Members of Congress sent a letter concerning the Israeli-Arab situation to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. I support the views expressed in this letter and to it give my wholehearted endorsement. I quote certain parts of the letter: "Under the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, our Government recognized 'that the Arab States and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purpose of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense

and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole.' Because of a fear of growing imbalance of arms, the Government of Israel desires to purchase defensive arms strictly for purposes of self-defense. We have individually, and now collectively, taken the position that Israel as a firm part of the free world should be allowed to obtain in the open market such weapons as would assure her protection against aggression. What is the position of the State Department on this matter?

"We do not contend that tension in the Middle East can be finally resolved by the provision of defensive arms alone. We are convinced that immediate negotiations for the conclusion of a treaty of peace between Israel and the Arab world should be undertaken. These negotiations should be effectively implemented by our Government in association with those governments which joined in the Tripartite Declaration of 1950.

"It is vital that prompt and decisive measures be taken to end the threat of war in the Near East.

"To achieve this end the negotiation of formal treaties guaranteeing the existing frontiers of Israel and the Arab nations is essential, but essential also is a willingness to negotiate such treaties. We believe that a treaty of peace and a guaranty of existing frontiers should be offered to all interested parties in the Middle East and should be implemented promptly as to the frontiers of that nation or those nations which accept the proposed peace terms. Otherwise we continue to be faced with the refusal of some nations to enter into peace negotiations or even to recognize the existence of the State of Israel. What is the position of the State Department in this regard?

"There are two additional matters as to which we seek information from the Department: first, we do not believe that economic aid should be extended to any nation which is engaging in warlike or aggressive maneuvers against any part of the Free World. Therefore, we would like to go on record as urging our Department of State to consider most carefully further extension of economic aid, denying such aid to those countries which by their actions endanger the peace and security of free nations. What is the position of the State Department in this regard?

"Second, we agree with your August 26, 1955, statement concerning the immediate desirability of economic and technical help in resettling those Arab refugees whose continued presence in their present location delays or impedes the possibility of a total solution of the Arab-Israel problem. What progress has been made by our Government and associated nations toward the solution of this matter?

"We recognize that the continuing effort of our Government to counter the spread of world communism has many facets. Action taken anywhere may have repercussions in all parts of the world. But we do urgently feel that our constituents will be better informed by frank statements of the position of the Department of State wherever that is possible, consistent with national security. As Members of Congress, who support the aims and objectives of this administration, we are particularly anxious that our constituents be advised that the Department is taking positive steps toward the protection of free nations such as Israel and toward the dissolution of dangers which, in threatening the peace of Israel, threaten also the peace of the free world."

UNITED NATIONS ACTION IN 1956

As a further blow to the Israeli efforts to maintain a balance of power in this troubled Mediterranean area, on January 19, 1956, the United Nations Security Council unanimously voted to condemn Israel for an attack on a Syrian military post which took place on December 11, 1955. Even though Israel agreed that United Nations action must be supported, nevertheless, she felt she could not solely depend on the United Nations because the Soviet Union has a veto in the Council. From January on, therefore, the State of Israel has been pressing for more dependable and quicker means to meet the threat of aggression from the Arab States.

On the 4th of April the Security Council of the United Nations unanimously requested Dag Hammarskjold to go to the Middle East. This was done by the adoption of a United States-sponsored resolution. It is hoped that the Secretary General's mission will result in decreasing tensions in that area. Mr. Hammarskjold will endeavor to obtain better compliance with the armistice terms. His recommendations, which are to be reported to the Council within a month, are anxiously awaited.

ISRAEL STRIVING FOR SECURITY

Israeli leaders have been striving persistently for some additional guaranty for her security, especially in the form of a mutual-defense treaty with the United States and military assistance to Israel in order to remove the arms imbalance being created by Communist arms shipments to both Egypt and Syria. Israel is well aware of the long-run value of the Tri-Partite Declaration by the United States, Great Britain, and France to intervene in the event of organized aggression by either side, but, nevertheless, she does feel that at the moment of attack, arms and military materiel will be needed if she is to withstand the initial shock of the aggression for which no big power declaration can effectively act as a substitute. In other words, a security guaranty is not a substitute for defensive strength. As a supplement to arms it would be an excellent idea, but it cannot be considered an alternative solution, but rather as one piece in the whole fabric of security and defense guaranties.

I have always maintained that the Near East is an area vital to the security of the United States and that of the free world. The little State of Israel forms an important bastion of freedom and independence in that area. I feel that it would be perfectly proper and timely for the United States to supply arms to Israel in the context of that nation's legitimate self-defense and within the larger context of the security of the United States. This is possible within the framework of the mutual-security legislation, which is the basic law governing United States military assistance to friendly nations. I have been a firm supporter of this legislation since its first enactment in 1949 and I have consistently supported aid to the State of Israel under the mutual-security program.

Israel is already getting arms and assistance from France. We have taken the position that we have no objection to the shipment of arms to Israel by France and Great Britain. In view of the unwillingness of the Arab States to reach an equitable solution on the frontiers and, in view of the determination to oppose Israel as is evidenced by the attitude of intransigence, Israel should receive arms from the West to guarantee her security. Such arms are necessary in our own national interests.

The shipment of arms to Israel would, in my opinion, serve as a necessary military deterrent, the element which needs to be restored in order to maintain security in the region. Israel, it must be explained, does not insist upon a numerical superiority in arms but only an adjustment of the existing military imbalance resulting from transactions of the Communists. It is my firm conviction that a United States arms shipment would be a positive step to settle, or at least to lessen the present trying conflict, and certainly would further American and world democratic interests in sustaining and strengthening the new democracy of Israel. This is a feeling that is increasing in the United States as the situation in the Near East steadily deteriorates.

CONCLUSION

But apart from the moral and spiritual blow which this would mean to the whole free world, it is only too apparent to us that the loss of the sovereign State of Israel would be a crushing defeat to the United States, since the disappearance of this citadel of freedom would not only break the bonds of world democratic soldarity but would also open up the Near East to Soviet domination. The United States surely will not allow this to happen, and it is becoming a matter of increasing concern to every American.

I feel, as I have stated, that it is proper for us to furnish arms to Israel on the basis of the legitimate self-defense of the nation and within the larger context of the security of the United States. This situation must be settled peacefully, for if war comes it may well destroy not only Israel but may well engulf the entire world. Israel is the bastion of democracy in the Middle East. The state has been established by the United Nations and with our wholehearted support. We were the first to recognize Israel. Our influence and leadership must be used to make the existence of the State of Israel a recognized and accepted fact and we must vigorously oppose any solution to the Near East problem that would interfere with the sovereignty and security of the State of Israel.

The integrity of Israel is essential to our own security. Israel has made a valiant struggle for freedom and democracy. Israel stands foursquare against the Communists and anything that would impair the state would be of assistance to the Communists in their endeavor to firmly establish themselves in the Middle East. Stability in this area must be restored and arms are essential for self-protection. At the same time every effort must be exerted to reach a peaceful and satisfactory solution in this troubled area. If we help Israel build the necessary defensive strength to protect herself against aggression, she will be able to build in peace the model of freedom which I believe firmly will inevitably have a profound influence on the whole area of the Near East. Thus, by setting an example of peace and democracy, Israel will fulfill her historic mission.

Israel is the bulwark of democracy in an area where the Communists are using every effort to secure a foothold. This bastion of freedom is the free world's greatest hope of halting the incursion of communism in an area vital to our security.

A Bill To Amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 requiring that no civilian aircraft should be operated within the territorial limits of the United States, unless the owner thereof has given proof of his ability to respond in damages in such amounts as the Board shall prescribe, for the death or injury to any persons or damage to property resulting from the operation of such aircraft for which the owner thereof may be liable.

Commercial airlines adequately protect the public in this regard. However, the rise in the number of privately owned civilian aircraft with its concurrent rise in accidents have caused a problem somewhat similar, although smaller, to that involving the use and operation of automobiles.

Many thousands of our citizens have been maimed and killed, and their property destroyed in accidents involving the use of privately owned airplanes. Adequate compensation for such damage has not been forthcoming due to the fact that many private owners of such aircraft are not financially responsible. This has resulted in economic privation and permanent suffering of the victims of these accidents who have found themselves with uncollectible judgments or claims.

This bill will provide adequate protection for the public in such situations.

The Quest for Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter:

THE QUEST FOR UNDERSTANDING—NEWSLETTER No. 178

MARCH 19, 1956.

DEAR FRIEND: Veteran Congressmen are like doctors in affecting a professional air of poise and self-confidence. Rarely do they seem disturbed. Even though they may be torn inwardly by doubt, fear, or anger, outwardly their attitude is one of totally unruffled composure.

Witness, for example, the ease with which Hanry Clay disposed of a hostile Congressman whom he encountered in one of the narrow corridors of the Capitol. The angry man refused to move over. "I never give way to scoundrels," he snapped as he pressed forward. Clay bowed and stepped aside. "I always do," he retorted as he continued on his way.

Members of the Appropriations Committee, handling as they do the purse strings of Government, generally possess this quality to a great degree. Long experienced in intricate problems of Government finance, they take even the most unusual and extraordinary budget request in stride. However, a hearing before our committee last week subjected us to an extremely rigorous test.

We were visited by a delegation of some of the Nation's most eminent scientists. They were asking for $28 million to complete preparations for the International Geophysical Year, the worldwide scientific exploration which will take place in 1957. They came loaded with charts, graphs, mathematical formulas and a disarmingly simple manner. But as soon as they began their presentation we knew we were going to have a rough time.

Dr. Richard Porter, one of the country's great experts on rockets, was the first witness. He discussed the proposed experiment to launch a small sphere, called the earth satellite, into outer space to revolve around the earth like the moon. Dr. Porter soon had the committee members revolving quite dizzily around him. In response to the blunt question, "How are you going to get the thing up there?" Dr. Porter replied: "We get it up there by rocket propulsion * * *. This is the fundamental equation of the rocket." Turning to the blackboard, he wrote the following:

$$\text{“}\Delta v = Vg \log \frac{m\ 1}{m\ 2}\text{”}$$

Then he proceeded to make the formula clear: "The change in velocity in any kind of rocket," he explained, "discounting gravity and the effects of air, in other words, just the effect of the rocket propulsion, is equal to the exhaust gas velocity times the logarithm of the mass at the beginning, divided by the mass at the end."

Chairman ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas, was equal to the occasion. "That is just simple," he said—"go ahead, Doctor." The doctor went ahead. For a brief period he moved through his complicated processes, and then, as though he had had enough, he summed up: "The satellite stays up because of centrifugal force. It is projected into its orbit by a three-stage rocket weighing 22,000 pounds at takeoff. It probably will be a spherical object about 20 to 30 inches in diameter. The final object will weigh about 20 pounds. It will carry instruments for at least one experiment at a time, which will radio information back to us on earth."

Until this summary, one of the committee members had been wishing for a more simple, if less scholarly explanation, like that of the astronomer who, while observing the heavens through the huge telescope at Mount Wilson Observatory, suddenly announced: "It's going to rain." His students were impressed, and one asked, "How do you know, sir?" Still peering through the telescope, the scientist declared: "Because my corns hurt."

It was the chairman who asked the $28 million question. He wanted to know whether the enormous amounts of time and energy and the scientific brains and effort to be poured into the experiment would bring commensurate results. Dr. Porter's answer was in the affirmative. "The important thing is not knowledge," he said, "but understanding. Understanding comes from knowledge. It comes from all kinds of knowledge. By taking the bits of knowledge we will get from the programs on aurora and air glow, and the upper atmospheric rocket program which gives only spot pieces of information, and by taking the continuing information we will get from the satellite program, I very confidently predict that the greatest upsurge of new scientific understanding of our time will follow."

The committee approved the funds for the experiment. Aware of our own limitations, we did not want to impose restrictions on those who know none—who are looking toward the horizon beyond the horizon—who are looking for greater understanding.

Your friend,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced two more legislative proposals prepared in collaboration with the Department of Justice to supplement the measures introduced Monday as part of the administration's civil-rights program. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER], who joined in proposing to establish a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights and a Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department on Monday, are likewise sponsoring this legislation.

One of these bills is designed to, first, prevent anyone from threatening, intimidating, or coercing a voter in any election; second, authorize the Attorney General to institute civil action in such cases; and, third, eliminate the requirement that all other remedies must be exhausted before cases can reach the Federal courts. The second proposal would give the Attorney General authority to bring civil suits against civil-rights conspiracies, such as groups attempting to deprive a citizen of equal treatment. In the past, such suits could be filed only by the injured individual.

Enactment of these 2 measures and the 2 introduced Monday will be an important step forward in guaranteeing the civil rights of all citizens regardless of race, creed, color, or political affiliation. At an appropriate time during the deliberations of the Judiciary Committee next week I shall offer these four proposals in a single bill as a substitute for the omnibus measure which we are now considering.

I trust that serious and open-minded consideration will be given these proposals. If we try to bite off more than we can chew, Congress will get exactly nowhere—as in the past. On the other hand, if we follow the administration's moderate and constructive suggestions on civil rights I am confident we can reach agreement and get favorable action. Solid accomplishment is now possible. Let us not ruin the chances of success by an unrealistic approach to this serious national problem.

Hon. A. M. Artajo, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Spain, Visits Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the city of Washington is playing host this week to the distinguished Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Spain, the Honorable A. M. Artajo, and to his charming wife and daughter. I join my colleagues on this occasion in expressing the hope that the distinguished foreign visitors will enjoy their stay in Washington, and that the official conferences between Foreign Minister Artajo and Secretary of State Dulles will aid in providing firm groundwork for cooperation between our two nations in coping with the menace of international communism.

I am certain that I need not recall the fact that the Republic of Spain has shown very realistic understanding of the nature and menace of communism.

Perhaps the most prominent evidence of this understanding has been the attitude of the Government of Spain toward the fate of the once-free nations of Europe which are today suffering under Communist domination. On repeated occasions, officials of the Spanish Government have declared their sympathy for the people of those captive nations, expressing their conviction that the principles of justice demand that they be freed from the bonds of Communist enslavement.

Indicative of the position taken on this issue by the Government of Spain is a statement made recently by Foreign Minister Artajo who, when asked to comment on the subject of coexistence with the Soviets, said:

> When Russia will liberate the subjugated countries, we will begin to believe in her good will of coexistence.

This was a forthright and farsighted statement, which offers an open and objective test of Soviet intentions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the exchange of views taking place this week between the representatives of the Republic of Spain and of our Nation will make a constructive contribution to our efforts intended to bring about an era of just and lasting peace in the world.

There Is a Bottom in the Barrel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, rich and powerful as we are, is there a logical reason why we should assume the burden of contributing to the support of the rest of the world? Endeavor through education and force—and don't forget the force—to maintain peace throughout the world?

There are other lands greater in area than the United States. Other nations with far more people. Yet some people assume that we should, and insist that we must, wherever on earth there are those who have less than we, divide with them. That whenever, wherever, nations quarrel, we should step in and, figuratively speaking, knock their heads together, insist they cease fighting. We would be as successful doing that as is the individual who ventures into a neighbor's home to settle a family argument.

Since World War I, we have given other nations more than $51 billion. If all the babies, the helpless, those who for some reason or other do not pay an income or other tax, pay their full share, you and I owe on that contribution around $300 each.

Some nations used 3 billion of the dollars we gave them to decrease their national debt. As we borrowed that $3 billion, we are paying $90 million a year interest on that $3 billion while our debt piles up.

While our national debt in 1916 was but $971,562,590, we have jumped it as of March 20, 1956, to $277,249, 684, 429. You figure how much you owe of that. I'm tired.

Now the Congress is being asked for an additional $4,858,975,000 for foreign aid for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1957.

We can ruin ourselves by imposing an ever-increasing tax burden on ourselves. We can, and eventually we will, if we continue our give-away program, destroy our prosperity, impoverish ourselves, be forced to repudiate our national debt, or find ourselves working, yes, perhaps fighting, for other nations.

There is a bottom to the barrel and, in my judgment, we have reached it.

It would be all very well to borrow money to help others or to furnish our allies munitions of war, if we could be sure that they would in time of need stand with us, oppose our enemies, fight Communism. But experience tells us that when their own interests are involved, other nations forget all about us, each does what it thinks will best preserve its own sovereignty.

Today, while we are sending aid and munitions of war to other countries, hoping to stop communism, those countries are doing business as usual with the Communist-block countries. They have been shipping more than 250 separate items, machines and machine tools, to Communist governments for the past 2 years. That is the report of a Senate committee of which JOHN L. MCCLELLAN is chairman.

Is it not about time we quit pouring our money down a rathole, wasting our substance and munitions in other lands, where eventually they reach the Communists? There are plenty of things which need doing here at home, not the least of which is the perfecting of our own national defense.

Peter D. Vroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there was waiting for me on my return from a few days in my district in Chicago a letter telling of the death of Peter D. Vroom. For half a century he was my close friend. For a number of years illness had confined him to his home, but the bonds of a long and dear friendship were kept freshly vibrant by frequent exchange of letters. I shall miss those messages from my friend who now has passed to another and a higher sphere.

Peter D. Vroom was one of the finest newspapermen that I have ever known. He was reporter on the Chicago Tribune during the colorful era of James Keeley. Oldtimers in Chicago will recall Jim Keeley as a powerful and dynamic newspaper editor. Pete Vroom was so close to Jim Keeley that when the latter left the service of the Chicago Tribune to take over the public relations of the Pullman Co., Pete Vroom went with him.

The world in which he was such a vibrant personality has gone. He was past 80 when the hand of death was laid upon him, and most if not all of his associates in the journalism of the period of his prime had preceded him to the grave. I should not want his passing to go unnoticed. He was in every sense of the word a great American, and he lived up to a great and a proud name.

I am happy that the name of Peter D. Vroom will be continued in the generation of the present by his son, also named Peter D. Vroom. Back in colonial days, in the early years of the Republic and in the developing years that followed there has always been a Peter D. Vroom. How many of that name and of that blood served as governors, as judges in the courts and in other high public offices I cannot say with exactness, but the number was large.

One of that family, whose name erroneously is spelled Broom in some published lists of the makers and signers of the Constitution of the United States, was but 35 years of age when he served with Washington, Madison, Hamilton, and the other immortals in the writing of the Constitution of our country. Maj. William Pierce, a fellow delegate to the Constitutional Convention, spells the name correctly "Vroom," in his pen sketches of his fellow delegates.

If my colleagues will turn to page 1959 of the biographical directory of the American Congress they will find that another of the family blood and name, Peter D. Vroom, was elected as a Democrat to the 26th Congress, convening on March 4, 1839. This Peter D. Vroom was electer Governor of New Jersey as a Jackson Democrat in 1829, 1830, 1831, 1833, 1834, 1835, and 1836. He was a presidential elector on the Democratic ticket of Pierce and King in 1852 and also a presidential elector on the Democratic ticket of Seymour and Blair in 1868. He at all times carried proudly the name of Peter D. Vroom. My friend whose death has brought to me a load of grief carried proudly and well in his day and generation that name. To the son, to whom is left the rich heritage of a good and famous name, is presented a challenge that I know he will meet in the spirit of his father and his forebears.

To the widow, Hope, and to the son I extend my deepest sympathy.

Hon. Jonah J. Goldstein 70 Years Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the partial story of a great man and a useful life. Judge Jonah J. Goldstein, of the Court of General Ses-

sions of the City of New York, is this month celebrating his 70th birthday. He is still in every way a young man and a vibrant personality. Through the years, he has dedicated himself to the service of his community and the well-being of others.

At the age of 16, he took charge of a group of youngsters from the lower East Side, accompanying them each summer to Surprise Lake Camp at Storm King on the Hudson. This institution is now known as the Eddie Cantor Camp For this service, Jonah received a little vacation himself—a free ride to and from camp, lunch, and 5 hours in the country. He was the first group boy in the Educational Alliance to serve as a group leader. The group he led was known as the Young Americans. Shortly after this, he helped to organize the Jewish Big Brother movement and served as its volunteer secretary. The Jewish Big Brother movement soon proved its value. Court records showed that 60 percent of youngsters who got into trouble and who had no big brothers, returned to the criminal courts and ended up in adult penal institutions. On the other hand, of those who did have big brothers to guide them, less than 3 percent found difficulty later on. In the course of his big brother work, Jonah acted as a lay rabbi on the high holy days, conducting religious services at the House of Refuge on Randalls Island.

As a young man, he was a resident worker at the University Settlement. A resident worker usually served at least 2 nights a week at the settlement, but Jonah did not limit himself to the 2 nights; more often he served 6 nights a week and all day Sunday.

Shortly after the infamous Becker case and the Rosenthal murder, he helped to organize the East Side Neighborhood Association for the purpose of combating vice and other evil conditions on the lower East Side. Of this association, Dr. Henry Moskowitz was chairman, Miss Lillian Wald was vice chairman, and Jonah was executive director without salary. In 1911, the late lamented Alfred E. Smith was majority leader of the Assembly of the State of New York. He took Jonah to Albany as his secretary and as clerk to the all important ways and means committee of the State legislature. While at the State capitol, Jonah helped draft a bill requiring that children, appearing in the children's court, should receive both physical and psychiatric examination before sentence. It took 3 years before this bill became law. For 2 years the State legislature passed the bill only to have it vetoed by the then governor. Upon the third try, Jonah succeeeded.

Al Smith was extremely fond of his indefatigable coworker and his affection for Jonah was returned in full measure. During this time, Al Smith was chairman of the annual fund raising affair for the Holy Name Centre for Homeless Men. Jonah assisted him. Upon Al Smith's passing, Jonah was asked to step into Al Smith's role as chairman and as director of the Holy Name Centre.

In 1920 he met Harriet B. Lowenstein, who was extremely active as a social-service worker and intimately connected with the Federation, the Joint Distribution Committee, as well as being philanthropic advisor to the late Felix M. Warburg. Harriet and Jonah were married in July of 1920. Ever since, she has been his partner, loyal and loving companion, and the inspiration for all of his many activities. Harriet was for 13 years the comptroller of Federation. When she retired, Jonah was elected a trustee at large. He now is, and for the past 15 years has been, the chairman of Federation's Council of Fraternal Organizations.

In 1929, as representatives of the Jewish Agency and the Joint Distribution Committee, Jonah and Harriet were asked, on 48 hours' notice, to go to Palestine to inaugurate a relief program and investigate the causes of interracial riots in that land.

In 1931, Mayor Walker appointed him a city magistrate. He served as chairman of the committee on reorganization of the magistrate's court, introducing such reforms as the consolidated bail bond, health examinations in the women's court before admission to bail, and the stagger system in traffic court. He was responsible for the organization of the adolescent term of the magistrate's court, over which he presided after regular hours, and he successfully fought for the removal of the criminal stigma theretofore given by the magistrate's court in all family nonsupport cases by turning them over to the newly created domestic relations court. He is the author of many articles on social service and the law, as well as the book entitled "The Family in Court," which is used as a textbook by social service students.

In 1936 Judge Otto A. Rosalsky died. In his place, Gov. Herbert Lehman appointed Jonah a judge of the Court of General Sessions. He was elected to that court in 1939 and has been serving there ever since.

In 1945 Jonah tried, but did not succeed in taking on the bigger job of mayor of the city of New York.

He was one of the organizers of the United Jewish Appeal for Greater New York, created to avoid a multiplicity of campaigns and has served as a member of the board since its inception. He was president for 5 years of the Central Bureau for Jewish Aged and Infirm. For 14 years, he was chairman of the New York Jewish Committee of the Boy Scouts of America and, for 7 years, he served as president of the Jewish Club. He is still active in support of the Harlem branch of the Young Men's Christian Association, but the major portion of his spare time after these many and varied activities is engaged in working for the organization which is closest to his heart—the Grand Street Boys' Association, of which he is now serving his 21st year as president. As a corollary and culmination to his work at Grand Street, his greatest pride is the Grand Street Boys' Foundation to which he has dedicated himself wholeheartedly.

Jonah has been one of the most useful members that our community of New York has ever had. His service has always been effective, unstinted, and given without distinction to race, creed, or national origin.

Mr. Speaker, I have given but a few of the highlights of Jonah's useful life. There are many people who played an important part therein. None, however, bore a greater influence than his dear wife Harriet, whose sacrifices and guidance in large measure made possible Jonah's many accomplishments.

Jonah J. Goldstein, 70 years young, still leading a crowded, busy, useful life, rich in experience, wise, compassionate and eager to help his fellow man—he stands as a tower of strength, whose contributions to society are, in his own words "only my way of paying back for the privilege of living in a great democracy."

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, why do we continue to tolerate an alien idea that politicians in Washington can manage our private affairs better than we can ourselves? They now manage our corn, wheat, cotton, rice, butter, cheese, dry milk, tobacco, peanuts, et cetera, or one-third of our agriculture. It is a mess. Government housing at half rent, tax-exempt, is an outrage on the taxpayers and just as bad on the Government tenants. Government socialized power, like TVA, and irrigation projects at taxpayers' expense everywhere are blights on the people who take the money. Our foreign aid, now up to $60 billion, or $1,500 per American family on the average, does not satisfy the Socialist governments to whom it is paid. They want it doubled. Our friends over there out of power scold us for financing their enemies and ours. They are nearly all mad at us. We have bought few friends. So, Government robbing of Peter to pay Paul weakens Peter and demoralizes Paul.

The very idea that our Government should ever exercise such powers was utterly repugnant to us for 140 years. It was thought impossible. We so feared the evil tendencies of government that we drastically limited its functions to its only legitimate sphere, namely, the protection of life and property, keeping law and order. Then, to make doubly sure, we had the politicians chained to these proper and limited functions—we specified in 1789 what Congress could tax and spend. We limited the functions and taxing and spending power of our cities and counties and States, too. Fortunately, we have kept and enforced those limitations and as a result we have not gone Socialist, with few exceptions, in our cities, counties, and States. Our socialism, viz: converting private property into public or government owned and operated property, is confined almost entirely to Washington. We breed our Socialists and Communists there.

After 25 years of their infiltration of one of the old parties in power, Congress is unable to repeal and wipe off the books the socialism we have already got. Unless we are able to somehow wipe it off the books completely, we must go on. For we must be all socialized or all free. There can be no coexistence—half Socialist, half free. Obviously if we socialize corn as we have for 17 years, every living thing that consumes corn must ultimately be socialized. Farmers cannot buy Government owned and controlled corn and sell beef, pork, milk, and eggs in a free market. The burden of an average of $250 per year on every family taxed to pay the $10 billion our present socialization costs makes its extension inevitable. For example, you hear people cry out under this burden and you hear them say: "After we pay our taxes we have not enough left to pay for the care of our sick, our aged, the education of our children," and so forth.

So Mr. KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, introduces the Kelley bill providing for Federal aid and control of education on a vast scale. It has already passed the House Committee on Education by a vote of 21 to 9. It will likely come before the whole House for action at this session.

It proposes to take from the taxpayers $400 million a year for each of the next 4 fiscal years, a total of $1,600,000,000, and redistribute that largess to some of the States at the expense of others for schoolhouse construction. Six industrial States in the North and West, that is, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, and California, would be compelled to put up 57.654 percent of the total tax moneys and get back but 35.747 percent of the benefits as grants for classroom construction in those States. They will pay approximately $928 million in taxes and get back approximately $576 million for the 4-year period. Besides, they will pay additional taxes to cover the overhead cost of the United States Government doing this utterly foolish job of taking our money from us, giving only about half of it back, and giving the rest to other States. Thus the unblushing scheme for the redistribution of the wealth started in 1932 goes on.

It works in detail like this: For example, for the 4-year period New York State will be compelled to give up $299,984,000 toward the $1,600,000,000 and will get back but $128,950,640. Thus New York will lose $171,033,360 in the transaction, plus its share of the overhead costs of the operation mentioned.

The city of New York would pay $134,454,320 and get back $72,480,000 representing a loss of $61,974,320 plus the usual overhead.

Westchester County residents would pay $13,777,920 and the county would get back $7,427,560 for building schoolhouses, a loss of $6,350,360.

And as for Putnam County, the smallest county, the Federal taxes would amount to $287,040 and the county would get back $154,740 in Federal aid, or a loss of $132,300 in the 4-year period. Thus you can readily see, based on the current cost of between $33,000 and $40,000 to construct a classroom, Putnam County will pay in Federal taxes enough to build about 8 classrooms in order to get the Federal funds back to build about 4 classrooms. The Federal Government will decide where to build the other schoolrooms with Putnam County's money.

These figures were compiled by the Empire State Chamber of Commerce at Albany, N. Y. They are available for every county in New York State.

Title II of this Kelley bill would put the Commissioner of Education in the investment banking business by creating a school bond purchase revolving fund with an original appropriation of $300 million and the further authority to purchase "obligations of local educational agencies" in the aggregate principal amount of $750 million. This is on the theory that the school district credit is so bad nobody else would make the loan to them. So, under the Kelley bill, the Federal Government just robs Peter and loans the money to Paul anyway. This so-called revolving fund is to have a life of 4 years. At the end of 4 years the headaches and uncollected balances, together with any cash remaining in the fund, will be transferred to the Treasury Department for them to worry about.

But, Mr. Taxpayer, these two little practice blows of the Kelley bill are just meant to condition you for the third blow. Otherwise title III of the bill would knock you cold.

Title III proposes that the Commissioner of Education may make Federal Government advances not to exceed $6 billion to some, but not all, of the 57,000 school districts. They would be selected according to his judgment as to need and other deserving qualities. So that those States that have sweated out their bond issues to build schools will get none because they no longer need them, while those that have dragged their feet longest, waiting for the Federal Government to take over, will get their loans. What a bonanza. Six billion to play politics with. But that's not all—the Commissioner of Education is authorized under the Kelley bill to "pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired or arising under title III."

So, if these borrowing school districts continue to drag their feet and say they "can't pay," why then the Commissioner can forget the loans. What politician wants to sue voters, especially school districts, anyway?

And section 313 (b) provides that the "financial transactions of the Commissioner in making advances pursuant to this title shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government."

This means that the Commissioner's acts are final. There is no appeal from his management even if he never collects a dime of the loans.

Now, all this adds up to $1,600,000,000 under title I, $750 million under title II, and $6 billion under title III, a possible total of $8,350,000,000. There are 40 million American families to pay it. That means that each American family will be taxed $207.75 on the average to provide this new form of Federal aid. Add to that $1,450 per family on the average each one pays now, and add $25 per family for each new billion dollars for new socialization to come, and you will get some notion of what we face.

Those families in New York State and the other States mentioned will get next to nothing under titles II and III because they are not so-called needy States. They can pay but cannot take. Many other States will get back a mere drip at best.

Thus, the Kelley bill, sponsored especially by the National Education Association, takes us the first big step in socializing and controlling the school system, like other areas described above are already socialized.

Below are the losses six industrial States will sustain annually under title I alone. These are normallly Republican States outrageously penalized by every Federal aid program on the books, including this proposed new one.

The overhead is not shown below because it is well-nigh impossible to estimate Government overhead costs. It runs as high as 30 percent in most Government activities. Our 2,400,000 Government employees, their offices, rents, and expenses come high.

We must add to these costs of Federal management of our schools the Federal wage rates of the Bacon-Davis Act. School districts cannot chip in and get volunteer workers, or workers of any kind if they accept Federal funds except generally unionized workers at union wages as determined by the Department of Labor. These additional costs are estimated at from 25 to 30 percent over and above what the school districts would pay without Federal intervention.

State	Pays in percent	Pays in dollars	Gets back aid dollars
California	7.620	$30,480,000	$27,545,819
Illinois	8.228	32,912,000	20,247,262
Michigan	8.711	34,844,000	17,058,887
New York	18.749	74,996,000	32,794,708
Ohio	6.734	26,936,000	20,236,416
Pennsylvania	7.612	30,448,000	25,105,737
Total	57.654	230,616,000	142,988,829

Subtracting the aid received back from what is paid out, the losses in each State are as follows:

California	$2,934,181
Illinois	12,664,738
Michigan	17,785,113
New York	42,201,292
Ohio	6,699,584
Pennsylvania	5,342,263
Total	87,627,171

Compare the losses in the 6 States with the gain in the State of Mississippi. Mississippi will pay in taxes $800,000 toward the Federal-aid program and get back $6,506,886, which is better than an 8-to-1 return.

In spite of that a committee of the Mississippi Legislature investigated and rejected some years ago the idea of Federal aid to education. Yet this proposed bill virtually forces the States to take it whether they want it or not.

There is great variation in the percentage of income which each State spends on education. There is not a single State but that can better afford its own education than can the Federal

Government with its almost bankrupt Treasury. Some States spend twice as much as others. For example, Wyoming spends 3.99 percent of its income and Massachusetts spends 1.88 percent on public education. This makes no allowance, of course, for the private and parochial schools.

The following table shows the percentage of income spent for the school year 1953–54 by each State and the rank of each State on the basis of its current expenditures for schools:

State	Percent of income spent on current expenditures	Rank
Alabama	2.92	18
Arizona	3.14	13
Arkansas	2.49	29–30
California	2.87	19
Colorado	2.76	21
Connecticut	1.90	47
Delaware	1.96	45–46
Florida	2.57	26
Georgia	2.61	25
Idaho	3.18	12
Illinois	2.04	43
Indiana	2.26	33
Iowa	3.34	7
Kansas	2.77	20
Kentucky	2.14	40
Louisiana	3.12	14
Maine	2.25	34
Maryland	2.24	35–36
Massachusetts	1.88	48
Michigan	2.19	37–38
Minnesota	3.24	10–11
Mississippi	3.00	16
Missouri	2.07	42
Montana	3.45	6
Nebraska	2.66	24
Nevada	2.16	39
New Hampshire	2.41	31
New Jersey	2.30	32
New Mexico	3.90	2
New York	2.12	41
North Carolina	3.08	15
North Dakota	3.61	4
Ohio	1.98	44
Oklahoma	3.24	10–11
Oregon	3.25	9
Pennsylvania	2.19	37–38
Rhode Island	1.96	45–46
South Carolina	3.32	8
South Dakota	3.49	5
Tennessee	2.49	29–30
Texas	2.56	27
Utah	3.75	3
Vermont	2.75	22
Virginia	2.51	28
Washington	2.74	23
West Virginia	2.97	17
Wisconsin	2.24	35–36
Wyoming	3.99	1

In some areas two-thirds of the school-age children go to private or parochial schools. They are cut out of aid entirely although the parents must pay the taxes. The Federal Government would, if let alone, flatten out all differences, religious, economic, and political, between the States. Obviously when this process which is now on is completed there will be no taxpayers to pay for our socialized areas. And there will be no private or parochial schools for the same reason. Central governments just cannot endure variety and differences between people, between States, between communities. It cannot endure differences in effort and compensation. It would flatten out everybody and make the industrious look just like the lazy and indifferent—and call the program Federal aid. It no doubt would give all pupils the same grade. There would be no reward for extra effort and skill.

Column 1 of the following table shows the percentage that each State pays of all taxes collected, for whatever purpose; column 2 shows on that basis how much each will contribute annually to the $400-million annual fund; column 3 shows how much each State will get back, according to the United States Office of Education:

State	Percent pay in	Dollars they will pay in	Dollars they will get back
Alabama	0.542	$2,172,000	$8,968,658
Arizona	.232	928,000	2,537,686
Arkansas	.226	904,000	5,313,957
California	7.620	30,480,000	27,545,819
Colorado	.897	3,588,000	3,611,322
Connecticut	1.841	7,364,000	4,782,562
Delaware	1.288	$5,152,000	$835,050
Florida	.967	3,868,000	7,623,902
Georgia	1.002	4,008,000	10,237,501
Idaho	.153	612,000	1,691,790
Illinois	8.228	32,912,000	20,247,262
Indiana	2.287	9,148,000	10,226,657
Iowa	.755	3,020,000	6,420,128
Kansas	.719	2,876,000	4,750,027
Kentucky	1.900	7,600,000	8,317,970
Louisiana	.744	3,096,000	8,090,229
Maine	.244	976,000	2,244,876
Maryland [1]	2.726	10,904,000	16,202,148
Massachusetts	2.719	10,876,000	10,573,691
Michigan	8.711	34,844,000	17,058,887
Minnesota	1.516	6,064,000	7,699,816
Mississippi	.200	800,000	6,506,886
Missouri	2.532	10,128,000	9,174,710
Montana	.167	668,000	1,594,187
Nebraska	.585	2,340,000	3,220,909
Nevada	.121	484,000	466,327
New Hampshire	.178	712,000	1,279,688
New Jersey	2.944	11,776,000	11,343,672
New Mexico	.152	608,000	2,320,790
New York	18.794	74,996,000	32,794,708
North Carolina	2.206	8,824,000	12,178,549
North Dakota	.091	364,000	1,724,325
Ohio	6.734	26,936,000	20,236,416
Oklahoma	.894	3,576,000	5,715,215
Oregon	.611	2,444,000	3,893,287
Pennsylvania	7.612	30,448,000	25,105,737
Rhode Island	.424	1,696,000	1,778,549
South Carolina	.361	1,444,000	7,005,748
South Dakota	.102	408,000	1,724,325
Tennessee	.729	2,916,000	9,174,710
Texas	3.120	12,480,000	21,982,431
Utah	.424	1,696,000	2,168,962
Vermont	.108	432,000	965,188
Virginia	1.539	6,156,000	9,207,244
Washington [1]	1.184	4,736,000	6,355,059
West Virginia	.419	1,676,000	5,747,750
Wisconsin	1.857	7,428,000	8,740,918
Wyoming	.081	324,000	780,826
Hawaii	.194	776,000	1,409,825
Possessions			422,000
Total	99.656	398,664,000	400,000,000

[1] Maryland includes District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. Washington State includes Alaska.

Such taking of private property without due process and transferring it into public or socialized property is, of course, pure socialism, according to the dictionaries.

The Kelley bill is not the administration bill, nor is it a Republican Party measure. It is the proposal of the National Education Association—a teachers' union and lobby—and of the Socialist wing of the Democrat Party.

The bill sets up no formula to guide the redistribution of $8,350,000,000. It writes a blank check. It makes a commissar out of the Commissioner of Education to "do good" with other people's money as he pleases.

This Kelley bill is the last word in a bureaucrat's prayer.

Think of the reams and reams of regulations that can be written around every step in getting this $8,350,000,000 away from the places where it is and out to the favored districts of some of the 57,000 school districts where the Commissioner thinks it should be.

Then just think of the thousands of new bureaucrats that will be needed to administer this section of the bill, to settle and cancel the claims, and do all the other things necessary to satisfy enough of the voters to keep the plan alive and going beyond the deadline of 1960 set forth in the bill. All of this is supposed to end then. But that too is only a part of the Government's deception.

For do we not know by now that a temporary measure in Congress to meet an emergency for schools or anything else becomes one of the most permanent pieces of legislation?

Mr. Eisenhower has said in a letter to me regarding Federal aid to education:

> In my own mind I am perfectly clear as to the basic principle and have more than once made public statements to the effect that I definitely oppose every unnecessary intervention of the Federal authority and the Federal Treasury in what should be local business and local responsibility. * * *
>
> I would flatly oppose any grant by the Federal Government to all States in the Union for educational purposes. Such policy would create an ambition—almost a requirement—to spend money freely under the impulse of competition with other localities in the country. It would completely decry and defeat the watchful economy that comes about through local supervision over local expenditures of local revenues.

That is the truth we all know.

Then he warns:

> In short, unless we are careful, even the great and necessary educational processes in our country will become yet another vehicle by which the believers in paternalism, if not outright socialism, will gain still additional power for the Central Government.

And to indicate that he is aware of the evils of socializing our local school systems, Mr. Eisenhower had this to say:

> If local communities do their job, then there will be no need for additional centralized revenues for nationwide subsidies of an essential local character, and we will avoid the pitfalls of extreme centralization.
>
> Very frankly, I firmly believe that the army of persons who urge greater and greater centralization of authority and greater dependence upon the Federal Treasury are really more dangerous to our form of government than any external threat that can possibly be arrayed against us.

His fear, our fear, lies in the seizure or assumption of power by government over us. We all fear, indeed we witness, the corrupting evils of government promises to do for us what we ought to do for ourselves. It weakens the capacity and the will of the people to manage their affairs for themselves. All of our great leaders have warned us against the evils of the Central Government we are now embracing. Who is so dull that he cannot understand that the Government has not a dime that it does not first take from the people? It corrupts us with our own money. It captures us and takes away our resistance by false promises of something for nothing.

All this adds up to a rule that whatever you add to the power of government you subtract from yourselves. So there is no such thing as Federal aid. For the Government to promise aid as though it has something to give apart from what it takes from the people themselves is a fraud on the people.

Of course, it is a bit natural that the professional schoolman should want the power of money from the Central Government in his hands. Some superintendents naturally want to be relieved of

the slower, more hesitant, and more democratic processes, as well as the mistakes inherent in the exercise of local responsibility. He assumes that in the exercise of the people's responsibility by government, it will make no mistakes.

To maneuver the people into a willingness to put themselves under Government management and control, the Government itself controls the very thoughts of the people by its own propaganda. For example, the Government makes a survey to see if there is a classroom shortage. A Government agency, the United States Office of Education, gathers the information from school superintendents in the States, and not from the parents, taxpayers, or laymen who have no professional interest at stake. The professionals who gather, and those who provide the information for the Government are by and large already committed to Federal aid and have been for years. After they get the information all slanted the way they want it they arrange a White House conference. When the conference is over it is manipulated so that a committee of 2 is appointed, one a former chairman of the Council of Chief State School Officers and now a chief school officer of one of the States, and the other a former chief State school officer, now executive secretary of the National Council of Chief State School Officers—operating in conjunction with the National Education Association. Both are active—almost violent—crusaders for Federal aid. With some considerable difficulty with the stubborn facts growing out of the White House conference of 1,800 delegates, this National Education Association committee of 2 report what they wanted to think was a consensus of the 1,800 delegates at the conference. The Government itself picks up just the right lines and gives them the whole Government propaganda works. The delegates had no opportunity to vote and create news for their side of the case. No one knows how they would have voted. All we have is the above-described consensus report of two prejudiced persons. All the modifying, restrictive, and the downright opposition to Federal aid that was in the White House Conference is buried. Even the great widespread opposition of the professionals themselves is buried at the bottom of the confusion of paperwork. What private citizen or group of so-called free citizens would dare to controvert even the false statements of Government?

The governmental propaganda machine picks out of the consensus report what the professionals who set it up intended for it to emphasize. So all officialdom beats the drums for the Kelley bill. The power of big government smothers individual freedom of thought and resistance.

While the President called the White House Conference in the best of good faith to study the 6 fundamental problems in our educational system, only 1 of the 6, namely Federal aid, got any serious attention. The best thinking of the professionals who manipulated the conference was that there was nothing wrong with education that more money from the taxpayers would not cure.

The laymen, taxpayers, parents, businessmen, farmers, and laborers, a small minority in the conference, asked questions about improving teaching methods. What about the use of television? How about renting school buildings more scientifically built by private capital, just as all the post offices are now being rented instead of owned by the school board? They wanted to know why the inventive creative capacity of the local citizens were not more capable of meeting all their local needs than the Federal Government. They questioned whether the great teachers of unusual skill and ability might not be used through new techniques such as television to reach a greater number of pupils. Could not such teachers be helped by assistants or aids or apprentices at lower cost to free the great teachers of many chores incident to the real job of teaching? They wondered why no particular changes had been made in the teaching techniques and particularly in the number of pupils per class and the costs per pupil while in every other profession tremendous improvements have taken place increasing the number served and reducing the cost of the same. Why should teaching be static?

No answer to any of these questions came out of the conference. The professional and the governmental bureaucratic purpose is to bring down the number of pupils in the class and bring up the number of the classrooms, always at increased cost. Obviously the size of classes must be increased far beyond what has been standard for about a century in order to bring down costs. Many of our colleges are conducting classes of 100 or more. George Washington University has had classes of as high as 1,300. It must not continue to be easier for one of the biggest lobbies in Washington to lobby for taxpayers' money than it is to try to improve education and reduce the cost at the same time.

Our school buildings, highly expensive, are idle much of the time, the weekends and holidays. Their use starts at 8:30 or 9:00 a. m., ends at 4:00 p. m. When William A. Wirt started his plan at Gary, Ind., he pointed out:

> We are handling three times as many pupils and giving each pupil more hours of education than is customary in a high school and that actually the cost per pupil is around 65 percent of the normal cost.

By starting his classes at 8:00 a. m., continuing them through the day and into the evening, 12 months of the year, he was able to give far more effective education at a lower unit cost. A similar plan might be suggested as one of the possible economies.

Local communities, if left alone, with their native American genius, intelligence, necessity, and financial capacity, will find a way to solve their problems. They alone can meet their necessities. They alone know what they are.

Address of Hon. Clair Engle at Annual Convention of National Wildlife Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest meetings in the conservation field is the annual convention of the National Wildlife Federation State affiliates. It is attended by delegates representing 3 million sportsmen and lay conservationists throughout the Nation.

This year's convention was held last month in New Orleans, just prior to the North American Wildlife Conference.

The keynote speaker at the 20th annual convention was our colleague, the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A distinguished conservationist, the Honorable CLAIR ENGLE, of California, advised members of one of the largest conservation groups to get behind an affirmative program of conservation legislation instead of concentrating on winning negative victories.

An audience of 250 heard his speech. Among them were delegates from State wildlife federations and sportsmen's leagues, together with the leaders of practically all the national conservation organizations—the Izaak Walton League of America; Wildlife Management Institute; International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners; The Wilderness Society; National Parks Association; National Audubon Society; The Wildlife Society; American Fisheries Society; Sport Fishing Institute; Nature Conservancy; American Forestry Association; American Nature Association; Sierra Club, and others.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in this important and timely address, which follows:

> Hon. CLAIR ENGLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Woodward, for that very complimentary introduction. I am not only flattered by that fine introduction but I am also proud and happy to be here.
>
> I am not quite sure whether or not you are prepared for a serious discussion tonight but I am convinced that within the confines of this room there is a deeper concentration of real conservationists than you could get into a room of comparable size anywhere else in the country.
>
> Of course, I hope that you ladies here do not mind listening to legislation for I have been informed by the toastmaster that the ladies are the real conservationists—they not only believe in it but they have to put up with their husbands who believe in it and go out hunting and fishing and leave them as widows.
>
> I am going to talk to you tonight as a legislator who deals in conservation. Eventually, in all of these problems, we have to get down to the point where somebody writes a bill. I always say to people who talk to me about legislation that I can give them the first line, "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives," and that is where I stop and say that they can take it from there.

Many of the things you want to achieve as conservationists can only be achieved through legislation. It is important therefore that conservation-minded people be informed on legislation affecting their interests and skilled in the use of the legislative process.

I would like to start with the last session of this Congress and comment briefly on three major pieces of legislation which I know were of great importance to you. One was the mining bill. Another was the defeat of the Echo Park Dam and the third had to do with the Pittman-Robertson funds. I would like to mention each of those, not in detail, because I am sure that most of you are familiar with them, but because they teach a lesson about the problems of legislation.

With reference to the mining legislation, there are two things that I would like to say to you about that. The first is that in that legislation, for the first time, we took a step toward getting ahead of this mining-claim problem so we will not be constantly lagging behind as in the past. Over the last 5 or 6 years, the mining claims filed upon the public-land areas of this country in the national forests and on the public domain have increased from some 4,000 to over 166,000 claims. Quite obviously, if we did not do something about setting up procedures for knocking off the old and stale claims, we were going to fall constantly behind. We got started toward holding even.

The second thing that I want to mention about that legislation—and it is significant—is the kind of support that it had. I would like to read to you what the committee report said about the organizations supporting the legislation:

"The language of the bill, as reported, has been developed with the support and cooperation of both the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

"Included in a long list of national, State, and local groups and individuals supporting this legislation are the following:

"American Mining Congress, American Federation of Labor, Independent Timber Farmers of America, American Forestry Association, Western Lumber Manufacturers, National Wildlife Federation, Sports Afield, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, National Farmers Union, Wildlife Management Institute, The Izaak Walton League of America, The National Grange, Northwest Mining Association, Northern Rocky Mountain Sportsmen's Association, Western Forest Industries Association, Western Forestry and Conservation Association, United States Chamber of Commerce, Society of American Foresters, and the American Nature Association."

This seems to me to set an example and a pattern for action for other and further successful legislation that should be followed in the future. When I get down to the next phase of this discussion, the problem still before us, I will further comment with respect to that.

I think this was the finest example of cooperative action among those interested in public land problems in the United States that I have seen in the 13 years that I have been in the Congress. This organization and all of the others that took part have a right not only to be proud of what they accomplished in getting it passed but they also can be proud of the unusual cooperation among the various users of the great public land area that they secured in getting it done.

I refer next to the defeat of the Echo Park Dam by deletion from the upper Colorado River project. This, of course, was a major victory for conservation; it did not occur because you convinced any of the sponsors of the bill that they ought to take it out of there on its merits. It occurred because they were convinced that they could not pass the legislation through the House of Representatives unless it were deleted. That bill passed the Senate Interior Committee by a vote of 11 to 1 with Echo Park in it. Then it passed the United States Senate by a vote of 58 to 23, better than 2 to 1, with Echo Park in it. But then what happened?

This is an interesting commentary as to how things are done legislatively. I walked up to one of my friends from Ohio one day and said, "Are you going to vote for the upper Colorado Basin project?" He said, "No; I cannot do it." I said, "Why can't you do it?" He said, "Because I have a stack of letters from the various conservation groups in my district and I cannot spend all of this next summer explaining to them why I voted for that bill."

It simply boiled down to this: He had no particular interest in the legislation—the project was not in his district—he was not going to gain anything by it for his district or his people; but if he voted for it he suffered a very definite detrimental effect in his area by having to go out and explain to all of the conservation groups why he did it. There were just enough people like that in the House of Representatives so that they could not pass the legislation with Echo Park in it and so it was taken out.

It is to the lasting credit, in my opinion, of those represented here and of the other conservation groups throughout the country, that after Echo Park Dam was taken out and language protecting the national parks was inserted, that these organizations withdrew their opposition.

That was clearly stated on the floor of the House the other day.

Why is it that conservation groups can show such significant power in one instance and then seem to completely spin their wheels in getting action in other instances?

The matter of the Pittman-Robertson funds is simply a lesson that we should not leave money lying around in Washington. We are lucky indeed that we got it in time and that somebody did not lay hands on it and make a distribution of it in other directions. We will not let so many years go by again, I hope, in letting that money pile up.

Now, I think that the conservation groups learned something about their strength in the preceding session of Congress. They have some solid accomplishments to talk about and in which they can certainly take real pride. This session that strength should be consolidated and put into affirmative action.

What do we have coming up in this session? We have legislation relating to funds for recreation in the national forests. Let me give you the history of that legislation going back for 6 years.

We had a Congressman from Arkansas who first introduced that legislation. That was in the 81st Congress, 6 years ago. It was called the Tackett bill and didn't pass. Then it was called the Baker bill and that bill died. Now we have a number of similar bills pending by METCALF and others. We realize the need for that legislation with 45 million recreational visits to the national forests in this land, an acceleration of 2 and 3 times since the end of the last war. We know that the budget for the Forest Service has been inadequate for recreational purposes even though it has been increased in the past several years from $611,000 to $1.6 million in the budget of 1956.

We have a Mission 66 for the Park Service and I am sure that you people are familiar with that, too, if not with all of the details, at least with the general concept and objectives of that legislation.

Why is it that conservation organizations that can defeat the Echo Park Dam legislation and cause amendment to the 1872 mining law cannot move a simple bill calling for earmarking of a percentage of funds, not to exceed $5½ million for forest revenues for recreation?

I think that it is because we have failed to realize what the legislative difficulties are.

For instance, the Appropriations Committee sits there and says, "We don't like this business of earmarking funds for we then do not have any control over them." The members on the Agricultural Committee have also said that they are opposed to doing it. In addition, recreation is hard to sell in Washington. When we were running a thirty-five to forty million-dollar military budget, people thought that they had better get some of this money into the Treasury rather than putting it in recreation. Recreation is a hard program to sell. It is hard to sell to some of these hard-fisted Congressmen who are worrying about the budget and about taxes.

We need some self-help provisions (as I call them) in this legislation. I think that we have got to do two things—first, we have to get around the opposition of the Appropriations Committee and, second, then we have to put in some self help insofar as the national forest users are concerned. If we get those two things put in the bill, then we might begin to move forward. My bill in this respect says that the money shall be earmarked but shall be appropriated each year by the Appropriations Committee. That is not quite as good as just slicing it off in a direct appropriation but it is going a half step. Our experience has been—and this legislation is drafted on the basis of similar legislation for the improving of grazing for I almost took the language right out of the statute and applied it to this situation—that if we ever get an earmarking of funds we are well on the way to getting them.

The history has been that money comes along because the earmarking acts as a mandate to the Appropriations Committee.

I think that we are going to have great difficulty in the self-help field with those provisions which would require a general license for the use of recreational areas in the national forests by all the users. That is something that is hard to administer in the first place and it is also going to get tremendous opposition, I think, from some of the sportsmen's groups.

I had a gimmick out in my area that the Forest Service will not go for but which is a good one. They issue the campfire permits and I said, "Why not charge a dollar for those?" The Forest Service said that they do not issue the permits in all of the States. I said, "So what? Forty percent of the visitations in the national forests occur in the three Western States and if we get that money in and earmark it for recreational activities, at least it will help." Those are just suggestions and there may be other ways of doing it, but in any case provision must be written which will require some user participation in the costs of recreation; that is what I call self-help.

With the Water Pollution Control Act expiring this year, we are going to have to get something done on that. The time is coming very soon when we won't have any game fish in the major streams in this country unless we stop the pollution of those streams. Mr. BLATNIK has that legislation. It is good legislation, and I feel sure that it will get through in some form before the present law expires. I am not so sure that he will get his hundred million annually for construction grants, but he will get something fairly close to it.

Now, in hurrying along I want to talk to you about another subject that will be before you and on which legislation has not as yet been drafted—that is the matter of military reservations on public lands. We have found out that military establishments are stepping out, especially in the Western States, and blocking out huge portions of our country for military uses and in some instances as special hunting preserves.

The Defense Department agencies have withdrawn lands which in total area exceed the States of Massachusetts, Maryland, New Hampshire, and Delaware combined. If the withdrawals of the Corps of Engineers are added, then the total acreage of the State of Connecticut could be added to that. If the present applications of defense agencies are approved, there will be added to the list of lands permanently withdrawn from multiple use and development an area totaling in size the States of New Jersey, Rhode Island, plus 50 Districts of Columbia. Therefore, if they keep what they now have and what they have applied for, they would have an area equivalent to a strip of land 14 miles wide from New York to San Francisco. I told them that if they couldn't hit that kind of a strip with their bombers, then I don't know how we were going to win any war.

We undertook to find out what kind of an operation we were up against with reference to these military withdrawals and here is what we learned:

We found out that a defense agency, by writing an application, simply by the stroke of the pen, can reserve various areas of lands in the western part of the United States out of the public domain area and that there is no other agency in the Government that has the power or the ability to pass upon the necessity for that military use. The Interior Department appeared before our committee and said they were in no position to weigh the question of military necessity. They said that they simply had to take the word of the Army, Navy, or Air Force for it.

In the hearings we pressed the defense agencies on multiple uses of the withdrawn areas. The Navy in particular began to concede concession after concession. In the beginning they claimed they needed the land forever and no one else could use it.

Now, what they have conceded to date is that withdrawal will not be necessary for longer than 10 years and that the reservations sought are really just for the use of airspace above the land and that grazing could continue on a 12-month basis. They would let the cattle in. If a cow gets killed they can pay for her. They will also allow special periods for spring and fall roundups, when the stockmen themselves can go in. They agree that established seasons for hunting and fishing can be observed under State laws; that game counts and related measures for game conservation can be carried out by responsible State officials in the area; that substantial mining operations can be continued; and that the area can be opened for recreation and prospecting purposes during the weekends.

The result of all this is that by this kind of investigation we have established the basis for multiple use of these defense areas even when they are taken over for defense purposes.

However, in my mind, that does not go to the real root of the problem and we are going to have to do something further. For that reason I am having legislation drafted which will do three things, and when it is drafted I am going to submit it to many of the leaders who are here at this meeting tonight.

The first thing that this legislation will provide is that when public land is taken over by an executive agency under a withdrawal and then thereafter becomes surplus, the land will be returned to the department from which it was taken so that it can again become a part of the public domain. Most people do not know that after they take over these areas and then declare them surplus, the property then goes to the General Services Administration and is put up for sale. I say that this is a fine way to break up the public land areas of this country and it can also be the basis for some high and mighty finagling with reference to taking over valuable pieces of the public land areas of our country. We are going to stop that.

Secondly, the measure will provide that no land can be withdrawn from public domain status by any department or executive agency without approval of the Congress unless the area involved is 5,000 acres or less. The purpose of that provision will be to return and restore control of the public lands to the Congress of the United States.

As a third item, this legislation will require that whenever public land areas are taken over for these special purposes, such as the Navy, Army, or for Air Force use, that publication in the Federal Register will be required to set for the other multiple uses that can be made of it, such as grazing, mining, lumbering, sports activities, recreation, and at what times and under what condition. The purpose of this provision is to require of the executive agencies, where they show a clear need in the public interest for a part of the public domain, that there be a sharing in use when such can occur consistently with the limited use for which the property is taken.

When we draft and pass that legislation I think that we will be a long way toward the settlement of some of these problems.

We are also doing something in connection with the protection of wildlife refuges. No sale or disposition of such lands should be made without the consent of Congress. We want to earmark a portion of the duck stamp funds in order to be sure that that money is used for the acquisition of additional refuges as was intended when the duck hunters supported the duck stamp tax.

Legislation has been drafted for a national wilderness preservation system. I have had an opportunity to examine the legislation in draft form and it will be introduced in one form or another. I am impressed with the importance of that because of a trip I made into the high Sierras this last fall. Even upon the very top of the Sierras there were jeep tracks. The jeep is opening up all of the areas of the public lands, national forests and otherwise, and unless some action is taken we are not going to have for very long a true wilderness area left in this country.

All of this legislation which I mentioned will operate in the same direction. The objective is the limiting of executive control over the public land areas of the Nation and placing the control of those areas more directly in the Congress of the United States. If we say that an area cannot be reserved for military purposes without the consent of Congress, or you say a refuge cannot be sold without consent of Congress, or that wilderness areas once established cannot be changed, abolished or reduced without the consent of Congress, then to that extent we have limited the authority and action of the executive agencies, and placed that discretion in the Congress.

Now, the problem is how far can we go in returning the control and restoring the control of the public lands to the Congress of the United States without destroying or improperly limiting executive freedom of action with reference to the administration of those lands in the public interest. We need a proper balance and in order to determine what that is we are going to have to, in the next few years, reevaluate the whole question of public land use. I am in hopes that some day we can write another piece of legislation which has been in my mind for a good long time which will set up the procedures for establishing the priorities of use of these public land areas for water conservation, recreation, lumbering, grazing, mining and whatever other uses may be made.

I have often said to my conservation friends that in my opinion they spend too much of their time in winning negative victories. I believe it is much more important to have an affirmative program that encompasses all of these things they seek to protect in negative victories. I would like to go one step further and say that I would like to see the conservationists tackle a real affirmative program such as set forth in the bills I have discussed and use your new found strength and unity in putting that affirmative program through Congress.

I would like to say to you, in connection with the 5 or 6 pieces of legislation that I have mentioned, that I hope that this great organization will undertake to follow through and help us in implementing these programs; that you will undertake to study the problems, to aid in drafting, introducing and supporting legislation which is designed to carry out those programs, and that you will continue to maintain an active and vigorous liaison with the other interested groups of all kinds. I hope that you will develop closer and more friendly relationships with the larger mining organizations, the livestock organizations, lumber organizations and water utilization groups with whom such excellent cooperation occurred last year on the multiple use mining bill.

I would like to take this occasion to again thank you for the opportunity of being here and to say to you that I am sure that we are in a position to move forward more constructively, more actively and more aggressively than we have ever done before in the field of conservation with the kind of leadership represented here and with the growing unity, strength and legislative know-how of this and other conservation organizations.

World Trade: Highway to World Peace and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today, with pride and high hopes, introduced a joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair to be held at the New York City Coliseum from April 14 to April 27, 1957. The personal satisfaction and pleasure I have in offering this resolution is twofold: I am honored to take this small part in the World Trade Fair for it is a step toward better international understanding, economic advancement and good will; and because the New York Coliseum is part of a vast new development in my district on Manhattan's West Side. From the Coliseum at 58th Street, north to the Lincoln Square dramatic arts center, we are witnessing a vast rebuilding and redevelopment of a too long neglected area. As a result, the entire West Side is being revitalized. The city of New York, the State, and the Nation will benefit immeasurably.

The United States World Trade Fair will bolster and encourage the economies of our friends throughout the world.

The fair will be one of the first of important events to be held in the Coliseum, and rightly so. It will be the most comprehensive of its kind ever to be held in the United States. Foreign nations will be given an opportunity to exhibit

their products together under one roof, to offer them for sale to the buyers from all of North and South America at our principal port and the hub of our merchandising and marketing industry: New York City.

The well-being of all of us depends upon the ability of each to produce products, goods or services which others need. Without trade we wither and die.

At the close of World War II we recognized this and in an effort to restore the devastated lands we established the Truman and Marshall plans. Point 4 aid enabled millions of people throughout the world to start rebuilding. It is now as it has always been, the policy of the United States to assist others to achieve greater prosperity for themselves through freedom and trade. This is a continuing policy. The dole, the handout is no part of it. Necessity has at times required such measures, both at home and abroad, but it is a well-known fact of life that a policy based on handouts is bankrupt and debilitating; the giver does not like it; the receiver detests it and in time comes to despise the benefactor. We all know this truth.

It is the same in international life as it is in family life. The brother-in-law who needs and gets monetary assistance to overcome temporary financial difficulties does not resent the help at first. But as it goes on, if he continues to accept a weekly gift, he begins to lose self-confidence and self-respect. The giver meanwhile deplores the lack of initiative he sees. How much better it is to help him find a job so that he might earn his own way. Then the formerly dependent in-law becomes a productive, happy, and proud member of the family.

The United States World Trade Fair presents a unique opportunity. At the Coliseum businessmen of all nations will assemble in the most modern exhibition hall in the world. Each will demonstrate what he produces and offer it for sale, proving again what we all know: Every dollar earned in trade is worth hundreds in aid.

The cold war is now being waged in the economic arena. I stressed this fact last June when we considered the foreign-aid bill. Russia has for the time forsaken bluster and force. Now she resorts to guile and economic penetration.

Russia is in reality trying to play our game. Let them play, for we will triumph. By a positive, continuing program in keeping with our historic aims, we can and shall help others to help themselves and to eliminate want and fear, disease and hunger, war and poverty.

The United States World Trade Fair is a tangible demonstration of our desire to work with and help peoples in all nations, through free and competitive enterprise. World trade, the mutual exchange in an international market place of goods and services, of arts, crafts, cultural and scientific ideas and advances is the high road to world peace and world prosperity. No greater goal can be desired. This is our aim.

On the other hand, pure or preponderantly military alliances, as history has demonstrated time and again, are highly perishable.

Economic ties are ties of strength and solidarity when based upon an awareness of common goals and common hopes and will result in the creation throughout the free world of indestructible alliances, freely and openly made, desired by all and impervious to Communist threats or guile.

Let us then join together, here and with our friends abroad, to stride forward with determination, and with hope and strength, confident in the knowledge that through efforts such as this trade fair, part of a continuing, morally forceful and responsible program of international trade, we shall as partners in the free world achieve that ultimate goal: peace, prosperity, and freedom.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, April 9, 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:

God of grace and God of glory, Thou hast summoned the few among the many to serve in this forum of democracy when millions in awaking nations are halting between two opinions. We are keenly conscious that this is an age on ages telling, when the forces of darkness and the armies of light are locked in contest for the bodies and souls of men. Save us, we pray Thee, from panic and despair in a decisive day when the bright prospects of peace and freedom are challenged and seemingly dimmed by malignant forces of destruction. As the battle rages may we be strong and of good courage, enabled by Thy grace to live as well as to defend the truth that alone can make all men free:

"Our strength is dust and ashes, our years a passing hour;
We pray Thee, use our weakness to magnify Thy power."

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 11, 1956, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON BILL TO ENCOURAGE THE MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT OF LOW-COST ELECTRIC ENERGY FROM ALL SOURCES, INCLUDING SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, as chairman of a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I desire to give notice that public hearings will be held on S. 2643 from April 17 to April 20 in committee room G-16 of the Capitol.

This bill seeks to encourage the maximum development of low-cost electric energy from all sources, including special nuclear material, through amendments to the Public Utility Holding Company Act.

Any persons who are interested in testifying are invited to do so, and should so advise the clerk of the committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take up the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Maurice E. Stans, of Illinois, to be Deputy Postmaster General; and

Two hundred and seventeen postmaster nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James W. Barco, of Virginia, to be deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lowell C. Pinkerton, of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Sudan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.