the resolution introduced today provides that hearings shall be held at a location not further from the claimant's residence than the capital city of the State in which he resides. The measure also gives each claimant the specific right to be represented by counsel, to have compulsory process to require witnesses to appear, and to cross-examine all witnesses on whose evidence the Commission has relied in denying his claim or in disapproving it in part. Evidence given by any witness on whose evidence the Commission has so relied, and who is not available for cross-examination by the claimant, must be disregarded by the Commission in reaching its decision.

In order that past abuses may be corrected, Mr. Speaker, the legislation which I have been discussing allows claimants to reapply to the Commisison for redetermination of their claims if, in the past, the claims were denied or approved for less than the full allowable amount, on the direct or indirect ground that the claimant collaborated with any hostile force or enemy of the United States.

Finally, the measure establishes the right of claimants, against whom adverse decisions have been handed down by the Commission, to institute proceedings for the review of such decision by filing a written petition in our Federal district courts.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge the careful and immediate attention of each Member of this House to the legislation which I have introduced today. The time has come to cut through the maze of fraud and hypocrisy which surrounds the proceedings of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. In a letter to me dated January 10, 1956, Mr. Whitney Gillilland, Chairman of the Commission, piously declared that "in the administration of this type of legislation there is no adversary aspect. No one prefers charges or makes accusations. The legislation is of a beneficial nature and the determinations of the Commission are based solely on whether or not a claimant factually meets the eligibility requirements." I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a claimant upon whom has been placed the burden of proof to establish that he did not collaborate with an enemy of the United States finds the proceedings to be adversary in every aspect. And I find it more than difficult to understand how Mr. Gillilland can say that "no one prefers charges or makes accusations" when he himself has signed hundreds upon hundreds of letters containing the summary of information against claimants relating directly to the issue of collaboration.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1956

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

Our Father God, beyond the circle of whose all-embracing love we cannot drift, turning from traditions which separate us and write our names in different camps of thought and conviction, we pause now for the upward look which makes us one in solemn yet glad communion with Thee, Thou God and Father of all mankind. The heartless cruelty that sweeps the earth often appalls us; but in this hallowed moment we are strengthened by the assurance that when willful man has done his worst he must still reckon with Thee.

Another empty chair in this body reminds each of us that swift to its close ebbs out life's little day. We thank Thee for the service that one whose face we will see here no more rendered with ability and devotion, and for the legion of friends his genial nature bound to him in a loyalty strong as steel. Grant the consolations of Thy grace to the dear ones who mourn his passing.

And now, as today we salute the President of a Nation whose long struggles for freedom boast the names of great emancipators and whose history goes back to the grandeur that was Rome, we pray that Italy, escaping the wiles of those who play on her human problems tempting her to barter her liberty and her very soul for specious promises, may recognize her true friends and tie her future to liberty, rather than tyranny, and to truth, and not falsehood, thus espousing the things that belong to her peace. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 28, 1956, was dispensed with.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 29, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THEODORE F. GREEN, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GREEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Harley M. Kilgore, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, since the Senate meets today following an adjournment, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, I ask unanimous consent that any statement made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

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

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF THE LATE SENATOR HARLEY M. KILGORE, OF WEST VIRGINIA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to Senate Resolution 221, agreed to yesterday, the Chair announces as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Senator Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, the following:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

EXPENSES OF FUNERAL OF THE LATE SENATOR KILGORE, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and request its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 222) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of Hon. Harley M. Kilgore,

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

late a Senator from the State of West Virginia, on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 222) was considered and agreed to.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF LIQUIDATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as of December 31, 1955, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Pearl Shucker, Chicago, Ill., relating to the lowering from 65 to 62, the age at which women could begin collecting social security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Long Island Chapter, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) to provide for a revision of the Status of Forces Agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Associated Equipment Distributors, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to implement the Hoover Commission report on the use and disposal of Federal surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from James Real Bird, Vice Chairman, Crow Tribal Council, Crow Agency, Montana, transmitting a copy of the minutes of an emergency council called by the Crow Indian tribe and held February 24, 1956, relating to the sale of certain Indian lands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

HOUSING FOR AMERICA'S AGED—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation welcomes the increasing signs that at this session of the Congress, legislation to provide specialized low-rent housing for aged Americans will be enacted.

Already, proposed legislation for this purpose has been introduced on a bipartisan basis.

Moreover, the Eisenhower administration indicates that it, too, has this objective very definitely in mind.

I was pleased, therefore, to receive from Harry G. Slater, first assistant city attorney of Milwaukee, and from Richard W. Perrin, executive director of the housing authority, a resolution, which had been approved by the Common Council of Milwaukee, fully supporting this objective.

I, for one, pledge my own efforts to make sure that ample provision for America's old folks is written into new housing amendments.

Of course, to fulfill adequately the needs of our 14 million elderly people over 65, will require basically the action of the great private housing industry, rather than action on the part of the Government; but to the extent that the Government can encourage such action, it should do so.

I present the resolution from Milwaukee, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

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

RESOLUTION RELATING TO URGING CONGRESS TO INCLUDE IN PUBLIC HOUSING LEGISLATION FOR ADEQUATE LOW RENT HOUSING FOR AGED PERSONS

Whereas there is a definite and growing need for low rent housing for aged people, so that such persons may find comfortable and adequate housing at rentals which they can afford to pay; and

Whereas present housing programs do not adequately reflect the needs of such aged people to secure convenient and comfortable housing; and

Whereas Congress should be urged to specifically provide adequate housing for aged people by including in Federal housing programs now being planned or which may be planned, plans directed toward providing adequate housing for aged people at adequate rentals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, and it hereby declares its policy to be, That adequate housing for aged persons be provided at reasonable rental rates; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be requested to include as a part of its Federal housing program a plan of providing adequate and comfortable housing for aged persons at reasonable rentals, either as to single persons who are aged or as to aged persons forming a family unit; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution urging such a program be forwarded to each representative from this State in the House of Representatives and to the two Wisconsin United States Senators; and be it further

Resolved, That the housing authority of the city of Milwaukee, city attorney's office, and such alderman or aldermen as may be selected by the president of the common council be authorized and requested to confer with Members of Congress and housing officials of the Federal Government for the purpose of urging a housing program for aged persons, as is more fully set forth in this resolution, and that they be further authorized and requested to appear at congressional hearings of either the House or Senate committees dealing with legislation pertaining to housing, for the purpose of explaining the position of the city of Milwaukee and for recommending a program consistent with the objectives of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the persons herein authorized so to do take whatever steps may be required in order to urge the Federal Government to enact appropriate legislation which would permit the local housing authority to make available its present housing to aged persons, either single or in family units, on a preferential basis.

DISASTER INSURANCE—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have received from the American Municipal Association, an organization which reflects the views of the mayors of 12,000 American cities, a letter enclosing a resolution adopted by that association at its 32d annual congress recently held in Miami, Fla.

This resolution deals with disaster insurance and urges the passage of appropriate legislation on this subject. The letter from Patrick Healy, Jr., executive director of the association, indicates special interest in the bill which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and I have introduced and which is pending before the Banking and Currency Committee (S. 3137) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Healy, and the resolution, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1956.

The Honorable HERBERT LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: The American Municipal Association at the 32d annual American Municipal Congress at Miami, Fla., unanimously adopted the enclosed national policy statement on disaster insurance. The statement which calls upon Congress and the administration to develop a plan for natural disaster insurance reflects the thinking of the mayors of the 12,000 cities who are members of our association.

As you probably already know, a mayor and another city official testified on behalf of this legislation before the House Banking and Currency Committee. Written support of this policy statement was also presented to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee for incorporation in the hearing record.

In view of your keen interest in this matter, you may wish to have our national policy statement incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. You may be assured of the support of this association for the bill which you have introduced or for any other Senate bill which will accomplish the purpose of protecting municipally owned property from loss through natural disaster.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK HEALY, JR.,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION 5

Floods of unprecedented magnitude have struck our cities the past year. These disasters have come without warning and have left in their wake a wide path of death, destruction, and suffering. Cities are unable financially to bear the tremendous costs of replacing municipal property that is destroyed.

The principle of distribution of risk through the medium of insurance is soundly established in this country. However, there is no insurance available which will cover losses to our cities from natural disaster: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Municipal Association calls upon the administration and the Congress to develop a plan for

natural disaster insurance which will adequately protect our cities and which will allow for the maximum participation of private business.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 3309. A bill to extend and enlarge the authority to provide housing for servicemen through the use of mortgage financing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 3310. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide greater coverage for employees of food industries whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 3311. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a permanent museum building to house the relics and other items of historical value of the Fort Berthold Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3312. A bill to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain tracts of land in the State of Mississippi to Richard C. French, Lewis M. French, and Ruth French Hershey; and

S. 3313. A bill for the relief of Ruth Carter Fairley; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3314. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 3315. A bill to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 3316. A bill authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. FREAR (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. KERR, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WELKER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 1 of each year as National Civil Air Patrol Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted, considered, and agreed to:

By Mr. NEELY:

S. Res. 222. Resolution to pay certain funeral expenses of the late Senator Kilgore, of West Virginia.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. NEELY, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, RELATING TO HOUSING FOR SERVICEMEN

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend and enlarge the authority to provide housing for servicemen through the use of mortgage financing, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a sectional analysis, prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and sectional analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3309) to extend and enlarge the authority to provide housing for servicemen through the use of mortgage financing, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 801 (g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) The term 'State' includes the several States, and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, and Midway Island."

SEC. 2. Section 803 (a) of said act, as amended, is amended by striking out the first proviso and inserting in place thereof the following: "*Provided*, That the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under this title (except mortgages insured pursuant to the provisions of this title in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955) shall not exceed $3 billion."

SEC. 3. Section 803 (a) of said act, as amended, is amended by striking out the last proviso thereof.

SEC. 4. Clause (B) of section 803 (b) (3) of said act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(B) not to exceed with respect to any project an average of $16,500 per family unit, and with respect to all projects for anyone of the armed services an average of $15,000 per family unit, for such part of the property (including ranges, refrigerators, shades, screens, and fixtures) as may be attributable to dwelling use: *Provided*, That such amounts shall be reduced by the average amount per family unit of the replacement cost, as determined by the Commissioner, of all usable utilities which are owned by the United States, and which are not provided for out of the proceeds of the mortgage, and are within the boundaries of the property or project; and."

SEC. 5. Section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 404. Whenever the Secretary of Defense or his designee deems it necessary for the purposes of this title, he may acquire by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer, any land or (with the approval of the Federal Housing Commissioner) any housing financed with mortgages insured under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955. The purchase price of any such housing shall not exceed the actual cost (as that term is defined in sec. 227 (c) of the National Housing Act with respect to new construction) of the housing as determined by the Commissioner less depreciation thereon at a rate of 2 percent per annum, less the amount of accumulated unexpended reserves for replacement, and less the principal amount and accrued interest under any mortgage or other indebtedness outstanding thereon and assumed by the Government. Property acquired under this section may be occupied, used, and improved for the purposes of this section prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General, as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended. The authority so to require housing may be exercised by acquiring the capital stock of a corporation owning and operating housing financed with mortgages insured under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955, but without deduction for such reserves for replacement as are held by the corporation at the time of the transfer of the capital stock to the Government."

SEC. 6. Section 405 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "$9,000,000" and inserting in place thereof "$18,000,000."

SEC. 7. (a) Section 803 (b) (3) of the National Housing Act, as amended, and sections 403 (a) and 403 (b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 are amended by striking out the term "eligible builder" wherever appearing and inserting in place thereof the term "eligible bidder."

(b) Section 403 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out the term "the builder" wherever appearing and inserting in place thereof the term "the mortgagor."

(c) Section 403 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out the term "with any builder" appearing therein.

SEC. 8. Section 407 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection (c):

"(c) Any funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be expended by a military department for military construction or by the Coast Guard for acquisition, construction, and improvements may, within the purposes specified in subsection (a) above, be used for capital expenditures other than the amortization of outstanding mortgages."

SEC. 9. Title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 410. (a) In the construction of housing under the authority of this title and title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, the following are the maximum limitations on net floor area for each unit:

"(1) For flag officers and general officers, 2,100 square feet.

"(2) For captains in the Navy and colonels, 1,675 square feet.

"(3) For commanders and lieutenant commanders and for lieutenant colonels and majors, 1,400 square feet.

"(4) For Officers below the grade of lieutenant commander or major, 1,250 square feet.

"(5) For enlisted members, 1,080 square feet.

"In this section 'net floor area' means the space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement, service space instead of basement, attic, garage, and porches.

"(b) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsection (a) are increased—

"(1) 10 percent for quarters outside the United States and outside the District of Columbia;

"(2) 10 percent for quarters of the commanding officer of any station, base or other installation, based on the grade authorized for that position."

SEC. 10. Section 106 (a) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, is amended by deleting paragraph (9) thereof.

The sectional analysis, presented by Mr. CAPEHART, is as follows:

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Section 1 would redefine the term "State" so as to remove an impediment to the possible use of the title VIII authority in Midway Island and the Canal Zone.

Section 2 would increase the authority of the Federal Housing Commissioner to insure mortgages under the new title VIII of the National Housing Act (Capehart Act) from $1,363,500,000 to $3,000,000,000 so as to increase the number of housing units to be covered thereby from 100,000 (plus 1,000 for the Coast Guard) to 200,000 (including 1,000 for the Coast Guard). At the same time, it would clearly exclude from this limitation the mortgages insured under the old title VIII (Wherry Act). This increase parallels the increase in cost limitations that would be effected by section 4.

Section 3 would remove the time limitation (now fixed at September 30, 1956) on the authority of the Federal Housing Commissioner to insure mortgages under the new title VIII of the National Housing Act. The removal of the customary short-time limitation on the insuring authority of the Federal Housing Commissioner is a recognition of the fact that such insuring authority is merely incidental to the principal objective of title VIII of providing a long-range authority in the Department of Defense for housing for servicemen to be used in the place of authority to construct such housing under a military public works bill. A limited life for the title VIII authority is inconsistent with that objective and is a deterrent to orderly planning, which covers a period of a least 4 years.

Section 4 would increase the statutory limitation on housing constructed under title VIII from $13,500 to $15,000 and, at the same time, include in the $15,000 limitation the cost of ranges, refrigerators, shades, screens, fixtures, and on-site utilities. This cost limitation is not directly comparable to the cost limitation on appropriated fund housing, which does not include work or equipment outside of the house. This amendment would apply $15,000 limitation on an overall service basis but would permit within that overall limitation a 10-percent increase to $16,500 for particular installations. This would insure sufficient flexibility to meet the requirements of the various installations, which vary with the applicable cost factor and personnel complement. This amendment would also clarify the meaning of clause (B) of section 803 (b) (3) of the National Housing Act by rewording the proviso so as to make it a direct limitation on the dollar amount specified in the clause rather than a limitation on the Commissioner's estimate of replacement cost, which is a matter that is dealt with separately in the preceding clause (A).

Section 5 would provide a realistic cost basis for the purchase by the Department of Defense of old title VIII (Wherry Act) housing. That basis would be the actual cost as defined in connection with a builder's cost certification under section 227 of the National Housing Act (which includes a reasonable allowance for builder's profit) and would include an allowance for depreciation on a life basis equal to the usual leasehold term. The fair market value basis for compensation is inappropriate in the case of such a purchase inasmuch as the determination thereof involves the valuation of an intangible leasehold interest directly dependent upon the success or failure of the operation of the project. The use of such method in these cases would involve the capitalization of prospective profits. The danger of windfalls under such a speculative valuation is very great. The amendment would provide a more equitable basis for evaluation.

Section 6 would raise the limitation on the total expenditures for principal, interest, and other obligations, except those of maintenance and operation, of the mortgagor corporation. This increase would be commensurate with the increase in the authority of Federal Housing Commissioner to insure the new title VIII mortgages.

Section 7 is a clarifying amendment and would provide for a greater uniformity of terminology in title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955. It would insure, for example, that section 403 (a) of that title is not intended to require the transfer to the Secretary of Defense of the capital stock of the corporation described in section 403 (b) as being qualified, among other things, to construct housing of the type covered by that act, but rather that it is intended to cover a new corporation formed for the purpose of executing the mortgage.

Section 8 would make construction funds available in connection with capital expenditures that do not immediately result in equivalent savings in appropriations for quarters allowances and hence are not properly chargeable thereto. For example, the cost of acquiring land or housing under section 404 should be charged against appropriations for construction rather than appropriations for quarters allowances. On the other hand, the cost of amortizing the principal and interest of mortgages on housing projects would continue to be charged against appropriations for quarters allowances inasmuch as those appropriations would directly benefit by the withholding of quarters allowances from personnel occupying those housing projects. The maintenance and operation of those housing projects would, of course, be charged to appropriations for that purpose.

Section 9 would apply to title VIII housing the same square footage limitations that are applicable to appropriated fund housing for military personnel in the Department of Defense.

Section 10 would insure that construction contracts entered into under title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 are not subject to renegotiation. The Renegotiation Act of 1951, like the Renegotiation Act of 1944, exempts from renegotiation those construction contracts that are entered into on the basis of competitive bids. There does not appear to be any valid reason why construction contracts entered into under this act on the basis of competitive bids should not be similarly exempted from renegotiation.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide greater coverage for employees of food industries whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING 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. 3310) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide greater coverage for employees of food industries whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, 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 this act may be cited as the "Food Industries Amendments of 1956 to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended."

FINDING AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Section 2 (a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Congress hereby finds that the existence, in industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or in activities affecting commerce, of labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for healthy, efficiency, and general well-being of workers (1) causes commerce and the channels and instrumentalities of commerce to be used to spread and perpetuate such labor conditions among the workers of the several States; (2) burdens and affects commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; (3) constitutes an unfair method of competition in commerce; (4) leads to labor disputes burdening and obstructing commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; and (5) interferes with the orderly and fair marketing of goods in commerce."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3 (j) of such act is amended by striking out "or in any closely related process or occupation directly essential to the production thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "or in any process or occupation necessary to the production thereof,".

(b) Section 3 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(p) 'Activity affecting commerce' includes any activity in commerce necessary to commerce or competing with any activity in commerce, or where the payment of wages at rates below those prescribed by this act would burden or obstruct or tend to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce."

MINIMUM WAGES

SEC. 4. (a) That part of section 6 of such act, which immediately precedes subparagraph (1) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) Every employer shall pay to each of his employees who is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and every employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall pay to each of his employees employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged, wages at the following rates:".

MAXIMUM HOURS

SEC. 5. (a) Section 7 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, no employer shall employ any of his employees who is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and no employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall employ any of his employees employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so

engaged, for a workweek longer than 40 hours, or a workday longer than 8 hours, unless such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of the hours above specified at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed."

(b) Section 7 (b) of such act is amended by striking out paragraph 3 thereof.

(c) Section 7 of such act is further amended by striking out subsection (c) and renumbering the subsections accordingly.

CHILD LABOR

SEC. 6. Subsection (c) of section 12 of such act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "and no employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall employ any oppressive child labor in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged."

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Section 13 (a) (1) and section 13 (a) (2) of such act are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. (a) the provisions of sections 6 and 7 shall not apply with respect to (1) any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity, (as such terms are defined and delimited by regulations of the Administrator); or (2) any employee employed in any retail establishment by an employer not having more than 5 such establishments and having a total annual volume of sales of not more than $500,000."

(b) Section 13 (a) is further amended by striking out subparagraph (4), including the proviso of such subparagraph and renumbering accordingly.

(c) Section 13 (a) of such act is further amended by striking out subparagraph 5 and renumbering accordingly.

(d) Section 13 (a) of such act is further amended by striking out subparagraph 10 and renumbering accordingly.

(e) Section 13 (b) of such act is amended by striking out subparagraph 4.

(f) Section 13 (b) is further amended by striking out subparagraph 5.

PROHIBITED ACTS; PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE

SEC. 8. (a) Section 15 (a) (1) of such act is amended by adding after the words "sell in commerce", the words "or in any activity affecting commerce", and after the words "sale thereof in commerce", the words "or in any activity affecting commerce."

(b) Section 15 (b) of such act is amended by adding after the words "sold in commerce", the words "or in any activity affecting commerce."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 9. The amendments made by this act shall take effect upon the expiration of 120 days from the date of its enactment.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO CITY OF ROSEBURG, OREG.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3316) authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to (1) that parcel of land, together with any improvements thereon, which comprises a part of the property commonly known as the Lillie Lela Moore estate, and which is described as lots 5, 6, and 7, block 29, Douglas County, Roseburg, Oreg., and (2) that part of such estate consisting of furniture, personal effects, and jewelry which has been designated by the said Administrator as lot A, personalty, such property having been devised to the United States by Lillie Lela Moore under the provisions of her will probated in 1940, and which has since been declared surplus to the needs of the United States.

The statement presented by Mr. NEUBERGER is as follows:

The growing interest in our own history is a frequent theme of book reviewers writing with approving amazement of the historical volumes regularly found in the best seller lists. There are many other indications that we are becoming increasingly conscious of our history. One of the most encouraging indications is the tremendous attention given to local history. It is manifested in the infinite number of county historical societies that have been formed, in the number of bronze commemorative plates that adorn the homes where the famous lived and died, in the thousands of markers on streets and lanes that list both the modern identifications and the original name. Deserted courthouses, schools, and churches, from coast to coast and border to border, are saved from wrecking crews when the emblazoned sign "museum" goes up.

In Roseburg, Oreg., the Douglas County Historical Society, under the guidance of the president, Mrs. V. J. Micelli, has evidenced the interest, perception, and fidelity that makes the society's contribution of major importance in the cultural life of the county. The devotion and dedication so characteristic of the leaders of organizations like the Douglas County Historical Society may not bring rewards of ringing praise, public acclaim, or particularly wide recognition. They bring a rich reward, however, in the knowledge that generations to come will have a better understanding of the life and times of those who preceded them. I recall that a few years ago the cars of the last narrow gage railroad to operate in the State of Oregon were hauled quietly and unceremoniously from the State. The transaction brought no more notice than the sale of a used car. An alert historical organization can stop these raids on the very substance of regional and local history. The ever-watchful eye of such organizations can prevent the irremediable loss and dispersal of the indigenous monuments to progress found in every community. Mrs. Micelli and the city manager of Roseburg, George W. Farrell, have provided me with information and facts that show the Douglas County Historical Society is alert and is serving faithfully the trust reposed on them by yet unborn generations.

There is an old house in Roseburg, referred to locally as the Lillie Moore home, which was built a century ago by Lillie Moore's father for his young bride, Alice Gaylord. The home was representative of that stability and permanence befitting a community conscious of its sudden transition from the frontier days and its pioneer origins. It was proudly graced with many of the refinements of mid-Victorians living shipped around the Horn by order of the young groom, Mr. Moore. I have been told how the daughter, Lillie Moore, who passed on at an advanced age, recognized that her childhood home had historical significance and should be preserved as a historical museum. This home has no electric lights, no modern heating or other features common to our day, but it is completely representative of a prosperous, middle-class home of the 1850's.

I have been told how Miss Lillie Moore sat with her neighbors and enumerated pieces of furniture within her home that should be included in any local historical exhibit. Her will, made in 1927, they tell me, evidenced her intent of a bequest for educational and public purposes. Lillie Moore was the last of her line. The family had its beginnings in the New England States, coming to Oregon in early pioneer days.

On her death the property was left to the United States Government in the will probated in 1940, and following a period of litigation, it was given to the Government in 1952. I am informed that the United States has had cash returns to date of $104,630.44 from this bequest.

There remain in the possession of the United States three lots, the old home, and the contents of the home. Of minor value in comparison to that part of the bequest which has been sold, that which remains is admirably suited to the purposes of a museum in a city of over 12,000. I have been asked by the Douglas County Historical Society and by the officials of the city of Roseburg to introduce a bill which would convey to the city this remaining property to be used as a historical museum.

The United States has profited handsomely from the bequest of Lillie Moore. In keeping with her memory, in the interest of the community where she lived and died, and in keeping with the basic intent of her expressed desire in her later years, it would appear that the earliest possible conveyance of this property by the United States Government to the city of Roseburg would be an act of justice and the recognition of a moral responsibility to the local community, which shared in her love and interest.

NATIONAL CIVIL AIR PATROL DAY

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and 42 of my colleagues, namely, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. KERR, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WELKER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. ALLOTT, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 1 of each year as National Civil Air Patrol Day. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be kept on the desk until Monday next, in order that any Senator who

may care to associate himself as a sponsor, may have that opportunity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Delaware.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 151) to authorize the President to proclaim December 1 of each year as National Civil Air Patrol Day, introduced by Mr. FREAR (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. MURRAY) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS TO RELIEVE OFFICEHOLDERS OF PRIVATE OBLIGATIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 20, 1956,

The names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] were added as cosponsors to the bill (S. 3242) to provide for Federal contribution to the election campaigns of major political parties, to reduce the importance of campaign contributions in Federal elections, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators) on February 20, 1956.

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. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Address entitled "Economic Justice," delivered by Senator BRICKER at the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association meeting at Philadelphia, February 28, 1956.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF ROBERT C. HILL, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Thruston B. Morton, resigned. I give notice that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

ANALYSIS OF GIVEAWAY CHARGES MADE AGAINST THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, along with remarks I am about to make regarding the Department of the Interior, Secretary McKay, and certain charges which have been made, I should like to have printed in the RECORD an analysis of certain other charges and allegations made in a series of articles in the Washington Post and Times Herald which purported to go into the giveaway charges made against the present administration.

My staff and I have gone through this series of nine articles which appeared beginning on January 8 through January 16 of this year, and the analysis which I am placing in the RECORD points up the one-sided aspect of these articles, and, in general, the misinformation which has been characteristic of these so-called giveaway charges.

The analysis, which covers the major allegations made in this series of articles, shows once again how some facts have been twisted and other facts totally ignored. It also lends strength to my remarks of January 19, in which I pointed out that a newspaper which has loudly championed freedom of the press, had best begin to practice the responsibility of factuality that the public accepts as a duty of the press. The most rigid and the most demanding of these in the instance of the freedom of which we speak is that reporting be honestly and objectively accomplished.

Mr. President, I submit that a reading of the analysis shows that not only did the articles not follow the course demanded by a free press—fact and objectivity—but that the irresponsible, politically inspired charges which have been made under the general category of giveaway are without factual basis.

The truth is that Secretary McKay and this administration have upheld the highest principles of conservation of our great natural resources, and that if any giveaway did occur, it occurred due to laws which were on the books when this administration and Secretary McKay came into office. The responsibility for any giveaway must be placed at the doors of those who failed to provide remedial legislation, rather than those who administered the law of the land fairly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the analysis of which I have spoken be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I am a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and have been for more than 9 years, but I can join wholeheartedly in support of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona. The Department of the Interior, under the direction of Douglas McKay, has been operated in accordance with law, and, to my knowledge, there has not been one single instance in which anything has been given away.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Utah for his remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona?

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

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMATION OF INTERVIEWS AND DATA FURNISHED WARREN UNNA, WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD STAFF WRITER, IN CONNECTION WITH RECENT GIVEAWAY SERIES

NOVEMBER 25, 10 A. M.

Mr. Unna interviewed the Director. Earl Thomas, Assistant to the Director; Michael Giller, Minerals Officer; Mack Corbett, Information Officer; were also in attendance. Mr. Unna indicated he was seeking information for use in a series of articles and submitted queries based on information he had previously received elsewhere on practically all of the charges made by conservationists in his series of articles. It was in this interview he took the quote attributed to Mr. Giller on Wind River Indian Reservation oil leasing. The quote, "It's debatable whether it's a giveaway to have a competitive lease or a noncompetitive lease," was taken out of context and leaves an unfair impression of what Mr. Giller really said. The remainder of that particular quote was: "By that I mean it is debatable whether the Government always gains any advantage by competitive leasing."

Then Mr. Giller went on to explain that the regulations are designed to bring maximum rates to the Government by having competitive leasing where it is warranted and noncompetitive leasing where it is warranted, namely, in wildcatting or unknown geologic areas for oil and gas. Certain facts were given Mr. Unna on the Wind River oil leasing at this time. Mr. Unna's statement, as always, carefully attributed to "critics of the administration's program," rather than to himself, that the private oil companies now lease for 20 cents an acre with no need for bonus payments, is an oversimplification of the facts that were given him, namely: Department regulations call for payment of rental as follows: 50 cents per acre for the first lease year, no rental for the second and third lease years, 25 cents for the fourth and fifth years, and 50 cents for the sixth and succeeding years.

NOVEMBER 25, NOON

Mr. Corbett, subsequent to Mr. Unna's interview with the Director, gave Mr. Unna a large photostat prepared by the Departmental Information Office of Oregon newspaper clips giving both sides of the Al Sarena question, including Secretary McKay's statement, charges of Drew Pearson, the refutations made by both Oregon daily newspapers, and a favorable analysis by former Governor Sprague of Oregon.

ABOUT DECEMBER 7

Karl Landstrom of the Lands Staff, was contacted by Mr. Unna over the telephone, as result of which he prepared a table of data on withdrawals, restorations, and disposals, showing that approximately 700,000 acres had been disposed of since January 1, 1953, as compared with approximately 918,000 acres from 1945 through 1952. The trend figures on withdrawals and restorations showed that withdrawals exceeded restorations in 1955 and 1954 for the first time in several years.

The figures furnished by Mr. Landstrom are attached.

ABOUT DECEMBER 8

Mr. Unna contacted Mr. Corbett by telephone, requesting figures on acreages under mineral lease or permit by International Nickel, Inc., M. A. Hanna, and Kennecott Corp., in Minnesota. After a careful check of Geological Survey and BLM records, Mr. Corbett telephoned Mr. Unna the following day to give him these data: No leases to any of the three concerns; no knowledge of any 50-year leases pending or granted to International Nickel Co. which Mr. Unna seemed to have inside knowledge from other sources; 5 permits to International Nickel for 3,587.47 acres, and 5 permit applications pending for an additional 4,620 acres. One permit issued M. A. Hanna for 741.03 acres and 1 application pending for approximately 10,280 acres; no permits on record for Kennecott Corp. The original hand draft listing every mineral permit on record for Minnesota, and on which Mr. Corbett prepared the information given Mr. Unna, is attached.

ABOUT DECEMBER 12

Mr. Unna telephoned Mr. Corbett seeking to verify the width of right-of-way granted to Pacific Gas & Electric Co. by Congress near Barstow, Calif., for a natural-gas pipeline. Mr. Corbett advised Mr. Unna the next day that a check of the records, in the short time allowed, did not disclose any actual right-of-way agreement indicating the size of the right-of-way, but that all right-of-way grants are either 40 feet from the centerline or 50 feet from the centerline; therefore, it might reasonably be assumed that the right-of-way was an 80-foot right-of-way, since Mr. Unna's other informants had described it as being 40 rather than 50 feet.

ABOUT DECEMBER 14

Mr. Unna contacted Lewis E. Hoffman, minerals staff officer, regarding a 50-year recorded advance form of lease for International Nickel Co., M. A. Hanna Co., and Kennecott Copper Co. Mr. Hoffman told him his office had no record of such proposed leases and that if any of these companies had conferred with the Assistant Secretary he did not know about it.

In addition to this chronological summation, these Interior Department officials also talked with Mr. Unna in connection with the series of articles which he wrote:

Lee Muck, Staff Assistant, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management. Mr. Muck has since retired from the Department.

Conrad Wirth, Director of the National Parks Service.

John L. Farley, Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Clark Salyer, Chief of the Refuge Division, Fish and Wildlife Service.

Alistair McBain, Chief of Information, Fish and Wildlife Service.

THE AL SARENA CASE

Charge: The one big giveaway case in the timber business * * * concerns Al Sarena Mines, Inc. It is extremely difficult to obtain timberland in the National Forest but one way is to obtain the lumber as a mere byproduct to claims for mineral deposits beneath the soil. In the past, Interior has been exceedingly tough on such claims because the timber byproduct being more valuable is usually the real incentive behind the claim for a mineral deposit.

Fact: Under Secretary of the Interior Clarence Davis has made it clear that the decision he made to grant patents in the Al Sarena case was dictated by the law, rather than by an unjustified usurpation by an executive agency of the powers rightly vested in Congress. Here is a quotation from his recent testimony on this point:

"Under the mining laws, which had not been changed since 1872, until last year, a miner who stakes out his claim on public lands and files on it, spends $500 in the development of it, and proves that he has a valid discovery of minerals, is entitled to a patent * * *. There is no reference to timber in the mining laws; whether there is much, little, or no timber make no difference whatever as a matter of law. * * *

"Nevertheless, a few years ago, the Department of the Interior attempted to inject into the mining laws a standard of discovery which required profitable operation and a showing that the mineral deposits had the greater comparative value than other uses. This is not the standard set up by law * * *.

"To allow mining claims to be located and then to judge them on standards other than those set up by the Congress and the Supreme Court is administrative legislation.

"If we are to adopt the philosophy that any Department of Government is vested with such vast powers, then it should be done by an act of Congress and not by administrative decision. * * *

"The wise use of our great national forests is a program supported by all of us. However meritorious that objective, I trust you will agree that we should never distort the law in order to attain it."

Charge: The standing timber on the Al Sarena claims, even before cutting is worth some $638,000—an 8,000 percent return on the company's investment.

Fact: The facts regarding the timber values have been set forth by Under Secretary Davis as follows:

"I must reemphasize at all times that the value of timber on mining claims is not material; that the Congress has never passed legislation which denies mining claims merely because there is timber on them; but there has been comment in the press and I believe from some of the members of your subcommittees to the effect that these claims constitute a timber grab. Let me point out:

"1. At the time these claims were filed on as mining claims, there can be no dispute that similar timber could have been purchased in Oregon for as low as $2 and $3 an acre. The fact that all the claims were staked between 1697 and 1939 would demonstrate conclusively that at least in the beginning there could have been no thought of any profits out of the timber.

"2. The only testimony in the record at the time I passed on the case was the testimony of Mr. G. Robert Leavengood of the United States Forest Service. His testimony is: 'The value of the timber which we would cut now runs about $77,000 on the contested claims.'

"Admittedly, timber has increased in value since this record was made up in 1950, but I have difficulty in believing that it has increased as fantastically as some of the figures which have been so freely used.

"3. If the mine had been developed, even without the issuance of any patent, the timber would have been available for the purposes of timbering the mine if underground workings were pursued and would have been largely lost to the Government."

Charge: Senator W. KERR SCOTT, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the joint investigating committee, finds the Al Sarena case smacks of "bottom of the deck" dealing by "high levels" within McKay's Department.

Fact: Here is the reply by Under Secretary Davis to this charge:

"Mr. Chairman, the language has been used that there was some kind of 'high level interference' in this case. I am a little puzzled as to what is meant by that term. * * *

"If you mean by 'interference' that the Secretary has overruled the decisions of one of the numerous bureaus, then I must protest the use of the language.

"The Secretary of the Interior, and by delegation in this case, the solicitor, is the final judge of the decisions of the Department. All of the actions of this vast army of 50,000 people employed by the Interior Department can be appealed ultimately to the Secretary for decision. * * *

"To say that the Secretary should not reverse field decisions or decisions of the bureaus is simply to argue that the decisions of field offices or bureaus should be final, and that we should have government by bureaucracy without interference from the elected executive branch. I hope it was not meant to imply that I am in error merely because I reverse the decision of some bureau. If so, then there is no need for a Solicitor, there is no need for Assistant Secretaries, and there is little need for a Secretary himself."

FACTS ON ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING WATER AND POWER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IN SERIES OF ARTICLES PUBLISHED IN WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD BEGINNING JANUARY 8, 1956

Charge: Not one new start has been made on a large Federal multipurpose dam (like Hungry Horse Dam in Montana) since the Eisenhower administration took office.

Fact: It is technically correct that no new dam "similar" to Hungry Horse in construction or in power capacity has been authorized or construction started. However, Glendo Dam on the North Platte River in Wyoming and the Trinity River development in California are new hydroelectric projects on which construction has been initiated in fiscal year 1956. The Glendo Dam will have 24,000 kilowatts capacity and the Trinity River project 233,000 kilowatts. The administration has supported Libby Dam in Montana, the upper Colorado River storage project, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado. All three would have major hydroelectric power production as part of their multiple-purpose functions. Several lesser hydroelectric plants have been started as part of existing reclamation projects.

Charge: Secretary of the Interior McKay failed in his responsibility to press for a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon.

Fact: The position of the Department of the Interior is that Congress has refused to authorize Federal construction and the Supreme Court has plainly placed responsibility for decision on the license application by the Idaho Power Co. in the Federal Power Commission.

Charge: This administration has abandoned dam sites such as Nez Perce on the Northwest's Snake River.

Fact: The Nez Perce site was abandoned in the previous Democratic administration on the insistence of fishery interests.

Charge: The Department of the Interior has abrogated the traditional "wheeling" regulation.

Fact: The Department continues to negotiate wheeling agreements with private power companies for delivery of Federal power to preference customers.

Charge: The Department has attempted to abolish preference customers altogether.

Fact: No example exists of any abolishment of preference rights of customers purchasing energy from the Bureau of Reclamation.

Charge: The Department's new marketing criteria is an attempt to force rural electric cooperatives out of existence.

Fact: The Missouri Basin marketing criteria was announced merely as a notice to advise the Missouri River Basin power suppliers, publicly and privately owned alike, that the Federal Government would not accept the responsibility of keeping the area supplied with power and that some long-range planning arrangements were necessary so that the suppliers could schedule construction of their own generating capacity.

In the Pacific Northwest, the Bonneville Power Administration policy of long-range commitments was considered for adoption on the same basis as in the Missouri River Basin; that is, that the Federal Government would not take the responsibility for supplying power for any particular area other than that developed as a byproduct of multiple-purpose river development facilities.

Charge: The Department of the Interior has allowed private utilities to enjoy "dump rates" for an indefinite period.

Fact: With respect to Canyon Ferry Dam, a Bureau of Reclamation structure in Montana, there is no question but that the Montana Power Co. is enjoying a benefit from Canyon Ferry power at dump rates. The final determination on construction of transmission lines, which would make possible delivery of power to other customers, rests with the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

Charge: The administration has proposed a downstream benefits bill, which would permit agencies with upstream private dams to charge the Government for storage of water.

Fact: In the Columbia River Basin, downstream benefits are computed and charged in operation of Federal dams. Simple fairness requires that private facilities receive the same treatment.

Charge: The administration is considering cutting the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. into California's publicly owned Central Valley project, by way of facilities of the Trinity River division.

Fact: This was a congressional action in the Trinity River authorizing legislation, which required the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the Pacific Gas & Electric and other possible partnership proposals for development of power facilities.

Charge: The administration, through the Bureau of the Budget, has generally discouraged Federal power projects.

Fact: While critics say there has been a general lack of enthusiasm from the Bureau of the Budget in authorizing new projects, evidenced by outright stop orders or behind the scenes "Dutch uncle" talks which keep Interior agencies from ever requesting funds, a little investigation would disclose that the same situation has existed for several years back during the Democrat administration in the Bureau of the Budget.

FACTS AND ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING MINERALS

Charge: The Department of the Interior is about to give away minerals on 12,000 acres of Superior National Forest, through a 50-year lease option to International Nickel Co.

Fact: While International Nickel has been a prospecting permit applicant since 1951 and does in fact hold 5 such permits covering an aggregate of 3,588.47 acres, no lease has as yet been granted.

International Nickel quite recently indicated it plans to request two leases covering a total of 4,938.77 acres. Involved in the two areas are one of International Nickel's own permits and one tract for which the company had applied for a permit not yet issued. The remaining acreage—about half the total—includes lands covered by other permits and permit applications upon which International Nickel holds options.

In view of the extremely low grade marginal copper and much lower content of nickel believed by experts to be present in the deposit, and the necessity for large investment to make production possible, it was found advisable to make preliminary arrangements for a long-term lease which might be issued if and when it was shown that an adequate mineral deposit was present and could be developed.

The schedule of rentals and royalties proposed under any lease, when and if issued, would be higher after the first 25 years than the terms of the average hard mineral lease issued by the Department on known commercial deposits, and the terms for the initial 25 years would be comparable, notwithstanding the marginal nature of the deposit in this instance.

The act of requesting that a lease be issued, as International Nickel has indicated it will in the near future, does not mean that the lease will be issued immediately, nor does such request assure that any lease ever will be issued. In making its request, the company will submit what it considers evidence of the presence of copper and nickel in sufficient quantities and of satisfactory quality to render mining operation feasible, and justifying the large investment which would be necessary to the operation.

Charge: The Department told the International Nickel Co. to draft the kind of lease it wanted and "we'll be glad to look it over."

Fact: In considering the preliminary arrangements for a long-term-lease form, conferences were held for a period of more than a year. Forest Service requirements for surface use of the lands, the marginal nature of the deposit, and the large operation handling a large daily tonnage which would be necessary in the area were among the factors contributing to the determination that a long-term lease would be needed if development of the mineral deposit were to be achieved.

The lease form finally agreed upon embodied terms proposed by the Bureau of Land Management and Geological Survey, and accepted by the International Nickel Co.

Charge: Under previous administrations, the company got nowhere in pressing for a 99-year lease, but once the administration changed it confronted the Forest Service with a letter from the Office of Defense Mobilization declaring the national welfare would be endangered if the Forest Service did not permit the mining.

Fact: The copper and nickel deposit in Superior National Forest was of sufficient interest to the ODM and other defense minerals agencies in 1952 that a representative of ODM called a meeting on July 17 of that year with the apparent intent of showing the need for immediate development of the deposit and to promote the issuance of prospecting permits.

Represented at this meeting on July 17, 1952, in addition to ODM, were the Office of Defense Materials Procurement, Defense Minerals Exploration Administration, Bureau of Mines, Geological Survey, Forest Service, and Bureau of Land Management.

During this meeting, maps of the deposit were examined and the nature of the deposit was discussed. It was considered to be highly marginal if commercial at all. The necessity for Government subsidy of any productive operation was foreseen as a strong possibility.

Defense minerals agencies indicated that development was important, in view of the existing scarcities particularly of nickel, and possibilities were explored for early issuance of prospecting permits. At that time two permits had been issued, and following the July 17 meeting work was begun on other applications so that by January 1, 1953, five permits had been issued. This number had been increased to 13 by February 1, 1953.

The act of June 30, 1950, 81st Congress, opens Superior and all other national forests in Minnesota to mineral leasing. This is a special act applying only to that one State.

FACTS ON ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING INDIAN AFFAIRS IN THE SERIES OF ARTICLES PUBLISHED BY THE WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD BEGINNING JANUARY 8, 1956

Charge: In a memorandum of May 16, 1955 the Commissioner of Indian Affairs made it possible for individual Indians to withdraw their share of the reservation or tribal land.

Fact: The May 16 memorandum had nothing whatever to do with tribal land which is the common property of all the members of a particular tribal group. It was concerned solely with allotted land which is the property of individual Indians. In essence, the memorandum provides that if the Indian owner of an allotment seeks a fee patent (or unrestricted title) and can demonstrate his competence, the patent shall not be withheld merely because the land happens to be located in a timber or grazing unit. In all cases where the sale of such patented allotments creates problems for the owners of Indian lands remaining in trust, the Indian Bureau will consult and cooperate actively with these owners in working out fair and equitable solutions. No problems have so far arisen under the May 16 memorandum which proved incapable of such solution and none is anticipated.

Charge: The Interior Department sponsored 1954 congressional bills removing from Federal protection a million acres of timberland on the Klamath Reservation in Oregon and 200,000 acres of timberland on the Menominee Reservation in Wisconsin.

Fact: Both the Klamath and Menominee Tribes were included in a list of tribes presented to the Senate Civil Service Committee in February 1947 by the then Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs with the statement that they "could be denied Federal services immediately or in the future, whichever the Congress should decide." Both tribes were also included in House Concurrent Resolution No. 108 which was adopted by both branches of Congress in the summer of 1953 without a dissenting vote. This resolution called upon the Secretary of the Interior to submit proposed legislation which would terminate Federal supervision over the property and affairs of the tribes named therein. In compliance with this mandate, such proposals were submitted covering the Klamath and Menominee Tribes, among others, in the forepart of 1954. After full hearings in which representatives of both tribes participated actively, laws providing for termination of Federal supervision over a period of approximately 4 years were enacted for both. Representatives of both tribes indicated approval of the legislation as finally enacted.

Charge: The Indian Bureau has given away property belonging to the Nez Perce Indians by authorizing the transfer of 19 acres of land and the several school buildings on it to Public School District No. 341, at Lapwai, Idaho.

Fact: For a period dating back 10 years up to 1949, some 150 Nez Perce Indian children have attended the public school at Lapwai. In 1949, that elementary school burned down; and the Government allowed the school district to use the buildings which had been the former Indian school. The State of Idaho needs long-term tenure to the property before it can make extensive repairs and heating equipment replacement.

There is a difference of opinion between the Government and the tribe as to the ownership of the land involved. That difference is now before the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia for settlement.

The Department's objective is to make the property available to the school district so that some 300 children (about half of them Indian) will have a place to go to school. Every effort is being made to accomplish this objective.

Charge: The Department released Wind River Reservation oil rights on 161,000 acres of the Riverton reclamation withdrawal area to the detriment of the Indians.

Fact: The pattern of administration of oil and gas development within the Riverton reclamation withdrawal was established not by the Department of the Interior but by congressional legislation—Public Law 284, of the 83d Congress. This legislation was

supported, prior to enactment, by the joint tribal council of the Wind River Reservation in a resolution of January 27, 1953, and by tribal attorneys and delegates at the Senate committee hearing.

Charge: The Department tried to shut down a garment factory in Flandreau, S. Dak., which, since 1935, has been adding $28,000 a year in earnings to the "submarginal existence of a group of 150 Indians." South Dakota's two Senators intervened and kept the factory open.

Fact: The Flandreau garment factory was established in 1934 to provide employment for Indian women of the local community during the depression period. After a few years of producing dresses only for the Flandreau Indian school, the operations were later expanded through the acquisition of high-speed power machines to include the manufacture of 30 different articles of clothing which have been widely used in schools and hospitals throughout the Indian Service.

In 1951 an intensive study of the factory's operations was made by a special survey committee of Bureau personnel. This study revealed (1) that the factory was not an economically sound enterprise (a loss of $7,656.70 was suffered in fiscal 1950; $6,853.62 in fiscal 1951), and (2) that closing the factory would not involve serious social or economic readjustment (19 of the 24 women then regularly employed were married and living with their husbands; current employment opportunities were available locally for 17 of the husbands while the other two were presumably eligible for old-age assistance; the 5 single women could obtain employment locally or in off-reservation garment centers). The committee recognized that the factory had served its original purpose but felt that there was no longer justification for continuing it as a Federal operation.

After discussions with the Indians about the possibility of their taking over the factory as a tribal enterprise failed to produce a favorable response, the committee recommended that the factory be closed on June 30, 1953.

The closing date, however, was later postponed to March 1, 1954, in order to allow ample time for the factory employees to make personal readjustments. Before this date was reached a further examination of the factory operation showed evidence of considerably improved prospects and an additional extension was granted to March 1955.

In August 1954, however, the picture was changed greatly when Congress enacted Public Law 568, providing for a complete transfer of all Federal Indian hospitals and other Indian health operations to the United States Public Health Service by July 1, 1955. Since the Public Health Service operates its own supply depot, it was obvious at once that a major market for the products of the Flandreau garment factory would be eliminated. In fact, during fiscal year 1955 sales of the Flandreau garments to Indian hospitals and health facilities totaled $49,935.93, as compared with $34,257.73 in sales to Indian schools.

In discussions leading up to the actual transfer of Indian health responsibilities, Public Health Service officials clearly stated that it would not be feasible for that agency to continue purchasing Flandreau garments indefinitely. In response to urging by the Indian Bureau and South Dakota Senators and Congressmen, however, they did agree to carry on the purchases for 1 fiscal year, so that every opportunity would be provided for making necessary adjustments and for exploring the possibility of having the factory taken over as a nongovernmental operation. Such explorations have been carried on but have thus far produced no tangible results. The factory is now scheduled to close by the end of the 1956 fiscal year.

Currently there are 15 workers employed by the factory. All of them have been offered full Bureau assistance in finding other employment opportunities.

Charge: The Bureau of Indian Affairs showed impropriety in awarding a food contract to an unpaid Bureau consultant.

Fact: The Bureau awarded a contract to supply food for five schools on the Cherokee Reservation in North Carolina for half a school year on a fact-finding basis to see if contract feeding would provide a better grade of food at less money than Government-operated kitchens. The short-term contract, which was limited to less than 1 percent of the Bureau's feeding operations, was awarded not to an "unpaid consultant" but to an experienced food service organization which had an excellent reputation for satisfactory performance on contracts of this general type. The final report of the operation, which ran from January to June of 1955, showed that the children got a greater variety of more nutritious and more palatable food from the private contractor than they did from Government-operation—and at less cost. Government prepared meals averaged 48.8 cents per meal; the contractor furnished better food at an average cost of 47.08 cents; and that average included some expensive cooking equipment which had to be installed, and which will last a number of years. After finding that a private contract was desirable, the Bureau invited bidding on a longer term contract to provide food service at the Cherokee schools. The competitive bidding resulted in the awarding of the contract to a company that had played no part in the carefully documented experiment; the contract was awarded to a Birmingham, Ala., concern which guaranteed the meals at 44 cents each—a saving of almost 5 cents per meal to the Indian Bureau.

Charge: The Bureau of Indian Affairs negotiated a "rigged" contract to rent automobiles instead of buying them and then abandoned the plan because of a threatened Congressional investigation.

Fact: The Bureau did rent 39 automobiles from a rental firm, after careful investigation of the company's rental plan and the plans of other national rental agencies. The contract was let as a "feeler" to find out if renting would be preferable and more economical than outright Government ownership. At the time of the contract, one of the Bureau's biggest problems in its operation of a fleet of 5,133 cars, trucks and busses was the cost of keeping them in running condition. The use of Bureau cars for a minimum of six years or 60,000 miles in remote areas and over bad roads made the maintenance problem one of serious proportions. The charge that the contract was "rigged" is entirely without foundation. It was an investigatory contract, let on what was the most feasible basis at the time. The chairman of the House of Representatives subcommittee investigating this matter publicly stated during the hearing that there was no evidence that would impugn the honesty or integrity of Bureau staff members in any way. The contract was not abandoned because of a threatened investigation, but was cancelled by action of the Comptroller General of the United States on the ground that it was entered into without competitive bidding.

FACTS AND ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING PLANTS FOR PRODUCING SYNTHETIC FUEL, OIL SHALE, ETC.

Charge: The Department has given away plants for producing synthetic fuel, oil shale, zirconium, titanium and helium.

Fact: The synthetic liquid fuels demonstration plants at Louisiana, Mo., converted from the Missouri ordnance works, were closed in the summer of 1953. The portion of the plants made up from the Ordnance works' original installation were turned over to the Army later in 1953 under terms of a congressional act dated September 13, 1951. The remaining structures were transferred to General Services Administration, as required by law. GSA, in turn, transferred custody to the Department of the Army. The Department of the Interior entered into no agreements or negotiations in the ultimate sale of the plants to private parties.

Fact: The oil shale retorting and refining installations at Rifle, Colo., have been placed in standby condition and still are the property of the Government. Some of the shops and other facilities are being used in connection with a Bureau of Mines research program in mining shale and some of the dwellings are occupied by Bureau employees assigned to the experimental mining program which involves an expenditure of $1 million in fiscal 1956.

No equipment, other than that damaged extensively by a roof fall at the experimental mine, has been sold.

Fact: Zirconium-production facilities of the Bureau of Mines at Albany, Oreg., remain intact as property of the Government. No equipment has been sold. In fact, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department have an agreement that the zirconium plant is to be maintained in such condition that it can be put into full-scale operation on 3 months' notice by AEC. Some of the equipment is being used by mines for special metallurgical research jobs. Most of the cost of building and equipping the zirconium plant was financed by AEC.

Fact: As a pioneer in titanium research, the Bureau of Mines was requested by the Army Ordnance Corps to enlarge its facilities at Boulder City, Nev., in order to test improved equipment and techniques for recovering superior-quality metal to be used in special Army ordnance military applications. This expansion was accomplished in 1952. All metal produced in research was used either by the Corps or for further experimental work at Boulder City. Although some commercial production was underway among several companies, the Defense Materials Procurement Administration decided output was not adequate and so requested the Bureau to step up its output at Boulder City. Between April 30, 1953, and September 7, 1954, the Boulder City pilot plant produced 246 tons of titanium, all of which went to the General Services Administration. This production supplemented but did not compete with private industry.

As industrial output gained, the Bureau ceased large-scale output and now uses the Boulder City facilities in research aimed at improving metallurgical methods. This work is being done under a cooperative agreement with an industrial firm which contributes funds to defray costs and agrees that any resulting patents shall be assigned the Government and made available to industry as a whole. No parts of the titanium production facilities at Boulder City have been sold or given to private industry.

In the Bureau of Mines laboratories, work continues on the improvement of present industrial processes and on development of new and improved methods for recovering superior quality titanium metal.

Fact: Helium production: No helium plants have been closed under this administration; in fact, the Department has authorized an additional plant for 1956. No helium-producing equipment has been sold or given away. The Department's Bureau of Mines remains the sole producer of helium on a commercial scale in the United States.

Charge: Coal-mine safety regulations have been given away to the States for supervision.

Fact: The Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, as approved by the Congress in 1952, has been administered by the Bureau of Mines of the Department in strict accordance with that law. No provisions of the Federal law

have been turned over to any State for enforcement. No State inspection has replaced Federal inspection of any coal mine. The Bureau of Mines survey team recommended a stronger safety training program by the Bureau. That suggestion has been put into effect. The survey team recommended strengthening of health and safety activities and separating them from the Bureau's regional setup so Federal inspection and related work would be strengthened. That recommendation was adopted. The team suggested a 24-hour advance notice of the Federal inspection of a mine. That proposal was rejected by the Department.

Charge: The Government's $35-million Louisiana, Mo., synthetic fuels plant was sold for $5 million to private interests—a return of 25 cents on the dollar.

Fact: The Bureau of Mines of the Department, as authorized by the Congress, invested $14,852,130.76 in the two coal-to-oil demonstration plants at Louisiana, Mo. The coal hydrogenation plant ($10,438,880.76) began operating first and proved the feasibility of large-scale production of synthetic gasoline and other valuable products from representative American coals. The gas-synthesis plant ($4,413,250), incorporating many refinements over processes developed by the Germans, made several successful runs. At this point, the Department felt that the necessary information that could be gained from the installations had been obtained and that the benefits of further operations would not be commensurate with the $10,000-a-day operating costs at Louisiana, Mo. Less costly research on specific phases of the various steps in synthetic liquid fuels studies were assigned to laboratories at Morgantown, W. Va., and Bruceton, Pa.

In taking over the former Missouri Ordnance Works from the Army, the Department got a head start in that, without exchange of funds, it obtained many basic facilities, including roads, buildings, compressors, and a tremendous array of machinery. When it left Louisiana, Mo., those facilities were several years older and consequently less valuable. The demonstration plants also were in used condition and many of the devices were custom-made for making synthetic fuels and nothing else. These facts notwithstanding, the Department entered into no negotiations whatsoever in connection with the ultimate sale of the various facilities to private industry.

Charge: The Government's $16 million Rifle, Colo., oil-shale plant has been shut down as not feasible on a commercial scale, although it had worked its cost of producing gasoline down to 13 cents a gallon (against an 11-cent price at a petroleum refinery), and only a token amount of work on mining techniques continues. Meanwhile Union Oil Co., of California, is spending large sums on its own oil-shale process.

Fact: The oil-shale plant at Rifle was shut down after a roof fall in the experimental oil-shale mine February 28, 1955, cut off the supply of oil shale and showed that the mining method then used needs revision. The investment in equipment, installation costs, and real estate to June 30, 1955, was about $6 million. The plant was put in standby condition when the Congress trimmed the Department's request for funds for Rifle from $1.25 million to $1 million and restricted work to be done there during fiscal year 1956 to mining studies. The estimate of a 2-cent cost spread between gasoline from shale oil and that from petroleum was based on extremely low mining costs, which could be attained in commercial operations by the method used before the roof fall. As mining the shale makes up about one-third the cost of crude shale oil, development of a revised mining system that will be safe and about as inexpensive as that formerly used is the key to early commercial production of shale-oil products. The Department is pressing vigorously its studies designed to develop such a revised system.

Union Oil Company of California, which owns large oil-shale deposits near Grand Valley, Colo., reportedly is confining its studies to retorting oil shale and refining shale oil. It intends to mine enough shale for its experimental work by open-cut methods, but only a minute fraction of the Nation's—or that company's—oil-shale reserves can be mined by such methods. When an oil-shale industry is established, virtually all of the shale used must come from underground mines.

None of the Bureau of Mines retorting equipment at Rifle has been sold. Some mining equipment, badly damaged by the roof fall in the experimental mine, is being sold and new mining machinery is being purchased.

Charge: The Government's multi-million-dollar zirconium-producing plant at Albany, Oreg., was shut down last June, dismantled, and put in standby condition.

Fact: At the request of the AEC, the zirconium plant of the Bureau of Mines was put in standby condition last summer. Part of the equipment was disassembled for cleaning and was put in mothballs to prevent deterioration. However, the Bureau has agreed with AEC to maintain the plant in such condition that it can be reactivated on short notice. The United States has only one large commercial producer of reactor-grade zirconium (a special type of zirconium), but there are several producers of lesser-grade zirconium. There is some doubt whether existing commercial facilities for making reactor-grade zirconium will be able to meet coming demands. In that case, the Bureau of Ships or the AEC probably will ask the Bureau of Mines to go back into production.

The Bureau of Mines has not given or sold to private industry any of its zirconium equipment. It has made available to industry valuable technical facts regarding the making of zirconium. When the zirconium plant at Albany went into standby condition, about 70 Bureau of Mines employees were laid off. It can be assumed that some of them did obtain positions with commercial zirconium producers.

Charge: The Department of the Interior has created a new office of education to help States get back to doing their coal-mine inspecting.

Fact: Educational activities of the Bureau of Mines have been strengthened in recent months, but not for the purpose of transferring Federal inspections of coal mines to the States. A revitalized safety program includes accident-prevention classes conducted among workers and supervisors. It is intensification of work that began in 1947. Thus far, about 150,000 employees have completed the accident-prevention course. Some 140 mines have completed 100-percent training. This means that every employee and every supervisor at nearly 150 mines has completed the Government's accident-prevention courses.

Charge: The Bureau of Mines survey team recommended that the Government get out of the helium-production business.

Fact: This is true, but the suggestion was not adopted by the Department. In a letter dated May 10, 1955, Secretary McKay wrote the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman, House Committee on Government Operations:

"The Department was hesitant to divest itself of the helium activity without giving intensive consideration to this subject; to assist it in reaching sound conclusions on so important an issue, the Department arranged for an independent study of the whole helium program and operations thereunder. The study was made under contract with Stone and Webster Engineering Corp. * * *

"As a result of our own deliberation and the findings of the Stone and Webster report, we have reached the conclusion that the Bureau of Mines should continue its helium-production program. Therefore, and since it was well established that current helium production was insufficient to meet prospective defense demands, the Department sought and obtained an appropriation of $6 million for additional helium-production capacity. Construction of additional facilities is now well under way."

FACTS AND ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING HELIUM

Charge: That Republican Congressmen HOFFMAN and MCCARTHY introduced—presumably at the administration's behest—identical bills to give the Secretary of the Interior the right to dispose of the Government's helium properties.

Fact: These bills were introduced, at the Interior Department's request, to restore powers the Secretary of the Interior had possessed for more than 25 years under the original Helium Act of 1925. A clause in this act gave the Secretary of the Interior the right to dispose of wells, lands, or interests therein "not valuable for helium production" and to dispose of oil, gas, and byproducts of helium operations "not needed for Government use."

This clause was removed from the Helium Act in 1951, when Congress passed legislation (Public Law 247, 82d Cong.), aimed at repealing Government property laws that seemed to conflict with the Federal Property Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.), which placed authority to dispose of all Government surplus property within the General Services Administration.

The Interior Department found that this action crippled it in performing its duties under the Helium Act, because:

1. Helium production facilities and other property utilized in the helium operation are not surplus within the meaning of Public Law 152. They are essential to the Bureau of Mines in its integrated program for conserving, producing, and selling helium gas.

2. The Bureau of Mines receives no funds directly from Congress for maintaining and operating helium plants. The entire activity of producing or purchasing helium-bearing natural gas, delivering it to the plants, extracting the helium, and disposing of residue gases must be financed from money received as payments for helium, related services, and other products of the operation.

Recognizing this, the original Helium Act provided that such money should be credited to a helium-production fund. This fund is used to finance the cost of producing helium.

For example, the Bureau is disposing of the condensate, similar to a light oil, which is produced during the processing of helium-bearing natural gas at the Navajo, Ariz., helium plant. Removal of this condensate is necessary to prevent fouling of plant equipment.

However, removing the condensate and preparing it for sale entail considerable expense and trouble. The condensate itself is not needed by the Bureau, but the money received from its sale is needed to offset the cost of producing it as an incidental part of the helium operation. Under the Helium Act, the Secretary of the Interior can sell the condensate and turn the money received into the helium-production fund.

Amendment of the Helium Act by Public Law 247 removed the Secretary's authority to sell such byproducts. Therefore, the Bureau would have to charge its loss in producing these products to the cost of producing helium.

When the Interior Department explained its reasons for wishing the disposal clause restored, GSA officials agreed, but requested that the phrases "not valuable for helium production" and "not needed for Government use" be omitted since they might be construed to mean that property so described was surplus and as such should be disposed of by GSA.

Although the Department of the Interior had no objection to this request, Congress insisted that the clause be restored in its original language.

OIL AND GAS LEASING IN WILDLIFE REFUGES

On December 2, 1955, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay announced new regulations governing oil and gas leasing on wildlife refuges. These regulations give a great deal more protection to the propagation of wildlife than those formerly in force.

The new regulations have been misinterpreted. The facts regarding the most serious of these misinterpretations are set forth below:

1. Do the new regulations permit oil and gas leasing on national wildlife refuges for the first time?

Lands within national wildlife refuges have been subject to oil and gas leasing since the passage of the original Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437). The authority for such leasing was reaffirmed by the act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 950), which amended the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. In 1947 Department of the Interior regulations were issued which defined conditions under which the leasing would be permitted. Oil and gas leases embracing lands located in several national wildlife refuges were issued under the authority of these clearly defined laws and regulations prior to 1953.

However, within a few months after Mr. McKay became Secretary of the Interior, he decided that existing regulations did not provide adequate safeguards for the refuges. On August 31, 1953, he suspended the old regulations until such time as his Department could formulate new rules which would guarantee maximum protection for wildlife values. While the old regulations were suspended no leasing was permitted except in cases where it was necessary for the Government to protect itself from oil drainage or where possible damage to wildlife values was not involved. An example of the latter category is the Railroad Valley National Wildlife Refuge in Nevada where only a small percentage of the 140,000-acre refuge is used exclusively in the protection and propagation of wild waterfowl.

During the more than 2 years between August 31, 1953, and December 2, 1955, the old regulations were given a thorough review by the Department of the Interior, specialists from its Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Land Management, its Solicitor, and the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Conservation. The new regulations embody the corrective measures that were recommended and agreed upon as a result of this study.

The most noteworthy provision in the new regulations is one which gives the Fish and Wildlife Service and its career technicians absolute authority over where, when, how, and by whom drilling will be permitted on the refuges.

Another significant revision makes refuges which provide habitat for rare and endangered species absolutely inviolate for the first time in history.

It is obvious, therefore, that the new regulations provide much more stringent limitations than the regulations in existence when this administration took office.

2. What is the legal authority for the leasing?

The legal authority for the issuance of oil and gas leases on national wildlife refuges is set forth in detail in the laws cited above. The confusion surrounding this aspect of the new regulations has been generated by those who have mistakenly contended that the same laws which apply to prospecting permits for fissionable materials also apply to oil and gas. This is not the case.

3. Do the regulations provide adequate safeguards for wildlife values?

As stated above, the purpose of Secretary McKay's 1953 stop order was to arrest a situation that obviously was inimical to the primary purpose of refuges—the protection and propagation of wildlife. The new regulations correct these deficiencies inherent in the old regulations by carefully spelling out the conditions, and on what refuges, oil and gas leasing is permitted.

It is significant that these regulations have the wholehearted endorsement of career specialists in the Fish and Wildlife Service and the approval of the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Conservation. Those who have the responsibility for protection of our wildlife feel that the new regulations are the means by which that protection can be insured.

4. Are the regulations in accord with the intent of Congress?

The assertion that oil and gas leasing on the national wildlife refuges is a violation of the intent of Congress is an error in fact. The laws mentioned above, which were enacted by Congress, are irrefutable proof that it has been the sense of Congress that these refuge lands should be subject to multiple use, including oil and gas leasing. The Department of the Interior is bound by the law. Any argument about the philosophy of permitting oil and gas drilling on the refuges is irrelevant. The Secretary of the Interior has no alternative but to abide by the provisions of the laws that apply to the functions of Government under his jurisdiction. The most that can be done is to make the regulations implementing these laws as stringent as possible. This has been done by Secretary McKay.

5. Have leases issued under the regulations returned the full amount due the Government in royalties and rental fees?

Only those persons who are unfamiliar with the law will argue that the Government is not getting its just rental and royalty fees from the leases issued under the revised code. Because these leases were issued on lands defined by the Geological Survey as not being on a known structure of a gas and oil field, they had to be granted on a noncompetitve basis. The act of August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913) is explicit on this matter. This act also prescribes the royalty to be charged in noncompetitive leases; to wit, 12½ percent, the amount stipulated in the so-called Frankfort leases. The rental fees of 50 cents per acre are also set by the law.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER OF HIS AVAILABILITY FOR SECOND TERM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning, in between subcommittee meetings, I was pleased to tune in for a few moments and hear on the radio the announcement which the entire Nation has been eagerly awaiting. It was the announcement that the Chief Executive of our country is willing to run again for the highest office of the land, if his party and his Nation desire that he do so.

The response of America and of his party is, I know, instantaneous. The Republican Party wants Dwight D. Eisenhower for a second term, and the Nation wants him for a second term.

Every public-opinion poll shows that President Eisenhower has achieved the almost impossible feat of remaining at peak levels of popularity—this despite ofttimes bitter partisan attacks against him, and despite his unfortunate setback last September.

The President's announcement was presented in a way that we have come to expect of him. He offered his services once more to the Nation, if the Nation desires him, knowing, as it does, the full facts concerning his health. His announcement, therefore, is one of honest humility and yet complete frankness. It is another page in the chapter of glowing sincerity which he has written, and which accounts for the great hold which he has on the affection of the American people.

Beyond any question, he will now run for a second term and be elected for a second term. To do so will be to fulfill the obligations of a good soldier carrying out the mandate of the people of the United States. To do so, moreover, will be an inspiring example to the people of the world of the power of a man's spirit to come back, the power of a man's mind to conquer any thought of inadequacy, of limitation. It will be a demonstration of the power of spirit triumphant, spirit which molds one's body, spirit which restores powers which might otherwise have been lost, spirit which conquers any fear of handicap or limitation.

More and more modern science confirms the supreme power of men's thinking, men's courage, and men's faith. Because of such thinking, courage, and faith, and because of our understanding of their power, we realize today that the heart or any other organ can be healed and healed completely.

There are millions of Americans who have some impairment or other, but they will see in the President's offering of his services a thrilling confirmation that their own future can be just as full, just as bright and abundant as it might have been before their impairment—indeed, far more so, because of the sensible attitude of care and moderation which they will exercise.

I rejoice in the President's decision, and I particularly commend him for the way in which he announced it, and the way in which he will present it to the Nation by his nationwide address tonight. The American people will take his announcement to their hearts because of the substance of the decision and because of the way in which it was submitted to them—not as a commander, but as an humble servant; not on the basis of carefully selected facts, but on the basis of the people's understanding of all the facts regarding the President's health and the problems of his office.

On the world scene, the President's announcement will be a great shot-in-the-arm for the cause of freemen everywhere. It will be welcomed behind the Iron Curtain, as well, because, despite occasional Soviet attempts at vilifica-

tion, I am convinced in my own mind that the average man and the average woman in the satellite countries and in Soviet Russia itself see in Dwight D. Eisenhower an honest, effective, humble champion of peace, a man who has tried at the summit, and in every other way, to avoid war, and who will continue to try to avoid, as it must be avoided, another world conflict. The President's continuation in office will assure America's success in the competitive coexistence race. It is the best possible answer to the recent policy decisions made at the 20th Communist Party Congress in Moscow, at which the Soviet leaders indicated their continued cunning efforts to subvert the world through peaceful means in some places, and through violence in other places.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, this morning, upon receiving the wonderful news about President Eisenhower, I released the following statement to the press:

The announcement from President Eisenhower is the greatest good news. The President is a symbol to all mankind of peace and good will. His recovery is God's gift to America and to the world. We can all be reverently thankful.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement which I issued this morning concerning the announcement by President Eisenhower.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE ON PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S ANNOUNCEMENT

President Eisenhower's decision to again be the Republican candidate for the Presidency is of momentous importance to the people of the United States and the world. I am delighted with the President's announcement. In 1952, I was one of the original supporters of Dwight Eisenhower's nomination for the Presidency. It was my privilege, as Governor of Maine, to head the Eisenhower campaign for delegates in our State and to actively work for his nomination and election. The outstanding leadership he has demonstrated as President in the past 3 years has more than justified my faith in him. I know that the people of the United States share my appreciation of President Eisenhower's long and earnest reflection on the decision he has announced today. We may all be certain that President Eisenhower is a candidate only because he considers it to be in the best interest of the American people that the principles of sound government at home and strong leadership abroad, for which he stands, be continued. The President's announcement is in line with my repeated predictions that he would be a candidate for reelection.

WELCOMING NEW INDUSTRIES TO WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on two occasions I have been pleased to invite attention on the Senate floor to the fine facilities offered to new industries by my State, the Badger State. They include facilities in the form of wholesome, established, forward-looking communities; skilled labor; honest, efficient government at State, county and local levels; as well as fine, leisure time, vacation-land attractions nearby; together with many other worthwhile inducements.

I am glad to call attention to still another attractive feature of the Badger State. It is the Wisconsin Development Credit Corp., an almost unique institution in the Nation, designed by forward-looking Wisconsin public officials and private citizens, to help on a voluntary, permissive basis to fill a credit vacuum, and thereby to help launch new industries or help expand old ones.

The Development Credit Corp. provides simply a "credit pool" for sound lines of credit to be made available by the free enterprise system for an expanding free-enterprise system. It is typical of the self-reliant philosophy of Wisconsin, relying on private initiative and on substantial action, not on special lures or one-time gimmicks. This is the type of State self-reliance which, it seems to me, should be encouraged to the fullest extent.

I send to the desk the text of an editorial from last Sunday's issue of the Milwaukee Journal, describing this relatively novel approach to expanding private business horizons. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

FILLING A CREDIT VACUUM TO HELP INDUSTRIES GET STARTED

Wisconsin's new awareness that it must have a conscious policy of stimulating industrial development is finding expression, among other ways, in the field of credit—helping industries meet the cost of getting started or expanding.

But there is no subsidy involved, no welfare statism. The only State action was to put some "do it yourself" legislation on the books last year. Conservatism of the approach is attested by the fact that it was pioneered by the State of Maine. Maine, indeed, threw in a little tax money to get a private development credit corporation started. The Wisconsin law is purely permissive and regulatory.

The purpose of such a corporation is to fill the credit vacuum, particularly for smaller industries in smaller communities, where the local bank may be unwilling or unable to carry by itself a single loan in the amount required by a firm that wants to locate or expand.

For such cases the corporation will offer a credit pool. It will have major lending institutions throughout the State as its members, and they will assign lines of credit to the corporation. It will then prorate approved loans among these members. This is purely private enterprise and entitled to profit.

The Marshfield banker, John L. Stauber, was a prime mover in obtaining the legislation, and he and others, through the Wisconsin Bankers' Association, are going ahead promptly with organizing and capitalizing the Wisconsin Development Credit Corp., one of the few of its kind in the Nation.

Obviously, in view of the sponsorship, this is not to compete with present lending institutions. The law specifies that pooled loans shall be made "only when credit is not otherwise readily available." But equally obvious is the implied recognition, by bankers themselves, that a credit vacuum does exist and needs filling.

Some few States let municipalities buy industrial sites and build factories for lease, as a special lure to new industry. A score of States make direct tax concessions of one kind or another, such as waiving or reducing property taxes on new plants for a period of years.

But industry is learning to look this kind of gift horse in the mouth. Firms that have taken such lures blindly have sometimes had the tax boom lowered on them later, or found themselves otherwise disadvantaged. The subsidy to them often means cheapening of other public services, and unfair burden on other taxpayers. Thoughtful industrial leadership is willing to pay the fair cost of doing business.

The kind of effort to win and hold industry that is reflected in the Wisconsin credit corporation law—enabling the business community itself to furnish stimulus and aid in a businesslike way—is in a sounder tradition, and should be better received in the long run.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER ON FARMERS' COSTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a speech made in Iowa on February 28, by one of our colleagues, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who is a candidate for nomination for President on the Democratic ticket. The speech made on that occasion by the Senator from Tennessee is described in part as follows in an article appearing in the Washington Star of yesterday:

The administration "bemoans" increased prices the farmers must pay for the things they buy, Senator KEFAUVER said, but higher interests rates are "the biggest increase in the expense of your farms."

The increase in interest rates was a matter of deliberate policy on the part of the administration, he said.

Mr. President, as a farmer who really farms, and who pays the bills each day and deposits the checks and knows exactly what is going on on his farm, and has done so for many, many years, I am amazed that any Member of the Senate or any other public official would make any such statement as the one made by the Senator from Tennessee, namely, that higher interest rates are "the biggest increase in the expense on your farms."

Mr. President, I simply cannot understand such irresponsible statements; and I cannot let pass such a statement as the one to which I have just referred, without calling it to the attention of the Senate, because it simply cannot be true.

I do not know what set of facts the able Senator from Tennessee may have used in arriving at that conclusion, but I simply cannot conceive that anyone would make the statement that increased interest rates are the principal cause of the increased costs of production on farms. I simply cannot understand such a statement.

TRIBUTE TO MISS TENLEY ALBRIGHT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on Saturday the city in which I lived for so many years—the city of Newton—celebrated the Olympic championship in

skating, which was won by Miss Tenley Albright.

Mr. President, we in Massachusetts set great store by character and hard work. It is heartening, therefore, to observe the outstanding accomplishments of Miss Tenley Albright, the remarkable young lady from Newton Center, whose achievements as a champion figure skater so cleary reflect her conscientiousness and determination.

Tenley Albright, who is now 20, started her skating career as a little girl of 9. Her father, a Boston surgeon, recognized her talent, and encouraged her ambitions in every way possible.

Tenley's climb to the heights of world fame has not been easy. There have been discouragements and disappointments severe enough to defeat less hardy spirits. At age 11 Tenley suffered an attack of polio. She fought back courageously, and 4 months after her struggle with polio she won the American juvenile figure-skating championship. At 14 she became the United States junior champion. At 16 she won a place on the United States Olympic team and finished second. In the following year, 1953, she became the first American to win the women's world figure-skating championship. She repeated the performance in 1955. This year, in Olympic competition, Tenley achieved her greatest ambition by winning a first-prize gold medal for the United States.

Hard work is certainly one of the foundations of this young lady's spectacular success. But courage, too, has played an important part. In the recent Olympics Tenley performed the most exacting, intricate, and dangerous figures while suffering from a painful gash in her ankle. In spite of this Tenley's performance was acclaimed as almost flawless.

Undoubtedly Miss Albright could go on to fame and fortune as a professional skater. Instead, she plans to become a doctor. She has chosen a highly demanding profession, but Tenley Albright has demonstrated in her skating career qualities which will carry her far in the medical profession.

Tenley Albright has earned the respect and admiration of the world.

Massachusetts is very proud of her and, I may say, expects to hear a great deal more from her in years to come.

Mr. KENNEDY subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] with regard to the pride which all of us in Massachusetts share in the accomplishments of Miss Tenley Albright, who carried the torch for the United States so ably in the Olympic games last month.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF ITALY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, following a quorum call, the Senate will stand in recess, so that it may go to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear, along with the Members of the House, an address to be delivered by the President of Italy.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, to assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear an address to be delivered by the President of Italy, the Senate to reconvene upon the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate, preceded by the Secretary, Felton M. Johnston; the Sergeant at Arms, Joseph C. Duke; and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to greet and to listen to the address to be delivered by His Excellency Giovanni Gronchi, President of the Republic of Italy.

(For the address delivered by the President of Italy, see House proceedings in today's RECORD.)

At 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m., the Senate returned to its Chamber, and reassembled when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

QUESTIONNAIRES FROM OFFICE OF SENATOR YOUNG TO RESIDENTS OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the results of a questionnaire which I sent to approximately 20,000 citizens of North Dakota. The returns are from the second most Republican State in the elections of 1952.

There being no objection, the questionnaire and results thereof were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following are the results of the questionnaires sent to about 20,000 North Dakota people. This tabulation is on the basis of incomplete returns totaling 4,385—2,817 being from farmers and 1,568 from nonfarmers. All but a few of these returns were signed. A few were critical of the idea of sending out questionnaires. The vast majority, however, looked upon them as a good opportunity to express their views on various important issues. Reading the many, many comments on these questionnaires was about like visiting with nearly 4,500 people in North Dakota.

1. If you plan to vote Republican this year, which of the following would you prefer to see as candidate for President? Eisenhower, 1,802; Nixon 83; Knowland, 171; Warren, 639.

2. If you plan to vote Democrat this year, which of the following would you prefer to see as candidate for President? Lausche, 137; Stevenson, 893; Kefauver, 1,343; Harriman, 210.

3. If the following were the Republican and Democrat nominees for President, which one in each group would you vote for? Eisenhower: Farmers, 922; nonfarmers, 971; total, 1893. Stevenson: Farmers, 1005; nonfarmers, 338; total, 1343. Nixon: Farmers, 436; nonfarmers, 517; total, 953. Kefauver: Farmers, 1457; nonfarmers, 579; total, 2036. Stevenson: Farmers, 1135; nonfarmers, 475; total, 1610. Nixon: Farmers, 564; nonfarmers, 603; total, 1167. Stevenson: Farmers, 958; nonfarmers, 344; total, 1302. Warren: Farmers, 902; nonfarmers, 710; total, 1612.

4. Do you think Ezra Taft Benson has done a good job as Secretary of Agriculture? Yes: Farmers, 338; nonfarmers, 627; total, 965. No: Farmers, 2,331; nonfarmers, 781; total, 3,112. No opinion: Farmers, 99; nonfarmers, 114; total, 213.

5. What do you think of the following new major Eisenhower-Benson farm proposals?

A. Conservation Reserve (soil bank)? Good, 1,051; fair, 1,431; poor, 1,406; no opinion, 335. (Nonfarmers were slightly stronger in favor of soil bank than farmers.)

B. Acreage Reserve? Good, 1,039; fair, 1,440; poor, 1,238; no opinion, 267.

C. Stepped-up program to dispose of agricultural surpluses? Good, 2,492; fair, 748; poor, 495; no opinion, 249.

D. Proposal to limit amount of price supports any 1 farmer can receive to $25,000 in any 1 year? Approved, 3,421; disapproved, 518; no opinion, 192.

E. Proposal to increase support levels of soy beans and flaxseed? Approved, 2,763; disapproved, 669; no opinion, 421.

6. Do you believe that these Eisenhower-Benson proposals, coupled with the present flexible price-support program will have much effect in improving farm prices in 1956? Yes: Farmers, 249; nonfarmers, 465; total, 714. No: Farmers, 2,297; nonfarmers, 870; total 3,167. No opinion: Farmers, 121; nonfarmers, 174; total, 295.

7. Do you believe 90-percent supports for basic farm commodities should be reinstated? Yes: Farmers, 2,441; nonfarmers, 948; total, 3,389. No: Farmers, 281; nonfarmers, 501; total, 782. No opinion: Farmers, 51; nonfarmers, 85; total, 136.

8. Do you believe price supports for other small grains such as oats, barley, and rye should be increased? Yes, 3,050; no, 960; no opinion, 301.

9. In general, do you think President Eisenhower has done a good job of handling international relations? Yes, 2,703; no, 976; no opinion, 545.

10. Do you approve of Secretary of State Dulles' proposal to increase appropriations for foreign assistance by about $2 billion? Yes, 673; no, 2,699; no opinion, 840.

11. Do you approve of President Eisenhower's super-interstate-highway program? Yes, 2,423; no, 1,091; no opinion, 704.

12. What, in your opinion, will be the major issues in the next presidential election? (1) Farm program, 3,146; (2) foreign policy and peace, 1,122; (3) taxes, 162.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the leading conservationists of America have become aroused over one of the gravest emergencies ever to confront their cause. They are aware that the decision of Secretary McKay to abandon the magnificent power site at Hells Canyon poses a terrible threat to the fisheries, wildlife, and outdoor grandeur of the Pacific Northwest.

These are men and women who have tried to stay out of the fight between public power and private power. They are interested primarily not in any ideological or political struggle, but in protecting the scenic and recreational resources of the United States. That is their mission.

And they have decided that the surrender of Hells Canyon is a peril to what they stand for, fight for, and work for.

This is an epochal development in the long struggle by a few of us to save the Hells Canyon hydroelectric-power site for the public, and to prevent its preemption by private greed and exploitation. I believe, Mr. President, that this is a turning point in that struggle. It is a determining event in alerting the American people to the disastrous implications of Secretary McKay's abject giveaway of a priceless resource.

On June 1, 1955, in the Senate, I warned that the surrender of Hells Canyon inevitably would lead to pressures for the building of dams on the great Salmon and Clearwater Rivers, which should be saved for migratory fish spawning, for wildlife, and for outdoor recreation.

In January of 1956, the administration submitted its budget recommending Bruces Eddy Dam on the north fork of the Clearwater River. My warning had come true, with a vengeance.

And on February 28, 1956, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources issued a major statement of policy, asking for a complete reappraisal of the Hells Canyon decision because of the danger to sites in the Northwest where wildlife values are at stake.

FAMOUS BIOLOGIST SEES HELLS CANYON SURRENDER AS PERIL TO CLEARWATER

Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, distinguished biologist and chairman of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, announced:

> We are not concerned with the battle between public versus private-power interests. But it is apparent that reduction in reservoir capacity at the Hells Canyon site is forcing power and water interests to advocate high dams on the Clearwater River, where a disastrous effect on fish and wildlife resources of national importance will needlessly result.

Dr. Gabrielson, who served for many years as Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, added that "big dams on either the Clearwater or the Salmon Rivers would wipe out important fish-spawning grounds, inundate many thousands of acres of forest land, and, in addition, destroy critical winter range for some of the country's finest elk and deer herds. It makes little sense to reduce drastically the amount of water storage at Hells Canyon, where no important wildlife or scenic values are at stake, if this means destruction of scenic and wildlife resources that the Nation could otherwise save for the enjoyment of present and future generations."

After all, Mr. President, we are losing 3 million acre-feet of water storage at Hells Canyon by letting the Idaho Power Co. proceed with its piecemeal and pigmy plans.

Mr. President, I said this to the Senate on June 1, 1955:

> Conservationists also pointed out that one river had to be kept forever free of man-made obstructions if the Chinook salmon runs were to survive. This, of course, was the Salmon River of Idaho, where not less than 30 percent—and perhaps as much as 50 percent—of the extremely valuable spring Chinook salmon runs migrate and then spawn the next generation and cycle of fish.
>
> On top of all this, it was agreed that the river which, next to the Salmon, had to be kept clear of new dams as long as possible was the Clearwater River, at the source of which foam and champ the two most majestic wilderness streams of the Northwest, the Selway and the Lochsa.
>
> So this was the schedule of the conservationists:
>
> First. The best dam for not destroying scenic and wildlife values was Hells Canyon on the Snake.
>
> Second. The river never, never to be dammed was the Salmon.
>
> Third. The river never to be dammed further, if possible, was the Clearwater.

I do not pose as a prophet, Mr. President, because it is said that only the seventh son of a seventh son can prophesy. Furthermore, I have been as wrong as the next person on many questions. But, in this particular instance, I was right. The warning was fulfilled that the abandonment of Hells Canyon would definitely result in an attempt to construct dams which would blockade fish runs, drown out wildlife habitat and generally ruin and destroy irreplaceable realms of scenic majesty and outdoor enjoyment.

The Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, under Dr. Gabrielson, which has reached a verdict to try to save Hells Canyon, is not any fly-by-night group. It includes men and women whose names are legendary and impressive in the modern history of American conservation—people like Howard Zahniser of the Wilderness Society; Dewey Anderson of the Public Affairs Institute; C. R. Gutermuth of the Wildlife Management Institute; Joseph Penfold and William Voigt of the Izaak Walton League; Ex-Chief Forester of the United States Lyle F. Watts; Alfred A. Knopf of the National Park Service Advisory Board; David R. Brower of the Sierra Club; Gen. U. S. Grant III, and many others.

CONSERVATIONISTS FAVOR HIGH DAM AT HELLS CANYON ON SNAKE RIVER

Mr. President, the position of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources makes it more evident than ever that Secretary McKay has failed as head of the Government Department charged with custodianship over our natural resources. He should resign. Instead of safeguarding resources from exploitation, he has hastened their looting. Instead of being a protectionist, he has defaulted his great responsibilities. Indeed, he has brought about the very thing he presumably sought to avoid. He has forced into a stand favoring a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon the conservationists of the Nation, who always had avoided taking sides in the power issue.

But, as the gifted poet Lowell wrote long ago, "new occasions teach new duties, time makes ancient good uncouth." When they realized what the abandonment of Hells Canyon meant in terms of pressure on the Clearwater and Salmon River sanctuaries, the conservationists acted unhesitatingly. They got into action on the side of Hells Canyon high dam—public power or no public power. With them, it was wildlife and recreation first. And to put first things first, they had to save Hells Canyon before the north fork of the Clearwater, and, later, the Clearwater's main middle fork, were in danger of being destroyed as vast wilderness reserves.

Mr. President, so that the citizens of the United States will know the stand of our conservation leaders with respect to the high dam at Hells Canyon, a stand made necessary by compelling exigencies, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter from the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, signed by the secretary, Mr. Spencer M. Smith, and also the statement announcing the organization's position, as prepared by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson.

I also ask that there be printed in the RECORD an analysis of the efforts under way to block off the Clearwater River and its picturesque forks, as prepared by Morton R. Brigham, secretary of the Idaho Wildlife Federation Committee to save the Clearwater elk.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD include an article by Mr. A. Robert Smith from the Pendleton East-Oregonian of January 26, 1956, entitled "Bruce's Eddy Dam Too Hot for Politicians."

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

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON
NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, D. C. February 28, 1956.

To Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

Just as soon as we have the Echo Park controversy settled, the administration appears bent upon starting another one like it. But if they insist on building dams on the Clearwater River they will certainly have the conservationists up in arms again.

Conservationists have been often accused of unreasonable opposition to power and reclamation projects, when in fact, conservationists have urged alternative sites or projects to protect the nonrestorable benefits of nature. The instant case is a classic demonstration of what conservationists have been urging again and again.

The high Hells Canyon Dam would fully develop a place ideal for power, water storage, etc.—a place that does not invade or destroy wilderness areas, parks, nor wildlife habitat. The administration has rejected this project. In its place is recommended a project, admittedly inadequate because of this underutilization, that would make other projects necessary, which in turn would damage severely wildlife and scenic beauty.

Just prior to leaving for the North American Wildlife Conference in New Orleans, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson gave an explanation of the conservationists' position, a copy of which is attached.

Sincerely,

SPENCER M. SMITH,
Secretary.

CLEARWATER DAM THREAT FORCES CONSERVATIONISTS TO HIGH HELLS CANYON DAM

A major threat to important fish and wildlife resources of Idaho's Clearwater River, big tributary to the Snake River, has forced conservation leaders to ask for a reappraisal of the role of the controversial Hells Canyon dam site. This development was announced today by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, Chairman

of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, a national conservation organization with headquarters in Washington, D. C.

"We are not concerned with the battle between public versus private power interests," Dr. Gabrielson stated. "But it is apparent that reduction in reservoir capacity at the Hells Canyon site is forcing power and water interests to advocate high dams on the Clearwater River, where a disastrous effect on fish and wildlife resources of national importance will needlessly result."

The President's budget provides for a huge dam at Bruces Eddy, on the Clearwater, which joins the Snake River downstream from the Hells Canyon site, Dr. Gabrielson pointed out. An additional Clearwater dam is planned at Penny Cliffs, with subsequent construction planned for the Salmon River, which joins the Snake between the Hells Canyon site and the Clearwater.

"Big dams on either the Clearwater or the Salmon," Dr. Gabrielson added, "would wipe out important fish spawning grounds, inundate many thousands of acres of forest land, and in addition destroy critical winter range for some of the country's finest elk and deer herds. It makes little sense to reduce drastically the amount of water storage at Hells Canyon, where no important wildlife or scenic values are at stake, if this means the destruction of scenic and wildlife resources that the Nation could otherwise save for the enjoyment of present and future generations."

Dr. Gabrielson's statement continues: "The Army Corps of Engineers, the Interior Department, and the Federal Power Commission have all made statements urging water development on the Clearwater, and plans are well advanced. With the Echo Park controversy out of the way, conservationists are now turning to protect natural resources from this new threat. They will need to act swiftly to block the Bruces Eddy Dam in the present session of Congress.

"Let me stress that this is not part of the public versus private power controversy, nor is it an attempt to prevent necessary flood control or power development. These needs can be met without jeopardy to important public values by intelligent use of other dam sites in the Columbia Basin. The kind of short-sighted planning that would allow the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers dams to be built can also lead to the building of Glacier View Dam, which would inundate an important part of Glacier National Park.

"No matter who builds on the acceptable sites, whether public or private agencies or a combination of both, these sites should be fully utilized. It is up to the Nation's citizens to see that they are, and to require proof that there are no alternatives before considering irrevocable damage to our best scenic and wildlife resources."

A REVIEW OF THE PROPOSALS FOR BRUCE'S EDDY AND PENNY CLIFFS DAMS

(By Morton R. Brigham, secretary, Idaho Wildlife Federation Committee To Save the Clearwater Elk)

The Clearwater Dam battle began in 1953 when Senator DWORSHAK, of Idaho, obtained an appropriation of $140,000 for the Corps of Engineers to spend in finding substitutes for a high Federal Hells Canyon Dam. Following a hurried survey, the Corps in November 1953 revealed for the first time at a public hearing in Orofino, Idaho, its plans to construct 2 nearly 600 foot dams on the North and Middle Forks of the Clearwater River. Federal and State officials, charged with the administration of wildlife resources, and sportsmen's groups found themselves opposing a thoroughly organized promotion as they struggled at the hearing to marshall objections.

The Corps of Engineers had not provided the agencies or the conservation groups with either specifications or locations of the dams that were proposed for construction.

Most of the opinions expressed at the hearing favored Bruce's Eddy and Penny Cliffs Dams, but a review of the hearing record shows that many of the proponents of the projects suffered as much from the lack of information as the opponents. Four nearby communities presented statements favoring 3 dams instead of 2, and another omitted reference to any particular dam. Seven organizations presented statements favoring 4 dams instead of 2. Regional Forester, Pete Hanson of the United States Forest Service, Missoula, Mont., asked the corps to "sit down and discuss" its plans with the Forest Service. Of 53 statements presented at the hearing, only 11 were related directly to the 2 projects—Bruce's Eddy and Penny Cliffs—which the corps proposed for construction.

The Idaho Fish and Game Department, Oregon Game Commission, Oregon Fish Commission, and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service presented statements outlining the serious effect that the proposed structures would have on fish, big game, and other resources. These showed that the Bruce's Eddy and Penny Cliffs Dams would flood winter game and seasonal migration routes of tremendous elk and deer herds at the project sites, and would eliminate most of the steelhead and salmon spawning waters of the Clearwater River to cause a serious loss to the fisheries of the Snake and Columbia Rivers.

On January 24, 1954, the Pacific Northwest Power Co. applied to the Federal Power Commission for a preliminary permit to investigate the two Clearwater sites. Although this was protested by conservationists from Idaho and over the country, the permit was granted by the Commission at the end of the 1954 congressional session. This action was taken by the Commission following the unsuccessful attempt of the Corps of Engineers to obtain authorization for H. R. 8981, a bill authorizing construction of Bruce's Eddy and Penny Cliffs Dams, which was introduced by Representative Angell, of Oregon. The bill never got out of committee.

In November 1954, the Pacific Northwest Power Co. announced that it had no further interest in the Penny Cliffs site and applied for deletion of this project from its preliminary permit (No. 2147). In its application the company stated that other sites showed greater potentialities for power production than Penny Cliffs. K. M. Robinson, Spokane, company president, stated publicly that his company had no interest in developing this site at any time in the foreseeable future.

After completing test drilling of the Bruce's Eddy site in December 1954, the Pacific Northwest Power Co., moved its drilling machine to the Pleasant Valley and Mountain Sheep sites on the Middle Snake River. Legislation to provide Federal payment for downstream benefits from storage at upstream sites was introduced in Congress in 1955 but failed to gain support and died in committee. Such legislation is thought to be necessary to make Bruce's Eddy Dam economically feasible for a private company. The company's interest in Bruce's Eddy appears to have been replaced by that in the two Snake River sites, which are economically feasible under existing laws. Recently the company applied for construction permits on the two Snake River sites. Conservation problems related to these sites are of a minor nature and losses to game and fish are believed to be negligible.

In 1955 Senator DWORSHAK obtained an appropriation of $78,000 for biological studies in the Middle Snake River Basin to be conducted by two United States Fish and Wildlife Service biologists. Studies of the Clearwater River's big game resource were begun in September. Continuation of this work, which is being integrated with a crew of three biologists of the Idaho Fish and Game Department will be dependent or additional appropriations. The Idaho Game Department plans to add a fourth biologist to the work, making a force of six biologists who will be assigned to the investigations of the Clearwater's rich resources.

Studies to evaluate fisheries resources of the Clearwater also got under way in 1956. When fisheries biologists of the Idaho Fish and Game Department began work on creel censuses, migration studies and the collection of other basic data on the Clearwater's salmon and steelhead resources. During the year ending in July 1955 the Clearwater steelhead count at the Lewiston Dam showed a sizable increase over any previous year on record. Approximately 14,000 adults were counted at the fish ladders. This represents an increase from about 3,500 in 1950, which was the first year a count was taken following the installation of fish passage facilities at the dam.

After obtaining funds for Federal survey on Clearwater resources, Senator DWORSHAK added an amendment to H. R. 6766, the Public Works Appropriation bill, which provided $100,000 for "detailed plans" of the Bruce's Eddy project by the Corps of Engineers. A telegram was sent to Idaho's Senator WELKER asking for an amendment on the Senate floor to remove the appropriation. Senator WELKER replied that the funds were believed necessary to "develop additional facts." A glance at the Dworshak amendment reveals that the "additional facts" brought out by the appropriation probably would have produced final plans for construction of the dam which has yet been unauthorized by Congress. The amendment was deleted in conference. As a result, the Corps of Engineers still lacks both the authorization and appropriations for the project and a stay of execution has been granted to the fish, wildlife, and other resources of the North Fork.

A review of the official position of Government officials relative to damming the Clearwater is interesting. Senator DWORSHAK is probably the most effective proponent of the Clearwater projects. Senator WELKER has tried mightily to stay neutral, but deserted conservationists in their hour of need when the appropriation for Bruce's Eddy Dam passed the Senate in 1955. Representatives PFOST and BUDGE give no clue as to their intentions. Idaho's Governor Smylie followed strict neutrality prior to becoming elected and carefully evaded any inquiry as to his position, but he has consistently favored a dam on the Clearwater instead of a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon during hearings held in 1955. Oregon's Governor Patterson and Washington's Governor Langlie joined Governor Smylie, of Idaho, in supporting dams on the Clearwater instead of a high Federal storage dam at Hells Canyon. Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay long ago expressed preference for dams on the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers by withdrawing opposition to the Idaho Power Co. proposals which conflict with the proposed Federal Hells Canyon Dam. Len Jordan, former Governor of Idaho and now chairman of the International Joint Commission, favored the Clearwater proposals by filing a statement 10 days after the so-called hearing held by the Corps of Engineers in November 1953. And in July 1954, while Governor of Idaho, he transmitted his official blessing for both Bruce's Eddy and Penny Cliffs projects, dams, to the Corps of Engineers by requesting their construction.

Lined up in opposition to dams on the Clearwater are many conservation groups, including the National Wildlife Federation, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho Wildlife

Federations, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Wilderness Society, the Izaak Walton League of America, Sport Fishing Institute, Outdoor Writers Association, Sierra Club, the National Parks Association, and the Natural Resources Division of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Senators NEUBERGER and MORSE, of Oregon have spearheaded opposition to the Clearwater projects.

The Penny Cliffs dam would cause the flooding of 46 miles of the completed Lewis Clark Highway up the Middle Fork and Lochsa Rivers. Its penetration of the Selway-Bitterroot wilderness area has caused it to lose public support and leaves the Bruces Eddy project as the more imminent threat to the resources of the Clearwater. This project would cause permanent ruin to some of the most popular and most accessible fishing streams in the State.

During the last decade the lower North Fork adjacent to the proposed Bruces Eddy reservoir has had a great increase in numbers of elk. Large numbers of whitetail and mule deer also occupy this range. Several years ago it became apparent that a game population problem was becoming acute on winter ranges of this area and a larger harvest was thought desirable. The October 1 opening date was advanced to September 15 in a large area adjacent to the Canyon Ranger Station but poor roads and trails still kept out most of the hunters and commercial packers. The opening date was advanced to September 1 and the area enlarged to further encourage harvest of the surplus animals. Reports from hunters forest service personnel and outfitters indicate excellent hunting for elk, deer, and bear in the area.

Studies in similar areas in Idaho indicate that whitetail deer would be seriously affected by Bruces Eddy dam because of the traditional dependence of the species on bottomland for winter range. The damage that the dam would cause to the estimated 10,800 elk in the drainage can only be determined after exhaustive surveys and field observations have been completed by competent ecologists who are familiar with game-survival problems.

No reliable count of game animals has ever been taken in the Bruce's Eddy area. Only very limited information is available on snow depths, seasonal migration routes, and winter browse utilization, big game throughout the proposed pool area. Observations to date indicate that a huge elk and deer population may be dependent on winter range that would be flooded. Preliminary studies by biologists show that the area surrounding the proposed Bruce's Eddy impoundment contains a large population of elk and deer which are underharvested. Winter range in this area is superior to many of the similar ranges on the Selway and Lochsa and farther up the North Fork because it has not been subjected to as heavy use for as long a period by big game herds. In short, the Bruce's Eddy impoundment would probably flood some of the best and most critical winter range in the Clearwater drainage.

Mule deer, which are scarce today in comparison to their former numbers on the Selway areas, are still abundant in the North Fork.

Surveys to determine the effect of dams on the resources of the Clearwater will require a minimum of 3 years. If a heavy winter with deep snows does not occur during this period, additional time may be required.

As stated previously, authorizing legislation for Federal dams on the Clearwater may be introduced in the next session of Congress.

The Pacific Northwest Power Co. plans for the Bruce's Eddy dam are not known. It is possible that the company may apply for a license to build Bruce's Eddy before its preliminary permit expires in January 1956. Protests against this dam mailed to the Federal Power Commission would give additional insurance against such an occurrence.

Much of the critical winter range land within and adjacent to the Bruce's Eddy site is privately owned. At present it is available to game herds during the winter and spring months. Slackwater transportation, if made possible by the Bruce's Eddy impoundment, would render the land accessible. In this event, critical winter range would be subject to heavy use by livestock and could be used for other agricultural purposes which conflict with the requirements of big game.

In summary, the abundant wildlife resources of the North Fork are in a precarious position, and most careful management will be required to maintain the present level of abundance. Bruce's Eddy dam would cause heavy inroads on the big game resource and certain disaster to sea run fish.

[From the Pendleton East-Oregonian of January 26, 1956]

BRUCES EDDY DAM TOO HOT FOR POLITICIANS

(By Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The Eisenhower administration has run into unexpected difficulties in a proposed partnership arrangement between private utilities and the Federal Government for construction of Bruces Eddy Dam on Idaho's Clearwater River.

So far, the administration has been unable to find a member of Congress who will sponsor such a bill.

Moreover, conservation groups have banded together to take a strong stand against building dams on the Clearwater or Salmon rivers, where they claim damage would be inflicted on migratory fish and wildlife in the area.

STORY BEGAN IN 1954

President Eisenhower said in his budget message last week that he would be glad to recommend a big chunk of construction funds to start the Bruces Eddy project, if Congress would authorize it as a partnership dam. This would mean, generally speaking, that local utilities would put up some of the costs, the Government would put up the balance, and the utilities would get the 240,000 kilowatts of power which this dam would generate.

The story began back in August 1954, when the Federal Power Commission issued a preliminary permit for Bruces Eddy explorations to the Pacific Northwest Power Co., a combine of utilities—Pacific Power & Light, Washington Water Power, Portland General Electric & Montana Power.

By last spring, the utilities had asked the administration for a partnership agreement by which the Government would put up some of the dam's estimated $122,935,000 cost. The administration agreed and went to work on it.

The draftsmen of the bill thought it should be patterned after other partnership bills previously introduced in Congress for Cougar and Green Peter Dams in the Willamette Valley. This would mean the utilities would put up the costs allocated to power, while the Government paid what was allocated to flood control and other nonreimbursables.

The administration asked Senator HENRY DWORSHAK, Republican, of Idaho, to sponsor the Bruces Eddy partnership bill—but DWORSHAK wouldn't touch it. Usually one to play the power issue with great caution, DWORSHAK thought it would not be a particularly popular move to sponsor the utilities' proposal.

The Representative of the congressional district in which the dam would be built is Congresswoman GRACIE PFOST, a Democrat who has sponsored the high Hells Canyon Dam project and been highly critical of the administration for its power policy. She was no help to the administration in getting a sponsor for the bill. More than likely, she would oppose it.

Many persons involved in the preparation of the bill thought it to be virtually a dead issue until the President's budget message last week revived interest and discussion of it.

Among those to bring it up were representatives of most of the major national conservation groups, who met here last week and adopted a vow to fight Bruces Eddy and other proposed dams in the Clearwater and Salmon River area. They took the position that while these projects have been represented as good sites at which to make up the water storage and power that would be lost by not building the high Hells Canyon Dam, they would be injurious to fish and wildlife in that region—but Hells Canyon would not be harmful from a conservationist standpoint.

Under these conditions, it is considered doubtful that any action can be expected on a Bruces Eddy "partnership" proposal in the near future.

THE NEED FOR WILDERNESS AREAS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege to receive unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 1, 1955, a significant address on the Need for Wilderness Areas, by Mr. Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society, and editor of the Living Wilderness. Mr. Zahniser had delivered his address at the National Citizen's Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces for the American People, in Washington, D. C., on May 24, 1955.

In asking for this consent, I said:

Mr. Zahniser not only pointed out the practical needs for areas of wilderness for recreational and other purposes; he also discussed the underlying philosophy, and proposed the establishment of a national wilderness preservation system.

Such a system, it was suggested, would be made up of areas already within our Federal estate that are appropriate for the purpose. No changes in jurisdiction would be involved. No new land-administering agency would be created. Areas within the system—areas already under some kind of Federal administration and still wilderness in character—would be designated, with congressional approval, by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, or by Executive order, with the provision that removal of an area from the system would be effected by Congress. The agency administering an area designated as a unit in the national wilderness preservation system would simply be charged with the responsibility of preserving its wilderness character.

The wildernesses in the national forests, for example, would continue under the protection of the Forest Service but with the guaranty of perpetuity that Congress can give. National park and monument areas would continue under the National Park Service. National wildlife refuges to be included would continue to be administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service as wildlife refuges, but without the developments and installations that destroy wildernesses. So it would be with any other kinds of land

in our proposed wilderness system. Each area would continue to serve its peculiar purpose in the program of its particular administering agency, but every agency would be charged with the responsibility of preserving the wilderness character of any such area in its custody.

A Wilderness Preservation Commission modeled in part after our Migratory Bird Conservation Commission would assist in the establishment and administration of the system and in the gathering and dissemination of information for the public, coordinating the common interests and activities of the various agencies. With a minimum of administrative time and expense and with only slight modification of our present land-management policies we would thus see affirmed our national policy to preserve for all time some areas of our pristine American wilderness.

The interest and response to this proposal from every part of the country have been remarkable. Few seem to doubt the underlying philosophy, or to dispute the practical need. Letters have been received from people in all walks of life—lay people and professional people, educators, physicians, scientists, conservationists—people with a deep concern to preserve their heritage of the magnificent, almost untouched, natural areas in our national parks and monuments, our national forests and wildlife refuges.

Mr. President, excerpts from letters responding to this wilderness proposal have been collected by the Council of Conservationists. Conscious of the special interest which I know this subject has for many Members of the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that these collected excerpts be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

The following are excerpts from letters which have been addressed in the past 8 months to Members of Congress, to well-known conservationists, and to conservation and civic organizations, copies of which were furnished to the Wilderness Society by the writers of the letters or their recipients. It is significant that people of widely diverse backgrounds, from urban as well as rural areas, should have responded with such a unanimity of appreciation of the wilderness and its benefits to mental and bodily health, as well as for its recreational, esthetic, historic, and educational appeal.

Elizabeth B. White, M. D., of Spokane, Wash., writes:

"As a physician I see the need for people to get out * * * commune with nature. A great many of my patients are improved in mind and spirit after spending * * * a vacation in one of our vacation spots here in (the State of) Washington. They seem to gain a perspective that is not obtainable in the rush and humdrum of a business world. * * * We need wilderness areas. Let's establish a system whereby they will always be preserved and properly controlled."

Conservation of the human being is one of the prime objectives to be obtained in the conservation of wilderness—a conviction expressed by a research worker, Burgess W. Heacox, of Essex, Calif. Mr. Heacox writes:

"I have come to realize the significance of conservation practices and their importance for our continued welfare. Through my present work I am beginning to realize the importance of another aspect of conservation—conservation of the human being. This may sound a bit nebulous, but of what importance is the conservation of natural resources without a comprehensive program aimed at providing man with outdoor recreational opportunities. The opportunity to lose himself in a relaxing and peaceful environment, to reestablish his relationship with all the world of nature, perhaps even to instill a little humility as he realizes his comparative insignificance. Nowhere have I seen this expressed more adequately than in the paper by Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of The Wilderness Society, titled 'The Need for Wilderness Areas' as inserted by Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 84th Congress, 1st session, on June 1, 1955.

"Speaking for myself and friends," Mr. Heacox continues, "we wholeheartedly endorse Mr. Zahniser's positive program (p. 7, The Need for Wilderness Areas) to secure the preservation of wilderness as a national policy—within the framework and jurisdiction of existing agencies."

These wilderness areas are essential to the American way of life, in the opinion of another research leader, John J. Craighead, of the cooperative wildlife research unit at the University of Montana. Mr. Craighead writes as follows:

"More and more we are beginning to recognize the need for preserving large areas of wild lands for recreational and esthetic purposes. As you well know, we have in the Northwest some of the finest and largest of these so-called wild areas (wilderness and primitive areas). As the population density in the Northwest continues to grow, decisions eventually will have to be made as to the best use of these lands in the general economy of the region. Many of us believe that these wild lands are essential to the American way of life, and in fact are becoming increasingly necessary as population density and its accompanying tensions build up.

"I am very much in favor of a bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system that would affirm a national policy to preserve such lands," Mr. Craighead continues. "Should such a system be established in cooperation with the Federal land administering agencies and conservation organizations, a provision that the removal of an area from the system can be effected only by Congress would be a tremendous step forward."

The desire for the consummation of national wilderness protection, with a recognition for the healing qualities of large wild areas, transcends political subdivisions. K. W. Hodgdon, assistant chief of the State game division, Augusta, Maine, writes:

"While we in Maine have several large tracts of relative wilderness areas and are fortunate in having been given the Baxter State Park area, I can well understand the concern of other States for the preservation of certain areas as wilderness areas to be set aside for the enjoyment of the future generation. I believe that we should not be blinded by our good fortune, and therefore should help in any way possible to establish a policy which would provide for such areas throughout the Nation which could be preserved against future exploitation. In the rush of today's business matters, such areas provide a mental relief as well as much enjoyment to those who have access to them. They could very well play an important role in the physical well-being of our people."

Another citizen, Paul J. Linsley, of Whittier, Calif., speaks for the serene influences of wild nature "as a most vital essential in this era of restlessness approaching hysteria."

"Such a bill if passed," writes John C. Asbury, Doniphan, Mo., "would be of great benefit to the general public as a whole, providing relaxation and recreational values for the present and future generations of our people."

The ministry of wild nature in its far reaches, to the soul, is touched upon by the eminent Suffragan Bishop of Connecticut, Robert McConnell Hatch, who writes:

"We have made an excellent start toward preserving a portion of our natural heritage for the recreational and spiritual benefit of our future citizenry. More needs to be done, in order to safeguard permanently certain of our remaining wild and primitive areas in a world that is becoming increasingly mechanized."

Again Bishop Hatch writes: "I hope that this program can be enacted before it is too late. * * * It is both practical and positive, and it contains the best hope that I know of for preserving our remaining wilderness."

"I pray," Bishop Hatch writes, "that Congress will act on your proposals."

The spiritual need is recognized also by Mrs. Helen M. Hiller, Mattapoisett, Mass.:

"These unspoiled places are of historical, scientific, and educational value but most of all spiritual. There is peace and relaxation. As Lois Crisler says in the Christian Century, no one can walk in the forest without a feeling of awe and pleasure. This is what saved Leo Tolstoy in his generation and ours.

"We have lost much of our virgin forests," Mrs. Hiller continues. "In 1907 there were 469 million acres. The annual burn has been 20 to 30 million acres, much of it the result of logging operations. Now there are 44,600,000 acres. The logging interests are determined to get more. They are working especially hard just now on the Olympic National Park. They want 225,000 acres. They have lengthy articles with many pictures in big magazines trying to win the public. We want the wilderness areas preserved for future generations by the maximum possible degree of security but is there any guaranteed security? The Indians thought they were safe when the Indian Reorganization Act was passed in 1934. Now it has been violated by an emancipation law and they may lose everything. Any law can be repealed or bypassed."

The intangible need is expressed also in a letter from Dave Gaskill, of Albuquerque, N. Mex.:

"I felt a deep kinship with your presentation; a difficult subject at best, dealing in large part with intangibles—intrinsic qualities that are generally out of the realm of majority experience—and often, I think, not well understood or even perceived in the sense desired. Wilderness values are something we must experience for ourselves. It is indeed sad that such universal values are so frequently unrecognized or overshadowed by practical, transitory demands.

"In particular, I am reminded of Europeans (mountaineers and such) whom I have met in our western high country and canyon lands, who, above all else, are deeply stirred by this quality of wildness, something fresh and delightfully new to their senses."

On this aspect I shall quote from another letter. It was written to Mr. Zahniser by Laurie Whitlock, of Arlington Heights, Mass., who said:

"Your address entitled 'The Need for Wilderness Areas' which was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, touched me deeply as I know it must have touched thousands of others.

"You spoke so directly and challengingly to the very finest of innate human understanding. * * *

"Would that it had been reprinted in every newspaper in the country."

Next a scientist comments:

"As a professional mycologist and plant pathologist, I recognize especially the scientific values that will accrue if Congress

brings into existence such a system," writes Francis W. Holmes, of Amherst, Mass. Of the recreational values, he writes:

"These values far transcend the commercialized view of nature that is often all that remains in developed natural areas. Far from threatening our national park system with invasions and bloodlettings, we should be bolstering and enlarging it for our larger population and also creating a parallel national wilderness system."

John F. Wanamaker, assistant professor of biology, at the College of Liberal Arts, in Elsah, Ill., writes:

"I took steps as soon as I read the report to write my Congressman."

The need for permanent wilderness preservation as a national policy, persists throughout all of these letters that were received from correspondents who were moved to write by Mr. Zahniser's address.

A scientist, philosopher, artist, writer, and biologist of note, the distinguished president and director of The Wilderness Society, Dr. Olaus J. Murie, writes as a private citizen from Moose, Wyo.:

"Mr. Zahniser does not advocate a new department, but suggests that administration of these various areas remain in the care of the agencies in which they now reside. * * * We here in Wyoming are proud of the beauty of these recreational areas, and they mean a lot to us as people, but also, I would add, economically. Anything that you can do in Congress to further these ends I am sure will be acclaimed by the people of this State as well as by conservationists throughout the United States."

The president of Philadelphia Conservationists, Inc., Allston Jenkins, of Philadelphia, writes on behalf of his organization:

"I heartily endorse the idea of a national policy of wilderness preservation. Coordination and cooperation are vitally essential in saving our wild natural areas from misuse. At present there are often conflicting policies between various Federal agencies and departments. Federal legislation to correct this deplorable situation is badly needed.

"We have a priceless asset in our wilderness lands. They have cost us nothing. The value of what they give us cannot be reckoned. We should immediately take steps to recognize their worth by a strong national policy of preservation."

"With the rapidly increasing population in the United States and the greatly increasing appreciation and need of natural areas," writes Mrs. A. R. Laskey, from Nashville, Tenn., "we need protection for our national parks, national monuments, and wildlife refuges from infringement on their boundaries and natural grandeur."

Miss Ada Fuller Crowley, Englewood, N. J., writes:

"Some definite national policy must be set up."

"As lifelong users of the wilderness areas," writes Miss Evelyn B. Bull, Pasadena, Calif., "we strongly recommend the preservation of wilderness as a national policy, using existing agencies."

T. N. Anderson, of Eustis, Fla., editor of Fun, Facts, 'n' Fishing,' writes:

"Every year we who are interested in conservation fight a losing battle against commercial interests who wish to capitalize on all or parts of our now existing State and national forest lands. A Wilderness Preservation Commission would possibly help us to assure the future of land being left in a wild state."

Wilderness areas must be carefully protected from the changes that would damage the characteristics which make wilderness the prized resource it is—a prized possession of all the people. This is a thought that many of these correspondents stress. Don Bleitz, of Los Angeles, Calif., writes, for example, that he has "for many years been an advocate of and an ardent supporter for the inclusion of additional wilderness areas in various sections of the United States," and he emphasizes the need for "wilderness areas, to be left exactly as they are now, without additional roads nor any improvements whatever except maintenance of trails, etc." Mr. Bleitz adds: "If, during the next session of Congress, legislation is introduced to form additional areas I should like to urge your support of such legislation."

When the destruction of a wilderness begins, irrevocable change also begins. Its value historically as a living museum, as a source of continuity from our past, through the present, to the future, is extinguished by man-made alterations.

H. M. B. Weicksel, Renovo, Pa., writes:

"Because I live in a small town in the middle of one of the largest areas of wild land east of the Mississippi, I can see some of the desirable features of providing for the future some unspoiled tracts.

"Man has put his stamp on the vast majority of our outdoors, and all too often it has resulted in anything but beauty.

"It is quite likely that many of our citizens will be unable to appreciate unspoiled nature. Many will see only lumber in a tree or potential electric power in a stream and will picture to themselves the wealth in mineral resources lying beneath the surface.

"We apparently were not satisfied until we had destroyed the heath hen, the grayling, the eastern buffalo, and elk. We have just about done the same for the plains buffalo, the whooping crane, and the trumpeter swan. Must we add to the sordid record the last of the unspoiled wilderness?

"Not far from my home considerable areas have been ripped up by strip miners in pursuit of comparatively cheap coal and clay while thousands of deep miners are out of work. What were once productive farms or timberlands are now desolate wastes. Farms that might have produced for centuries are ruined for a few thousand quick dollars.

"The same thing can conceivably happen to our last remaining wilderness areas. If for no other reason than sentiment let's use every effort to preserve them as nature made them."

Douglas E. Wade, editor and educational director with the South Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, Columbia, S. C., comments:

"It was a genuine pleasure to receive from you a copy of Howard Zahniser's wonderful essay, The Need for Wildnerness Areas, which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"Believe me when I say that it gives one a good feeling to realize that some of you folks in Congress see clearly in this matter of wilderness preservation. Personally I consider an understanding of the wilderness problem basic to an understanding of the entire conservation picture. In your own State the Quetico-Superior country is much to the point. I have been in that part of our State. My home State is Wisconsin."

The "proposal to secure congressional recognition for such areas is very significant and should have the backing of various conservation organizations throughout the country," writes Paul W. Thompson, chairman of the Michigan Natural Areas Council, Birmingham, Mich.

A private citizen, Miss Irene Koslan, Bronx, N. Y., writes:

"It was with great pleasure that I read this paper. * * * It * * * presents the problem from every vital point of view * * * its philosophy (is) of such basic importance to the people of our land."

How universal is this sense, this need for wilderness preservation. Mrs. Robert R. Usher, of Tully, N. Y., relates this to experience nearer home.

"At present there has been much discussion in various parts of the country—including our own New York State—over preservation of national wilderness areas, parks, etc. I have just read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, The Need for Wilderness Areas, remarks of Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY quoting an address by Howard Zahniser, the executive secretary of The Wilderness Society.

"We hope that a bill may soon be drawn up to establish a national wilderness preservation system, with the joint cooperation of the Federal land-administering agencies and conservation organizations.

"We would like to see the bill include certain important provisions, such as: It should affirm the national policy to preserve such a wilderness system.

"It should define the proper uses of areas within the system and provide protection from misuse.

"The bill should list areas included and provide for additions by executive order or as recommended by Secretary of Agriculture or Secretary of the Interior and also provide that no area could be removed without approval by Congress."

On the editorial page of the Christian Science Monitor, issue of November 3, 1955, in a letter to the editor, Rose K. Gidley, of Palo Alto, Calif., discusses the importance of preserving the wilderness, and stresses what the wilderness does for mankind individually and, so, collectively. She writes as follows:

"To quote Robert Marshall, one of the world's foremost conservationists, 'it is difficult to overestimate the importance adventure assumes in the longings of innumerable vigorous people. Lack of opportunity to satisfy such longings undoubtedly is responsible for much unhappiness, for a considerable portion of the crime which is so often committed as a means of self-expression, and * * * even for war.' He (Robert Marshall) also continues to point out that the demand of the wilderness brings out a person's resourcefulness, is ideal relaxation, and stimulates esthetically all the senses which a man has. Further he points out that the wilderness brings 'to many human beings the most perfect experience of all the earth.'

"Are these not more important than all the political maneuverings and axe-grindings that seem to accompany the so-called development of the wilderness?"

William Mussig, of Lapeer, Mich., writes:

"I enjoyed reading Mr. Howard Zahniser's paper, particularly the chapter The Wilderness and Human Realities. The whole text illustrated explicitly the finest resort one can turn to in his most despondent and hopeless hour, for solitude and comfort, and to regain composure.

"It was my fate to experience the agitated harshness of a big city when inflicted early in youth with an eye injury and later on severe eyestrain because of occupation, with frightful consequences of becoming a total nervous wreck and making life an enduring misery. It was when I bought some wilderness land (it was wilderness to me—a mere scrub farm where I was prepared to grub for a living as a last resort) that I discovered the healing powers of nature—ever so slow but sure. That was 16 years ago and now at 49 I possess perfect health except for limited occular capacity.

"During those years it grew upon me to devote all my energy and time to preserve and develop this beautiful wooded lake farm for those who seek sanctuary. It is not wilderness by exact description, but enough for those with a sense of appreciation and imagination.

"It is gratifying to know this cause is toward a national policy. With an already over-industrialized Nation and all forms of business merging into colossal pyramids, cold and calculating, characteristically dwarfing more and more insignificant man, is it not possible for man to counteract these smothering forces to ground himself by the many natural resource organizations and start

climbing these colossal granite structures like a clinging vine to give it life and beauty? Imaginative as it is, there is room for individualism to make the most of this opportunity in promoting natural resource conservation by constructive objectives."

Mrs. Eddie W. Wilson, of Los Angeles, Calif., writes:

"As a citizen deeply concerned regarding the preservation of our wilderness areas—national parks and forests, State parks and forests, and our other heritages of the out-of-doors—and realizing the recreational, educational, historical, scientific, and inspirational values of these areas, I wish to tell you how greatly pleased I am with the paper presented by Howard Zahniser, May 24, 1955. I rejoice that this paper is now a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"I feel that Mr. Zahniser's statements on the need for wilderness areas and his assertion that wilderness needs are interrelated are true, indeed. And, finally, I feel that his detailed proposal for a national preservation system housed in a bill which thus provides for the joint cooperation of the Federal land-administering agencies and conservation organizations is very necessary and worthy of passage at the earliest possible time.

"Here I am reminded of the late President Theodore Roosevelt's plea at the Grand Canyon, Ariz., on May 6, 1903: 'Leave it (the canyon),' he urged, 'as it is. You cannot improve on it. What you can do is to keep it for your children, your children's children, and for all who come after you.'

"May necessary and immediate action be taken to keep our wonderful wilderness areas exactly as they are."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me say, in concluding my remarks on the subject today, that in the very near future I hope to introduce a bill which will establish a wilderness-preservation system, thus embodying in legislative form this imaginative proposal which has already attracted such widespread support.

EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, last Thursday, February 23, I discussed briefly on the floor of the Senate the results of the investigation by the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee into East-West trade, or trade between our allies and the Soviet bloc countries.

At that time I pointed out that since the meeting of the COCOM—Coordinating Committee—in Paris in July 1954, considerable trade had occurred between our Western Allies and Communist bloc countries in some very strategic materials, machine tools, and other items which are vital to a war effort.

Mr. President, on the following day Great Britain admitted that it had doubled its trade with the Communist countries since the COCOM conference.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a news article published in the New York World Telegram and Sun of Friday, February 24, 1956. The article, which was written by R. H. Shackford, is entitled "Britain Admits Doubling Red Trade."

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

BRITAIN ADMITS DOUBLING RED TRADE

WASHINGTON, February 24—Great Britain disclosed today that the 1954 relaxation of export controls on trade with Communist countries allowed her sales to Soviet Russia to more than double—from $41.2 to $89.3 million in 1955.

The sale of copper wire to Russia by Britain jumped from 7,500 tons in 1954 to 33,200 tons in 1955—more than four times.

Copper wire is one of the 100 items which Harold Stassen, former administrator of the Battle Act, agreed in 1954 to let 14 allies take off the embargo list.

SENATOR'S POINTS

The 1955 British figures were made availabe here by the British Information Service. Chairman JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, Arkansas, of the Senate permanent subcommittee on investigations accused the administration of:

Making "astounding secret concessions to our allies whose merchants want business as usual with the Soviet Union."

Concealing the facts about this action and doing "everything to hamper and hinder the subcommittee's efforts to ascertain the facts."

Misleading Congress and misrepresenting the facts about Mr. Stassen's 1954 negotiations.

The Senator urged that Congress withhold action on the administration's request for $4 billion in new foreign aid money until his subcommittee gets the evidence.

Senator MCCLELLAN'S outburst in the Senate yesterday was the culmination of weeks of unsuccessful effort by the committee to get the executive departments involved in trade controls to agree to publish the facts.

In its survey of East-West trade, the British Information Service disclosed that, despite extraordinary efforts in the last couple of years, Britain had succeeded only in increasing its exports to Communist China from $19.3 million in 1954 to $22.1 million in 1955.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a syndicated article by David Lawrence, published in many newspapers throughout the country, including the Washington Evening Star. It is entitled "Strategic Materials List," and was published in the Washington Star of February 27, 1956.

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

STRATEGIC MATERIALS LIST: TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS OFFER TO SENATOR OVERSHADOWED REVELATIONS ON BANNED GOODS ALLIES SHIPPED TO SOVIETS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—Sometimes the most sensational news is overlooked in the hurry of modern news gathering and maybe it's because the subjects themselves are not easily grasped. Thus a $2,500 contribution to a campaign fund makes headlines because it is easily understood or is announced under dramatic circumstances. But one would think that the revelation of a scandal in which the Allies of the United States obtain American money and then proceed to help to arm and industrialize Soviet Russia might also get full coverage in the press. But is received scant mention.

SENSATIONAL SPEECH

On Thursday of last week, Senator MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Permament Investigations, made a sensational speech on the floor of the Senate which was recorded verbatim in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He spoke of the most astounding secret concessions made by our Government in a conference with its Allies. He gave instance after instance of strategic materials released which will help the Soviet Union to build an armament machine that some day can be used to kill American soldiers and to devastate American cities.

Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, Democrat, chairman of the allimportant Armed Services Committee of the Senate, rose afterward to characterize it a most startling state of affairs. Three other members of the Armed Services Committee joined to deplore a scandal that shocked them. It was disclosed that Defense Department experts had protested in vain.

Senator MCCLELLAN reported to the Senate that his investigating committee had conducted hearings to try to find out how and to what extent the United States Government had agreed to allow its Allies to arm Soviet Russia. After reading the Arkansas Senator's speech one wonders whether the American Government in refusing to let Israel have arms or in letting tanks go to Saudi Arabia isn't straining at a gnat in the Middle East while swallowing a camel in Central Europe.

For Senator MCCLELLAN said that in August 1954 at a secret meeting of the United States and its allies 200 of the 450 items previously under embargo to the Soviet Union were released. The Soviets know what the items are because they are buying them, but to this day the executive branch of the Government here refuses to disclose to Congress just what the items are that have been released, though they have been published in technical periodicals abroad and in an official journal of the British Government's trade bureau.

Here are 4 conspicuous examples of the 200 articles released to the Russians:

1. Boring mills essential to the manufacture of tanks, artillery, aircraft, and atomic reactors used in submarines.

2. Vertical boring mills essential to the manufacture of jet engines.

3. Dynamic balance machines used for balancing shafts on engines for jet airplanes and guided missiles.

4. External cylindrical grinding machines which a Defense Department expert testified are essential in making engine parts, guided missiles, and radar.

"It was emphatically stated," says the Arkansas Senator in describing the testimony of a Defense Department expert on machine tools, "that it would be better to permit shells, guns, or guided missiles to be disembargoed and sent to the Soviet Union for they could be used against us only once while these machine tools will be used to make armaments of war which could be used against us many times."

Senator MCCLELLAN and other Senators served notice in the same debate that they wouldn't vote for the $4,900,000,000 asked by the administration for aid to our allies unless the whole matter was satisfactorily cleared up. Mr. MCCLELLAN said to the Senate:

TERMS POLICIES INCONSISTENT

"If we are providing these funds to our allies for the purpose of helping them to develop their military power and strength as a defense against communism, then how inconsistent is it for the same allies, for the sake of trade and profit, to place in the hands of the Communist bloc, the machines, materials, and other essentials of the war potential in a war effort? Is not the advantage we are trying to gain, and for which we are trying to provide, being offset by the making of such machines, tools, and materials available to a potential enemy?"

Plainly the administration is in for trouble in the Senate on the whole foreign aid program because of what has been done secretly and injudiciously to satisfy allied pressure for more trade with the enemy.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have

printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial published in the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., on February 27, 1956.

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

BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

In August 1954, a 15-nation group, including United States representatives, agreed to ease trade embargos which prevented Western nations from shipping strategic materials behind the Iron Curtain. Counsel Robert F. Kennedy, of the Senate Investigations Subcommittee, says the number of embargoed items was reduced from 460 to approximately 250.

Included among the items decontrolled or downgraded were machines essential in making heavy artillery, guided missiles, jet engines parts, and tanks, as well as materials required for the production of ammunition and weapons parts. Rail equipment vital to the movement of tanks and oil also was included, as was beryllium, a metal used in atomic reactors.

Defense Department representatives, testifying before the subcommittee, have said they opposed downgrading and would be against further decontrol, because such moves aid the Soviet war potential.

Unfortunately, however, their testimony has been limited by the same official stumbling-block that has hamstrung the subcommittee for 2 years. It still is unable to get a list of the items that were downgraded in 1954; officials appearing before the investigating committee have cited President Eisenhower's letter to Defense Secretary Wilson on May 17, 1954, as authority for not replying to certain questions.

Mr. Kennedy believes protection behind the May 17 executive order has been sought to a point where it could be used by a future tyrant in the White House to cover up malfeasance, corruption, and even treason. Chairman MCCLELLAN, Democrat, Arkansas, of the Senate subcommittee says the United States has made astounding secret concessions to allies whose merchants want to trade with Russia. He has charged that the facts behind relaxation of free-world trade embargoes on strategic items have been concealed and hidden from Congress and the public, and that documents have been censored and classified to hide the errors, inefficiency, and poor judgment of certain officials.

These are serious charges; they are doubly serious because, in the wake of Prime Minister Eden's recent visit to the United States, American officials now are discussing liberalizing free-world trade by relaxed policies involving Red China and the European Soviet bloc.

Moreover, if satisfactory explanation is not given to Congress as to why East-West trade data is being withheld, this policy may, in the words of Senator JACKSON, Democrat, Washington, "invite complete jeopardy of the foreign-aid program." Congress deserves to know what agreements have been made in this field, and what moves are contemplated; a matter so closely akin to national and free-world security should be subject to the most careful analysis.

The administration ought to effect immediately the revocation or modification of the President's 1954 letter, which prolongs the unwarranted and undesirable curbs on information imposed by former President Truman, and which already has been the subject of considerable criticism.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial published in the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of February 25, 1956.

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

TRADE WITH SOVIET BLOC

Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN is fully justified in his demand for public hearings on East-West trade by his Senate investigating subcommittee. Senator MCCLELLAN says that America's allies are selling war goods to the Communist nations, and if that is so, the fact shoud be made known to the American people.

He maintains also that one of the reasons for Prime Minister Anthony Eden's visit to Washington is to obtain further relaxation on Western restrictions on trade with the Soviet bloc, particularly Red China. Britain's trade with Red China is an established fact.

It is well known that the Western Powers relaxed export controls against Communist countries at the conference in Paris in August 1954. Harold Stassen represented the United States at that conference, and he has declared that the changes made at Paris were approved by the Eisenhower administration. It is understood that many items of a strategic nature were included in the list on which export controls were removed.

If this is so, it is difficult to understand why President Eisenhower gave his approval. Stassen has maintained that such a relaxation of trade with the Communists was for the best interests of the United States. But to furnish strategic materials to a government unquestionably devoted to a program of aggression against the free world, with major emphasis on the United States, certainly cannot be in the best interests of the American people.

This situation presents a subject for thorough examination, and Senator MCCLELLAN is fully justified in planning a careful study by his Senate Investigating Committee. Many items of a strategic nature are undoubtedly being sent to the Soviet bloc, and it is hard to understand why our Secretaries of Defense and State, and even the President, should approve this procedure. The best interests of the United States, as well as the security of the free world, demands that the situation should be looked into thoroughly.

MR. DULLES AND SOVIET POLICY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent editorial written by Marguerite Higgins entitled "Mr. Dulles and Soviet Policy." The editorial appeared in the Monday, February 27, 1956, issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

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

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles is unquestionably a brilliant, highly motivated man with an immense scholarly background in foreign affairs. But, strange as it seems, there are an important number of his associates who wish the Secretary were not quite so scholarly, not quite so sure of himself, because, if this were so, he might consult more often with his own experts in such fields as Soviet affairs and, in the opinion of some, save himself from some errors. For while these experts may not have as impressive a scholarly background as Mr. Dulles, they do have more time to keep abreast of changing developments.

And the astonishing thing is that the vast majority of Government officials versed in Soviet affairs do not by any means agree with Secretary Dulles' statement Friday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the Russians have failed and that this accounts for their revisions of Communist doctrine. So deep is the disagreement that one official after reading the Dulles testimony sighed ruefully and said, "Sometimes I wonder whether the Secretary ever read telegrams from our Embassy in Moscow."

It may even be that in the heat of senatorial cross-examination, Secretary Dulles went farther than he had intended. For it can be authoritatively revealed that shifting Soviet tactics and impact they have already had not only in neutralist nations but among our allies, have already caused in the State Department and in the executive branch of the Government a major reexamination of our policies. And it can also be stated with equal authority that as a result important policy changes are in the offing. These include, specifically, those areas in which the United States has seemed to condone colonialism and oppose nationalism, by keeping silent out of deference to one or another of our European allies.

Instead of being the result of failure, the present Soviet tactics are viewed by the overwhelming majority of specialists in Russian affairs as being a sign of new economic and military strength and a new Soviet self-confidence. Tactics have been changed because Russia's new economic and technical strength (more engineers graduated yearly, for instance, than in the United States), as well as big backlogs of military hardware give Soviet leaders in the nuclear age an opportunity to use less risky methods of trade and technical assistance to attract nations if not into the Communist orbit at least out of the Western orbit.

Being a dictatorship, the Russians can afford to sacrifice their own people's standard of living to wage a politically motivated trade offensive. Moscow's recent and highly qualified renunciation of violence is a technique to soften fears of the target nations and make them more amenable to political and economic penetration. And the Russians also possess today what they did not have only a year ago—the threat of fear implicit in their new capacity for mass delivery of nuclear weapons by bomber, rocket, and guided missiles.

What is the Communist record? Here are some of the high points.

Between 1945 and 1950 the Communist empire expanded at the rate of 50 to 60 square miles an hour: all of East Europe, East Germany, China, North Korea, Tibet, Outer Mongolia, parts of northern Indochina.

During the war in Korea the United States had to face the fact that the Russians were mass-producing far more modern fighter planes (such as the jet MIG 15 and jet MIG 17) than we were and were able to give far more to its Far Eastern allies than we could to ours. The Chinese built up, thanks to the Russians, a 2,000-plane force in slightly more than 2 years, but we were saved in Korea by quality performance of our pilots.

Between 1945 and 1955 Soviet steel production more than trebled.

The Russians exploded an atomic bomb 2 years earlier than we said they could; they recently exploded a hydrogen bomb. They put formations of Soviet intercontinental jet bombers into the air before our own long-distance bomber counterparts were operational.

With the truces in Korea and Indochina (which the Communists claimed as smashing victories for their side and proof that the United States was a paper tiger) the only major Communist threat of force has been in Formosa.

By 1954, the Communists, who had exploded their own nuclear weapons and grasped their destructive power, looked around for methods of expanding Soviet power without risking Communist real estate. A rather vacillating New Look policy was born.

But it has reaped rewards (Austrian neutrality, for instance) and the realists in the State Department believe that the American people should be braced to expect further Communist progress resulting from the hard fact of visibly growing Soviet nuclear and industrial power.

And certainly one of the vital international results of the New Look is the discovery by many nations of the profit to be had in flirting with the Communists, now that they do not (outwardly) seem so menacing.

Egypt led the way. She traded some cotton for Communist-made jet planes and thereby galvanized the United States into extending credit and assistance for building the giant Aswan Dam—a project previously under discussion for 2 years.

This example has not been lost on such countries as Saudi Arabia which have been dropping hints that there are certain things they have long been wanting to get from the west and might, reluctantly of course, have to get from the Communist world. It's an example that hasn't even been lost on our stanchest friends and allies such as Turkey and Pakistan where voices are being raised to say that the way to lower your priority with the United States is to allow yourself to be taken for granted.

And who would have thought only 2 years ago—when the New Look was just beginning to emerge—that atheistic engineers of Communist Poland would be surveying the historic and holy pilgrim's railroad in the Arabic world with a view toward its reconstruction?

Or that Lebanon would be strongly tempted by Soviet offers to give technical assistance and credit in return for accepting Lebanese products, such as fruit, which the country is having a hard time selling?

Or that Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the Premier of Cambodia, who 2 years ago told this correspondent that the friendship and assistance of the United States was the crux of that country's future, would be making a trip to Communist Peking and negotiating there a treaty of friendship?

Certainly the United States ought not to be panicked by the prospect of competition with the Soviet Union. This Nation is starting in a position of vast surpluses. Russia is a nation of enforced scarcities. It's true that such a Communist-type dictatorship can offer amazing financial terms without fear of public criticism at home. But if the United States handles matters coolly and flexibly—with maximum attention to promoting the independence and freedom of the nation involved—our rich and prosperous country has every advantage. But it's no use pretending that the Soviet offensive is a sign of weakness. To do so is to encourage people to think it will fail and cause popular disillusionment when—as is inevitable in the nature of things—the Soviets do have occasional successes. The new Soviet tactics, including the trade offensive, have been adopted because in the nuclear age they best seem to serve the age-old Communist purposes. And they will be carried out with the same determined—and deadly—earnestness as the tactics of old.

PRISON CAMP VETERANS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which I have received from Vincent A. Harrold, commander, American Prisoners of War, Inc.. 155 Richard Road, Braintree, Mass., together with the editorial referred to in the telegram which appeared in the Boston Post on February 28, 1956.

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

BRAINTREE, MASS., *February 28, 1956.*

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request you insert in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Boston Post editorial of this date entitled "Heroes or Chickenhearts?" This editorial completely expresses the feeling of this organization for prison-camp veterans. Maj. William E. Mayer's statement, "And, all too often, the prisoner lost even his will to live. He would crawl off in a corner, refuse to eat, and—without having any disease whatever—simply die" is vicious beyond all understanding. What a tribute to American servicemen who died for their country. What a consolation to their families. What a reflection on America's gratitude. Since repatriation from Communist dungeons American GI's have been the target of false accusation without parallel in the history of the Nation. This organization has and will continue to lead their defense. Hardened from experience of dealing with charges made against survivors of captivity, we are shocked beyond belief that even the dead are now to be included in this torrent of slander and abuse.

VINCENT A. HARROLD,
Commander, American Prisoners of War, Inc.

[From the Boston Post of February 28, 1956]

HEROES OR CHICKENHEARTS?

One of the dreadful legacies of the Korean war—the first of the Nation's wars in which we were not victorious—is the insistent attacks upon the behavior of the American soldiers while captives of the Communist enemy.

Red Chinese have given wide currency to the contemptous view that American soldiers were men who, if deprived of material sources of support, proved insecure, easily manipulated and controlled, lacking real loyalty or conviction either to country or to comrades.

Several hundred Turkish POW's in Korea survived almost to a man because they held to military discipline and comradeship, it is claimed by Army psychiatrists.

Are these low estimates of soldierly character in Americans true, or unfair distortions? One-third of the American prisoners died in Communist prison camps. Did they die because of a basic defect of character, as psychiatrists would have us believe, or because they were special targets of a ruthless campaign to discredit all things American?

Brain-washing techniques used by the Communists in Korea on American prisoners were successful in one-third of the four-thousand-odd Americans who returned home, according to Maj. William E. Mayer, an Army psychiatrist.

He bases his astounding claim on 1,000 case histories of released Americans. In view of the latest Red claim that 450 missing Americans cannot be accounted for Major Mayer's conclusions concerning "chickenheartedness" of Americans should be investigated. How can he reach this conclusion on the basis of testimony of men who have been brain washed?

Asked if brain washing turned many American prisoners into Communists, he replied: "Brain washing did not turn a soldier into a Communist. But it often did weaken him as a loyal American. It extracted from him astounding amounts of military information, and a great deal of useful, believable propaganda material. It achieved widespread collaboration. It created a substantial loss of confidence, among prisoners, in the American system, raising doubts and confusion in the prisoners' minds about themselves and their country, and it turned the American prisoners into the most docile uniformed men we have ever seen.

"Brain-washed prisoners rarely tried to run away, never organized any effective resistance to their captors. They apparently learned nothing from the Communists that would be of tactical or strategic value to the United States.

"And, all too often, the prisoner lost even his will to live. He would crawl off in a corner, refuse to eat, and—without having any disease whatever—simply die."

What proportion of the 450 unaccounted for crawled off in a corner and died?

The code of behavior set up for American personnel in the event of capture is either too easy, or completely ineffectual in dealing with a fundamental insecurity. We had better find out which and stop pussyfooting around the problem.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION INVESTIGATION OF BOSTON & MAINE RAILROAD

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I know that every Member of the Senate was shocked and grieved to read last night of the heavy fatalities and injuries suffered as the result of a collision between two Boston & Maine Railroad passenger trains near Swampscott, Mass. Many citizens of Massachusetts and New England have long been disturbed by the growing number of accidents, mishaps, and mechanical failures which have plagued New England railroads in recent years and endangered the lives of their passengers.

Particularly disturbing are the reports that many of these incidents are due to inadequate expenditures for maintenance and safety. In recent years, both the Boston & Maine Railroad and the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad have been taken over by interests with financial ambitions more highly developed than their concern for their passengers or the area they serve. Since that time, both events and the official figures on file with the ICC have been cause for alarm. In 1955, for example, total cash expenditures for maintenance by the Boston & Maine Railroad—during its first year under new management—showed a drop of 20 percent below the previous 2 years. Most of this decrease came in the second half of the year following the installation of the new management, despite the heavy expenditures required as the result of last fall's floods.

It seems to me it is high time for the ICC to investigate fully the condition of these railroads and to report to the Congress and the people of New England on what steps may be taken promptly to prevent further accidents and fatalities.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey obtained the floor.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be very glad to yield for that purpose.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, by the courtesy of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has the floor, it was arranged yesterday through the majority and minority leaders that I might be recognized for a period of time today to reply to remarks made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on Monday concerning the Secretary of State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I request, then, Mr. President, that I not be interrupted during the presentation of my statement. After that, I shall be happy to answer any questions which may be asked of me.

Mr. President, last Monday on the floor of the Senate the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] made a sharp attack on the Secretary of State. I regret that because of conflicting engagements I was not on the floor at the time, but the matter was called to my attention Monday evening and I read the full text of the speech.

In his opening remarks the Senator from Arkansas said:

> Will Secretary of State Dulles tell America the truth about our present peril, or will he say one thing publicly and an opposite thing privately? Will he give us a fair chance to decide for ourselves with full knowledge of the facts, what efforts we should make for our own salvation, or will he lull us to sleep in an hour when the Soviet Union has launched a powerful diplomatic offensive against us? Will he by his candor rally the free world to a trust in American leadership; or, from an apparent craving for popular approval, will he endanger the mutual trust which supports the association of free peoples?

Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas based his attack on the testimony of Secretary Dulles before the Foreign Relations Committee on the afternoon of Friday, February 24. The appearance of the Secretary was primarily to answer questions with regard to the tense situation in the Middle East, and it was not intended at that open hearing to go into questions affecting our foreign affairs generally. In fact, during the hearing Mr. Dulles stated that he was making a speech in Philadelphia on the following Sunday before the Philadelphia Bulletin Forum, discussing more fully the general world situation.

On last Monday before the Senator from Arkansas spoke, I inserted the Philadelphia speech in the body of the RECORD.

In attempting to make a reply to the criticisms of the Senator from Arkansas, I feel myself personally in a difficult position because of my personal relationship with the distinguished Senator. He and I have been in the Senate together since the elections in 1944, a period of over 11 years, and although we belong to different parties, we have been close collaborators in all matters pertaining to foreign affairs. I have particularly valued the Senator's world vision and his interest, which is mine also, in such important subjects as the exchange of students, technical assistance, and, in general, our so-called partnership relations with the underdeveloped countries of the world. The Senator from Arkansas and I have served on the Foreign Relations Committee for 9 years, and we have, generally speaking, been in full accord with the overall objectives of developing a truly bipartisan foreign policy.

I was deeply shocked, therefore, when the Senator attacked our Secretary of State because of certain off-the-cuff statements which the Secretary made at the Friday hearing, and completely ignored the more complete statement that the Secretary made in the Philadelphia speech. I would not have been shocked if the Senator from Arkansas had differed in the appraisal of world facts from the position of the Secretary—that would be a perfectly proper position—but to charge that the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, had actually misrepresented the facts to the American people, and to charge that he would say one thing publicly, and an opposite thing privately, is to me completely indefensible.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should prefer not to yield until I have finished my speech; then I shall be glad to answer any questions the Senator from Arkansas may desire to ask me.

I feel strongly that such an unfair representation by the Senator from Arkansas must be answered by those of us who were present on these various occasions, who have known and worked with the Secretary of State, and who realize that the carefully prepared Philadelphia statement was the complete presentation of the Secretary's position.

He was not endeavoring at the Friday meeting to cover completely the whole field, as he did on Sunday.

I could not refrain from feeling at the hearing on Friday that the Senator from Arkansas did all he could in questioning the Secretary of State to put the administration's policies in a bad light, and to imply that the position taken by the Secretary was calculated to give to the American people a false impression of success in our policies.

Let me turn to the exact language of the Philadelphia address so that we may attempt to find where the Secretary is guilty of misrepresentation.

When, on Sunday, in Philadelphia, the Secretary, in referring to the Communist Congress, said, "We cannot fully appraise what has happened," did he misrepresent the facts? I think not.

When the Secretary on Sunday in Philadelphia stated that these policies of the Russians are being revised "because they have been thwarted by the free world," was he misrepresenting the facts? I think not, and, once more, the Senator from Arkansas apparently thinks not, too. In his Monday speech the Senator from Arkansas said:

> The unity of the free world, as it was first forged after the Second World War, checkmated the Soviet policy of expansion as it was pressed along rigid Stalinist lines.

That, as I understand, is precisely the point the Secretary was making. Having been checkmated, the Communists are now trying a new and equally dangerous and perhaps more insidious method of achieving their objectives—which have not changed one iota—namely, the domination of the entire world.

When the Secretary stated on Sunday in Philadelphia that these recent Soviet moves have come about "not through change of heart, but because old methods had failed," I do not see how he was saying anything more than what the Senator from Arkansas said when he discussed on Monday the new—and I quote the Senator—"more effective means than the bluster, threats, and blackmail crudely employed by the Stalinist regime."

Certainly there can be no disagreement between the Senator from Arkansas and the Secretary with regard to the failure of the old, rigid, blustery Stalin methods, which caused the free world to unite. Surely that Stalin policy did not work out as planned. That is why we are now faced with a new method of Communist subversion which we must meet head on and with imagination and courage.

When the Secretary stated on Sunday in Philadelphia with regard to Soviet moves last summer that "We could only safely assume that new tactics were designed as a means of conquest," where did he misrepresent the facts to the American people?

What misrepresentation was there in the Secretary's forthright comment with regard to the meeting at the Summit, when he stated Sunday in Philadelphia that "We cannot yet tell the full effect of that conference"?

Speaking of the new Soviet political economic and trade offensive, the Secretary said that "We must assume that the intent behind the Soviet economic campaign is to subvert and communize the nations that are its targets."

Where is the misrepresentation here? I find none.

I call special attention to the following statement in Philadelphia by Mr. Dulles:

> But we must always recognize that the Soviet Communist experiment has won for itself a considerable popular prestige in the less developed countries.

Is this not a statement of the facts? Where are the distortion of the truth and the misrepresentation?

This last problem of Communist prestige, which Mr. Dulles has frankly noted, is a serious one to which we all must give considerable thought. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas has done so. I certainly have. I hope he and I can work together to see if we cannot help the State Department and Congress find an answer to this and other serious

questions raised by recent Comunist moves.

The Secretary stated on Sunday in Philadelphia that important as these Soviet moves are, nevertheless "We need not be panicked by the new Soviet economic policy."

Of course, that is an optimistic touch.

The Senator from Arkansas said in part:

> The new strength and boldness of the Soviet policy should not be the occasion for despair.

That is a note of optimism on the part of the Senator from Arkansas, which I am delighted to observe.

I cannot see that the Senator from Arkansas is so far from the position of the Secretary of State. In any case, surely here is no misrepresentation or attempt to mislead our people.

The Secretary went on to say in his Philadelphia speech:

> I do not wish to minimize the threat of the Soviet "new look," of which the economic campaign is a part.

I would ask, Is this a misrepresentation of the facts? Does this sound like a man attempting to "deceive the American people about the deadly menace which confronts them," as the Senator from Arkansas has stated? Or does it sound like a man who is trying to "lull us to sleep," as the Senator from Arkansas charged in his speech on Monday?

The Secretary on Sunday in Philadelphia went on to say:

> Meanwhile we have new problems. These will require new efforts, without relaxation of the old cohesion, resolution, vigilance, and strength.

I am sure the Senator from Arkansas and his colleagues will join us in supporting these new efforts.

I know that my distinguished colleague is aware of my deep interest and concern with regard to assisting the underdeveloped nations. I have spoken on that subject frequently and at length. Just a year ago next month I made an extended speech on the subject on the floor of the Senate.

The Secretary of State has now in his Philadelphia speech again urged support for a new and more flexible policy of economic aid to these same areas, a policy which will have more continuity and I hope even more sucess.

I urgently hope that all Senators will join in supporting this sound and vital request, originally made by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message.

The challenge of the new Soviet policy seems to me to be clear.

As Mr. Dulles said on Sunday in Philadelphia:

> If our Nation and the other free nations play their proper part, we can face the future not with complacency—that would be disastrous—but with confidence.

The President has also asked for increased funds for the USIA and for student exchange. These are vitally important parts of our answer to the Communist challenge.

I know perfectly well that the Senator from Arkansas will continue to work with us in supporting these urgently needed requests.

Let me conclude by saying that I deeply regret that the Senator from Arkansas, for whom I hold such high esteem and deep affection, saw fit to castigate publicly on the floor of the Senate, and for the American people to hear, the Secretary of State for the ad lib statements he made on the general subject of world policy in a meeting which was called to consider specifically the tense situation in the Middle East.

I hope the Senator from Arkansas will not continue to insist upon charging the Secretary of State with various misrepresentations of the facts to the American people. By all means let us have our debates on the high plane of discussion of principles, let us always continue to review here at home matters of our foreign policies, but let me suggest that, in the future, attacks on the Secretary and our leaders be based on the full facts and complete statements of policy, such as were presented on Sunday in Philadelphia by the Secretary in his speech there.

Let us in a bipartisan way review together, work together, discuss together, our foreign policies. In this way we will provide a real service to Congress, to the Secretary of State, and to the American people.

If we work together, criticize constructively, and do not in the future permit ourselves in this election year to slip into mere acrimony and personal political attacks over foreign policy, we will, God willing, meet the serious world problems of today and tomorrow with confidence and success.

Mr. President, finally I desire to close my remarks with a personal reference to my relationship with the Secretary of State. I have known the Secretary for many years, and have observed with pride his growth in his chosen profession, foreign affairs, and his real leadership in the cause of world peace, which he has so successfully advanced during the administration of President Eisenhower. It has been my privilege to be with him in Japan in connection with the Japanese Peace Treaty and in the Far East in connection with the Southeast Asian Defense Pact. We may not always agree in all details with Secretary Dulles' approach to some of these problems, but we can all agree that there never has been a Secretary of State of higher integrity, or a Secretary more anxious to discover the facts and disclose all the facts to the American people, whom he is serving so effectively. I cannot permit the record of Congress to show that the integrity of Mr. Dulles was questioned without a strong protest from one who knows him personally as an individual, as a valued friend, and as a great American statesman.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I promised to yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have additional time in order that Senators who wish to ask questions, such as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], whom I have criticized, may be permitted to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from New Jersey make a request for a definite period of time, say 5 or 10 minutes?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should think 5 minutes would be sufficient.

Mr. KERR. At the end of that time, if the Senator finds he does not have sufficient time, he may make a request for additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the desire of the acting majority leader?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from New Jersey ask unanimous consent that he be given a specific number of minutes of additional time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for additional time not to exceed 10 minutes, so that Senators who have heard me may ask me questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I certainly should like to make it clear that there is nothing personal either between the Senator from New Jersey and myself, or between the Secretary of State and myself, which influences the discussion of foreign policy. I do not believe I said anything in my speech on Monday, or in the examination on Friday, which would justify any inference that my remarks about the Secretary of State were based upon any personal feelings about him.

If the Senator alludes to my reference to the New York Times item which said that Mr. Dulles did not believe what he said, I was quoting the New York Times. Of course, I think that is a statement which would leave the impression that the Secretary did know what he said was not true, but I did not say that. I merely stated it as an example of the extremity to which the Secretary of State had gone in his statement before the committee.

If I may make 1 or 2 preliminary observations preparatory to the asking of questions, the Senator has said the remarks of the Secretary of State before the Committee on Foreign Relations were

off-the-cuff statements. I do not know what impression the Senator seeks to leave. It was a very formal meeting with all the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Every member was present except one. There were also present a large number of other Senators. There were far more Senators before that committee than there were on the floor of the Senate, or than are on the floor of the Senate at this moment.

The Secretary's statement was a very formal part of our procedure of legislating and considering American foreign policy. The Senator well knows that the caucus room was full to overflowing. There were present a half dozen television cameras. Radio representatives were present, as were representatives of the press. To try to leave the impression that this was a private curbstone opinion is not accurate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the Senator will remember that some discussion took place between the chairman of the committee and Mr. Dulles. Mr. Dulles asked, "Is this to be a discussion on the Middle East situation, or am I to be prepared to discuss the whole question of foreign policy? I am going to give a full-dress speech in Philadelphia on general matters of foreign policy."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will permit me to say regarding his reference to whether the Secretary's statement would cover the Middle East rather than foreign policy generally, of course we presume the Secretary of State knows something about the whole foreign policy situation and not merely about the Middle East, although meeting arose as a result of events in the Middle East. It is difficult to put a particular geographical area into a watertight compartment in a discussion of foreign policy, because all areas are interwoven into the policy. But this was not a meeting in which one casually bumped into the Secretary of State and he made a statement. It was an extremely important formal meeting; it was not casual in any respect. I am sure the Senator will agree with that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with that, but the Secretary had said at least once that he was to make a statement in Philadelphia on the overall foreign policy, and the particular statement of Friday was on the Middle East. I cannot understand why the Philadelphia statement was not considered by the Senator in making his remarks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The testimony of the Secretary took place on the afternoon of Friday and appeared in the newspapers on Friday evening, Saturday and Sunday. I had Saturday and Sunday to think about it, and I wrote my speech on Sunday. I could not both write it and look at television. My remarks were based on the Secretary's testimony before the committee, where the Secretary was exposed to questions.

Under our system, the process of questions and answers is considered to be an acceptable way to arrive at the truth, or at least to arrive at the truth of what a man says and does. That is the traditional way it is done in our courts of law. If a witness is not exposed to cross-examination, it is thought that a witness may sometimes misrepresent facts.

All my speech was based on the statement made by Secretary Dulles on Friday. I felt compelled to confine my speech to that statement. I did not look up his statements to see what the Secretary of State said last week, or the year before, or subsequently. I would like to say that one of the principal reasons for criticism of the Secretary of State is that he will make one statement on Friday, a different one on Saturday, and another different one on Sunday. That is one of the reasons so many of us are critical of him. I know I, as one Senator, and I think it is true of others on our committee and in the country, would like to see the Secretary develop a policy which he could consistently describe, or describe in a somewhat similar manner day after day.

The fact that the Senator is saying that the Secretary of State said something different on Sunday from that which he said on Friday seems to me not to be relevant to a discussion of what he said on Friday.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Secretary of State did not say anything different on Sunday, but he had announced on Friday that he was going to make a carefully prepared statement on Sunday dealing with these matters and elaborating on the general policy statements he made on Friday.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me the Senator insists on putting together what the Secretary said on Friday and what he said on Sunday, when I was talking about what he said on Friday. I was writing the speech on Sunday. The Secretary was not put under cross-examination in Philadelphia on Sunday. He was not subjected to any questioning. He made a statement before television, and that was that. The Friday before, he made a statement before all the members of the committee. We could all ask him questions. The Secretary is an accomplished lawyer from New York City. He has made a great success in the field of law. I hope the Senator is not trying to leave the impression that Secretary Dulles cannot take care of himself in questions and answers.

Mr. Reston, head of the New York Times Bureau in Washington, is the one who made the statement I quoted in my speech. I will quote it again. He is the one who said the Secretary of State—at least, in his opinion—did not believe what he said on Friday. I consider that a rather serious indictment. I do not know what the Secretary believes. I have no idea what he believes. I am completely confused as to what the Secretary does believe. All I am saying is that it was a great disservice to say what he did say to the committee on last Friday.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to say that it is interesting that the President of Italy, who just spoke to us in the House Chamber a few minutes ago, said this, which is almost directly contrary to what Mr. Dulles said.

I do not wish to implicate the President of Italy. I am sure he did not know what Mr. Dulles said. But, for the record, I wish to quote what the President of Italy said when he addressed the two Houses of Congress today. As shown on the first page of the draft I hold in my hand—and a few minutes ago all of us heard the address delivered by the President of Italy—the President of Italy said:

> It should be recognized that, despite hopes and patient and generous endeavors, the world is not more secure today that it was 1 or 2 years ago.

That statement is almost directly contrary to, and the opposite of, what our Secretary of State said on last Friday.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Has the Senator from Arkansas read the speech Mr. Dulles made in Philadelphia on Sunday? It seems to me that is a fair question for me to ask, in view of the criticism the Senator from Arkansas is making.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My observation is made on the basis of what the Secretary of State said in his appearance before our committee, where he was answerable for what he said. The fact that he said something different when he spoke in Philadelphia on Sunday, seems to me to be, not an excuse, but, on the contrary, all the more inexcusable.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Secretary of State did not say anything different when he spoke on Sunday; he simply amplified on the point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me read further what President Gronchi, of Italy, said today in addressing the Congress:

> In fact, we are going through a disquieting phase of confusion of ideas and political orientation, and consequently of greater potential danger.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, Secretary Dulles has never denied that we are in danger.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from New Jersey to what Mr. Dulles actually said in his appearance before our committee—something he did not say in the speech he made in Philadelphia. Let me say that I hold in my hand the official transcript of the proceedings on February 24 before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The transcript was made by Ward & Paul, and I shall read from page 35.

The Senator from New Jersey has said that Mr. Dulles came prepared to speak about the Middle East and, apparently, nothing else—although I do not accept such a restriction. I think he should have been prepared to make at least general observations about our situation generally, when he addresses the Committee on Foreign Relations.

But the observation of the Secretary of State to which I took as much exception as I did to any other observation he made

was this—and I read from page 35 of the report on the proceedings:

Senator FULBRIGHT. Unfortunately, they—

I was referring to the Russians—

seem to be making progress, and especially in the Middle East; do they not?

I referred especially to the Middle East.

Secretary Dulles replied:

I do not think so. I think they made very little progress in the last few years, and the proof of it is that at this very moment, in Moscow, they are having to revise their whole program. If we had to go through such a revision and change of our whole program as they are undergoing, it would be advertised all over the world that we had failed.

The fact is, they have failed, and they have got to devise new policies.

I submit that that was a statement about the Middle East; and the origin of that answer by the Secretary of State was my question which included the words "and especially in the Middle East." That was the question I asked—although there were some following parts, with which I shall not delay the Senator from New Jersey or burden the RECORD, because I have dealt with that before.

But that was the core of my question to the Secretary of State, because in the mind of any reasonable person the statement he made leaves the impression that things are fine and that the Russians have made no progress. I believe such a statement completely ignores the significance of the developments in Egypt and the riots in Jordan and the difficulties between Israel and the Arabs, and so forth. I submit that the statement he made was about the Middle East; and I submit that the objection about bringing in some extraneous matters is not supported by the record.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Does the Senator from Arkansas think that is misrepresentation, or does he think perhaps it is an optimistic statement?

Let me call attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for last Monday, when the Senator from Arkansas made the following statement to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]:

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Surely the Senator from Massachusetts will not deny—for the record is very clear—that I remarked during the course of my questioning of the Secretary on Friday that, unfortunately, the Russians appeared to be making progress in the Middle East. The Secretary of State categorically denied that.

But the Secretary of State did not categorically deny it. He did not say "absolutely not." Instead, he said, "I do not think so."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I cannot hear what the Senator from New Jersey is saying.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Let the Senate be in order.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have been quoting from the remarks made on Monday by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. From what page has the Senator from New Jersey been reading.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have been reading from page 3375 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 27, at the center of the first column on that page.

I shall read it again:

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Surely the Senator from Massachusetts will not deny—for the record is very clear—that I remarked during the course of my questioning of the Secretary on Friday that, unfortunately, the Russians appeared to be making progress in the Middle East. The Secretary of State categorically denied that. He said absolutely they were not making progress at all. I believe he used the precise words "absolutely not."

And so on. On the contrary, the actual words used on Friday by Secretary Dulles, in reply to the Senator's question, were:

I do not think so. I think they are making very little progress.

I think the Senator from Arkansas himself went a little overboard in trying to interpret what the Secretary of State said on Friday; and I do not think the entire statement or speech made by the Secretary of State, on Sunday indicated that he was overly optimistic. In fact, the Secretary indicated that the Russians had made some progress. So it is a matter of interpretation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator from New Jersey is making any point about the Secretary's use of the word "absolutely," I point out that the word was used as a part of the exchange between the Secretary of State and myself. I have already read from page 36 of the report of the hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I shall read from the report again, for this part of the exchange takes only a few lines in the report.

Following the statement by the Secretary of State that "the fact is, they have failed, and they have got to devise new policies."

The next portion of the report of the hearing is this:

Senator FULBRIGHT. That is a very interesting demonstration.

I was referring to the applause which followed that statement by the Secretary of State; I was not referring to what the Secretary of State said.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And then I said:

You consider that an approval, of course, of the accuracy of your statements.

Do you think this last meeting which just ended, I believe, would indicate, or that the speeches of Khrushchev and the other leaders in the Russian Government would indicate, a failure in their foreign policy.

Secretary DULLES. Absolutely, sir.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is a totally different question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not totally different; it is a part of the questioning as to whether the Russians are failing, and are not making progress, and so forth. I think that is a legitimate interpretation of that passage. In one case the Secretary of State said, "I think not"; but in the other instance he said, "absolutely it is a fallacy."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is a matter of interpretation of the facts; but I say that the Senator from Arkansas is not correct in saying that the Secretary of State has made misrepresentations to the American people.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an additional 10 minutes be allowed for this colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President I did say personally that Secretary Dulles did not believe what he said was true. I quoted the article in the New York Times; and I call the attention of the Senator from New Jersey to the language used—which, as I have said, is not my language.

But the question of motives and of what the Secretary of State intended is a difficult one. Either he intended to misrepresent, or else he is so badly informed that he knows little about the facts. It seems to me that one may take his choice. Personally, I am willing to take the position that the Secretary of State does not understand the plain developments that everyone else seems to understand. I do not know of a single person who knows anything about foreign relations who agrees with him. I have just read what the President of Italy said today. The Senator from New Jersey will recall that on yesterday there was a report of what happened in the British Parliament. It was said that there was "stunned disbelief" when they heard what Secretary Dulles had said.

Many outstanding journalists, such as the head of the New York Times bureau, Mr. Reston; Mr. Salisbury, also of the Times, who is one of the acknowledged authorities; and others take the position I have stated. I shall not repeat my speech; but I repeat that we have been losing strength in the Middle East and we are still losing strength in the Middle East.

I am not blaming the Secretary of State for the difficulties. But I blame him for not telling the American people, and especially for not telling our committee what everyone else believes and what I believe is the truth.

If the Senator from New Jersey says Secretary Dulles did not know better, then either the Senator from New Jersey accuses Secretary Dulles of being uninformed—much more uninformed than a Secretary of State should be—or else it must be that the Secretary was trying to deceive the people of our country.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from Arkansas says Secretary Dulles did not tell the truth about our present peril. If that is not accusing the Secretary of misrepresentation, I do not know what it is.

But Mr. Dulles, himself, admits the peril. In his speech at Philadelphia, he said:

But we must always recognize that the Soviet Communist experiment has won for itself a considerable popular prestige in the less developed countries.

He has not missed realizing the danger for 1 minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would like to have him tell us the truth. I did not say what his motive was in not telling

the truth. He could do it from ignorance, in which case he did not deliberately misrepresent.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I maintain——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator maintain that the Secretary is an honest man, but does not know what is going on in the world?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I maintain no such thing, as the Senator knows.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator does not believe that we have not lost ground in the Middle East in the past year, does he?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course not; and the Secretary so indicates. He says that we must realize that "the Soviet-Communist experiment has won for itself considerable popular prestige in the less-developed countries." That means, of course, that we have lost ground in certain areas. He did not mean to say that we have not lost ground anywhere. He understands what the dangers are, and he warns us constantly of those dangers. He keeps telling us to be alert, and not to let down our guard.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is exactly what the Secretary did not tell us on Friday. He did not tell us to be alert, and that we are in danger. On the contrary, he said that the Russian policy was a failure. I asked him if the recent congress would indicate that it was a failure. He replied:

Absolutely, sir. It is a failure.

The whole purport of his testimony was that the Russian policy has failed, and that we are much stronger than we were before. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] asked him:

Are we stronger today than we were a year ago?

The Secretary replied:

Yes, sir.

What does that mean? Perhaps I do not understand language.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is a matter of appraisal of all the facts, and of both statements by the Secretary, on Friday and on Sunday. The Senator from Arkansas may take one view and the Secretary may take another. What I am objecting to is the charge that the Secretary misrepresented the facts. I am objecting because the Senator from Arkansas did not read the entire Philadelphia statement, which was made in connection with the other one, before he made his attack. It is not fair to castigate the Secretary of State before the eyes of the world, as misrepresenting the facts to the American people, when there was no misrepresentation of facts. All the facts are clear.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think he misrepresented them. I will not assert for what reason, whether it was because he did not know any better, or whether he did know better, and did it for some ulterior political reason, which was not the enlightenment of the committee. In that connection I state no opinion. I do not say now that he did it for this or that reason. What I say is that what he told us was completely contrary to the facts.

I do not wish to engage in a long exchange with the Senator from New Jersey. However, I should like to make one final observation.

There is one program which has been very dear to my heart, and which I think has much merit. It is a program in which I know the Senator from New Jersey is as much interested as I am.

On page 6 of the Senator's prepared statement appears the following:

The President has also asked for increased funds for the USIA and for student exchange.

I am bound to say that during all the time I have followed the student exchange program, this year is the first time a budget request has come to the Congress which was less than the request the year before.

Last year the budget authorized a request by the State Department of $22 million for the student exchange program. This year the budget would authorize only $20 million. Last year, after a very difficult struggle with the House, we got $18 million. The Senate granted the full $22 million, while the House figure was $12 million. We compromised at $18 million. To maintain that either the Secretary of State or the President has given the support which I think they should to this program leaves a false impression. I was very disappointed, and still am. I think it shows extremely poor judgment to fail to increase the appropriation for the student exchange program. The Advisory Commission on Exchange advocated and formally recommended $31 million for this program. However, in the face of all that, the budget, which we all know is controlled directly by the White House and not by the Congress, would permit the Department to ask for only $20 million.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree entirely with the Senator on that point, as he knows. I was in favor of the larger request, and I still am very critical of the amount arrived at by the Congress for the student exchange program. I think a mistake was made in not making the amount larger.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is a serious mistake. It indicates a lack of discrimination as to what is important and effective in this field. When we build up the Military Establishment, and constantly emphasize it, and deemphasize a thing like the student exchange program, it does not increase my confidence in the capacity of the administration to administer our foreign policy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator and I are entirely in agreement on that point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is in agreement on that point.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am in agreement on that point.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I correct in assuming that morning business has been concluded, and that there has been an extension of time for other matters?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY EARL OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, without losing my right to the floor, to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to thank my distinguished friend and colleague for allowing me to introduce a very distinguished visitor from one of our sister legislative bodies.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce to Members of the Senate the Earl of Buckinghamshire, one of the Deputy Speakers of the House of Lords of the British Parliament. [Applause, Senators rising.]

THE CONSERVATION OF TUNA RESOURCES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, before the Senator from Minnesota resumes his speech will he yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy to yield to my friend from California, provided I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Minnesota in yielding to me at this time.

Mr. President, it had been my intention to address the Senate on a subject quite foreign to the pending agricultural bill. I had prepared an address on the conservation of tuna resources, which is of very great interest to the people of the State of California and to the Senators who represent that State in the United States Senate. However, I do not wish to interrupt the comments of my friend from Minnesota on the pending business. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD the address which I had prepared to deliver at this time.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL ON THE CONSERVATION OF TUNA RESOURCES

The tuna fisheries support one of the large industries of my State. Somewhat more than 90 percent of the tuna caught by United States citizens is caught by California fishermen. Several thousand Californians man the far-reaching vessels of the tuna fleets,

other thousands can and distribute the product when it is brought ashore, and many industries, large and small, both in California and in other States profit substantially by supplying the vessels and other components of the industry with needful items. A substantial portion of the economy of San Diego and San Pedro is dependent upon the tuna fisheries.

In the normal course of events about 5 percent or less of the tuna catch consists of bluefin tuna which occurs close by southern California and the adjacent high seas off northern Mexico. Another fifteen-odd percent of the catch consists of albacore, the tuna of temperate waters, which is mostly caught also off southern California and adjacent northern Mexico, but is also caught commercially on north to British Colombia, and at various places in the North Pacific straight across to the main islands of Japan.

The other eighty-odd percent of the catch is about equally divided between the 2 tropical tunas—yellowfin tuna and skipjack tuna. These 2 types of tuna do not, and never have, regularly occurred in commercial quantities in the waters of California or the high seas off our coast. In the fall months of some years both sorts of tropical tuna may be found in the channel islands area off southern California in varying quantities and for varying periods of time depending on temporary and shifting movements of the warmer ocean currents to the northward, but in the normal course of events the commercial fishery for yellowfin and skipjack tunas has its northern limit in the seas about 200 miles south of the southern boundary of the United States. From there it continues all along the coasts of the Americas down to central Peru and even, on occasions a little farther south yet.

Around the outlying islands that rise steeply from the ocean floor, such as the Reuilla-Gigedo's, Clipperton, Cocos, the Galapagos, and Marquesas the fishing may be within a stone's throw of the beach, but along the mainland coast the fishing is ordinarily done out of sight of land, and, in some places and times, several hundred miles from land. The tropical tunas are truly pelagic fish. They are borne, they develop, live, feed, and breed and die in the open waters of the high seas. Where they come in over the shallow waters over the Continental Shelf it is ordinarily at the edge, and they practically never come into the shoal waters near the mainland. They stay, for the most part, out over the ocean deeps and that is where the fishery for them is plied.

The fishery for tuna in southern California began toward the end of the First World War. It developed rapidly during the 1920's and grew primarily on the basis of the albacore which were closest at hand. After 1926 the albacore virtually disappeared, suddenly from the inshore waters off southern California, and did not return for some years. The shifting ocean currents had diverted them to the northward and to sea beyond the range of the small vessels that were then employed in the fishery.

The market demand for canned tuna continued to increase sharply as it has continued to do up to this date, and the fishery shifted from albacore to the tropical yellowfin and skipjack tuna which were abundant, and unused, in the offshore waters to the south off Baja California. To get at these more distant resources larger and better equipped vessels were required. The large vessels had to operate longer periods of the year as they increased in size in order to keep the cost per ton of production down to a level which would permit consumers to buy canned tuna. By the time of the outbreak of the Second World War the small, local summer fishery had grown into a year-round fishery which customarily covered an area of ocean larger than the continental United States.

At the outbreak of the Pacific war the United States Navy drafted into war all of the large vessels of the fleet, and this type of vessel proved to be so useful to it in the central Pacific that the Navy constructed a substantial fleet of them for its own wartime use. At the end of the war the Navy returned to their former owners such of the tuna clippers as had not been sunk, and sold its own fleet of YP's one by one to tuna fishermen. In the postwar hunger for protein food the landings of the augmented California fleet grew by leaps and bounds, and the market absorbed all that could be produced.

Prior to this time the Fish and Game Commission of the State of California had conducted scientific research on the tunas, practically from the inception of the fishery. There had been no need for conservation regulations because the fishery had been so small when compared to the size of the resource. Only maximum- and minimum-size regulations had been instituted by the State of California.

But the tuna fishermen had well in mind the experiences of the halibut fishermen in the northern Pacific and the salmon fishermen in that same area. In those fisheries the resource had been overfished, the fishery reduced in productivity, and many fishermen had gone broke. Then, in both instances, treaties with Canada had been formed establishing International Fisheries Commissions which were empowered to make proper scientific studies, formulate and apply adequate regulations, and enforce those regulations. In each case, after a period of research, the resource had been restored to full productivity and the industries dependent upon them had returned to economic prosperity.

In view of the fact that the tuna fishery was increasing so rapidly in the postwar period, and with the prior halibut and salmon experience before them, the tuna fishermen of California took the sound precaution of asking their Government to take up with Mexico the possibility of a fishery conservation treaty similar to those that existed to the north with Canada in order that adequate research could be done on the tuna stock, regulations prepared against the day that they would be needed. They sought to avoid the period of overfishing and economic distress through which the halibut and salmon fisheries had passed by being forearmed with adequate scientific information so that regulations suitable for preventing overfishing could be made ready and applied when the time came that they were needed.

The United States did engage in such conversations with Mexico and in 1948 an adequate treaty for this purpose was signed with Mexico and ratified by both countries. It established the International Commission for the Scientific Investigation of Tuna. The United States appointed its Commissioners, but Mexico has not yet done so, and thus the International Commission for the Scientific Investigation of Tuna has never been able to meet and begin its work.

Meantime, however, actions had begun in another section of the world which were profoundly to affect the tuna fishery of California but which none of us recognized as having any connection with it at the time. In 1946 the Argentine Republic proclaimed its sovereignty over the Continental Shelf, the islands rising from it and the sea above it off the Argentine coast. The Continental Shelf off Argentina is wide, extending hundreds of miles to sea in its southern parts. There was no foreign fishing off Argentina. Presumably the only practical reason for the claim was an effort to perfect a claim over the Falkland Islands which rise from the Continental Shelf, which for generations had been occupied by England, and over which Argentina had been in dispute with England for some years.

Some 8 months later, on June 23, 1947, Chile issued a similar proclamation. But Chile, practically speaking, had no Continental Shelf. The mountains shelve off abruptly into the ocean depths. So Chile proclaimed its sovereignty to a belt of sea extending 200 marine miles from its coast. Nobody fished off Chile's coast, except an occasional European whaler, and, as a matter of fact, Chileans themselves did very little fishing despite the large fishery resources of the area. So far as could be determined the reasons for Chile's proclamation were not much more complex than the thought that if Argentina was going to expand its territory out to sea, then Chile had better do likewise.

Later in 1947 Peru issued a proclamation almost identical with that of Chile, proclaiming its sovereignty over 200 marine miles of sea, and incorporating it into its territory. This also had no effect on the tuna fishery because in that time no foreign tuna vessels fished off Peru. As a matter of fact the United States Government at that very time was giving financial and technical assistance to Peru to aid the Peruvians in establishing a fish canning industry to take advantage of the rich resources off its shores.

But in 1948 Costa Rica published a 200-mile claim also. Costa Rica was in the center of the area fished by the California fleet. Cocos Island, which belonged to Costa Rica lay about 350 miles off its coast.

Thus Costa Rica aimed to establish a band of territory extending 500 and more miles out into the Pacific Ocean which lay athwart the navigation routes to the valuable fishing areas in the high sea off Panama, Colombia, and Ecuador. Also they gave as a reason for their action that the tuna resources off their coast, although they did not use them, were being destroyed by American fishermen.

This appeared to the California tuna fishermen to be just the opportunity to which they were looking forward. They immediately solicited the United States Government to negotiate a conservation treaty with Costa Rica, and this time make it open-ended so that any other country with similar worries could also join in the work later by simple adherence to the treaty. Costa Rica was pleased to do this. In 1948 such a treaty was concluded and in the following year the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission began its scientific investigations. The Supreme Court of Costa Rica subsequently declared its 200-mile proclamation to have been unconstitutional.

At this point the conservation and diplomatic histories of the tuna fisheries took separate paths for a time. The scientific research of the Commission went on apace aided by the California State Fish and Game Commission, the Scripps Institution of Oceanography of the University of California, the Office of Naval Research, and the tuna fleets themselves. Panama adhered to the treaty and began to participate fully in the Commission's work.

By the end of 1955 the Commission had enough research information to be able to make some conclusions. Put in simple form they were these:

1. The stocks of yellowfin and skipjack tuna were quite different as to volume and their reaction to the fishery, and they required to be treated separately.

2. The intensity of fishery on yellowfin had grown to the point that in 1951 it had been close to the maximum sustainable productive level that the stocks were capable of. Had the fishery continued to grow it would have been necessary to apply conservation regulations in it. Because of economic circumstances however, the fishery had shrunk after that time instead of growing and no regulations were required at this time. In view of the uncertainties of the economic situation, however, the fishery might again take an upturn. Therefore, a careful watch was be-

ing maintained upon it and a proper form of regulation was being worked out which could be applied when needed.

3. The skipjack tuna stocks were so large in comparison with the fishery upon them that not only were no regulations required at this time but there could not be detected any effect of the fishery upon the stocks.

4. The tuna bait stocks in inshore waters were all ample and were not in immediate danger of overfishing; and

5. The anchovette stock in the Gulf of Nicoya (Costa Rica) had been completely killed off by natural causes (red tide), had been restocked by the Commission by transplantations from Panama, and the new stock appeared to be thriving.

In the meantime, the diplomatic developments had continued to come along their separate way. To each such claim to extended territoriality the United States filed a reservation stating that it would not recognize the jurisdiction of any country over vessels wearing its flag at greater distance from shore than 3 marine miles.

In 1952 Chile, Peru, and Ecuador signed a treaty which, among other things, purported to establish "the exclusive sovereignty and jurisdiction corresponding to each of them over the ocean adjacent to the coasts of their respective countries up to a minimum distance of 200 marine miles from said coasts." Since that time these three countries have acted as a unit on this subject in the United Nations and in the Organization of American States. The United States filed reservations to this joint claim, too.

Their next move was to drive a "draft convention on territorial waters and related questions" through the Inter-American Juridical Committee meeting in Rio de Janeiro by a 4-to-3 vote over vigorous objection of the three outvoted members, among which was the United States member. This was in July 1952. This treaty would have given the sanction of the American republics to these extravagant claims.

Later in 1952 the Inter-American Council of Jurists, of which the Juridical Committee is a permanent standing body of technicians, met in Buenos Aires. The IACJ pointed out that the Juridical Committee had exceeded its authority and returned the whole subject back to the committee for the study it had been requested to make in the first place, and which it has not done to this day. This was the last of the subject in the diplomatic field until the 10th Inter-American Conference met in Caracas in March of 1954.

At the Caracas meeting Ecuador, with the support of Chile and Peru, introduced a resolution, one part of which read: "The 10th Inter-American Conference reaffirms that the sovereignty and jurisdiction of each of the American riparian States * * * shall include an area of 200 marine miles, reckoned from the outermost points of the coast."

By exceedingly skillful diplomatic work by the delegates of the United States, Cuba, and Uruguay, a vote on this issue was prevented, and instead a resolution was passed calling for a "specialized conference" by the Organization of American States to study the conservation of the natural resources of the Continental Shelf and the waters above it.

Subsequent to this Caracas meeting in 1954 the Congress took heed of this situation and that its shrimp and tuna fishermen were being subjected to hardship and economic loss through seizures upon what the United States claimed was the high seas, and told them they had a right to travel freely upon them and under the American flag. The Congress passed what the President signed as Public Law 680, 83d Congress, 2d session. The principal provision of this act was that if a United States vessel was seized by a foreign country under claims of rights not recognized by the United States and was forced to pay a fine in order to escape, the amount of the fine was to be repaid the fisherman by the United States Treasury.

The Department of State then moved on the question in the General Assembly of the United Nations. In the fall 1954 meeting of the General Assembly two resolutions were passed, one instructing the International Law Commission to undertake a review of the total subjects Regime of the High Seas, and Regime of the Territorial Sea, and report back to the General Assembly on it with recommendations on the subject in the fall of 1956. The second resolution instructed the Secretary-General to convene a specialized technical conference on the conservation of the living resources of the sea in Rome in April in time so that the results and recommendations of the technical conference could be of use to the International Law Commission in its meeting in June at Geneva.

The International Technical Conference did convene in Rome as scheduled. Forty-five countries sent accredited representatives, and another six sent observers. After more than 3 weeks of study and deliberations, the conference adopted a report which defined the objectives of fishery conservation, cited the types of scientific information required for a fishery conservation program, listed the types of conservation measures applicable in a conservation program, described the principal specific international fishery conservation problems of the world for the resolution of which international measures and procedures have been instituted (including the tuna fishery), analyzed the applicability of existing types of international conservation measures and procedures to problems, and arrived at a set of general conclusions:

In the course of its report the conference said "The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, already referred to, is an instance where an international conservation policy has already been formulated for the exploitation of a fishery of comparatively recent origin. Such early action, however, has been exceptional."

Of all the nations of the Americas, Africa, Europe, and Asia gathered at this conference only the delegations of Chile, Peru, and Ecuador filed reservations to the report.

On the basis of the report of this conference and other considerations, the International Law Commission prepared its recommendations on the Regime of the High Seas, and the Regime of the Territorial Sea. In the first section it set forth a commendable and generally accepted set of articles under which nations could practically, by joint and peaceful means, undertake and insure the conservation of living resources of the sea. In its second section it said this about the breadth of the territorial sea:

"1. The Commission recognizes that international practice is not uniform as regards the traditional limitation of the territorial sea to 3 miles.

"2. The Commission considers that international law does not justify an extension of the territorial sea beyond 12 miles.

"3. The Commission, without taking any decision as to the breadth of the territorial sea within that limit, considers that international law does not require States to recognize a breadth beyond 3 miles."

Both of these United Nations meetings during the first half of 1955 resulted in sharp defeats for the 200-mile countries, and improved the position of that great majority of nations who hold that the breadth of the territorial sea shall be narrow, and that the high seas shall be free for the use of all, subject to appropriate conservation, regulations, applicable equally to all, in fisheries that have reached the stage of development where regulations are required. With reference to the tuna fishery of the eastern Pacific, specifically, it had been demonstrated that a high-seas fishery could be prevented from overfishing a resource by peaceful international cooperation and without the extension of territorial sovereignty into the high seas.

In the spring of 1955 Ecuador seized, again, two vessels of the United States on the high seas off her coast and, in the course of this seizure, an American seaman was seriously wounded by gunfire. One of these vessels was a tuna purse seiner from Monterey, Calif. and the other was a large refrigeration ship from Seattle, Wash. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held executive sessions at which officials of our State Department were heard, and for which our Ambassador to Ecuador was recalled.

An outgrowth of this activity was a request by the United States Government to the Governments of Ecuador, Peru, and Chile, jointly and severally to take this dispute to the International Court of Justice for settlement, to sign a treaty providing for joint action to protect the ocean resources from over-fishing, and to stop seizing vessels on the high seas while the case was under adjudication.

The three countries quite firmly refused to submit the case to the International Court of Justice. Their reasons, of course were obvious. They would lose, becaues their actions were contrary to international law.

It was only after the most severe pressure was exerted by the United States that they agreed to a conference to negotiate a treaty under which the countries could jointly protect the fish resources off their coasts. Finally on September 14, 1955 such a negotiation was begun in Santiago, Chile. The negotiations finally broke down completely on October 5. The Department of State has published the full documentation of the conference. At the end of its report the Department says:

"In the course of the Santiago negotiations the United States made every effort to include in its proposals for a conservation agreement measures and procedures adequate for the cooperative activities necessary to assure the continued productivity of the stocks of fish in the eastern Pacific Ocean of interest to four countries. Such an agreement would make the participating countries full partners in a conservation program involving effective research, recommendations for conservation based on scientific data, and enforcement of necessary measures. However, it was not possible to conclude such an agreement owing to the inability of the delegations of Chile, Ecuador, and Peru, without further consultation with their respective Governments, to negotiate an agreement which did not include provisions in effect giving recognition to their claims to exclusive jurisdiction over large areas of the hgh seas off their coasts."

Thus it turns out that Ecuador, Chile, and Peru were not, in fact, interested primarily in the welfare of the tuna stocks off their coasts, which is the only one fished by the United States. Obviously, they were not interested in competition between the United States fishermen and their own fishermen either, because the native fishermen of all three countries combined catch nominal quantities of tuna.

As a matter of fact, what they are driving at now with respect to the tuna fishery, aside from saving of pride, is somewhat obscure. Surely they should understand by this time that the United States Government is not going to pay tribute to them for permission for its vessels to pass by their coasts or to fish in the high seas off their coasts. At least this has been told to them bluntly by President Eisenhower, Assistant Secretaries of State, and our Ambassadors both informally and in writing. The Congress, in passing Public Law 680, 83d Congress, 2d session, confirmed and strengthened the actions of the Executive. The International Law Commission has refused to consider favorably their petitions. Forty-two nations at Rome

refused to act in a way favorable to them. By refusing to join the United States in submitting the dispute to the International Court of Justice they have as much as admitted that their claims are beyond the pale of international law.

Yet they persist and that is my reason for speaking at this time. The head of the Ecuadoran Navy has informed our fishermen that no matter what the Ecuadoran Foreign Office says, he is going to enforce the 200-mile limits off Ecuador. Within the past month his vessels have overhauled four of our tuna vessels off his coast. All were on the high seas. One he seized and took into port. It was released without fine upon direct representation by the United States Ambassador to the President of the Republic and through him to the head of the navy. The other three had their papers seized only, and were released because it was found that although they had been fishing off Peru all three had had proper licenses to fish in Ecuadoran territorial waters.

Now we come to the meeting of the Inter-American Council of Jurists held at Mexico City between January 15 and February 6, 1956. There we find the meeting rigged against the United States in advance by the broad territorial sea countries—Ecuador, Chile, and Peru. They had in secret prepared a resolution designed to appeal to nationalistic feelings of the delegates. This was hurried through on the last day of the session without study, without discussion, and without time for consideration. The only thing that our distinguished delegate, Mr. William Sanders, could do was file the following declaration and reservation of the United States, which eloquently states the situation:

"DECLARATION AND RESERVATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE RESOLUTION ON TERRITORIAL WATERS AND RELATED QUESTIONS

"For the reasons stated by the United States representative during the sessions of committee I, the United States voted against and records its opposition to the resolution on territorial waters and related questions. Among the reasons indicated were the following:

"That the Inter-American Council of Jurists has not had the benefit of the necessary preparatory studies on the part of its permanent committee which it has consistently recognized as indispensable to the formulation of sound conclusions on the subject;

"That at this meeting of the Council of Jurists, apart from a series of general statements by representatives of various countries, there has been virtually no study, analysis, or discussion of the substantive aspects of the resolution;

"That the resolution contains pronouncements based on economic and scientific assumptions for which no support has been offered and which are debatable and which, in any event, cover matters within the competence of the specialized conference called for under resolution LXXXIV of the 10th Inter-American Conference;

"That much of the resolution is contrary to international law;

"That the resolution is completely oblivious of the interests and rights of states other than the adjacent coastal states in the conservation and utilization of marine resources and of the recognized need for international cooperation for the effective accomplishment of that common objective; and

"That the resolution is clearly designed to serve political purposes and therefore exceeds the competence of the Council of Jurists as a technical juridical body.

"In addition, the United States delegation wishes to record the fact that when the resolution, in the drafting of which the United States had no part, was submitted to Committee I, despite fundamental considerations raised by the United States and other delegations against the resolution, there was no discussion of those considerations at the one and only session of the Committee held to debate the document."

I submit that these are not tactics and procedures which free and friendly nations should use in dealing with each other. For a body which is supposed to be technically qualified only in international law, which under the Charter of the Organization of American States is supposed to work as a serious, technical body, to adopt such a resolution affecting vital legal, defense, social, economic, and security interests of all nations with virtually no study, no analysis, and no discussion is amazing. It shakes one's faith in the whole structure of the Organization of the American States.

Certainly we are glad to work out in the traditional spirit of inter-American cooperation and friendship the complex problems of the high seas. But actions such as that taken at the recent meeting of the Inter-American Council of Jurists will only create difficulties for a program of genuine inter-American cooperation. It is not too much for us to ardently hope, indeed, to ask that the Council of the Organization of American States will take such actions as it may require to correct this ill-advised action of the Council of Jurists and reestablish faith in the normal processes of inter-American cooperation.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me for a few observations on the pending bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield whatever time is necessary to the Senator from Michigan, who wishes to speak on the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me at this time. I would not make the request, except that I shall be absent tomorrow attending the funeral of our late distinguished colleague, Senator Kilgore.

Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on the business pending before the Senate, the proposed Agricultural Act of 1956.

Our time is short. I am sure we would all like to have this bill voted on as soon as possible. We must have a new farm law quickly, so that our hard-pressed farmers may receive at least some benefit during the current crop year. I shall confine my remarks to something I hold essential to this legislation, namely, 90 percent parity, at least on basic commodities.

There is no need for me to dwell on the plight of our farmers. The statistics are on record showing how the farmers are caught in a price squeeze which is growing worse by the day. Even the Eisenhower administration admits that the great prosperity of which it boasts somehow does not include the farmers.

I have the honor, in part, to represent the State of Michigan. I am proud of the fact that wherever I go people refer to my State as the home of the automobile. It is a great industrial State. I am proud of the many thousands of men and women who have made this possible. But I am also proud of many Michigan men of whom we have heard much less, namely, Michigan farmers.

The farmers of Michigan are good, hard-working, solid citizens. They, along with all other farmers, have been hurt.

The parity ratio, that measure of justice which describes in unmistakable terms the relation between prices paid by the farmers for industrial products they use and the prices they receive for their own products, was at 80 percent of the national average last January 15. That was very low, indeed, but the same parity ratio for the farmers of Michigan was even less, only 79 percent.

When farm parity is down to 80 percent, 1 percent here or there does not make much difference. I merely wish to show that our Michigan farmers are no better off than their brothers across the Nation.

Whenever our Nation faces a great crisis—for example, World War II, or the Korean conflict—our farmers are urged to increase their production to meet the expanded need for food. They have always responded with zeal by increasing production, often going into debt. Did they not know, when the fighting stopped, they would be left with an expanded agricultural system producing far more than necessary to sustain a peacetime economy? Certainly they knew. But they assumed, in good faith—and they had every reason to do so—that when the last shots were fired, when the grim reality of overproduction was staring at them, the United States Government—the very Government that had asked them to work hard and produce more—would stand behind them. They felt that while a period of readjustment was taking place, the Government and the people would share the common burden. That is what did happen after World War II.

But what happened in 1952? The big business, hard-money hucksters persuaded the people to accept a Republican administration. As a sort of bonus, the farmers got Mr. Benson. Let loose on the sensitive field of agriculture, Mr. Benson did his best to prove again an old fact, that the Republican Party is more interested in the profits of big business than the needs of the farmers.

After working hard for 3 years to ignore the needs of the agricultural population, Mr. Benson and the Eisenhower administration are suddenly interested in doing something for the farmers—so interested, in fact, that they forced themselves to borrow ideas the Democrats have been urging day in and day out; but the Republicans were late, as usual. We could ask, What is the hurry? Why the urgency after 3 years of inaction? Could it possibly be the heat of the pending election?

Someday, we may see a magazine article telling in praiseful terms how Mr. Benson drove the farmers to the brink of disaster just as his Republican colleague in the President's Cabinet brags of dangling the Nation on the brink of war three times. But Mr. Benson may not be as adroit as Mr. Dulles claims to have been. Too many of our farmers not

only have been dragged to the brink—they have toppled over. And Mr. Benson's only solution is a soil-bank mattress at the bottom.

What we need, Mr. President, is a fence—a high, rigid fence of not less than 90 percent of parity—to help the farmers, at least until the full effects of the soil-bank program can be felt.

But Mr. Benson says that 90 percent parity on basic commodities will defeat the purposes of the soil bank. He says the soil bank is designed to cut down production and, ultimately, to raise prices. So far so good. But then he says that 90 percent parity will counteract this by inducing the farmer to produce more.

Mr. President, I believe there is a fundamental error in the Secretary's thinking. Indeed, recent developments have brought out that his argument has no basis in fact.

If the volumes of statistics prove anything, they prove that we have hardly ever lost any sizable sums of money on crops which were supported at a relatively high level. On the contrary, most of the losses came on commodities which were supported by a sliding scale.

I think, also, that Mr. Benson's statements show something else, namely, a basic distrust of the farmer. Would the farmer overproduce if his acreage should be cut by the soil bank and he had 90 percent parity? I am not a farmer, Mr. President, but I know the farmers of Michigan and the kind of people they are. And I am sure they think like a majority of American farmers. The farmer, I believe, will look at it this way: He knows that farming is in great trouble, and that this trouble is overproduction. Now he is promised 90 percent parity. He may not be entirely happy, because 90 percent is only 90 percent, and not 100 percent. But he is realistic and reasonable.

He is willing to shoulder his fair share of the burden of readjustment, if he is given a decent break. He knows he will not get rich, but he will get along until better times come. So he will not feel forced, or even inclined, to defeat the program by overproduction. And when we ask him to put some of his acreage into the soil bank, he will cooperate.

In addition to giving the farmers a pretty low score for intelligence—and honor—Mr. Benson also is attempting another time-dishonored Republican stratagem. I refer to his remarks designed to drive a wedge between the farmers and the industrial workers. By placing the blame for the farmers' predicament on industrial wage levels rather than on inept Republican policy, he hopes to turn these two mighty groups against each other.

But he cannot do it, Mr. President. The farmer and the industrial worker need each other, and America needs both. They will live and work and prosper together, if we help them and if we ignore the crippling attempts of Mr. Benson and others in the Eisenhower administration.

All we are asking, Mr. President, is justice—justice for the farmers—to enable them to gain their rightful share of the Nation's economy.

There is talk that passage of the pending bill, containing 90 percent parity provision, will meet with a veto. Mr. President, the Republican conscience—if there is such a thing—already has to put up with quite a burden, but a veto of such a bill would not be merely the rejection of a piece of legislation, it would be a rejection of the American farmer.

Again I thank my distinguished colleague from Minnesota for the opportunity to make my statement for the RECORD at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to congratulate and commend the Senator from Michigan for the statement, and for his expression of conviction on the subject of the agricultural program. The Senator represents in part a great agricultural State, and he is doing it exceedingly well. We welcome the support and guidance he is giving us in this matter.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, yesterday the Secretary of Agriculture announced an export-sales program on cotton. The New York Times today carries a statement from a spokesman of the Egyptian Embassy, which states that his Government was most unhappy about the American decision. He said, "We consider it a very unfortunate step at this time."

I call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the fact that what the United States is doing in supporting the prices of farm products, and then selling them at a cheaper price in the world market, is exactly what Egypt has been doing. The Egyptian Government, until 2 years ago, had in effect a form of export subsidy. Then it also indulged in currency manipulations. The Government was using trade practices of that kind in order to take the markets of the American cotton farmer.

What the United States is doing is meeting unfair competition.

Most of the Southern delegation in Congress have worked for several years to get an export-sales program adopted by the Government. I think it means the difference between life and death for the American cotton industry.

The Department of Agriculture for a year now has been pressing to secure that kind of program, because its officials have realized that it is right and just, but their efforts have been blocked by the State Department.

I congratulate the Secretary of Agriculture and the officials of his Department on the announcement and on the imminent institution of that program. I did not know the announcement would come so quickly, and I had no inside information about the terms of the announcement. However, I am very highly pleased with its terms, and I am sure that what will happen will be of great benefit to the cotton growers of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when I yielded the floor on Monday, I indicated that my next discussion of the farm bill would be in the nature of a review of the position the agricultural economy occupies today in relationship to the other segments of the American economy, and, also, that I would cite for the RECORD some of the developments which have taken place in the past 3 years in the agricultural areas which should long ago have commanded our attention.

Mr. President, before I go into that, on this particular subject, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to a matter of rather grave concern to me, and, I hope, of rather grave concern to my colleagues.

It may be recalled that on Monday I cited the propaganda and advertising program which was going on throughout the country under the sponsorship of the Republican National Committee in an effort to persuade the farmers of America to vote for the Eisenhower farm program. I hope, Mr. President, that that program will be offered by someone, so that we can vote on it, because if it is offered, it will be defeated. Of all the misrepresentations any man ever heard of, or to which this country has ever been subjected, the advertising program that is going on at the present time is the supreme and extreme example.

I have been receiving a few letters. In fact, Mr. President, I sat in my office last night until after 2 o'clock signing mail in response to letters which I had received from farm families in Minnesota. I picked out a few of them. We have two or three thousand of them, yet unanswered, I must confess, even though I signed more than 700 last night. I added some personal note in an effort to keep our farm people apprised of what is going on in the Senate in the discussion of the agricultural bill. But some of those letters referred to the Eisenhower farm program, and I received a few of the coupons—a good old advertising technique: "Send in a box top and get a farm program."

The trouble is, Mr. President, that some farmers have sent in the box tops, but the instructions on the box tops related to nothing which is before the Senate. The farm program which is before the Senate was written by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is true that a few parts of the program were recommended in the President's message—a message in an election year. That was a very interesting message. Many of the other points in that message had been scorned and scoffed at by the same administration only a year before—the soil bank, for example. Apparently someone reached the President's ear and told him that the soil bank was popular. Anyone who traveled with the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when it was holding hearings would know that many farmers were interested in some kind of a soil bank.

Of course, Mr. President, I wish the record to be accurate and clear that the soil-bank proposal is not new. We have

had the soil-bank proposal in Congress since 1933. Several Members of the other House presented bills providing for a soil bank, but all such bills were rejected by this administration.

It was my privilege to introduce a bill on the soil bank almost identical with the conservation reserve section in the pending bill. As late as September 30, 1955, the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Agriculture said that the program which Hubert Humphrey suggested was unworkable, too costly, undesirable, in addition to several other adjectives by which it was described. That was on September 30, 1955.

But then came the President's message on agriculture. A few stories appeared in such outstanding farm journals as the Wall Street Journal which indicated that the administration was going to urge a soil-bank proposal; and all at once the soil bank became a great miracle formula for solving all our farm problems. It is around this concept of the soil bank that the newspaper advertising, the spot announcements, and the radio advertising are going on—the Eisenhower 9-point farm program.

Some of my Republican colleagues want to vote for it. I hope someone will offer the whole 9-point program, and we shall see how many votes it can receive in the Senate as a substitute for the pending bill.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I may say that some of us will offer 1 or 2 amendments covering portions of that 9-point program, such as limitation on crop loans for price-support purposes. I had such a bill pending for several months, but the administration was opposed to it when a Democrat introduced the bill. Yes, I had a proposal to cut off and to limit crop loans for price-support purposes along the lines suggested by the President in his message, but his own Department of Agriculture said, last July, that it was unworkable, administratively difficult, undesirable, and used a few other descriptive phrases.

Mr. President, I want the American farmers to know that if they can get someone to offer the Eisenhower farm program they might have more chance to collect on all the box tops which have been sent in.

But I am happy to know that the farmers of my State are alert, as they have always been. They are good, solid farm folk. At some time in the course of this debate I intend to read quite a few of the letters which I have received from them. There is one at hand which I think is rather interesting. I picked it off the top of the pile. It says:

DEAR SENATOR: I just finished reading the Republican ads regarding Eisenhower's nine-point plan and how we should write immediately to our Senator. This is not the kind of letter they have in mind. Nor was it the kind of letter Benson had in mind in his hysterical tirade in St. Paul the other night. I am the lady who recently gave you the housewifely example on the price squeeze.

She goes on to tell about the prices the farmers are paying, and then she says:

Another point that frightens me—and threatens what you are fighting for—is the veto of 90 percent of parity. We small farmers are competing with the big farmer now. Then we small ones will be squeezed between Uncle Sam and the big farmer.

She goes on further in her letter and says, speaking of Mr. Benson:

He mentioned your sad comment that the administration is trying to wipe out all parts of the farm plan that will bring an insured income to the farmer. In injured agony he shouted, "How dare HUMPHREY make a political issue of the farm situation?" (He neglected to mention the Republicans will spend $250,000 to advertise their plan, assuring us we can charge our necessities. If instead if they, like you, would try to assure us an income, we could buy our overshoes next year, too.)

You don't have to answer me, but just keep your slingshot handy and ping away at Benson. Ping him a good one for me.

She is a lovely lady and shows good judgment.

Mr. President, there are many letters which I could bring to the attention of the Senate.

As I said in a reply to one of my constituents, I would be happy to have an opportunity to vote on the Eisenhower farm program. Of course, I would vote against it. But the only place where I have seen the program mentioned is in the newspapers. While there are departments of the Government which hand out statements of their policies to periodicals—selected periodicals, of course—generally, Congress does not base its votes on newspaper stories; we generally vote—and I know of no exceptions—on bills which are before us.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator familiar in a fairly complete way with the nine-point Eisenhower farm program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I am reasonably familiar with it.

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator find in the entire nine points any provision which indicated an additional dollar would be put into the pocket of either a Minnesota or an Oklahoma farmer in the calendar year 1956?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I must say that after careful examination I not only found that there would be no additional income; but if the program as it was presented to our committee, in the terms of the administration bill, had been approved by the committee, the prices of farm commodities would have gone down, down, and down.

I exposed the joker in the administration bill under which the administration was to have a sleight-of-hand performance to pay for the program. It is interesting to note that there was nothing included in the budget for the new soil bank program. It was to have been paid for by selling surplus commodities from the Commodity Credit Corporation into the domestic market at any price which could have been obtained for them.

When my colleagues learned that such a provision had been placed in the bill, they abandoned the bill as fast as it was humanly possible for them to leave it.

Mr. KERR. Is there any Republican now living of whom it can be said that he understands definitely every one of the nine points in the Eisenhower farm program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have not found one. I might say that if we continue to look, there is a possibility one will crop up.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Minnesota earlier mentioned something about election year programs. To what was he referring?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was referring to the most recent election year promise—the 1956 variety. The old promise of 1952 is still existent; it is untouched, unused. It apparently has been encased in some kind of political mothball preparation. But there is a brand new one out.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Was the old promise honored?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The old promise was not honored. Apparently the old promise was a part of the storage program. It has been stored away.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What was the old promise?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The old promise was repeated often. Many of the letters I have before me refer to that old promise. It was the golden promise in Minnesota. The little town of Kasson has attained international fame because it is the place where the promise was made, but it was never redeemed by the Republican politicians.

At Kasson, in Dodge County, one of the finest areas of our State, the President, who was then the candidate of the Republican Party, promised 90 percent of parity; and he became so enthusiastic that he even put the amount up 10 more points, to 100 percent of parity. He went up to 100 percent. It paralleled the reaction of the stock market after Eisenhower speaks; it goes up 10 points.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Was the promise made only in Kasson?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then Candidate Eisenhower went to Brookings, S. Dak., to Fargo, N. Dak., and to Omaha, Nebr. He was sort of making the rounds of the Midwest with his promise. It got better as time went on; it was a promise, without any ifs, ands, buts, or ors, that there would be not less than 90 percent of parity.

Mr. Benson has commented about the mess which the Republicans inherited, and about the terrible aspects, as he points out, or paints it, of 90 percent of parity. But all of that was known to the Republican candidate for the Presidency in 1952. He knew what 90 percent of parity meant. I trust he did.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is not the Senator indulging in a pretty violent assumption to state categorically that the Republican candidate in 1952 knew what he was saying?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am of a charitable nature today, and of a charitable mind.

Mr. KERR. Then, if the Senator speaks through charity, I can find no fault.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I am happy to yield to my charitable friends.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I take it that General Eisenhower, when he was a candidate for office in 1952, knew that the Republican farm program was for at least 90 percent of parity, and eventually for full parity, with no ifs, ands, or buts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is eminently correct. Candidate Eisenhower went even further by promising 90 percent of parity not only for storage commodities—the basic commodities—but for perishable commodities as well. Our hog farmers, who are getting about 60 percent of parity, are looking for the other 30 percent. One of the greatest hunts is now going on in our part of the country. The hog farmers are looking for the other 30 percent from the Republican parity.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I take it, then, now that we have laid the groundwork, that what the Senator really is referring to is what is supposed to be the present Eisenhower farm program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; the one which is appearing in the newspapers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The one which is getting the half page advertisements for which the Republican senatorial and House campaign committees are putting up $250,000 to popularize the propaganda throughout the country. Is that the program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Where is that program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only place I have been able to find it is in my mail. It is not on the Senate calendar, I assure the Senator. It is not before any committee. I imagine there is a copy of it at the White House, and I assume there is a copy in the possession of the public relations firm in Chicago, about which I shall have something to say before the debate is finished.

Here is a copy of it. I always keep one handy. This is one of the half-page advertisements.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am getting them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The interesting thing is that there is not an upper Midwest Republican Senator or Representative who wants to endorse it; yet it is being published in their areas so as to help them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is true; but it does carry the name of a Republican Senator and a Republican Representative.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what could be called service beyond the call of duty. Those men should be honored for that, rather than to be chastised. I know the Senator meant his remark only in the sense that those Members of Congress are doing political work and political duty.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator indicates that this is a part of what seems to be a $250,000 advertising campaign.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the price which is stated. That is probably conservative.

Mr. KERR. Is there any statement in the advertisement as to where the funds came from with which to pay for the ad?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, it says: "Paid for by National Republican Senatorial and Congressional Committees."

Mr. KERR. Is that a farm organization?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I doubt it. The chairman of the senatorial campaign committee, our distinguished friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], has resigned, just as the sponsors of the administration's farm bill withdrew when they learned what the administration had placed in the bill.

I feel sorry for my colleagues if they were led to believe that something else would be in the bill. It is necessary to read through the fine print. There is a lot of fine print.

Mr. KERR. That is, in the advertisement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is very little heavy print. It is the fine print which really should be noted.

No; if this is a farm organization, it is a new one. But I doubt if we could really call the National Republican Senatorial and Congressional Committees an agricultural organization.

Mr. KERR. The advertisement does not contain a list of the board of directors, does it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, it does not.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed at this point in my remarks the release entitled "The Joker in Ike's Farm Bill." It explains what was in the administration's farm program.

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

THE JOKER IN IKE'S FARM BILL

There is a joker in the deck of the administration's widely publicized new program for solving the farmer's plight, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, charged today.

"Instead of helping to bolster farm income and farm prices, all it is designed to do is to unload Government holdings of farm commodities at distressed prices on the domestic market in direct competition with the farmer already struggling for a better break on that market," Senator HUMPHREY said.

"Because they have run into too many obstacles against disrupting foreign markets by dumping these products abroad, they now propose dumping them at home—underselling other products farmers have to sell, and underselling their own support program.

"The entire farce is exposed in language of the administration's own farm bill introduced in the Senate yesterday—the fine print in the insurance policy that belies all the glowing promises made by the salesmen in the President's farm message and in the Secretary of Agriculture's testimony before the Agricultural Committee.

"It is a provision permitting the Government to sell surplus commodities into our domestic markets at the market price, regardless of support levels, to pay off the certificates given farmers in return for voluntarily cutting back their production beyond the allotments to which they would be entitled under law.

"Neither the President's message nor the Secretary's testimony revealed this fact. Both indicated that the program would be financed out of the existing stocks, but neither revealed that their intent was to dump these commodities at any prices they would bring regardless of how much they depressed the existing market.

"It becomes apparent that they are more concerned about getting rid of Government holdings than they are about what happens to the farmer.

"Anybody in the commodity trade will tell you that this single action will be the greatest price depressant for prices of basic farm commodities yet invented. If such a measure is pressed further and enacted, you can expect sharply lower prices for major grains.

"The sad part about it is that this administration brainchild would in the long run increase rather than decrease Government holdings.

"If the Government intends to sell its present holdings at lower than support prices, it only means that it will capture all the market from farmers and in turn have to take possession of all the farmers' commodities placed under loan at higher levels. It would just be a vicious circle, of everything having to go through Government hands to be sold back cheaper to the trade. I doubt very much if any buyer would be foolish enough to buy at higher prices from the farmer if he knows he only has to wait to get the same commodities at the administration's fire-sale bargain counter."

Senator HUMPHREY explained that the present law prevents the Commodity Credit Corporation from selling its stocks at less than 5 percent above the support level, plus interest, unless they are in danger of deteriorating. The administration bill provides for removing that 5-percent restriction, but then goes even further to exempt from any limitation the sale of any amount of commodities necessary to pay off the soil-bank certificates, he added. It is the latter proposal that Senator HUMPHREY vigorously protested as sabotage of the entire farm program price-support loan concept.

"Every action this administration has taken since it has been in office has tended to depress farm prices, and thereby drive more stocks into Government hands. It was too good to believe that the bold, new program would be any different—and now the truth is exposed. Once again, the administration is embarked on driving farm prices still further downward. The only difference is that the former objective was supposed to have been to force some farmers out of business. NOW, the objective is just getting rid of stocks in the Government's hands—regardless of the consequences upon farmers.

"Strangely enough, it is entirely contrary to everything this administration has preached about 100 percent of parity in the market place. Now, apparently, they want to determine themselves just what the farmer should get in administered prices and drive the market place down still further.

"When they talk so glibly about paying for removing the surplus with the surplus itself, what they are really saying is that they want to pay for it out of the pockets of farmers—out of their already depressed income, by driving it down still further.

"After having lowered farm prices, increased surpluses, and driven thousands of farmers off the land, the administration now proposes that the farmers still remaining pay the bill for the failure of its farm program and its administrative bungling.

"This new formula will result in crippling the free market, lowering farm prices, and lowering the boom on the Nation's farmers," Senator HUMPHREY said.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to be clear. So far as

the junior Senator from Minnesota can recall—and I will keep the RECORD open for any corrections—all the Senators who introduced the administration farm bill repudiated that particular section when they found out what kind of a provision had been placed in the bill for financing the soil bank. That was an act of honor and intelligence on their part. I commend them for thinking in terms of the public interest, rather than being victimized, so to speak, by a measure which did not carry out what they thought was in it.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Minnesota mentioned something about Secretary of Agriculture Benson going around the country talking about the mess which he inherited. Can the distinguished Senator tell the Senate and the country how much farm prices have declined in more than 3 years under this administration, and how much, in comparison, farm costs have risen?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have that on page 22. I have a long speech to make. I intend to document the farm case. It will take a little time to do so, because there has been so much misinformation that even when one has the truth it is necessary to take a little time to study it.

The total net farm income has declined 29 percent. The increase in the cost of farm operations I shall get to in more detail, but answering the question broadly now, most of the manufactured goods farmers use have risen 4 or 5 percent in price. That does not include the increases in taxes and interest, and the largest single increase is in interest.

Do my colleagues remember the day Ezra Taft Benson raised interest rates on emergency disaster loans? Interest—— this administration has had a price-support program for bond brokers and bankers ever since it has been in office. The first thing it did was to raise interest rates. Interest rates have not flexed one bit; the administration wanted them high, and rigid.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator not include power trusts as a group for whom the administration has had a program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I could expand the area of friendship and affinity of interest to many groups.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that when the President directed the preparation and execution of the Dixon-Yates contract, he proved he not only was in favor of fixed price supports, but was in favor of at least 125 percent of parity, provided it was for the benefit of a select few rather than for the farm families?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma is so right that there is not a man alive who would even think of disputing what he has said, because the record is replete with the very unfortunate and unhappy facts of the Dixon-Yates fiasco.

Mr. KERR. Therefore we can fully assume, at the beginning of the discussion, that the administration is not against fixed price supports and is not against 100 percent of parity or more, provided it is for the benefit of the designated few who are the especially favored of the administration. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is so right. I should say that, with few exceptions, there is an exclusive class in the group of the favored few wherein the farmer is not to be found.

I have another matter I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues. The New York Times of this morning carried a very interesting news story, to which some reference was made earlier today. The news story is by one of the most able, noted, and distinguished reporters, Mr. William M. Blair. The date line is Washington, February 28. I shall read parts of the news item:

> WASHINGTON, February 28.—Ezra Taft Benson announced today that the Government would put all Federal-owned surplus cotton on the world auction block, effective August 1.
>
> The Secretary of Agriculture said also that he had offered southern Democratic Senators a higher support price for cotton in return for their support of the administration's flexible price-support system.

A little further down in the column, the following appears:

> Both actions by Mr. Benson were expected to have explosive effects. His recital of dealings with southern Democrats appeared certain to set off new political fireworks as the Senate moved toward a showdown vote on the bitterly contested farm issue.

I would not want to say that what I am engaging in now is fireworks, but I intend to light a match and throw a little light on the subject.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Might it not be an entirely worthy aspiration that it develop into fireworks insofar as the continuity of the present administration and the Secretary of Agriculture is concerned?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed.

Mr. KERR. The Senator would not be averse to building a little fire under the Secretary of Agriculture, would he?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not now or in the future. Let me say I would not be averse to having a fireworks display now, although I usually wait until the Fourth of July.

Mr. KERR. Nor would the Senator be averse to adding a little fuel to the fire which he believes is burning, would he?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to add the fuel of facts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the New York Times to which I have made reference be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

BENSON TO OFFER SURPLUS COTTON IN WORLD TRADE — FOREIGN PROTESTS EXPECTED — HIGHER PROPS PROPOSED FOR SOUTH FOR FARM BILL AID

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, February 28.—Ezra Taft Benson announced today that the Government would put all Federal-owned surplus cotton on the world auction block, effective August 1.

The Secretary of Agriculture said also that he had offered southern Democratic Senators a higher support price for cotton in return for their support of the administration's flexible price-support system.

[Reports of the surplus-disposal plan sent cotton futures tumbling as much as $3 a bale in heavy selling on the New York Cotton Exchange. In Liverpool, some futures dropped the daily limit permitted by market rules.]

A protest was registered immediately by Egypt, one of the world's leading cotton producers. A spokesman at the Egyptian Embassy said his government was most unhappy about the administration decision. "We consider it a very unfortunate step at this time."

Mr. Benson said the new program would seek to recapture "our share" of the cotton market through sales of surplus cotton at world competitive prices. This is a step long sought by many southern Members of Congress and some cotton interests.

DUMPING IS DENIED

Both actions by Mr. Benson were expected to have explosive effects. His recital of dealings with southern Democrats appeared certain to set off new political fireworks as the Senate moved toward a showdown vote on the bitterly contested farm issue.

The competitive sale of all surplus cotton was regarded as likely to cause worldwide repercussions among countries that already have protested strongly the administration's surplus disposal methods.

Mr. Benson decried intentions of dumping cotton or other products to force down world prices. But, he said, the new cotton program is "notice to the world that we're not going to continue to hold an umbrella over world markets."

He referred to the Federal price support program that has held American cotton prices above world levels. He set an export goal of "somewhere in the neighborhood of 5 million bales a year as our share of the world market."

Exports totaled 3,500,000 bales for the fiscal year that ended last July 1. Exports for the current year have been estimated at less than 2,500,000 bales.

Nearly 12 million bales of cotton valued at more than $2,100 million are tied up under Federal price supports. Under a special program, cotton is being sold abroad at 6 to 10 cents a pound below domestic market levels. This program was started with an offer on January 1 to sell at competitive prices 1 million bales of low-grade cotton. More than 890,000 bales have been sold to date.

In instituting the special program, the United States promised other countries it would not sell more than the 1 million bales between January 1 and August 1.

These major farm front developments were accompanied by a reiteration from President Eisenhower today that he would not compromise on the flexible versus rigid price support issue in this election year.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, Senate Republican leader, said the President had "made clear" that he stood solidly behind the flexible system at a White House conference with Republican congressional leaders.

SOUTHERNERS NOT NAMED

Mr. Benson declined at his press conference, the first in several weeks with Washington newsmen, to name the southern Democrats or other Members of Congress with whom he had talked. But he named three Democrats about whom, he said, "it was rumored" that they might switch from rigid to flexible supports. All are from major cotton-producing States. Their names had been put forward previously as possible "switches" by farm organization lobbyists on Capitol Hill.

They were Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, of Mississippi, and Senators JOHN J. MCCLELLAN and J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas.

Mr. Benson's statement was elicited by a reporter's question on whether he had made any commitments, oral or written, to any Members of Congress in return for their support of flexible price supports. He answered:

"I have had some very frank discussions with some of them but so far as making firm commitments, there hasn't been a word written. We have just talked and I have talked very plain and very frank as to what I thought was needed, particularly in the case of cotton."

Pressed for a definite answer as to whether he had made any commitments "oral or otherwise," he replied, "Well, I don't know."

He then said he had told the southerners of the need for "flexibility in the cotton support program" and "what we would be willing to do in this Department" if flexibility was obtained.

He said, "we would be willing to move the adjusting support level" by a smaller amount if he obtained adjustments in the price and in the staple length upon which price supports were based.

"And we have even talked in terms of what amounts," Mr. Benson added in referring to what the support level would be if the Southerners were willing to grant concessions.

Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND gave a clue to the situation only yesterday in a speech in the Senate floor. He said be believed that the support rate on cotton for this year "will be fixed at a reduction in price of less than 3 cents a pound." This reduction was necessary, he said, to place "cotton in a better competitive position" with synthetic fibers.

He coupled this statement with a conviction, that the administration probably would support legislation to fix a minimum cotton acreage allotment for 1957 to 1958 to prevent a 1,500,000-acre cut next year. He thought the floor under cotton would be 17,391,000 acres, the national allotment for this year.

Mr. Benson said the price support of parity mentioned by Senator EASTLAND was a little high. Mr. Benson said 86 percent of parity might be a better figure. Cotton was held at 90 percent last year, the first year of operation for flexible supports.

Prior to the adoption of flexible supports, 90 percent of parity was mandatory for cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and peanuts. The Senate bill would restore this fixed level to these so-called basic crops.

Parity is a Federal standard designed to assure farmers a fair return for their products in relation to purchasing power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to read parts of the article:

Mr. Benson declined at his press conference, the first in several weeks with Washington newsmen—

He has been away from Washington. He has been having conferences at Des Moines, St. Paul, San Francisco, and other places. He has been out of the city, explaining the farm program, so he has not been here to have these conferences.

Mr. Benson declined at his press conference, the first in several weeks with Washington newsmen, to name the Southern Democrats or other members of Congress with whom he had talked. But he named three Democrats about whom, he said, "it was rumored" that they might switch from rigid to flexible supports. All are from major cotton-producing States. Their names had been put forward previously as possible switches by farm organization lobbyists on Capitol Hill.

Then he goes on to name our colleagues.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Neither Senator from Texas is included?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, the Senator from Texas is not included.

Mr. DANIEL. Neither Senator from Texas is included.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Neither Senator. I protest Mr. Benson's indicating that he can make any kind of offer which will in any way change the vote of any of our colleagues. I think what he was trying to say was that he had such a wonderful policy and program to offer that he switched their votes.

I happen to know that one of those Senators had his mind made up a long time. In fact, I know of two of them, and I am sure the third is going to stand with us on 90 percent of parity price supports.

I should like to remind the Secretary of Agriculture and any other official of the Government of the fact that this is the administration which seems to think there are arrogant lobbyists running around. My colleagues may remember that in the President's veto message of the gas bill he mentioned the arrogance of certain interests, and the administration suggested that there are lobbying activities which should be investigated. There are 1 or 2 lobbies which they might investigate in their own shop, such as Executive lobbies.

Mr. President, in the United States Code, under title 18, section 1913, there is a section under the heading "Lobbying With Appropriated Moneys," which reads:

No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service * * * telephone * * * or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Whoever, being an officer—of the United States, or of any department—thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment.

There have been many Members of Congress who have been quite disturbed by what they consider to be the lobbying activities of the present administration.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. On the basis of what he knows to be the facts, with reference to vigorous lobbying by certain representatives of the executive branch of the Government, would the Senator think that when the President uses the term "arrogant" with reference to lobbyists, his application of it is based solely on whether or not the lobbying coincides with his viewpoint or can be found in his official family?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There seems to be a good deal to show that is true. I should like to point out that, as I said earlier, Mr. Benson, in his press conference, makes quite clear what he is trying to do. He is trying to split up the votes in the Senate, and I want my friends from any section of the United States, particularly from the South, to know that one of the ties which has bound together the North and the South, particularly the Midwest and the South, is our great agricultural economy. We have had a great deal of identity of interests. The Secretary is moving in. He is offering a special corn program deal, a special cotton deal, and other suggestions here and there—anything to break down the provision before the Senate for 90 percent of parity.

I shall in a moment read from the report of his news conference. I think what I am saying is most moderate, and temperate. I wish to say again that I refuse to believe that the votes of any of my colleagues are for sale or barter to this administration or anyone else. I think it is about time we hammered that home. I do not think that minimizes the reflection Secretary Benson has cast upon some of our colleagues by naming them and stating that he expected them to switch their votes as a result of his attempts to influence them.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not perfectly and dramatically apparent that he is trying to divide and conquer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator took the words right out of my mouth. I was about to say it is part of Benson's tactics to divide and conquer. He has been trying to use Senator against Senator. For a long time the laboring man was used against the farmer and the farmer against the laboring man. Now we see the tactics of arraying farmer against farmer.

I read from the Secretary's press conference of February 28, which was reported stenographically by the Federal Reporting Service, in reply to questions as to whether he had made any kind of commitments on any commodity to any Members of Congress:

I have had some very frank discussions with some of them but so far as making firm commitments, there hasn't been a word written. We have just talked—

Mr. President, the written word seldom appears if we are trying to get at lobbying. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not entirely possible that the facts the Senator is now laying before the Senate would form a basis for indicating at least the possibility that the special committee which was recently selected by the Senate might look into the actions and statements of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was going to put a statement in the RECORD. I was about to say that reports of what Secretary

Benson has said he has done or attempted to do come mighty close to indicating infringement of at least the spirit of the statute to which I referred earlier, namely, title 18, section 1913, lobbying with appropriated moneys—close enough to make it appear necessary to let our new Special Committee on Lobbying look into it closely.

I wish to continue reading from the transcript. The Secretary said:

We have just talked—

Speaking of visiting with Members of Congress—

and I have talked very plain and very frank as to what I thought was needed, particularly in the case of cotton.

In answer to another question the Secretary said:

Well, I don't know. We have gone quite a ways, in which I pointed out what I thought was necessary, and expressed the hope they would go along with that kind of a program, including getting some flexibility in the cotton-support program.

Asked as to whether or not he had made any firm commitment, he said:

Well, I have made no firm commitment. You can put it that way. I have discussed possibilities, and what I thought would be a reasonable thing to do, and what we would be willing to do in this Department.

The Secretary of Agriculture should be the Attorney General. This is lawyer's language. He says "what we would be willing to do in this Department."

That is not a commitment. It is what he is willing to do, which means, "Perhaps you can push me up a little more."

We would be willing to move in this direction if we could get some adjustments in price supports and staple length.

What the Secretary is saying, in substance, is, "We would be willing to move up the price supports on cotton as close to 90 percent as you can get it, so long as you do not say '90 percent.' "

Then he says:

We are going to discuss the staple length.

I will say to my friend from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] that this has quite an effect on Texas. It has quite an effect on Oklahoma. It has quite an effect on Arkansas. We do not raise cotton in Minnesota, but I do not intend to allow the Secretary to divide me and the people I represent in the Senate from our friends in the great agricultural areas of the Southwest and the South. The moment we start to pit cotton against wheat, beef against soybeans or flaxseed, or dairy products against some other products, we become divided, and we have no farm program.

This administration has not believed in an effective price-support program. I have said publicly, and in the confines of our committee, that responsible officials in the Department of Agriculture have said openly that they did not believe in price supports. Those who are administering this program do not believe in price supports. I regret to have to say this, but even if we write the best law the human mind can conceive, if this administration remains in power and Secretary Benson remains on the job, it will be so poorly administered that it will be ineffective. No law is any better than its administration. We may have all the laws necessary on the books to prevent crime, but unless there is a good enforcement officer, a good chief of police, crime will be rampant. We may have a weak law on the books, but if we have a diligent, persevering administrator, good results will be obtained. There is much power in the present law which has not been used. There has not been the will to use it.

Listen further to what the Secretary said in his press conference:

We would be willing to move the adjusting support level at a smaller amount than though we didn't get those things—

That is not a very clear sentence, but I think we can get the idea—

We would be willing to move the adjusting support level at a smaller amount than though we didn't get those things; and we have even talked in terms of what amount.

What the Secretary is saying there is that if he gets what he wants, he is perfectly willing to move the price supports up just a little more, so that they will be palatable.

Let me say to my colleagues, who are here representing their areas and their States, that they should do the best they can, as they see it, for their respective States. They have problems. There are many problems in the cotton industry. But it is not the privilege of the Secretary of Agriculture to create an air of doubt over what we, as Senators, are going to do in connection with this bill.

Furthermore, if the Secretary had any proposals with respect to any particular commodity, he, or his representatives, should have appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If they had anything in particular they wanted to say, 15 members of the committee were sitting day after day and night after night to hear from them. Is it not interesting that this proposal is made only a few days before we vote on the farm bill? Mr. Benson is not much of a Secretary of Agriculture, but I take off my hat to him; he is some politician. He plays rough.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator mentioned something about Mr. Benson trying to divide Senators from the South and West—a very reprehensible act on his part. I wish to join the Senator from Minnesota, and say that I, for one, will not be taken in by that kind of strategy.

The Senator has also pointed out that Mr. Benson has tried to assign, as the cause for the farmers' plight at present, the fact that workers are getting increased wages. I point out that in New Orleans last September, Mr. Benson went so far as to say that the reason for the plight in which the farmer found himself was the fact that industry was making too much in the way of profits. How thin can he slice it? How much can he get away with? I think we should go into this question very thoroughly, as I am sure the Senator from Minnesota will do—and no one is better prepared to do so—and bring out the facts.

Let us bring out a few facts in connection with parity, high rigid price supports of 90 or 100 percent.

Is it not true that this administration—and the Senator from Minnesota and I voted for it because we believed in it—reintroduced the Brannan plan so that the woolgrowers of this country could get 106 percent of parity at the present time, and be entitled to as much as 120 percent of parity?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In substance that is correct. The principle of compensatory payments, which was the economic principle of the Brannan plan, is in the wool plan.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Parity for wool is 106 percent at the present time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It could go up to 120 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is nothing wrong with that. I am in favor of it. Why not put that principle into effect, so that it will be of some benefit to all other farmers?

We all know that parity means subsidy. If we are going to talk about a subsidy to the farmers, why not lay all the subsidy cards on the table and talk about subsidies to railroads, steamship companies, and airlines? Why not discuss the tariff, a form of subsidy which has been in operation for more than 150 years in the interest of businessmen? Why not talk about all these things? In effect, we are discussing the same subject. Why pick on the farmer, who, in the entire concept of our economic life, is the only segment whose income is going down and down? This administration, in the person of Secretary Benson, has said that the farmer can expect a further 6- to 10-percent decline this year. Why not do something to help the farmer, instead of using him as a scapegoat, instead of browbeating him and putting out propaganda publicity for the purpose of beating down the farmer and placing him in a bad light?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has placed his finger on something which should be discussed, and which we intend to discuss.

The American farmer has been far from the only recipient of beneficial programs on the part of the Government. I have before me a report from the Library of Congress on subsidy payments by the United States Government since 1940, pertaining to the Post Office Department, among others. More subsidy was paid on second-class mail last year than was paid out at any time, in any one year, in all the dairy program, to all our dairy farmers.

One would require a pretty good digestive apparatus to be able to eat a copy of the Reader's Digest and get much nutrition from it. However, one can eat butter and drink milk.

The Reader's Digest is a fine magazine. I am not complaining about the fact that three copies of this magazine can be sent through the mail at a lower rate than is charged on a letter which I write to my mother. I do not write to my mother as often as I should, perhaps, but she has never asked that the letters be longer.

In the February 1956, issue of the Reader's Digest is an article entitled "What To Do About the 'Farm Parity' Fiasco," written by Henry Hazlitt, and condensed from Newsweek. Mr. Hazlitt says:

> The myth of a farm crisis has been built up by the farm bloc in Congress.

Mr. Hazlitt, I hope you are here. If you want to find out about the farm crisis, take a little trip with me to Minnesota. First, you will see some beautiful scenery. Second, you will get some straight economic facts which you do not get out of an office, or out of your prejudice.

To put it frankly, this kind of article burns me up, Mr. Hazlitt goes on to say that—

> Certain farm groups, such as hog raisers, face special difficulties.

What delightful language that is. We can all understand, of course, that Mr. Hazlitt does not know the difference between a hog and a corncob, or he would not make the kind of statements made in this article. Perhaps I should say French poodle, because there seems to be some similarity there.

Then he writes:

> But gross farm income was running in the first half of 1955 at the annual rate of $33.7 billion, compared with an average annual income of $33.8 billion in the preceding 9 years.

Mr. Hazlitt should know that gross income is one thing, and net income quite another. In the preceding 9 years the prices that farmers had to pay for what they had to buy were very much less. Therefore, gross income gave a net profit. In the first half of 1955, the net profit was slim, indeed.

The tragedy of Mr. Hazlitt's article is that it was written by an economist. It is a good thing that Mr. Hazlitt did not go to the same school I attended, or he would have flunked the course. That is no way for an economist to write. If a Broadway actor wants to say something like that, that is all right, because he is used to exaggerating and to overdramatizing. However, an economist knows better than to talk about gross income in the first half of 1955 as compared with gross income for the preceding 9 years. One can lose his shirt on gross income. What should be considered is net income. That is what is used to pay bills and it is what profits represent.

After the first prejudiced paragraph, the article continues to expand and enlarge upon that general assumption. That is the kind of propaganda which has been broadcast over America. But, Mr. President, it is subsidized propaganda. It is subsidized distortion. It is subsidized misrepresentation.

I challenge any Senator on the floor today to defend that paragraph I have read from the article. The Government is paying the bill to send that kind of material through the mail. It is paying the bill for telling the American people a pack of lies, a pack of distortions. That kind of article puts farmer against city man, and city man against farming man.

When a person is riding in an airplane, and is being bumped around in rough weather, and is trying to hold on to his seat and read that article by Henry Hazlitt, and what Mr. Hazlitt has to say about the American farmers, he is angry in the first place for having taken the ride in the airplane, and then, as he reads the article, and tries to give the impression that he is not scared, he becomes even angrier when he reads about Senators trying to give a handout to farmers.

Mr. President, the only handout involved is the subsidy to a magazine which carries that kind of article.

I have asked the Post Office Department to give me the latest figures on subsidies. In 1952 the subsidy for such mail was more than $200 million. That is according to the Advisory Committee of the Post Office Department. I want the latest figures, Mr. President.

No segment of our farm economy receives an outright subsidy of $200 million. Not one segment of our farm economy receives that kind of subsidy. If we include all the commodities, that may be true, but it is not the case if we take one segment, and I am speaking of only one.

That is the kind of trouble we face, Mr. President. It is that kind of an argument we face, as we argue the case for agriculture.

By the way, Mr. President, to whom will the magazine publishers sell their magazines if people do not have enough money to pay for them? Farm people like magazines. There are a great many farm people in my area of the country, and they like to read magazines. We have a great many other people who read magazines and who do business with our farm population. When the people living on the farms are prosperous, the others are prosperous. When farm people have trouble, the others find themselves in difficulty. When farmers have good times, the other segments of the population have good times. All are in the same boat. Therefore we should not talk about a farm program or a farm problem, but, rather, about a national program and a national problem.

I should like to say to my friend the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the other day I said I was going to expose certain myths. For example, there is the myth of 90 percent high rigid price supports. Some people have taken 90 percent and have almost succeeded in making it a nasty phrase. We hear about a 90-percent mortgage guaranty on a house, and about a 90-percent guaranty on a loan. Oh, that is all right. That is wonderful. That is free enterprise. That is delightful. Then we hear about a 90-percent credit loan on a commodity to the American farmers. Oh, that is terrible. That is socialism. That is destroying the farmer's fiber, and it is bankrupting the country.

I should like to have someone tell me the difference between a 90-percent guaranteed loan on a house and a 90-percent loan on a commodity. Someone may say, "Oh, but farmers do not always pay back their loans." Well, that is not unique with farmers. A great many people have not paid their loans. They failed to pay their loans not because they did not want to pay them, but because they could not pay them. Farmers will pay off their loans if they make a profit. However, no living soul can pay off a debt if he does not make enough money with which to pay it off.

What happens when a man does not pay off a loan on his house? The person who loaned the money gets the property. That is exactly the way the Government gets the farmer's crops.

Someone will say, "Oh, yes, but in the case of a price-support loan, if the farmer can get more than 90 percent for his grain, he can sell the grain. On the other hand, if he gets less than 90 percent of parity for his grain in the open market, he can let the Government take it."

Well, Mr. President, when a man borrows money under a mortgage guaranty, in order to buy a $15,000 house, if he can sell the house for $20,000, the Government does not say, "Oh, no; you cannot sell it, because you have a mortgage for 90 percent." The Government, of course, says, "Go ahead, sell your house if you have a chance to make money on the sale." If the man cannot pay off the mortgage, what happens? The lender gets the house.

Mr. President, that practice is as old as the Statue of Liberty. It is thoroughly American. It has been going on for years. The only difference is that some people have taken the farm picture and have made it stand out as though it were a grotesque monster.

Since when do we consider 90 percent to be high when 100 percent is supposed to be level? Apparently the Department of Agriculture has been working from the bed of the Dead Sea. According to that kind of philosophy, 100 percent is fair and level.

Let us consider industry, labor, and farming. So far as industry and labor are concerned, 100 percent is all right for them. However, when we come to the farmer, we say to him, "You get 90 percent. If you can climb up the other 10 percent, that is well and good. However, we will not help you by giving you 100 percent. We will give you 90 percent. When prices drop, we do not want you to drop into the pit, and therefore we will give you 90 percent, and you can scramble up."

That is 90 percent. What is high about that? There is nothing high about it, unless we want to say that it is a little higher than 75 percent. What is fixed about 90 percent? What is the difference between a fixed price at 75 percent of parity and a fixed price at 90 percent of parity? They are both fixed. They are both set for a full crop year, and the parity is set every year.

What is more rigid?

I wish someone would use a measuring device which would show which is more rigid, 90 percent or 80 percent.

What is so rigid about 90 percent that is not rigid about 80 percent? What is so rigid about 90 percent that is not rigid about 60 percent? One is just as rigid as the other.

The truth is that parity itself is flexible. The parity is adjusted all the time. It is like a gyroscope. It is a balance wheel. It adjusts itself all the time. Parity is just another word for equity.

Parity is merely another descriptive term for the price the farmer gets for what he sells, as compared with the price he pays for what he buys. That is all it is.

The railroads are given parity rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Magazines get parity postal rates from the Post Office Department. Air lines get parity rates. Bankers get bank parity rates from the Federal Reserve System. Trade laws govern independent businesses. Wage laws are in effect for workers. We have unemployment compensation laws on the statute books. We have fair labor standards acts, Walsh-Healey Acts, Davis-Bacon Acts. We have every kind of act we can think of. What is the purpose of all those acts? The purpose is to accord equity, to provide balance, and to assure stability in our economy. However, for one reason or another, when a Republican administration comes into power, it cannot stand to have the same principle apply to farmers. That is the record. That is the sorry, full record.

I am happy to say that that is not the record of all my Republican senatorial colleagues. I want that to be made crystal clear in the RECORD. Some of them have stood the test. Some of them have fought hard for their people. They have put their country above their party.

However, that principle does not seem to work so far as the top command is concerned. I said the other day, and I will repeat it over and over again, that every time the Republican Party is in power, at least in the begining of its term, the New York stock market goes up, and the grain and hog and livestock markets go down.

A person could be asleep for 20 years. If he awakened after 20 years, even without reading the newspapers, but merely by looking at the grain market and the New York stock market, he could tell which party was in power. If the New York stock market was up and the grain market was down, he would know that the Republican Party was in power. He would not have to go to school to find that out, or make any extensive studies. He would just know that to be the fact.

I am not opposed to the New York stock market going up. That is fine. That is a part of our American enterprise system. However, I should like to see the other markets go up a little, too.

What seems to have been the philosophy of late, as Mr. Benson explained it, is that one of the problems of American farmers today is the labor cost. What he is apparently suggesting to the American farmer is, in effect, "Mr. Farmer, we have you down in the ditch. We realize that you are getting lonesome down there. Therefore we will get somebody down there with you. We will give you labor to keep you company. So we will put labor in the ditch with you." I suggest it is better to have everyone out of the ditch and up on the grand highway of American abundance, equity, fair play, and plenty. Instead of pushing one down and then looking for someone else to put down with him, because misery loves company, we should get the first one out of the ditch, and keep both out of the ditch.

It is not because the cost of operation has gone up too much that farmers are in trouble. It is not because some people are getting too much. The problem is that some people are getting too little, and those people are the farmers.

A few years ago I pointed out what was going to happen to agriculture. I said it on the floor of the Senate when I made my daily 5-minute remarks during the morning hour in 1953. I said then what would happen to agriculture. Look in the RECORD, Mr. President, and it will be seen that I predicted what would happen, and it has happened. Every time Mr. Benson made a speech he said things were now stabilized, but agricultural prices went down the next day. I have a full tabulation on that point. I shall not burden the RECORD with it, but it is here and available to any newspaper reporter or any Senator who wishes to see it. Every time the Secretary said the adjustment period was over and the decline had been stopped, prices went down the next day.

I recall, Mr. President, that there were those who scoffed when we talked about the possibilities of a farm decline and a farm depression. We were called prophets of doom and gloom. I remember that three of us were selected for treatment on that subject, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who took most of the abuse, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and myself. We were called prophets of doom and gloom, because we were pointing out what we thought might happen. Time after time I warned that when a farmer goes broke it makes little difference whether he is a Republican or a Democrat, he is just plain broke. He can have a paid-up membership in a local county Republican club, but when he goes into the bank the chairman of the Republican club is not going to say, "I love you so much that I am going to make you a loan." He will find out how much collateral the farmer has. A farmer can be a good Democrat, but if he is broke and goes to the local bank to ask for a loan, he will be asked, "What is your collateral? What do you have that is worth while?"

So, Mr. President, I only point out that when prices start to go down and income starts to fall, there is no party label upon the consequences.

So, Mr. President, it is not partisan politics we need to talk about in pointing to 1956 as a year of decision. It is legitimate farm politics I am talking about, the fight of American agriculture for survival, through the processes provided in our democracy for translating the will of the people into action, here in this legislative Chamber.

It is the insistence by farmers to be heard in this Chamber, and at the ballot box, if they cannot be heard anywhere else.

Mr. President, I predicted that Mr. Eisenhower would veto the natural gas bill. I thought he would run for reelection. I am predicting now to my friends on the other side of the aisle that if this Congress does not do something to restore our farm economy, there will be, come November, the greatest switch of votes at the ballot box this country has ever known. Farmers are not Republicans or Democrats; they are producers, and they will think of their own interest, as they should, and they will keep books on some of us. They will see how much we think of them, where we stand, and how much we are willing to fight for them.

I told my constituents what I was here to do for them, and I have been trying to keep my promise every day. My distinguished opponent used to say he wanted to go to Washington to help Ike.

I used to say, "Help Ike do what?"

He used to say, "I want to go to Washington to help Ike finish the job."

I said, "On whom?"

I said, "If you want to send somebody to Washington to lower your farm prices, he is the man."

These people kept their faith and trust in me, and I am keeping my faith and trust in them.

The welfare and economic well-being of our agricultural economy is so vital to the long range prosperity and progress of this Nation, and the ability and capacity of our country to give effective international leadership, that this issue can no longer be ignored or dealt with in indecisive or uncertain terms or policies.

We would be foolish indeed to forget the lessons of our history.

American agriculture still maintains a pivotal role in the total national economy. It is the keystone of our economic structure.

That keystone is crumbling, while men in high places in Washington utter pious phrases and slogans to hide their inadequacy or their stubborn unwillingness to meet the realistic needs of our time.

It is bad enough to be wrong, Mr. President, but it is worse to be righteously wrong. There are people who are just plain righteously wrong.

Let us squarely face the cold, harsh facts of our farm economy.

Farmers' total net income is down nearly one-third since 1952. Family farm purchasing power is down at least 25 percent since 1952. Farm population has been squeezed down 9 percent since 1952. The number of farms has been forced down 7 percent. Yet, the average-per-person income from farming, in our population, is down 19 percent.

What is worse, Mr. President, is that the young people are being forced off the land, the young GI veterans, the Korean veterans. They cannot stay on the land. I have an office full of mail from young men who have tried to farm, young men with college educations, trained at our best agricultural colleges. But they have had the price squeeze put upon them so hard that they cannot make it.

The farm population is growing older every single year. I think the average age is now approximately 57 years. Why? Because young men and young women in this day and age are not going to stay on the farm and be treated un-

fairly. They are going to go to the towns where they think there is a better chance, and where they may better their economic condition.

After years of struggle, farmers got REA so that some of the blessings of modern life could be brought to the farm homes. But, Mr. President, as I go along, I shall show the lack of modern facilities in some of our farm homes. When a young man finds that he has to buy high-priced machinery, high-priced land, and high-priced buildings at fairly high interest rates on long-term commitments, and then the price of his products drops out from under him, he is done. We are permitting them to be driven off the farms by sheer economic attrition.

That is the greatest single tragedy of the farm depression, namely, what has happened to the young men and their young wives and their young families.

The Secretary of Agriculture says, when he is on TV or at other places, that farm land values have not gone down. That is correct. Why? First of all, land values around the cities for the new suburban developments are considered to be in part land of the general farming area. Such land, which was about $100 an acre then becomes $2,000 an acre. It is all averaged in with sales of agricultural land.

Furthermore, many a farmer, when he saw what was happening to him, decided to expand his operations in the hope that if he could produce more he could save himself. I am going to show a little later that that is what farmers have been doing.

The administration said it was going to use the miracle formula, namely, flexible price supports, to solve the problem of supply and demand. It did not come anywhere near it. The supply is greater than it has ever been.

The flexible price-support program has not worked, and the price situation is becoming increasingly bad. Farm income and farm prices are still going down. This is the ray of hope to the young farmer: The prophecy for next year is that the situation will be about 6 percent worse than it is this year.

Then the administration wonders why farmers are up in arms. Imagine what would happen if the Secretary of Commerce said to the businessmen, "I am sorry for all you businessmen, but the situation is going to be 10 percent worse next year." He would not be liked any too well. I am quite sure we would hear at least some Senators saying, "We have got to have a change in policy to prevent this thing from happening."

That is what we in the Congress are now faced with—the responsibility of changing the direction of the course of agriculture so that we can move it up to its proper position.

Mr. President, hog prices at the year end were only 50 percent of parity, and the recovery flurry was short lived. They are headed downward again.

Mr. Hazlitt said they were having some difficulty. I do not know whether he wishes to call it difficulty or not, but if someone should cut my income in half, I would call it a major disaster.

There is not a Senator here from an agricultural State who has not received hundreds of letters from hog farmers telling them of the very dire circumstances they face.

Cattle prices continue at a level below 60 percent of parity, in many areas of the country.

Grain sorghums, oats, corn, rye, barley, cottonseed, and many other farm commodities hover at only 60 percent of a fair price.

Our parity index—the accepted standard of fairness in the relationship between prices farmers received and the prices farmers must pay—was down to 80 on January 15—the last report available.

Yet it was at 100, when the elections were held in November of 1952, and this country learned it was in changed hands.

In the face of this drastic and continued decline, Republican spokesmen have the effrontery even today of trying to point back before they assumed the helm of our Government and say much of the decline in farm prices came before they took office.

Perhaps such phrases sound good in Lincoln Day speeches to city folks, but they do not sound good to farmers. They would like to see Secretary Benson worrying more about conditions today than about conditions 3 years ago.

They know he got A in ancient history. They realize that. They would like to have him take a course in contemporary economics and see how he comes out.

Because it is their own pocketbooks which are hit, farmers know there is quite a difference between farm prices declining to 100 percent of parity, and declining far down under 100 percent of parity.

What a peculiar comparison the administration officials like to make. The Republicans say things were beginning to get bad even before they came in. It got so bad the farmer was getting 100 percent of parity. Would that we could be restored to such hard times again. Would that something would happen to get the American farmer back to 100 percent of parity.

The outlook is for more of the same for 1956—another 5, 6, or 7 percent decline. This is not merely my opinion; it is the official forecast from the annual outlook conference of the Department of Agriculture.

Farm prices are going to be still lower, it is said. Farm income is to drop even further.

In the midst of widespread national prosperity to which our colleagues on the other side of the aisle point with pride, farm families are having forced upon them the heavy hand of poverty.

While farmers total net income declined 29 percent, corporation profits after taxes went up 33 percent, dividends went up 19 percent, and interest increased 28 percent.

This is what some Republican economists and orators call the 50–50 treatment—1 horse to 1 rabbit—the farmers getting the rabbit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation of how farmers are doing, compared with other persons, as compiled from Economic Indicators, published by the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

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

How farmers are doing (compared with others)

[Billion dollars]

	1952	1955	Percent change
Corporation profits:			
Before taxes	35.9	[1] 44.0	+23
After taxes	16.1	[1] 21.9	+36
Dividends	9.0	[1] 11.0	+22
Interest	12.3	[2] 15.8	+28
Rental income	9.9	[1] 10.6	+8
Business and professional proprietors	25.7	[1] 27.8	+8
Compensation employees	190	[2] 219	+15
Weekly earnings manufacturing workers (dollars)	68	[1] 78	+14
Farmers' total net income	14.9	[1] 10.6	−29
Farmers' total net income	[1] 16.7	[1] 10.6	−37
Per family (1954 dollars)	2,806	2,120	−24
Number of farms (millions)	5.4	5.0	−9

[1] 3d quarter annual rate, seasonally adjusted.
[2] September 1955.

Source: Economic Indicators, published by President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this table is from official figures available to the White House. It is on one page. It can be read by everyone. It tells the sad economic story of what has happened to agriculture.

Mr. President, we have heard so much said about preferential treatment of farm people as compared with city people that I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation comparing the earnings of farm people with those of nonfarm people.

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

Do farm families get parity income? Average per family income from all sources

	1950	1951	1953
Farm operator families	$3,382	$3,959	$3,459
Nonfarm families	5,232	5,721	6,393

Source: Survey of Current Business (March 1955), published by Department of Commerce.

Middle family income[1] of farm families compared with other families, 1952

[Figures from Bureau of Census; in 1954 Statistica Abstract of United States]

City families	$3,678
Rural town and village	3,408
Farm families	2,011

[1] Half of families in group got more; half less than figure shown.

Income from all sources	1952	1955 [1]
Income per person of people on farms	$949	$896
Income per person of nonfarm people	1,832	1,960

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Farm Income Situation (November 1955, published by Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Middle family income[1] of farm families compared with other families, 1952—Con.

	1952	1955[1]
Farm people were	15.5 percent of national population.	13.4 percent of national population.
And received	8.7 percent of national income.	6.1 percent of national income.

[1] Preliminary based on 3d quarter 1955 annual rate seasonally adjusted.

Source: Farm Income Situation, published by U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the income per capita of those on farms has been falling, while the income per capita of nonfarm people has been rising. These figures are from "Farm Income Situation," published by the Department of Agriculture. They show that the income per capita of people on farms has been going down since 1952, while the income per capita of nonfarm people has gone up about the same proportion as the amount of the drop for farm people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two tables based on data from Economic Indicators, published by the President's Council of Economic Advisers, showing that farm family purchasing power has gone down 25 percent since 1952, and down 12 percent last year alone.

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

Family-farm purchasing power down 25 percent since 1952

	1952	1955[1]	Percent change in 3 years
	Billion dollars		
Farm operators' gross income:			
Excluding inventory change	$36.9	$32.2	−13
Including inventory change	$37.7	$32.5	−14
Farm production expenses	$22.9	$21.9	−4
Farm operators' net income:			
Excluding inventory change	$14.1	$10.3	−27
Including inventory change	$14.9	$10.6	−29
Per farm:			
Current dollars	$2,778	$2,120	−24
1954 dollars	$2,806	$2,120	−25
Number of farms (thousands)	5.4	5.0	−7
Average per-person income from all sources:			
Farm population	$949	$896	−6
Percent of nonfarm average	51.8	48.9	
Nonfarm population	1,832	1,960	+7
Average per-person income from farming: Farm population	$698	$568	−19
Average per-person income from nonfarmers: Nonfarm population	$1,812	$1,939	+7
People on farms (millions)	24.3	22.1	−9
Nonfarm population (millions)	132.7	143.1	+11

[1] Third quarter, annual rate seasonally adjusted.

Source: Economic Indicators, published by President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Family farm net income and purchasing power down 12 percent from last year

	1954	1955[1]	Percent change
	Billion dollars		
Farm operators' gross income:			
Excluding inventory change	$34.0	$32.2	−5
Including inventory change	$34.4	$32.5	−6
Farm production expenses	$22.2	$21.9	−2
Farm operators' net income:			
Excluding inventory change	$11.8	$10.3	−13
Including inventory change	$12.3	$10.6	−14
Per farm:			
Current dollars	$2,413	$2,120	−12
1954 dollars	$2,413	$2,120	−12
Number of farms (millions)	5.1	5.0	−2
Per-person income, people on farms:			
From farming	$653	$568	−13
From all sources	$913	$896	−2
Nonfarm people: All sources	$1,837	$1,960	+7
Farm population (millions)	21.9	22.1	+1
Nonfarm population (millions)	140.5	143.1	+2

[1] Third quarter, annual rate, seasonally adjusted.

Source: Economic Indicators, published by President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, farm income cannot be separated from farm prices. Family farm income will not go up while prices are still going down. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks three tables showing the trends in farm prices on individual commodities, with the source of the figures used in each table designated thereon.

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

Prices received by farmers mostly down from pre-Korea base period

[Figures from Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA]

Commodity	1947–49 average	Oct. 15, 1955	Percent change, up (+), down (−)	Commodity	1947–49 average	Oct. 15, 1955	Percent change, up (+), down (−)
Wheat, bushel	$2.14	$1.94	−9	Beef cattle, hundredweight	$20.20	$15.30	−24
Rye, do	1.82	.926	−49	Calves, do	22.60	16.80	−26
Corn, do	1.64	1.14	−30	Wool, pound	.460	.540	+17
Rice, hundredweight	5.38	4.60	−14	Lambs, hundredweight	21.90	17.40	−21
Oats, bushel	.852	.591	−30	Sweetpotatoes, bushel	2.35	1.44	−39
Barley, do	1.37	.909	−33	All milk, wholesale, hundredweight	4.42	4.34	−2
Grain sorghum, hundredweight	2.53	1.63	−36	All chickens, live, pound	.293	2.204	−30
Baled hay, ton	22.40	20.50	−8	Eggs, dozen	.466	.429	−8
Butterfat in cream, pound	.712	.569	−20	Tobacco, types 11–37, pound	.420	.550	+31
Cotton, do	.312	.328	+5	Average of all farm products (index)	271	230	−15
Cottonseed, ton	71.60	43.50	−39	Food grains (index)	246	220	−11
Soybeans, bushel	2.84	2.08	−27	Feed grains and hay (index)	230	167	−27
Flaxseed, do	5.54	2.76	−51	All crops (index)	247	224	−9
Peanuts, pound	.102	.118	+16	Meat animals (index)	334	240	−29
Beans, dry edible, hundredweight	9.92	7.04	−29	Dairy products (index)	275	264	−4
Potatoes, bushel	1.48	.723	−51	All livestock and products (index)	292	236	−19
Hogs, hundredweight	21.90	14.50	−34				

Prices received by farmers mostly down since 1952 harvest season

[Figures from U. S. Department of Agriculture]

Commodity	Oct. 15, 1952 price	Oct. 15, 1955 price	Percent change up (+) down (−)	Commodity	Oct. 15, 1952 price	Oct. 15, 1955 price	Percent change up (+), down (−)
Wheat, bushel	$2.07	$1.94	−6	Hogs, hundredweight	$18.60	$14.50	−23
Rye, do	1.74	.926	−47	Beef cattle, do	22.00	15.30	−31
Corn, do	1.53	1.14	−26	Calves, do	23.80	16.80	−30
Rice, hundredweight	5.76	4.60	−20	Wool, pound	.50	.62	+24
Oats, bushel	.83	.59	−29	Lambs, hundredweight	22.20	17.40	−22
Barley, do	1.42	.909	−36	Sweetpotatoes, bushel	2.94	1.44	−51
Grain sorghum, hundredweight	2.87	1.63	−43	All milk, wholesale, hundredweight	5.30	4.34	−18
Baled hay, ton	25.60	20.50	−20	All chickens, live, pound	.242	.204	−17
Butterfat, in cream, pound	.735	.569	−23	Eggs, dozen	.504	.429	−14
Cotton, do	.3703	.328	−12	Average of all farm products (index)	282	230	−19
Cottonseed, ton	70.70	43.50	−39	Food grains (index)	240	220	−9
Soybeans, bushel	2.71	2.08	−23	Feed grains and hay (index)	219	167	−24
Flaxseed, do	3.73	2.76	−26	All crops (index)	260	224	−14
Peanuts, pound	.111	.118	+6	Meat animals (index)	328	240	−27
Beans, dry edible, hundredweight	8.48	7.04	−17	Dairy products (index)	316	264	−17
Potatoes, bushel	2.11	.723	−66	All livestock and products (index)	301	236	−22

Average prices received by farmers for farm products, United States

Commodity and unit	Dec. 15, 1954	Nov. 15, 1955	Dec. 15, 1955	Commodity and unit	Dec. 15, 1954	Nov. 15, 1955	Dec. 15, 1955
Wheat, dollars	2.12	1.94	1.95	Hogs, dollars	17.00	12.20	10.60
Rye, do	1.14	.897	.944	Beef cattle, do	15.20	14.10	13.50
Rice (rough), do	4.63	4.63	4.62	Calves, do	15.70	15.70	15.90
Corn, do	1.39	1.09	1.15	Sheep, do	5.69	5.37	5.51
Oats, do	.767	.605	.62	Lambs, do	17.50	17.20	16.50
Barley, do	1.09	.919	.920	Butterfat, in cream, cents	58.1	57.2	57.7
Sorghum, do	2.22	1.67	1.72	All milk, wholesale, dollars	4.33	4.43	4.35
Hay, all baled, do	23.30	20.80	21.30	All chickens, live, do	17.4	20.0	18.8
Cotton, American upland, cents	32.67	32.42	31.19	Farm chickens, live, do	14.3	17.8	17.8
Cotton, American-Egyptian, do	63.3	53.9	53.3	Commercial broilers, live, do	19.2	21.5	19.4
Tobacco, types 11-37, do	50.0	52.5	57.2	Turkeys, live, do	29.6	30.3	31.1
Cottonseed, dollars	59.60	44.30	45.00	Eggs, do	32.7	43.4	47.1
Soybeans, do	2.57	2.06	2.11	Wool, do	50.5	39.0	39.2
Peanuts, do	12.5	11.7	11.9	Adjusted for seasonal variation:			
Flaxseed, do	3.04	2.80	2.84	Butterfat, in cream, cents	55.3	56.1	55.0
Potatoes, do	1.05	.829	.817	All milk, wholesale, dollars	3.97	4.06	3.99
Sweetpotatoes, do	2.54	1.68	2.03	Eggs, cents	29.2	38.1	42.4
Beans, dry edible, do	8.34	6.96	6.80				

Source: Agricultural Prices (Dec. 30, 1955) published by USDA.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think my colleagues would be interested if I noted for the RECORD a few of the commodities. For example, take the 1947–49 average as compared with the October 1955, prices.

Let us take, for example, corn. Corn has dropped 30 percent. Rye has dropped 49 percent. Wheat is down 9 percent. Flaxseed is down 51 percent. Soybeans are down 27 percent. Cottonseed, per ton, is down 39 percent. All chickens, live, are down 30 percent. All butterfat in cream, per pound, is down 20 percent. Grain sorghums are down 36 percent.

The great State of Texas produces a large amount of grain sorghums. I am proud to be associated in the offering of an amendment by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and other Senators, including the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], which will do much for the feed grain producers. That amendment will be called up at the proper time. It would restore some of the balance in the feed grain price situation.

Mr. President, it is not pleasant for any Senator to witness a drop of 46 percent in the price of any single commodity of his State. Of course, Senators representing their constituencies will want to do something about this condition. I hope there will be enough support to have the amendment placed in the bill. We came very close to adopting it in the committee; in fact, if the amendment in the committee had been prepared then as carefully as the amendment which the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] finally prepared it, I am certain it would have been adopted in the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair). The present occupant of the chair appreciates the kind words of the junior Senator from Minnesota, and sincerely hopes the Senate will adopt the amendment we have sponsored.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure that if logic and reason shall prevail, the amendment will be agreed to.

While farm prices have been tumbling, prices paid by farmers have still been going up.

We have heard a great outcry from the Secretary of Agriculture lately, about the cost side of the farm cost-price squeeze. Yet it is interesting to note that costs have not risen anywhere near the percentage income and prices to farmers have fallen.

It would appear wiser for the Secretary of Agriculture to concentrate more on boosting farm prices and income to meet current costs, instead of trying to bring the rest of the economy down to the farmer's depressed level.

And of all the costs confronting the farmer, those rising the most have been interest rates and taxes. Between October 15 of 1952 and October 15 of 1955, for example, the index of interest paid by farmers went up 27 percent.

During the same period the index of prices paid by farmers for farm machinery went up only 4 percent.

If Mr. Benson is so worried about farm costs, perhaps he had better start at the point where costs are the greatest burden—and where Government policy can either ease or contribute to that burden. I am referring to interest rates. All I can recall Secretary Benson doing about interest rates is to raise them.

These interest rates are established in Washington by the Department of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board. I go back to some of the early days of this administration. One of the first things done by the Eisenhower administration was to raise the interest rates, which are price supports for money. The administration raised the interest rates in order to tighten credit. After the interest rates had been raised to the stratosphere, the administration said, "Now let us loosen up on the credit. Now that we have raised the interest rates, let the folks borrow all the money they want at the new high rates."

That is why the profits of the investment and commercial banks have been unprecedented under this administration. If any one of those fine institutions does not support this administration, it is an ingrate. Of course, such institutions ought to support the administration. Prior to the advent of the Eisenhower administration, they were doing well; they were getting rich. Now they are doing extra well and getting rich twice as fast. They, of course, ought to support this administration.

I myself would not accept their support. I am against their high interest rate policy. I would do anything I could to cut it down. This is no secret; I have said so privately and publicly many, many times.

All I can recall Secretary Benson's doing about interest rates is that he raised them. But he is the same man who said that the farmer was in a price-cost squeeze. One of the reasons why the cost of farm operations has gone up is that interest rates to the farmers have risen 27 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, a tabulation of the index of prices paid by farmers, taken from Agricultural Prices distributed by the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture.

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

Prices paid still rising—Index of prices paid by farmers

[1910–14=100]

Item	Oct. 15, 1952 [1]	Oct. 15, 1955 [1]	Percent change, up (+) or down (−), since Oct. 15, 1952
Taxes	353	409	+16
Interest	107	136	+27
Clothing	301	310	+3
Autos and auto supplies	282	292	+4
Farm machinery	310	321	+4
Farm supplies	284	265	−7
Building and fencing	350	365	+4
Fertilizer	157	152	−3
Household operation	190	198	+4
Motor supplies	157	163	+4
Motor vehicles	358	365	+2
Cash wage rates	506	518	+2
Household furnishings	276	271	−2
Building material, house	381	396	+4
Average production items:			
That farmers buy from nonfarmers	268	269	[2]
All items	269	246	−9
Average of family living items:			
That farmers buy from nonfarmers	274	282	+3
All items	269	274	+2
Average production items, interest, taxes: That farmers buy from nonfarmers	263	273	+4

[1] Or latest available data.

[2] Less than 1 percent change.

Source: Agricultural Prices, Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the tabulation I have placed in the RECORD is official Government information. Mr. Benson knew what these tables showed when he started to make speeches in which he tried to place the blame for the farm problem on the wrong people. He could have stated, for example, what his own departmental figures revealed.

The price of farm machinery has risen 4 percent since 1952. The cost of automobiles has risen 4 percent; clothing, 3 percent. The price of fertilizer has fallen 3 percent. Supplies are up 4 percent; interest up 27 percent; taxes up 16 percent. Those are the taxes which farmers paid for putting in new roads and building new schools in the consolidated school areas.

I sometimes wonder whether the speech writers in the Department of Agriculture ever get together on statistics with the statisticians or the economic advisers.

Mr. President, to give us a better picture of farm price trends over the years, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation tracing the average market prices received by farmers for various commodities back to 1929.

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

Average market price received by farmers

	1929	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1947	1949	1952	1955 [1]
Wheat, per bushel	$1.04	$0.38	$0.74	$0.85	$0.83	$1.03	$0.96	$0.56	$0.69	$2.29	$1.88	$2.09	$1.92
Barley, per bushel	.54	.22	.43	.69	.38	.78	.54	.37	.41	1.70	1.04	1.35	.90
Flaxseed, per bushel	2.81	.88	1.63	1.70	1.42	1.90	1.87	1.59	1.46	6.15	3.63	3.72	2.74
Oats, per bushel	.42	.16	.34	.48	.26	.45	.30	.24	.31	1.05	.66	.79	.56
Rye, per bushel	.86	.28	.63	.72	.40	.81	.69	.34	.44	2.26	1.21	1.73	.87
Sorghum grain, per hundredweight	1.32	.54	.91	1.70	.98	1.66	.88	.70	1.02	3.27	2.00	2.80	1.67
Beef cattle, per hundredweight	[2]	4.25	3.75	4.13	6.04	5.82	7.00	6.54	7.14	18.40	19.80	24.30	15.60
Beef calves, per hundredweight	[2]	4.95	4.64	4.92	7.16	7.20	8.10	7.90	8.40	20.40	22.60	25.80	16.80
Eggs (farm price), per dozen	[2]	.14	.14	.17	.23	.22	.21	.20	.17	.45	.45	.42	.44
Hogs, per hundredweight	[2]	3.34	3.53	4.14	8.65	9.37	9.50	7.74	6.23	24.10	18.10	17.80	15.70
Butterfat in cream, per pound	[2]	.18	.19	.23	.28	.32	.33	.26	.24	.72	.62	.75	.57
All milk, wholesale, per hundredweight	[2]	1.28	1.30	1.55	1.74	1.93	1.97	1.72	1.68	4.27	3.95	4.85	4.16
Wool, per pound	[2]	.09	.21	.22	.19	.27	.32	.19	.22	.42	.49	.54	.40
Potatoes, per bushel	1.32	.38	.82	.45	.59	1.14	.53	.56	.70	1.61	1.28	1.96	.71
Soybeans, per bushel	1.88	.54	.94	.99	.73	1.27	.85	.67	.81	3.33	2.16	2.72	2.00
Cottonseed, per ton	30.93	10.35	12.91	33.03	30.54	33.30	19.50	21.79	21.14	85.90	43.40	69.60	43.70
Sweetpotatoes, per bushel	1.12	.47	.68	.75	.67	.92	.78	.70	.73	2.16	2.14	3.38	1.42
Lamb, per hundredweight	[2]	4.47	5.04	5.90	7.28	8.05	8.88	7.05	7.78	20.50	22.40	24.30	17.70
Rice, rough, per hundredweight	2.22	.93	1.73	1.75	1.60	1.84	1.47	1.42	1.62	5.97	4.10	5.87	4.50
Corn, per bushel	.80	.32	.52	.82	.66	1.04	.52	.49	.57	2.16	1.25	1.53	1.24
Peanuts, per pound	.04	.02	.03	.03	.03	.04	.03	.03	.03	.10	.10	.11	.12
Tobacco, per pound	.18	.11	.13	.21	.18	.24	.20	.20	.15	.44	.46	.50	.52
Beans, dry edible, per hundredweight	6.82	1.97	2.77	3.52	2.95	5.37	3.10	2.56	3.25	11.60	6.59	8.67	7.07

[1] September 15, 1955.

[2] Not available.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this table includes commodity prices up to September 15, 1955; and a most revealing document it is, too. Hog prices are lower this year than they were at any time since the period of the 1940's.

I could go on reviewing such depressing statistics for the next hour, and filling the record with supporting evidence. There are plenty more of them, and they are all bad.

I have made certain charges on the floor about the economic situation of those engaged in agriculture. I have supported my charges by statistics taken from official Government records. They are not merely my figures. They are the official statistics of the agricultural marketing service of the Department of Agriculture, and are taken from Economic Indicators, published by the President's Council of Economic Advisers. They have been made available for Ezra Taft Benson to read and study, just as much as they are available to me or to anyone else.

The simple truth is that every valid economic indicator confirms the fact that agriculture is in trouble—serious trouble. I know I need not prove this to our farmers in Minnesota, or the farmers in your home States. They know all too well, from personal experience. Their own bankbooks and farm records provide all the depressing statistics they need.

Yet, I am recounting them for the record for the sake of those skeptics who have stubbornly refused to demonstrate any concern as to what is happening to the foundation of our economy—the very bloodstream of our economic life out in the great Midwest, the Far West, and the South.

When some of us tried to warn the country 2 years ago where agriculture was headed, we were openly scoffed at. We were called "prophets of doom." We were assured everything was all right; it was just a "temporary adjustment," they kept saying.

That was done with regard to our foreign policy, too. This administration says, "Hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil. Just put on rosy glasses. Just smile. These things are not really happening," so the administration says. Everything is really going to be simply wonderful.

Well, the facts are to the contrary, and one does not have to be a pessimist to face the facts; he merely has to be a realist.

When propaganda machines are grinding out favorable comments about the administration and the President, setting forth how wonderful everything is, and how wonderful everything will be, I know it is pretty hard to say, "But look what is happening to agriculture."

The easiest answer is to say, "It isn't so," and then have publications like the Reader's Digest carry thousands of copies of distorted misinformation. There have been such articles in similar publications. The articles simply say it is not true.

After all, only about 13 or 14 percent of the people are now living on farms, so if one desires, if it is his will, he can ignore what farm people are saying and believe only what they want to believe.

That is what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was talking about earlier today with regard to our foreign policy. We are told that world conditions are much better, that they are all right, and we are told that continually, except that all the specific information leads us to believe conditions are not so good. Then when persons say they are not so good, they are told that they have no faith, that they have no confidence, that they are pessimists. Well, there is a difference between being a pessimist and being a fool. It is all right for people to face facts and then be a little pessimistic, but the man who refuses to face the facts is a plain fool.

The temporary adjustment to which I was referring is still adjusting, apparently—and always downward.

When we became even more concerned over trends a year ago, some people in high places still scoffed. We were already at the bottom of the decline, they said; everything was going to be rosy from here on out. It was all just politics, according to them—just an attempt to create a statistical depression. It was not supposed to be real.

Well, I ask my colleagues today: Have you asked the farmer in your State whether his loss of income during the past year has been real, or have you tried to convince him his shrinking buying power is just statistical?

That kind of fancy talk may be all right for appointive officers in the Department of Agriculture, but I doubt if many Senators can get by with it out among their farmer constituents.

Mr. President, I mentioned some time ago that I had some quotations from statements of the Secretary of Agriculture when he was painting a rosy pic-

ture. The first meeting at which he spoke was in St. Paul, on February 11, 1953. He said:

A drastic drop in cattle prices was in progress as we came into office. We hope you approved of the steps taken to stabilize the cattle markets.

Ten days later he said:

Markets have stabilized. People are again eating beef. The Department of Agriculture expects no major price changes for the next several months.

Of course, you know, Mr. President, that each week conditions became worse.

On April 7, 1953, at the Chamber of Commerce in Denver, Colo., the Secretary said:

Our analysts anticipate that prices of farm products during the spring and summer will be steady.

He ran out of paper. He should have said, "Will steadily decline." Then he would have been more accurate.

Then the Secretary said on October 21, 1953, at the National Retail Farm Equipment Association in Chicago:

There are soft spots in the agricultural economy. They are being firmed up.

Then at the annual convention of the National Grange in Burlington, Vt., the Secretary said:

This has been a difficult year. But I firmly believe that most of the price adjustments have now been made. The situation has become fairly stabilized. The outlook for next year is for continued stability.

Mr. President, since that statement was made, farm income has dropped about 18 or 20 percent. I think I mentioned the date of that last speech. It was in November 1953. In November 1953, parity was 90 percent, and the Secretary said that the outlook for the next year was for continued stability. A year later parity was 87. Stability sort of leaned to the port side, Mr. President.

A little later the Secretary said:

I believe 1953 has marked the turning point in the right direction.

That was December 16.

At the National Farm Bureau, in Chicago, Ill., he said:

Nineteen hundred and fifty-three has marked the turning point in the right direction.

I do not want to indicate that Mr. Benson thinks lower farm income is the right direction, but he was really quite a prophet at that point, in terms of the direction in which the farm economy was moving.

Mr. President, when we have a Secretary who thinks everything is rosy and jim dandy, he is not going to do anything. I have three pages of clippings from the Secretary's speeches, from 1953 through the middle of 1955. Every time he spoke he said, "It is just wonderful. It has been getting better. It has been stabilized. We are over the worst. The adjustment has been made."

I was in Des Moines, Iowa, in the latter part of October. The front-page story in that city was "Secretary Benson Says Price Decline Stopped."

Poor fellow. The next 2 days the Department of Agriculture announced that there had been another 2 point drop in the parity ratio.

I want to make a friendly suggestion to the Department of Agriculture. Why do not the speech writers get together with the economists and the statisticians? I think there was a disservice done to the Secretary. Those who help write the addresses never check with the research division, and that puts the Secretary in a rather untenable position. He finds himself time after time predicting that everything will be well, and, of course, it turns out a few days later that the situation is a little worse than anybody anticipated.

For example, True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, on the 16th of November, 1954, at the conference of bank correspondents at the First National Bank, St. Louis, Mo., said:

Adjustment problems of farmers will be less severe in 1955 and for the years ahead.

Well, 1955 was about the roughest year farmers ever had. I hope Mr. Morse never goes into the prognostication business. Those bankers must have been pretty unhappy with him. That would have been a better speech to have been made to people who are a little more willing to have some inaccuracy govern their lives.

Then we note that on February 1, 1955, a little over a year ago, Mr. True D. Morse, speaking at Lexington, Ky., said:

The most drastic adjustments are over.

That is not the way the cattle and hog farmers of my State feel. Hog prices in February, 1955, were fairly good. The cattle and hog producers started to be hurt about the summer and fall of 1955.

The loss has been real enough for the thousands of farmers who have been forced to the wall.

It is real enough, too, for the small town businessman who has felt the decline of farm purchasing power.

And, at long last, it appears real enough to scare some previously unconcerned public figures who now see another election around the corner.

But all these charts I have submitted for evidence are just statistics, and national averages, one may say. Perhaps they present a distorted picture.

Out our way, we were not satisfied with just looking at USDA statistics, particularly when officials of even the USDA did not believe them enough to do anything about it.

Farmers are people, with the same desires, aspirations, and problems as anyone else. They work hard, earn as much as they can, do their best to keep ahead of the bills they have to pay, and hope to have something left over to send their children to college or provide some of the normal comforts of modern living accepted as commonplace elsewhere in our country.

One of the great Midwest cooperatives, itself making a constructive contribution to farm-family living by sound group marketing, set out to find out just how our farm families were getting along.

I am referring to the GTA family-farm survey, conducted by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, with which I am sure at least some of my colleagues are familiar.

It was a unique adventure on the part of a farmers' cooperative to get an actual audit of a cross section of family farms, as a basis for reexamining and reforming farm policy.

The main body of this report consists of the findings of a confidential and very careful survey of 4,321 farm operations. The survey avoided estimates in regard to receipts and expenditures in the farm business. Instead, it makes use of the very same data that farmers submitted to the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

It has required a full year to make and present this farm survey to the Congress and the public.

In my opinion, the survey fills a big gap in the Nation's knowledge of agriculture, and should be of tremendous value in shaping the necessary legislation to protect America's historic family-type agriculture.

The sole purpose of this GTA survey was to find out how the typical family-operated farms have fared in five Midwestern States, namely, the States of Montana, Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and South Dakota, during the 5 years from 1950 through 1954.

The findings primarily throw light on the trends in gross income, costs and net returns of the grain, livestock, and dairy farmers of the Dakotas, Montana, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

As M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the GTA, explains in his introductory remarks to the study before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

These findings help explain why, in the face of unprecedented national prosperity, we are witnessing the most rapid annual decline in farm population and in the number of family-operated farms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the body of the RECORD at this point some excerpts from Mr. Thatcher's introductory remarks for this survey, followed by a brief explanation of why the GTA survey was conducted, how it was conducted, and a summary of the facts revealed.

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

EXCERPTS FROM INTRODUCTION BY M. W. THATCHER, GENERAL MANAGER, GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION

"This rapid decline is the inevitable consequence of two powerful forces: (1) declining gross farm receipts produced in large measure by the policy of lowering price supports, and (2) a persistent advance in costs of farm production.

"The administration's farm policy, deliberately sold to the consumer as being in his interest, has forced farm prices down. Parity prices for many important farm products have been 'modernized' downward, and the Secretary of Agriculture has in virtually every discretionary action entrusted to him by the Congress lowered price supports.

"In large measure, you can trace the trouble in dairying, livestock production and grain farming to this price support cutting. This administration's program of flexible prices (always flexible downward) has lowered income wherever applied. It has taken income away from dairy farmers. It has

taken income away from hog and cattle producers who were induced by downward-flexed feed prices to produce beyond market requirements, tumbling real prices of livestock to the lowest levels in 20 years.

"The persistent advance in farm costs is due to the ever-expanding power of business, manufacturing, finance, transportation, and labor over the prices of their products, aided by State and Federal legislation as well as by their own powerful organizations. There is no foreseeable hope whatever that this trend will be reversed. Every official forecast is for further increases in the price farmers must pay for nonfarm goods and services.

"The GTA survey findings for the years 1950–54, inclusive, verify our fears for the survival of family-type farming as we now understand it. And it appears, that, when we complete tabulations of 1955 farm cost and income records, the results will show a further setback for farmers. Furthermore, based on the Department of Agriculture's own estimates, the situation will be even worse in 1956.

"As you review the material and graphs relating to these findings, you will find that the stated objective of Congress—to provide parity income for farmers—has not been realized. On the farms in this five-State area there is clearly a farm recession, and a state of anxiety approaching that of the thirties.

"Based on the survey, the farm families of this area are in economic danger. Our findings lead us to believe that—

"Only the largest family farms can survive under today's prices and even these will not be able to maintain their farms and homes as they have been.

"Medium and small family farms will either be heavily mortgaged or lost to big operators.

"Only a few more years like the present will eliminate many of the younger farmers, many of whom are GI's trying to make a home for their growing families.

"Congress must act quickly or we shall see a further substantial decline in the number of farm families and a further rise in large-scale farming. We believe this would not be in the best national interest."

WHY THE GTA SURVEY WAS CONDUCTED

GTA is dedicated to serving farm families. That is its only reason for being. Consequently, it has always worked for national policies to enhance the take-home pay of the family-operated farm.

GTA, in carrying out its obligations to its patrons, speaks out aggressively on legislation affecting farmers. There has been and is a lack of information on the financial situation of family-type farming. To meet this need, GTA conducted an intensive survey to find out how the average farm family in the Northwest is doing. These findings are now available to the public and to Congress, an essential information in considering what should be written into the farm policy of this Nation.

The findings of this survey make up the body of this report. Here is information long needed. The survey answers such questions as these:

1. What has been happening to gross-farm receipts on farms in the Dakotas, Minnesota, Montana, and Wisconsin since 1950?

2. What has happened to farm costs of production and why?

3. What has the typical family-operated farm been earning on the capital it has invested in the farm plant and on the labor put in by the farmer and his family?

4. How do these earnings compare with rewards for capital, labor, and management in other occupations?

5. What are the reasons for the accelerated decline in number of family farms and the continuing rise of large-scale farming?

6. To what extent are farmers living on their depreciation allowances?

7. What is going to happen to farmers' ability to hold on to their farms if the level of farm prices is pushed down still more?

8. What has happened to the purchasing power of farmers' take-home pay?

9. What do farmers have in the way of home facilities and how does their standard of living compare with that of city people?

10. What do farmers need in the way of farm improvements, repairs, and equipment as a potential market for industrial production?

The answers to these and other questions are contained in the findings of this survey. They show the precarious condition of the typical family-operated farm in these States producing grain, livestock, and dairy products. The results of the study enable us to judge the economic and social impact of current national policy aimed at bringing down the level of farm prices still further.

HOW THE GTA SURVEY WAS CONDUCTED

From the outset, the board of directors and management of GTA were determined that the survey be expertly planned and conducted to get the real facts as to what was happening to the family-operated farm. It was a painstaking task in which guesses as to farm receipts, expenses, and net income had no place.

GTA dedicated a considerable sum of money to make possible a careful job. To draw up the questionnaire (a copy of which will be found at the end of this book), great care was taken. Economists from several State agricultural colleges and elsewhere, experienced accountants and survey specialists discussed and decided upon the questions to be asked.

To direct the assembling of the information, a well-known firm of certified public accountants, Strand & Roe, of Minneapolis, was retained.

It was decided that it would be necessary to go right out into the field and talk to farmers, face-to-face, about their farming business. It was decided, too, that the Federal income-tax reports filed by farmers would be the basic source of information as to how the farm family was getting along, the first time this has ever been done.

The tax returns provide data as to money receipts from the sale of farm products, even greater detail as to actual out-of-pocket expenses, and the reserve set aside for depreciation. This material, obtained from the tax return, is the hard, factual core of the survey.

The field auditors, on the average, spend about a half day with each farm family, usually going over records right at the kitchen table. The four-page questionnaire also secured additional facts on the farm family's investments, debts, inventories, facilities, hours worked, ages of members, and other social data.

These auditors were farmers carefully selected on the basis of ability. They were given intensive training to assure accuracy in obtaining the needed information. At the close of each day's work, the interviewer forwarded his completed questionnaires for the day to the GTA home offices in St. Paul. Name sheets were removed, and each questionnaire given a number so as to respect the confidential character of the information. Electronic tabulating equipment was used to speed the compiling of accurate tabulations of findings.

In order to obtain typical family farms that would be representative, it was decided to conduct the survey in 6 counties in each of the 4 States, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and Montana. In Wisconsin, five counties were covered. Small-sized farms of 30 acres or less were not included.

Care was taken to choose counties that would best give information on typical family operated farms and an accurate portrayal of average conditions for the State as a whole.

In the counties in 4 of the States, cooperation of about 11 percent of the farms was secured. (Montana, 12.1 percent; North Dakota, 11.6 percent; South Dakota, 11.3 percent; Minnesota, 8.4 percent.) In Wisconsin, where farms are more numerous, a 4.5 percent representation in 5 counties was obtained. All counties had larger samples than are usually statistically required for adequate representation.

A SUMMARY OF THE FARM SURVEY

This survey was made during the first half of 1955. Very detailed reports for the 5 years 1950–54 were made for 4,321 farms in Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana. This is one of the Nation's best farming areas, with a large part of the national production of livestock, dairy products, and grains. Only family operated farms were selected, and they were larger than average in the 29 counties sampled. The sample represents 10 percent of the farms in the selected counties.

1. For 1954 these typical better-than-average family farms had well under half of parity returns as compared with returns to city labor and city businesses of similar skill or investments. Long hours of labor by wives and children are being donated without pay, and capital amounting to scores of thousands of dollars going unrewarded. The returns for 1955 will undoubtedly be lower, and for 1956 still lower yet.

2. Income from 1954 operations (including food raised for home and before paying any income tax due) was only $2,531, about $200 per month, or $50 per week.

3. This income came from some $8,400 from sales and home use of farm products, less $4,600 operating expenses and $1,300 depreciation charge to maintain farm equipment.

4. The average investment required to farm was $42,000 including a farm home with insurable value of $5,000 and some $14,000 of equipment and stock. In early 1955 debts of some $4,000 stood against this average farm. The investment varied from an average of $26,000 in the lowest counties to $115,000 in the county having the highest average.

5. The farmer, his wife, and children from the age 8 up, reported work on farm production totaling over 5,000 hours during 1954. Reducing the labor required to the barest minimum for efficient, able-bodied men, the farm family put in the equal of 3,300 man-hours, with much more on dairy farms. This is at least 75 percent more than the standard city work year of 2,000 minus sick time and holidays other than 2 weeks vacation.

6. Income for 1954 would return only 77 cents per man-hour with no return for a $42,000 investment. This is well under half the average factory wage in this area of $1.70 per hour. Or if only 5 percent is allowed as a fair return on investment, then only $449 remained as pay for labor performed, or 14 cents per man-hour. Returns from city businesses are yielding over two times as much on a similar investment. Neither estimate of farm returns includes anything for highly-skilled management of businesses with assets ranging from around $20,000 to over $150,000 apiece. Private farm management services for this purpose would cost from $500 to $1,500 depending on size of farm.

7. The returns for 1950–54 show depressed conditions throughout the entire period except for limited areas in years of exceptional yield. Prices received by farmers have gone down while everything they must buy has gone up. Farmers have increased production to attempt to make ends meet, thereby driving prices still lower. 1954 returns were about 25 percent lower than

1950, itself a badly depressed year for farmers. Further price declines in 1955 and indicated for 1956 will make these income figures still smaller, and raise the size of mortgages.

8. As of the time of survey, farmers reported they needed an average of about $5,000 per farm for repairs, new equipment and new buildings needed for farming.

9. Many farm homes were lacking some of the most essential facilities, such as running water or central heating, which have been enjoyed by city people for a generation or longer. Insurable valuation of farm homes indicates many new homes are needed and very few have been built since 1920. Average needs for housing and home equipment are 2 or 3 times what is needed for farm production.

10. If farmers were making fair income, they would provide a tremendous market for capital goods, estimated to be at least $5 billion just in these 5 States.

11. The low incomes brought about by low prices, as revealed by this survey, go far to explain the startling loss of farm homes now shown by the 1954 United States census. In these 5 States, between January 1950 and the fall of 1954, 38,000 farm homes have disappeared. That means one family in 13 gave up trying to live the life of their training and choice. In 1955 more farm homes have disappeared, and the prospect for 1956 is bleak. Our figures show that even the bigger-than-average family farms are in difficulties.

12. Nearly half of the farms had been taken over since the war by their present operators. Now, many older men are near retirement. With present depressed conditions, their farms will go to the biggest operators instead of to younger men. Many more farm homes will be wiped out unless drastic steps are taken to aid family farms.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just asked and received consent to have the descriptive material relating to the GTA survey placed in the RECORD. That includes a summary of the farm survey, a description of how the survey was conducted, and a section relating to the introductory remarks of Mr. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Grain Terminal Association. I have the survey in my hand. It is an excellent document. It is authentic. The description of how the survey was conducted will reveal that a substantial sum of money was expended to hire certified public accountants to make an analysis of the income tax returns from 1950 through 1954, and some in 1955, so that the accurate economic picture could be developed.

Mr. President, I commend this entire survey to my colleagues for careful study. I understand copies have been made available to each Senator. Others can be provided to those interested in knowing just what is happening to our farm families in these five Midwestern States.

The summary already placed in the RECORD shows that the average investment of the 4,321 farms studied was $42,000, with an average of 3,300 manhours of labor put in annually on each by the farm family.

Yet the income from 1954 operations, including food raised for home and before paying any income tax due, was only $2,531—about $200 per month, or $50 per week.

That seems to me not to be a very adequate profit. How many Senators would be satisfied with such a return on a $42,000 investment, plus 3,300 manhours of work?

I wish Mr. Henry Hazlitt, or anyone else who has made snide, half-truth comments about American agriculture and its economic difficulties, would look over this document.

To doublecheck this study and determine if it is really typical of our midwestern farms, the representative character of the selected counties and the GTA's distribution of farms surveyed, by size of acreage, was compared with 1954 census figures.

Mr. President, I would like to place at this point in the RECORD a table showing that comparison.

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

Comparison with census for countries, distribution of farms by size

[Percent]

	GTA survey	Census
Montana:		
30 to 259 acres	5	9
260 to 499 acres	11	13
500 to 999 acres	27	25
1,000 acres and over	57	53
North Dakota:		
30 to 259 acres	9	17
260 to 499 acres	37	36
500 to 999 acres	39	33
1,000 acres and over	15	15
South Dakota:		
30 to 259 acres	27	36
260 to 499 acres	35	33
500 to 999 acres	22	17
1,000 acres and over	16	14
Minnesota:		
30 to 139 acres	16	23
140 to 219 acres	37	34
220 to 499 acres	41	38
500 acres and over	6	5
Wisconsin:		
30 to 139 acres	38	50
140 to 219 acres	39	31
220 to 499 acres	22	18
500 acres and over	1	1

Mr. HUMPHREY. It will be found that the figures which were developed in the GTA survey were all on the conservative side, as compared with the Census Bureau figures of the Department of Commerce.

That table reflects fairly close agreement as to distribution of farms, according to size, in each of the States surveyed. Another comparison usefully made was between the average value of land and buildings as given by the census, and the averages obtained in the GTA survey for the selected counties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed at this point in the RECORD a brief table showing that comparison, and a third comparison between the census and GTA survey distribution of farms according to the value of products sold in 1954.

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

Average value, land and buildings, 1954

	GTA survey	Census
Montana	$47,000	$56,000
North Dakota	24,000	23,000
South Dakota	31,000	31,000
Minnesota	27,000	25,000
Wisconsin	17,000	13,000

Distribution of farms by value of products sold in 1954

	Value of products sold, 1954	Percent of farms	
		GTA survey	Census
Montana	$250 to $2,499	3	11
	$2,500 to $9,999	46	49
	$10,000 and over	52	40
North Dakota	$250 to $2,499	5	21
	$2,500 to $9,999	75	65
	$10,000 and over	20	14
South Dakota	$250 to $2,499	3	18
	$2,500 to $9,999	65	61
	$10,000 and over	32	21
Minnesota	$250 to $2,499	6	18
	$2,500 to $9,999	72	61
	$10,000 and over	22	21
Wisconsin	$250 to $2,499	11	11
	$2,500 to $9,999	82	70
	$10,000 and over	7	19

Mr. HUMPHREY. A final comparison was made between census data and the GTA average expenditures listed for gasoline and oil, for feed, for equipment, and for rental, for the surveyed counties. Because these comparisons emphasize the validity of the sampling for the rest of the GTA, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this other comparative table appear at this point in my remarks.

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

Average expenditures, gasoline and oil, 1954

	GTA survey	Census
Montana	$1,051	$955
North Dakota	848	788
South Dakota	769	709
Minnesota	591	561
Wisconsin	367	325

Average expenditures for feed and equipment rental, 1954

	Feed expenditure		Equipment rental	
	GTA survey	Census	GTA survey	Census
Montana	$236	$503	$275	$687
North Dakota	204	376	133	310
South Dakota	502	690	315	408
Minnesota	1,029	1,347	204	238
Wisconsin	903	908	143	166

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only purpose of the tables is to ascertain the validity and accuracy of the statistical information which is now presented in the GTA family-farm survey for the years from 1950 through 1954.

While the income and expense figures revealed by this GTA survey are significant enough, I want to emphasize, Mr. President, that they are based on 1954 earnings.

Every indicator we have shows that these farm people were hit even harder during 1955.

Among the many fundamental facts about family-operated farms emphasized in this comprehensive survey was the large investment required in land, buildings, machinery, and inventory in crops and livestock.

The minimum investment required for farming today is large compared to what is required for substantial city businesses which support their owners on a level far above any to be found on the farm.

Just as families cannot farm without an investment, so they cannot stand this increased overhead when prices are by design forced to drift or drop to lower levels.

The heavy investment required in modern farming presents the typical family-operated farm with the kind of problem many faced in the early 1920's and early 1930's. In those decades, many farms were heavily mortgaged and then went bankrupt, pulling banks and other businesses down with them when prices were allowed to collapse.

The necessarily heavy investment in farming today holds an even greater threat in a period of declining prices than did the heavy mortgages in the 1920's and 1930's. Farmers can go broke much faster today than ever before.

Another significant fact was developed by this study, regarding the length of time the farm-family operator has been on the farm being surveyed.

They found that as of the first part of 1955, 65 percent of the farms surveyed were taken over since 1940. By now, this percentage is above two-thirds. About 20 percent of the farms had been occupied since 1940–44, and 45 percent during the 10-year period, 1945–54. As the survey itself comments:

Thus, many of the typical family farms are committed to investments made during the last 10 years of high land values and high capital costs. A sustained higher price level is as vital to these and all farmers as a sustained wage level is to industrial workers and a sustained consumer income level is to business in general.

I think this is a very important fact, and it should be well understood. It is not fair to compare the drop in farm income today with the drop in farm income in any other period, primarily because the investment involved in a farming operation today is an investment which was accumulated during high cost periods. Therefore, if prices are not a fairly high level, there is no chance in the world for the farmer to survive.

It used to be that a young man could enter upon farming in Minnesota, back in the 1930's, for $2,000 or $3,000 working capital. No young man or young woman would think of going into farming today without a minimum investment of from $10,000 to $15,000. We figure, on the average, that a reasonably good amount of capital with which to start a farm in our State today is $20,000. The farmer must buy high-priced equipment. He cannot pasture his tractor. He must have gasoline or fuel oil. So any drop in farm prices and farm income can have disastrous consequences.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing when farmers occupied present farms in the five States covered by the survey.

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

When farmers occupied present farms

	Before 1940	1940–44	1945–54
South Dakota	31.2	21.1	47.7
Minnesota	32.1	18.5	49.4
North Dakota	36.7	23.2	40.1
Wisconsin	37.0	16.8	46.2
Montana		18.8	40.2
5 States	35.0	19.9	45.1

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the GTA survey also shows the lack of opportunity for young people to start in farming, and the resultant increasing percentage of older farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point a portion of the survey entitled "Family Type Farming Declines."

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

FAMILY TYPE FARMING DECLINES

The widening gap between farm and nonfarm income, the inadequate returns for capital and labor, as shown on the farms surveyed by the GTA, throw much light on certain revelations of the 1954 agricultural census, particularly those relative to the decline in the number of family-operated farms. Those Americans concerned with preserving the family farm as a necessary basis of American life, have had their fears greatly heightened by the more-than-usual decline in farm population since 1950, and the continued rise in large-scale farming. The failure of the family farm to hold its own in the face of sagging prices, rising costs, and limited acreage, clearly spells a decline in the number and position of owner-operated family farms. This is always the result when the cost-price squeeze in agriculture makes it more difficult or impossible for farmers to hold on.

Farm population is shrinking much faster than ever before. It has always done so relatively, but in recent years there has been an absolute decline of startling proportions. Between the depressions of 1921 and 1930, farm population declined from 32,123,000 to 30,529,000, or at the rate of 150,000 per year. Between the depressions of 1932, and 1942, farm population declined from 32,393,000 to 29,234,000, or at the rate of 316,000 per year. The first 2 years of our participation in World War II took nearly 4 million people out of agriculture, or at the rate of 2 million per year. Between 1949 and 1954, the farm population has declined from 25,954,000 to 21,890,000 or at the rate of 813,000 per year. This is a sharper decline than in any peacetime period.

In the five States surveyed by the GTA, as well as elsewhere, this decline in farm population shows up also in a decline in the number of farms. Wisconsin shows a drop of 9 percent in the 5 years, 1949–54; South Dakota a drop of 6 percent; Minnesota a drop of 8 percent; North Dakota, a drop of 5 percent; and Montana, a drop of 6 percent.

This shrinkage in the number of farms has resulted in an increase in the size of farms, particularly among the larger farms. In Montana, where 1,000 acres is not a large farm on dry land, the number of farms with 1,000 acres or more has now risen to about 40 percent, compared with 34 percent 10 years ago. In North Dakota, the proportion of farms of 500 acres or more has risen from 45 percent in 1945, to 51 percent, and in South Dakota the proportion has risen from 30 percent to 34 percent.

Undoubtedly, family-operated farms, as well as others, have increased their holdings in recent years, but we do not know to what extent. Judging, however, from the distribution of farms by size of income, we infer that most of the increase in large-sized farms is not typically family operated.

In Wisconsin, the 1954 census shows 3.7 percent of all farms with gross receipts over $25,000, compared with only 0.7 percent in 1949. Minnesota shows an increase from 1.3 percent to 2.5 percent. In North Dakota, the percentage rose from 2.3 percent to 2.9 percent, and in Montana, from 6.8 percent to 10.6 percent.

The GTA survey shows the lack of opportunity for the young people to start farming has a great deal to do with the increase in size of farms. With very low returns and high investment needed, only established farmers can take over available land. The GTA survey found only 1 or 2 farms per 100 operated by farmers under 25 years of age, and only 14 percent to 21 percent under 35 years of age. On the other hand, 18 percent to 21 percent were between 55 and 64 years old, and 6 percent to 12 percent over 65.

Age of farm operators in GTA survey

[Percent of all operators]

Age	Wisconsin	Minnesota	North Dakota	South Dakota	Montana
Under 25	1.9	1.0	0.9	0.9	2.1
25 to 34	11.8	16.1	16.5	20.2	17.9
35 to 44	32.8	31.9	28.2	27.2	30.4
45 to 54	24.7	26.7	30.0	25.3	21.1
55 to 64	20.6	18.1	18.4	18.7	16.2
65 and over	8.2	6.2	6.0	7.7	12.3

Soon, most of the farm operators over 65 years of age will be retiring on such savings as they may have and on social security. In 5 years perhaps as many as one-sixth of all farms will be taken over either by a new farmer, or one already farming. If present conditions are not greatly improved, young people are not going into farming, so this large acreage will go to others already farming to enlarge their holdings. If present trends continue, most of this land will go to the biggest operators to make them still bigger, thereby further weakening the position of family farms.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I commend the reading of the survey to my colleagues, because it shows what is happening to the family-type farms of America. I should like to quote one sentence from the survey, as follows:

Soon, most of the farm operators over 65 years of age will be retiring on such savings as they have and on social security. In 5 years perhaps as many as one-sixth of all farms will be taken over either by a new farmer, or one already farming. If present conditions are not greatly improved, young people are not going into farming, so this large acreage will go to others already farming to enlarge their holdings. If present trends continue, most of this land will go to the biggest operators to make them still bigger, thereby further weakening the position of family farms.

Mr. President, a great deal has been said about family farms. I do not suppose anyone can say how many acres comprise the average family-size farm. The best way we can identify a family farm is to say that that kind of farm is run by a family, that a family operates it and tills the soil. Perhaps it is done

with the help of one hired man. That is a family farm. That family farm has been the backbone of rural America. It has been the backbone of every State in the Union.

Do Senators know what is going to happen to the country if the number of family-size farms continues to diminish? It will mean that the small towns—where boys and girls have an opportunity to grow into manhood and womanhood—will be finished. It will mean a greater concentration of population in metropolitan centers, with all the problems which come with metropolitan living. It will mean that the little church one sees on the crossroads will be just a shell of a building, with no congregation. It will mean that the local government institutions—the small township governments that have been so important to the whole experience of democracy—will be obsolete and will no longer form an institution of government.

It will mean that the good, wholesome, challenging experience of living in the rural areas of America will be done away with.

I have been somewhat perplexed by our Government's policies relating to agriculture and to foreign relations. Many Senators heard President Gronchi, of Italy, speak at a joint meeting of the House and the Senate today. The President of Italy pointed out that the Italian people have made considerable progress in their land-reform program.

What did he mean by that, Mr. President? He meant that in Italy, in order for free government to survive, they have got to go back to the family type of farm; have got to get away from the big feudal estates, the big plantations. All over the world where democracy has been extinguished or real freedom never lived, it will be found that there is a land pattern which approximates the old feudal baronies of the middle ages. Wherever there is a country which is trying to become free and democratic, one of the first actions of the government is to break up the landed estates. General MacArthur did a magnificent job of that in Japan. That was the first task to which he set himself.

In South Vietnam we are having some of the best experts of this Government breaking up the land holdings, that the French colonial system had, as a pattern of agricultural activities.

Every country that is in trouble, or every country where freedom does not live, has a land pattern of large land accumulations, small baronies, so to speak, and huge estates. In some places they are privately owned.

In Russia they are owned by the State. It does not make any difference whether it is state collectivism or private collectivism, it is still collectivism.

The only difference is that when it is state collectivism, the government collectivizes it, and when it is private collectivism it means that some economic lord collectivizes it. This Government is spending many millions of the taxpayers' dollars to establish family farming all over the world, taking dollars away from our own farmers to send experts all over the world, to make loans and grants to get family farming. Right here in the United States the same Government, by its policies, is destroying family farming. The same Government, by its policies, is aggravating the collection of land into larger and larger units, driving the young people elsewhere, making it unprofitable for young men and young women to live on our farms.

Ask a member of the State Department or of the International Cooperation Administration why we are spending money and sending people to country after country to divide up the land to have land reform, and he will say it is because it is sound political and social practice for those countries.

Ask this question: "Now, Mr. State Department, maybe those folks over in Italy could operate more efficiently at lower costs per unit of production if they had bigger land holdings."

What will the answer be? The answer will be, "That may be true, but it is more important that people live on the land and own the land on which they live than it is to have cheap production or efficient production."

Yet the same Government, in another department, will go out into the countryside and say that farming is big business. That is what one of the Assistant Secretaries said. He said, "We have to face up to it. It is big business." Very frankly stating that the family farm is on its way out.

Representatives of the Department of State are going around the world and telling people, "What you need to do is to have family farms. We will help buy them. We will send people to show you how to get them."

Perhaps those are some of the people that the same Government has driven off the farms in the United States who are being sent overseas.

If anyone can make any sense out of this jumbled mess, I wish he would give us a logical statement as to our policies.

Of course, it can be pointed out that it may be more efficient to have a 2,000-acre farm with huge machines and hired help, frequently hired Mexicans, Jamaicans, imported labor; all too frequently. We can produce commodities at a lower unit cost, but what do we do to people? What kind of a country are we going to have if this is the way we are going to act, if this is the policy we are going to pursue?

Mr. President, I have never defended the family farm on the basis that it can produce a commodity at less cost than can a big operation. I am not interested in cheapness. I do not want cheap agriculture, cheap people, or a cheap country. There is something else in life than being efficient. We can look through the Old Testament and the New Testament, Mr. President, the Sermon on the Mount, and the Ten Commandments; we can look through every book of Holy Scripture, or the writings of Thomas Aquinas or John Locke; we can go back to the writings of Socrates and Cicero, and come down through the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation, and the Constitution of the United States, but we will never find the word "efficiency." That word has been made "holier than thou" by the Republican National Committee.

I want all students of Holy Scripture to show me one word in the Bible about efficiency. There is a great deal about justice and love; there are words about compassion and charity. There are words about evil and good. But the word "efficiency"? No. That is not there, because efficiency is a byproduct. We do not seek that as our main goal. We seek the good life; we seek a sound social structure and a good social order.

Mr. President, if some of the policies now being pursued are continued, we will drive thousands and thousands of people off the land in the States of Mississippi, Minnesota, and others of our States.

Where will those persons go? There are already serious social problems and economic problems in many of those areas. The cities are already overcrowded. Where is the tenant farmer going to go, whether he be white or black? Where will he make a living? He does not want to go on relief. But if we continue the present kind of program and policy now being pursued, he will have to go on relief. He will be in the cities, living in hovels in the slums.

A man can live on a little farm. He may not make too much money, but he can breathe fresh air. He can bring up his family under good, wholesome conditions. He can go fishing and not have to fish in a polluted stream. He can have a place for his children to work rather than to loiter on the streets. Family farming has something to it besides dollars. It is a way of life. It is important to have enough dollars to sustain the farm and to provide some of the necessities and a modicum of the luxuries of life.

This Senator has always worked on the theory that if some people are entitled to 2 months in Florida or in the Caribbean, or somewhere on a yacht, then everyone is entitled to 2 weeks in a rowboat. Up my way we like to go canoeing. If men are willing to work—and if there is any group of people who work hard it is our farm people, who work hard and long—I happen to believe they are entitled to at least a fair shake, that the cards ought not to be stacked against them, and that one thing they should have a right to expect is a spokesman in this Government for their interest.

One of the reasons why I am speaking today, Mr. President, is because there are people in Minnesota who believe in me, and I will not let them down. I receive letters by the hundreds. Here is one which I picked up at random, which says, among other things:

> We have heard plenty of speaking over TV by Benson giving his side of the story, favoring flexible support. Now let's hear the other side.
>
> Would appreciate it if you would give a talk on 90-percent supports and a general discussion of agriculture. We heard you

talk at Albert Lea and again at Waseca. We feel that you are one of the best speakers to do this.

Sincerely,

HENRY WALSER,
Minnesota Lake, Minn.

I have thousands of letters, Mr. President, and I serve notice on editors, publishers, and commentators that when they start picking on those people they have got a bear by the tail, namely, HUBERT HUMPHREY, because I intend to fight for their interests. I know those people. They have never asked for a free ride in their lives, and they have never received one. But they are not asking to have the train derailed half way down the track, either, and have to get out of the debris of the wreck.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a report from Buckeye, Hardin County, Iowa, stating that they went on record last week as favoring 90 percent price supports and compensatory payments on perishable commodities. There are 132 farmers in Buckeye Township, and of that number 118 signed the petition.

These are folks who get together and talk over their problems. They are people who know their land. Most likely they have a mortgage on it, too, but they are working the land and are trying to pay off the mortgage. They are people who are doing their own talking. They did not have to read that two-bit ad. Of course, it cost a lot more; I was only giving its qualitative worth. Those people did not have to read that ad about Ike's nine-point farm program. They had 10 points before Ike ever thought about a farm program. These farmers have been farming the land in the Midwest for generation after generation.

If Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Benson could see the mail I am getting, believe me, Mr. President, they would know there was something afoot in that section of the country. I cannot read some of the mail into the RECORD, because the rules of the Senate prohibit my doing so. These are modest, temperate persons, but they have a full head of steam on right now.

One farmer sent me a three-point program, and started out by telling me he had always been a Republican, but he now had three points for a farm program: Vote Democratic, restore 90 percent of parity, and fire Benson. I agree with all three points. That is a very good program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire document prepared by the 118 farmers of Hardin County, Buckeye Township, Iowa, printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BUCKEYE, IOWA.—While the debate in Congress rages over "flexible versus rigid" when it comes to price supports, 9 out of 10 farm operators in Buckeye Township, Hardin County, Iowa, went on record last week as favoring:

1. Ninety percent price support on storable commodities.

2. Compensatory payments on perishable commodities.

3. Whatever production controls would be necessary to achieve the first two objectives.

There are 132 farmers operating farmland in Buckeye Township. Of that number, 118 signed a petition addressed to their congressional representatives endorsing those 3 major objectives. The percentage is 89.4 in favor of the petition.

Five farm operators out of the 132 refused to sign the petition because they felt that the 90-percent supports were too high. Eight did not sign because they were either undecided or had no opinion. Three signed but said 90-percent supports were too low. One did not sign for "other reasons." Only 2 farm operators in the township were not contacted; 1 of these was out of the State when the poll was taken on February 22 and 23. Some operators living outside the township but farming land within the township were included in the survey.

The survey was conducted by teams of 2 farmers in each of the 9 school districts in the township.

Leonard E. Hoffman, Ellis Township farmer and seed grower, flew into Washington, D. C., on Sunday night where he is presenting the results of the survey to various members of the House and Senate where proposed agricultural legislation is now being debated.

The idea to poll Buckeye township grew out of a "cracker barrel" discussion among farmers congregated in the combination Buckeye post-office and drug store. The poll was not sponsored by any particular farm organization and Farmers Union, Farm Bureau, and NFO members all participated. A Farm Bureau spokesman, however, said that the big majority of those taking the poll were not bureau members.

Buckeye township has never been a strong Farm Bureau township. Wayne Halstead, Farm Bureau fieldman, said that there are 43 Farm Bureau memberships in the township at the present time and there would be more before the drive was completed. Last year there were 57.

Hoffman, who is on the State Farmers Union committee, said that there were 65 Farmers Union memberships in the township at the present time. Otis Liittschwager, Buckeye township farmer and former member of State PMA committee, served as chairman of the informal meeting which was held to organize the poll. Myron Thomas served as secretary.

At a followup meeting, it was voted by the farmers attending to have Hoffman present the results of the poll to congressional Representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture, and presidential assistant Sherman Adams.

The petition circulated read as follows:

"We the undersigned, all qualified farm operators in Buckeye township, Hardin County, Iowa, respectfully request that all Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress who are concerned with agricultural welfare thoughtfully consider the following petition for the good of both producer and consumer:

1. That 90 percent parity price supports be restored to all storable commodities.

2. That there be enacted into law a program of compensatory payments for all perishable commodities selling at less than 90 percent of parity, similar to that already in effect for wool and sugar.

3. That since the above proposals cannot be effectively administered without both production controls and a sound long-range soil-conservation program that will assure a continued abundance of food and fiber we pledge our support to such controls and conservation program. A good many farmers made some additional comment when signing the petition. One remarked that "in addition to controls some sort of cross compliance would be necessary."

One, not signed, said that "90 percent is too high; it will hamper our foreign trade."

One farmer said that "I am not in favor of 90 percent supports, but I do favor the soil bank 100 percent."

One farmer commented that he "wouldn't join the Farm Bureau because flexible price supports wouldn't work and 90 percent of parity would cost too much."

This is a breakdown of the poll by each of the nine school districts in Buckeye township:

	Number of farmers signing	Number of farmers believing 90 percent too high	Number believing 90 percent too low, but signing	Undecided or no opinion	Other reasons
1	15	0	0	0	0
2	10	0	0	1	0
3	15	1	0	0	0
4	7	3	0	3	0
5	13	0	3	0	1
6	18	0	0	0	0
7	14	1	0	1	0
8	16	0	0	0	0
9	10	0	0	3	0
Total	118	5	3	8	1

The farmers who conducted the poll were Dale Kellogg, Bennie K. Hall, V. R. Blome, M. E. Hyland, Gus Lettow, Henry Daum, Jr., Myron L. Thoms, Orville Knutson, Cecil O. Engelson, G. C. Kinney, Carl Brockett, Darrel Sielaff, Kenneth Berndt, Robert Hoffman, and Sig Halsve.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if any of my city friends think the farmers do not know what they are talking about, let them take time to read the resolution of these farm families. They know what is going on. They know what they are talking about. There may be a lot of support for flexible price supports, but it is not in that area.

I pride myself on being able to count. I have been in the rural areas. I can go for mile after mile in State after State and know that the overwhelming majority of the farm families are for 90 percent of parity. They are willing to accept control if only they can make an honest living.

I get a big bounce out of some of the surveys which are taken on flexible price supports. The interviewers will go to a beauty parlor and ask the operator, "Are you for flexible price supports or not?"

One would expect the beauty parlor operator, who constantly has to face the demand for long hair one year and short hair the next year, to be for a flexible price-support program.

The interviewers then ask an insurance salesman if he is for flexible price supports. The insurance man has read the Reader's Digest, Harper's Weekly, or Life magazine editorials. He bases his answer on such distorted information. I have in my folder such editorials from the leading newspapers in the State of Minnesota. I have a number of them. They are all for the Benson farm program. The editorial comment of the Minneapolis Star, the Minneapolis Tribune and the St. Paul Pioneer Press Dispatch are all for the Benson farm program.

Editorial writers know about as much how to operate farms as farmers know how to operate newspapers. Let anyone go into the country and get a farmer to write a good editorial on how to operate a newspaper. It will be just about as successful as the editorials are on how to operate farms.

The people of Minnesota have not been listening to the editorial comments of these newspapers—and they are fine newspapers. If the people had been paying attention to the editorial comments of those newspapers, I would not be here. As a matter of fact, if the people had believed the editorial comment of the newspapers, they would really have expected Eisenhower and Benson to give them 100 percent of parity, because that is what those newspapers said in 1952 would happen.

But I welcome the opposition of the press. When they start supporting the program which I favor, I shall begin to reexamine the program I am supporting. I would rather have one letter from a small farmer at home in Minnesota than 10 of these editorials. I have before me on the desk many nice letters. They really make me feel good. One letter says:

Please stick to the farm program you have now before the Senate. The President's and Benson's plan is not helping us small farmers. We have a 120-acre farm, started after the war as a GI.

Yours truly,

LEONARD SHERMAN.

Leonard, you can rest assured that I will stand by the 90-percent price-support program.

Here is a letter from Lakefield, Minn.:

DEAR SIR: The Senate Agriculture Committee turned out a good farm bill. It should be passed by a large majority. I would have liked to have corn kept as basic, and premium payments on hogs under 200 pounds up to $3 a hundred. I farm in Jackson County, Minn.

CLARENCE K. TALLMAN.

That county is on the Iowa border. It used to be hard to find there anybody who would vote on my side of the fence. It is not hard now, Mr. President. I have a fine group of friends there. I intend to be there, by the way, the coming weekend, in the vicinity of Albert Lea, in Jackson County.

Here is a letter from Walnut Grove, Minn., a lovely area of the State. It is an intriguing name. A lovely walnut grove is exactly what used to be there. The letter, addressed to me, says:

I am strongly against flexible price supports, which is endorsed by the Eisenhower administration. This program will create more surpluses and will lower our income.

I digress to say that that letter contains more sense than I have heard from five universities on the subject. I continue:

The Eisenhower 9-point program is all right (omitting flexible supports) for a long-range program, but will not help the farmer now when he needs it.

I am for the old parity formula, which will give us 90 percent of parity, as the old law states—not the new parity formula.

I would appreciate your voting for 90 percent parity and the soil bank program, providing that it will pay enough so we can take our acres out of production.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

DON E. ANDERSON.

WALNUT GROVE, MINN.

Listen to this letter from Paynesville, Minn. Paynesville is on the highway, off from St. Cloud, in west central Minnesota. It is a fine community and has one of the finest schools in the State. The letter, signed by Lionel G. Reeck, says:

The soil bank is of little value in keeping me on the farm unless I get parity for corn, dairy products, chickens, hogs, feed grains, and beef. This I do so hope you will inform other Senators from other States about.

Mr. Reeck, that is what I am doing. There are not many Senators in the Chamber to listen, but Mr. Reeck's statement will be in the RECORD. I continue:

Basic commodities must be supported at parity, including corn, according to the old parity formula, and production payments direct to the farmer, not the packer or chain store for perishables. I know you are fighting for us, and after Worthington, I've repeatedly told farmers that we can be ever so glad and thankful we have a Senator HUMPHREY with us. Keep it up.

Mr. President, that makes me feel good. I receive a great many letters like that. This man attended the farm hearings at Worthington.

This is a letter from Francis Senden, of Marshall, Minn.:

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I wish to thank you for the fine job you are doing, according to price supports, and the farmer as a whole. But as Secretary Benson has the farm situation all messed up, I am sure many of our farmers will have to quit and sell out, including myself. In fact, there has been a farm auction sale where the young man had to sell out. I hope that you will keep up the good work and fight for the 90 percent on basics.

Mr. Senden, you can rest assured that I will keep up the fight.

Here is a letter from Fred Wyells, of Marshall, Minn.:

I have been a farmer all my life, and in the years before we had price supports, about the time a farmer was getting along pretty well financially, the speculators and big business would cause a crash, and we would have to start over again. I know with high support prices we are protected against such wide fluctuations.

You know how a farmer's income is dropping; and if something isn't done soon, we will undoubtedly have one of the worst depressions we ever had.

Hoping you will vote for high support prices,

Sincerely,

FRED WYELLS.

Fred, you can be assured that that is what your Senator will do.

Marshall, Minn., is in Lyon County, one of the finest farming areas in the United States. If Senators ever have occasion to go to Marshall, Minn., they will see one of the finest, most up-to-date modern towns they have ever laid eyes on. There is a good baseball team there, too.

This letter is from Victor Schilling, also of Marshall, Minn. He says:

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am writing to thank you for the fine way you have been representing the farmer all along, and to say I believe it imperative that we have rigid supports returned if we are going to avert a national financial catastrophe.

I am of the opinion it is a national disgrace to allow many of our GI's to be sold down the river as farmers, after the sacrifice they made during the war.

Respectfully yours,

VICTOR SCHILLING.

Here is a letter from Mahnomen, Minn.:

DEAR SIR: This is a letter to let you know how much many, many farmers around Mahnomen and also the business people appreciate all you are doing for them. We sincerely hope this farm bill will be passed with at least 90 percent of the old parity formula.

Thank you.

Mrs. J. L. LOCKWOOD.

MAHNOMEN, MINN.

Here is another letter from Mahnomen, Minn.:

DEAR SENATOR: Would like to add our voices to encourage you in your efforts on behalf of the hard-pressed farmers of this country.

We believe in, advocate, and desire 90 percent (at least) support prices on all commodities, the old system of figuring parity on the basics, a ban on imports of commodities now in surplus.

From a gathering of some 300 last night, perhaps not more than a dozen people will write to express themselves, but there was no doubt that sentiment for these provisions in a farm bill was almost unanimous.

Be of good cheer—we're behind you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. SAM PASKEWITZ.

I am of good cheer, Mr. and Mrs. Paskewitz.

Mr. President, I have in my hand another letter from Martin County, at Grenada. Martin County is in southern Minnesota. I have been in Martin County. I have visited the county fair. I have stood in the fairgrounds and have shaken hands with the farm people and visited with them. I think I know a little bit about the county.

Mr. President, I hope it will not sound too immodest if I say that I have traveled every highway and byway, and every country road in Minnesota. If the folks would not come to listen to me, I would go out to talk to them.

Many times I have stopped my car, crawled over a fence, gone into the field, and talked to farmers. I do not have to get my agricultural information from the Reader's Digest.

I have in my hand a letter from Grenada, Minn., in Martin County, which reads:

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: I want to compliment you on the fight you are putting up for the farm program.

I am inclosing figures on my corn allotment for 1955 and 1956 on my 80 acres. If you can use them to any advantage, you are welcome to do so.

Wishing you the best of everything.

Yours sincerely,

R. S. HOLLAND.

I am asked questions about the soil bank and what benefits the farmer will receive. I mention a few of these letters because every one of them receives a personal answer. If I have to stay up every night until 5 o'clock in the morning, I shall answer letters. I pride myself on answering my mail. I do not give my constituents a blanket reply; they get personal answers. When they write to me and ask me a question, I try to find the answer. Sometimes I have a little trouble getting service from the Department of Agriculture. But the service has picked up after I have had to use some harsh words on this floor about the lack of replies by the Department of

Agriculture to Senatorial mail. I am happy to say that of late I have been receiving replies.

(At this point Mr. HUMPHREY yielded to Mr. MONRONEY to introduce a bill amending the Civil Service Retirement Act and to make brief remarks on the bill.

(Mr. MONRONEY's remarks appear elsewhere in today's RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, while I had a free moment, I went through some of these letters. They are all very much alike. The count in my office on farm mail is about 7 percent for the Eisenhower farm program, as announced in newspaper ads, and about 93 percent for the principles embodied in the committee bill before the Senate at the present time.

I may point out that the mail comes from all sections of my State, and from people dealing with different farm organizations.

As I should have mentioned when I was discussing the Hardin County report, Iowa, the 118 farmers mentioned in that report belonged to the Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, and other farm organizations, about evenly divided.

I picked out at random a letter from Mr. Philip E. Boxrud, of Madelia, Minn., which reads:

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I trust you'll be able to read this letter personally as I am a common dirt farmer concerned over the welfare of agriculture. I admit to following the Republican policies of the past but am nearing the boiling point (as are many of my neighbors).

Have just finished listening to Mr. Benson's speech and could personally tear it all to pieces. Farmers are not lethargic, Mr. Senator, they'll not stand flowering phrases, ludicrous stories, and euphemism. "Let's have a little more light and a little less noise." Wasn't it ironical?

The true facts of the situation were not revealed. Let's face up to it, the Republicans want to stabilize the dollar and the farmer is the only group they can squeeze, by, as you say, "lip service," and doing nothing. They cannot control labor nor can they control big business but they can play coy with the farmer and subsequently achieve their purposes.

Mr. President, this man is a really smart man. This is the way the Republicans have stabilized the cost of living. Other costs have gone up. Farm prices have gone down. The Republicans say, "Look, we have stabilized the cost of living. We have stopped inflation." They have stopped inflation by letting some people be inflated and some deflated.

I continue to read from the letter:

I'm downright mad, Mr. Senator, as I'm young and want to stay in farming, but what chance does an honest man have?

I want to pay off my bills and obligations but unfortunately I'm too small as against the huge farming corporations and the likes of Pillsbury Mills. Thirty-four indictments for mixing Canadian wheat with American wheat for export. Under the present crisis farmers are experiencing, I call it sabotage.

There are people in this country that are not buying the protein foods because they cannot afford them.

And so forth. That is good, sound, basic thinking.

Mr. President, I shall not go through all the letters I have received. They come from Clarissa, Sleepy Eye, Olivia, Lake Lillian, Mountain Lake, and other places.

I should like to read this one letter I have picked up:

DEAR SENATOR: I heard over the noontime news we are supposed to write to our Senator right away about the 90-percent parity. Oh my yes, we all want the program at 90-percent parity. That is the only thing, so we don't have to slave the way we do for nothing. Can't have any enjoyment for ourselves, only put every cent for debts. If we can't get 90 percent we will quit, and I am not the only one. There are many like us. We have to work hard and still get nothing. We might as well stop working. We will have the same because with times like now we have to sell everything to make ends meet. We can't even eat. It takes everything to keep going and still we go in debt. What a living. We might as well give the land back to the Indians and let them feed and clothe us. So we need 90-percent parity and that is all that will help us now. But there will have to be a way to stop.

This lady goes on for two pages, stating that she wants 90 percent of parity support prices. I want to say to this lady, whose name is Mrs. Frank Warzecka, of Westport, Minn., that is the way I shall vote.

Mr. President, we have heard so much about the plush life our farmers are living, in such periodicals as Harper's, that I want the RECORD to show the true and typical picture of midwestern farming.

The survey I have mentioned shows it most dramatically, breaking it down county by county, State by State, with scientifically balanced sampling and a larger sampling than usually statistically required for fair and accurate representation.

I refer, of course, to the GTA farm family survey. The cross check with census figures provides ample evidence of the fairness of the sampling distribution.

So that my colleagues from the Midwest may know, I should like to call attention to some more of the survey's findings. After all, we in the Midwest are proud of our great agricultural area. We regard it as one of the finest in the United States. So if farmers in our region can do no better economically than these figures show, agriculture's picture is far from rosy.

Let us take a look at my own State of Minnesota. Minnesota is considered to be rather prosperous, in comparison with other States. Audits were made of 1,319 farms in 6 typical counties—8.4 percent of the farms in those counties.

The average Minnesota farm, as depicted by the survey, had 248 acres, with a total investment of $38,596. Gross receipts for 1954 were $7,577, with total farm expenses of $5,752. That left an income before taxes of $1,825. Adding $350 as the estimated value of food furnished by the farm for the farm family, boosts the total income from the farm, before income taxes, to $2,175.

If we deducted a 5-percent return to the farmer for his cash investment—a reasonable return by business standards—it would leave only $245 as a return for labor and management by the farm operator and his family.

Mr. President, General Motors Corp. made a return of approximately 20 percent on its investment. I am speaking about a return of only 5 percent on the farmer's investment.

As I have said, if we deducted a 5-percent return to the farmer for his cash investment it would leave only $245 as a return for the labor and management by the farm operator and his family. That does not look as if too many Minnesota farmers are buying Cadillacs.

In fact, the survey took a look at farmer-owned automobiles.

There has been so much talk on that subject that the press may be interested in the actual facts:

Out of those farmers owning automobiles in Minnesota, 39.5 percent had 1949 or older models, and another 49.3 percent owned 1950 to 1953 models. Only 11.2 percent had 1954 or 1955 models.

Out of those cars, 83.1 percent were in the low-price range, 13.1 percent were in the medium-price range, and only 3.8 percent owned cars in the high-price range.

Only 47 percent of the farms surveyed had bathroom facilities, and only 55 percent had hot running water. Believe it or not, in spite of the heavy investment in these farms, only 63 percent had even cold running water.

As evidence of what can happen when our Government provides the means and methods whereby farmers can advance their living standards, quite a corollary to the above facts is presented by a reference to the use of electrical appliances. Ninety-eight percent of the farms had high-line electricity and 97 percent had power washers.

Mr. President, when the REA was established, farmers began to live; and when the REA established lines to local cooperatives, farmers started buying electrical appliances. In the case of the farms in some of the best counties in Minnesota, where the land is good, only 47 percent of the farms surveyed had bathroom facilities, only 55 percent had hot running water, only 63 percent had even cold running water, 98 percent had high-line electricity, and 97 percent had power washers, or electric washing machines. Why? Because they had electricity. Mr. President, I cannot help wondering how the washing machine industry would have survived if the REA had not been established.

A tremendous potential market for other needed materials and facilities exists on these farms, if the farmers had adequate income with which to pay for them.

For example, for farm production alone, not including farm home needs, the average farm surveyed in Minnesota needed expenditures of $663 for repairs and painting, $1,749 for new farm buildings, and $1,713 for new farm equipment. These amounts are necessary for their immediate needs. That is a total of $4,125 in immediate needs, expenditures that would be flowing into our stream of economy if these farmers were getting anywhere near parity of income.

What is true of Minnesota is true of our surrounding States and all farm States. Mr. President, I think it is reasonably fair to say that the farm situation in my

State is not as bad as that in many other areas. The farms in Minnesota are a little larger than the farms in some other sections. In Minnesota we have good land, and there has been reasonably good production.

The GTA survey in five States alone showed a great potential market for American industry. Farmers were asked what they needed to spend for repairs and paint, for new buildings, and for new equipment. The needed expenditures totalled from $4,000 to $6,500 per farm. The very large outlet for capital goods in these five States alone could amount to $2 billion for just farm needs, aside from household needs, if farmers had the income with which to maintain and improve their farms.

The potential is equally great for farm home improvements.

The data compiled in this survey fails to bear out the notion prevalent among many city people that farmers are enjoying an abnormally high standard of living. Instead 21 percent to 44 percent of farms in the entire 5-State area are without cold running water; 28 to 56 percent are without hot running water; telephones are still lacking in 24 to 66 percent, and bathroom facilities are lacking in 36 to 58 percent.

I am sure my colleagues from South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, and Wisconsin will be interested in seeing the corresponding facts and figures for their States.

Mr. President, high policy makers have been telling those of us who serve in Congress that what the country needs is foreign trade. I am in favor of foreign trade. I have always voted for the reciprocal trade program, and I have voted against any crippling amendments. But we are having trouble getting foreign trade, because we are always in conflict with some friend of ours. We always have to be concerned with the needs of Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, the Scandinavian countries, Italy, or other countries that need foreign trade, if they are to live. They cannot even exist without foreign trade; foreign trade is their market and their livelihood.

Then there are the problems of tariffs and the problems of exchange—for instance, the problems which arise because of different currencies. In addition, there are language barriers. There are all kinds of problems. However, our Government relentlessly pursues foreign trade, and we justify the making of many hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of appropriations on the basis of foreign trade. That is well and good, and what I am saying is not to discount at all the importance of foreign trade. It is important.

But, Mr. President, if we would spend on getting increased domestic trade, 10 percent of the effort we spend on getting additional foreign trade, we would be better off. In the United States there are unlimited markets. One out of every six families in the United States is living on a very low subsistence level. The best market for American production is in America. The best market for bathroom fixtures is in the United States, including the five States I have just been talking about; and the people of the United States will be willing to buy bathroom fixtures long before persons living in Burma will be willing to buy them. The best market for additional electrical equipment and the best market for machinery and the best market for repair parts and for paint and wallpaper and for repairs to homes and buildings is in the great hinterland of America. On the basis of plain, sensible economics, a farm program that will increase farm income is good for business.

Many of our farm families were hoping they would get some major tax reduction. I went home to Minnesota and said, "Fellow Minnesotans, your taxes are going to be reduced. This Republican administration has a tax-reduction program. It has a system. It reduces your income, and that reduces your taxes."

That is exactly what happened. Farm income has gone down and Federal revenues from income taxes from farm families has gone down.

Any program that is directed toward lifting the income levels of the farm family will lift the levels of every single businessman, factory worker, producer, and manufacturer in the United States. The great untapped market in America is out in the countryside—to be sure, in our cities, too. I have noticed that some of our big industrialists are very much interested in foreign trade. They like foreign trade, because sometimes they can build their factories in foreign countries, hire labor cheaper, and make more money.

I call upon industry in this country to be interested in domestic trade, with our own American families, insofar as humanly possible, with the view of allowing those families to obtain the opportunity to earn a fair living.

The best thing that ever happened to business was when a workingman received a good wage. We could always notice the difference in our cash register when the men out at the packing plant received a raise in pay. Every time the employees of the Armour Packing Co. received an increase in pay, Humphrey's drugstore got a little increase in business. We did not have to negotiate a contract. But the salary of the manager of the plant could have been increased by 100 percent and it would not have helped our business. When the 1,200 or 1,400 workers in that plant got another $5 in their pay envelopes, they were downtown spending it for unfulfilled needs.

I have never been able to understand why a small-business man, or any other businessman, little or big, should resist so vigorously programs of economic justice and progress for the rank and file of our people. It seems to me to be a rather shortsighted policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a condensed portion of the report entitled "Survey Shows Great Potential Market."

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

Farmers were asked what they needed to spend for repairs and paint, for new buildings and for new equipment. This is what we found:

Capital expenditures needed per farm

	Repairs and paint	New buildings	New equipment	Total
Montana	$802	$1,707	$1,626	$4,135
North Dakota	1,258	2,426	2,877	6,561
South Dakota	1,029	1,945	1,956	4,930
Minnesota	663	1,749	1,713	4,125
Wisconsin	1,021	1,810	1,952	4,783

The needed expenditures total $4,000 to $6,500 per farm. In the case of new equipment, these needed expenditures would add about 15 percent to present equipment inventory for Montana family operated farms, about a fourth for those in South Dakota and Minnesota, and about a third for those in North Dakota and Wisconsin. These largest percentages of needed additions and equipment show up among farmers in the two States having the smallest average gross income, namely, North Dakota and Wisconsin, whereas the smallest percentage was reported by farmers in Montana, the State with the largest average gross income.

The very substantial expenditures that the typical family operated farm needs to make could mean much to industries selling to the farm market. This very large outlet for capital goods in these five States alone could amount to $2 billion if farmers had the income with which to maintain and improve their farms. This is suggestive of the large potential market for industrial products, not only in these five Northwest States but also in the many other rural regions of the country.

The GTA survey did not secure estimates of needed expenditures for the farm home similar to the estimates of capital expenditures needed for production. But the gaps and deficiencies in the farmers' living standards and the potential market for industrial products for use in farm homes is clearly shown by the proportion of farms that still do not have certain home facilities that are generally taken for granted in city communities. Further, the insurable value of farm homes in the survey averaged only $5,000, indicating many very old and inadequate houses. Certainly many of these need replacing.

Measures of farm living standards

[In percent]

Percent of farms that do not have—	Montana	North Dakota	South Dakota	Minnesota	Wisconsin
Cold running water	23	38	44	37	21
Hot running water	28	44	56	45	34
High-line electricity	2	2	4	2	1
Telephone	66	31	31	21	24
Power washer	4	2	4	3	1
Refrigerator	2	4	4	4	4
Deep freeze	24	52	55	56	51
Television	73	68	82	64	53
Radio	1	1	1	2	2
Bathroom facilities	36	50	58	53	39
L. P. gas	79	37	25	51	54
Central heating	38	45	58	63	49

These facts do not bear out the notion prevalent among many city people that farmers are enjoying an abnormally high standard of living. The fact is, today very many farmers still do not have some of the elementaries of everyday living—21 to 44 percent without cold running water, and 28 to 56 percent without hot running water. Telephones are still lacking in 24 to 66 percent of the surveyed farms, and many of the phones in use date back to before World War I. Deep freezes were lacking in 24 to 56 percent of the farms in spite of the fact that deep freezes are of greatest benefit to farm families.

Most farms do not have television even though they are in areas receiving service. Bathroom facilities are still lacking on 36 to 58 percent of the farms, and 38 to 63 percent do not have central heating.

The total required to replace or modernize the farm homes in just these five States must be at least twice as much as most farmers reported they needed for farm capital expenditures. This would indicate a minimum of $4 billions for housings, with corresponding totals for the country as a whole, and a grand total of farm needs of five or six billion dollars for these five States alone.

We do not need to look only to foreign underdeveloped countries as potential additional markets for our industrial products. Millions of our own farm families, west, south, east, and north need billions of new capital expenditures to close the gap between rural and urban living standards.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The survey I have discussed brings out alarming facts on the situation of the average family-operated farm the five-State area covered.

No longer is this matter a subject of speculation and guesswork, for contained in the report I have reviewed is the factual material that tells the story of what is happening to typical farm families.

The farm family is in serious trouble, and heading into deeper trouble, unless action is taken to reverse the trend.

It should now be obvious to all that the farm family is not receiving parity with the rest of the country. It is, likewise, apparent that the farm family is losing still more ground from the goal of a fair standard of living, in return for its contributions not only of providing the Nation's food and fiber but also of being a major user of industrial products.

The farm family is being forced to use money for living expenses, that, in keeping with sound business practice, ought to be set aside for depreciation—to replace wornout machinery and other equipment, and to maintain the farm plant in good condition.

It should be apparent for all to see that farm families put in long hours to keep the farm going, and, in return, their take-home pay—what is left for their living—has been shockingly inadequate and is shrinking still more.

It is this lack of income, and lack of opportunity for income, that Congress must be concerned with now if we hope to restore balance to our economy.

Perhaps this review of where our farmers stand today will help set the stage for this Congress seeing that justice is done to the farmer when we vote on the new farm bill.

In any event, it sets the record straight about typical farm income, and typical farm living standards and needs.

It is just a start of what needs to be said, to complete setting the record straight.

Before going into details of the legislation before me, it is my intention, as I mentioned at the outset, to next review how agriculture got plunged into its present predicament.

For that purpose I shall continue this discussion this evening.

HOW AGRICULTURE GOT IN ITS PRESENT FIX

I wish to speak now on the subject of How Agriculture Got in Its Present Fix. Perhaps I should say "How the Present Fix Got on Agriculture."

If we concede that American agriculture is in economic trouble today, it is only fair to look at the cause of its troubles before proceeding with the remedies needed.

How did we get into this fix?

How did the Republican administration let agriculture drift aimlessly into depression while the rest of the economy was booming?

Oh, I know our Republican friends have conducted quite a propaganda campaign to divert attention from their own failures, by putting all the blame on so-called surpluses.

I challenge them to back up their propaganda with facts.

Contrary to the basic philosophy behind President Eisenhower's farm plan recommendations, surpluses are not the cause of present low farm prices.

Low farm prices have been caused by mismanagement of the price-support programs, in two principal respects. First, supports have been cut under the sliding scale policy, thus directly driving market prices down; second, the markets have been demoralized by threats that Government-owned commodities will be dumped, contrary to long-standing legal provisions for sale only at 105 percent of the support price plus carrying charge.

Those are two rather serious charges, and I intend to document them. I charge the Department of Agriculture with being grossly inefficient. One can charge the Republican administration with almost any crime except inefficiency. It flinches at the very thought of such a charge. I charge them with gross inefficiency, inefficiency of the worst kind, and mismanagement. I not only charge them with it; I intend to prove it. Not only is the Department inefficient, but the administration has so messed up the farmer-committee program that today it is practically a shambles. The letters which pour into my office dealing with the farmer-committee system are really very touching. They are very pathetic. Farmers who served for years were pushed out, for sheer political purposes. Today, as many a farmer says, they do not like to go into an office and ask a clerk, a young girl just out of high school, or a young boy just out of a short course in agriculture, how to do their farming, or what the farm program is about.

I say that low farm prices have been caused in part by mismanagement of the price-support program; and I have listed the two principal areas of mismanagement.

Partial responsibility must also be shared by the fact that existing and even previous farm programs are not fully adequate—but the administration has only acted and proposed to further weaken them, not strengthen them.

More than legislation alone is involved in the skids that have been put under American agriculture. Basic attitudes are involved.

The attitude of this administration with respect to agriculture is indefensible. Those who operate the program do not believe in it.

Too many people in Washington turned their backs on the fundamental importance of agriculture to our economy.

Too many people in Washington—and, yes, even too many people out on the farms—were deceived into rejecting sound, time-tested agricultural policies—policies and programs that helped bring American agriculture out of the depths of depression, strengthen its economy to where it withstood every challenge of World War II, the readjustment afterwards, and the Korean conflict.

That is the kind of farm program we have. It was strong enough to get us out of the depths of the depression and strengthen our economy to the point where it withstood the challenge and responsibilities of World War II, the following readjustment, and the Korean conflict. It required a pretty good program to do that.

Too little concern was shown when our highest public officials relegated agriculture to a minor role of importance in their considerations and counsels. Too many people let themselves be brainwashed by propaganda and slogans designed to conceal a deliberate intent to reverse agriculture's progress toward full and just equality in our economy.

If only half the energy and effort used by those in high places in our Government to distort historical facts—as part of a brazen, partisan, political attempt to divert responsibility for the fix we are in today—had been devoted to aggressive, constructive attempts to stem the tide of agricultural recession, American agriculture would be in a far better condition today regardless of any laws on the statute books.

Of course, we are more interested in the present, and the future, than the past.

I would rather talk about what can be done now, than argue over what was done in years gone by—and I intend doing so before I conclude. It would be far better if the Secretary of Agriculture would do the same.

But Secretary Benson has so distorted history in his stubborn partisanship that it is time to call him to account, before his unfounded dogma is preached further as fact by great segments of the misguided press in this country.

Let us set the record straight today, once and for all.

Where did our temporary surplus of food and fiber come from?

Were price-support loans at 90 percent of parity really responsible for the excess

abundance that has created much concern?

Were surplus the result of wartime policies "too long continued," as the President has charged in his message to this Congress, and his supporters are echoing across the land?

Those are the charges. Let us look at the answers.

Turn back, for a moment, to 1950. We, as a nation, became involved in a deadly serious attempt to halt Communist aggression in Korea, with grave fears that world war III might result.

Even though we have spent billions upon billions of dollars for defense, I charge today on the floor of the Senate that our Government has no policy whatever for food and fiber in case of war.

When representatives from the Office of Defense Mobilization came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry they had not even thought about a strategic reserve of food and fiber in case our country became involved in a war.

Our State Department does not even think about how to use food and fiber as a supplement to our foreign policy when it presents to us programs on foreign economic aid.

We talk about a lack of planning. Mr. President, better planning could be done in a madhouse. I charge that there is no planning in our Government on the use of food and fiber for our international responsibilities or for a program of national security.

The planning that is going on is to condemn surpluses, to cry to high heaven about surpluses and to cry about the mess some officials of the administration say they have inherited.

Mr. President, the outfit in the Department of Agriculture is sterile when it comes to imagination. It has no plan. It has no program. It is without any imagination whatever as to what should be done with the great stocks of food and fiber we have on hand.

What do Senators think Mr. Khrushchev or Mr. Bulganin would do if they had the supplies of food and fiber that we have on hand? They would make a Fuller brush man look like a man with rheumatism and arthritis as they went around the world. They would go around the world with that food and fiber and make one friend after another and one deal after another. What do we do? We stand around like a stunned ox, saying it is a problem.

I have said it many times, and I say it again, that if the biggest problem we have to face is the problem of what we are to do with our God-given abundance of food and fiber, then indeed we have been very well treated by Divine Providence. If the administration cannot determine what they can do constructively with the food and fiber of our country, they will never be able to figure out what to do about Russia.

(At this point Mr. HUMPHREY yielded to Mr. CLEMENTS for the purpose of proposing a unanimous-consent agreement. On request, and by unanimous consent, the proposal and the ensuing colloquy were ordered to be printed in today's RECORD following the conclusion of Mr. HUMPHREY's remarks for the day.)

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to thank my distinguished colleague for having yielded to me so that I might introduce a bill of importance to my State.

I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota on the leadership he is showing in the effort to work out a fair farm program. I happened to be occupying the chair of the Presiding Officer when the Senator from Minnesota referred to the promises made by a certain candidate for the Presidency in the 1952 campaign. As I recall, there was one set of promises made to which the Senator from Minnesota has not referred in his very able address.

Am I not correct in recalling that the distinguished Republican candidate for the Presidency said that a program would be evolved which would provide some form of Government help to producers of the various perishable commodities as well as to certain feed grains which were not included among the so-called basics?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is very definitely true. If the Senator from Oregon will refer to the speech of candidate Eisenhower at Kasson, Minn., he will find a very special and important section in the speech which was critical of the previous administration's farm program with respect to its failure to have an effective price support program for perishable commodities. The Republican candidate pledged that his administration would come forward with a program which would give to perishable commodities the same degree of protection and support as it would give to the so-called storable commodities.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure to know that a colloquy is in progress between the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oregon, but we on this side of the aisle are unable to hear it. If the Senators desire Senators on this side of the aisle to hear what they are saying, may I suggest that they speak a little louder?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I certainly wish to share my words with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who is the acting minority leader.

The question was asked by the Senator from Oregon as to whether the Republican candidate for President in 1952, General Eisenhower, had announced or described a program for the support of perishable farm commodities.

I replied to the Senator from Oregon to the effect that in the speech at Kasson, Minn.—and possibly in other speeches; I am not certain of that—the Republican candidate for the Presidency said that one of the weaknesses of the previous administration's agricultural program was its failure to do anything effectively for perishable commodities. He pledged that his administration would develop a program for perishable commodities which would give them the same kind of treatment and help as had been given the storable commodities, such as grains. I have not his exact words before me, but I am sure that in substance I have given an accurate description of that portion of the speech. It made a very powerful impression at the time.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The reason I asked my question was that I happen to represent, in part, a State which has thousands of farm families, many of whom live on very small farms and raise perishable commodities, including vegetables and fruits. They have orchards, and they raise row crops.

In the 4 months that I was in Oregon recently, I visited many farm families. Mrs. Neuberger and I stayed overnight with some of them in their farm houses. They are receiving no Government support whatsoever.

May I ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota if there has been any attempt, to his knowledge—I know he is very familiar with the farm program—to carry out that campaign promise to do something for the people who raise or produce perishables.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In all honesty, I must say that the administration now has a program for the purchase of pork products, but it has been relatively ineffective, even according to the words of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The administration has a program for milk, which we in Congress have authorized. It has a special school-milk program, which was not recommended by this administration, but which came from Congress. There is a school-lunch program which has been in existence for the past 15 years or so. Those are the essential purchase programs which the Government has operated. Frankly, those purchase programs are not very effective unless they are timely. That is, if they are used at an early time after the market begins to slump, there is evidence that they will be helpful. But so far as a kind of overall program of assistance to perishable commodities is concerned, there is no such program. What is more, the administration has not shown any desire to develop such a program or to present one to Congress.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Undoubtedly the Senator has seen the reports in the press to the effect that the cost of living has been stabilized under the present administration. There has been much bragging and boasting about that. The administration has expressed much satisfaction over the so-called stabilization of the cost of living.

Is it not true that the stabilizing of overall price levels has been largely at the expense of the farm population, whether they have been raising livestock, grain, cotton, orchard fruits, or row crops?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt about that. While the cost of living has leveled off, according to the price index, the main reason for its having leveled off is that there has been a drop in the farm price index, which has been taken off the increase in the other price indexes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Should it not be emphasized to the American people that, although the cost of living has begun to stabilize to some extent in the past 2 years, it has been at the expense of sacrifices on the part of the American farmers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. While such products as steel, lumber, aluminum, and rayon, which are produced in the Senator's State as well as my own, have gone up substantially in price, the cost of farm products has gone down, and the cost of food is about 30 or 40 percent of the budget of the average family. The administration can say that the cost of living is stabilized, inasmuch as the farmer is being sacrificed for the increased profits being reaped by industry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's analysis is directly to the point. The argument should be made again and again to correct the false impression which has gained such wide acceptance in this country.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the Senator will permit me to ask one more question, I shall not interrupt him further.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is not interrupting me; he is contributing to the debate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator. Is it not particularly unfair and unjust to the farmer that the price of his products should be going down at a time when the cost of nearly everything else in our economy is going up? It would be bad enough to have the farmer's prices go down in a general decline, but at least then he would be perhaps benefiting to a limited extent from the fact that the things which he himself and his family would have to buy would be getting less costly. But is it not particularly unfair to the farmers to have the price of farm produce going down at a time when automobiles, farm equipment, clothing, medical care, transportation, and other items which they need are going up in direct contrast to what has happened to the farm economy?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. The squeeze on the farmer under these conditions is getting to be unbearable. There can be no question about that. A farm price decline which goes to a point below the cost of operation, while higher costs continue could be disastrous. Such a condition is rapidly approaching in some areas of the Nation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, the farmer is isolated. He is in a sort of large island of adverse economic conditions, while all around him is the great sea of prosperity. He has to buck adverse conditions, while many others in the economy are prospering immediately. It seems to me this contrast is especially inequitable so far as the farm population is concerned.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his efforts, both on the floor and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to prepare a bill which will attempt to reverse the present very destructive drop in farm income.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator. He has been very helpful, and his observations are surely pertinent. They are explanatory of what some of this problem is about.

Mr. President, I am about to yield to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. Then I shall end my remarks for this evening, since I understand the Senate is about to recess or adjourn.

A friend of mine has just handed me a note saying the headlines in the papers now read "Ike Decides to Run." The body of the story under the headline, which I gather is not printed, but which should be printed, should read: "Found he cannot afford to retire on Gettysburg farm while Benson is still Secretary of Agriculture." [Laughter.]

I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER OF HIS AVAILABILITY FOR SECOND TERM

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, in the hope of maintaining at least a semblance of political equipoise in the history of today's proceedings in this body, attention is invited to the following telegram which was sent by President Eisenhower on the 19th of January 1956 to the secretary of state of New Hampshire:

> It would be idle to pretend that my health can be wholly restored to the excellent state in which the doctors believed it to be in mid-September. * * * My future life must be carefully regulated to avoid excessive fatigue.

Today Mr. Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, issued a press release relative to this matter. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

> Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, said today "the American people will never elect a President who, at 65, has had a serious heart attack and who is unable to be a full-time Chief Executive."
>
> In response to requests for comment on Mr. Eisenhower's decision, Mr. Butler also said:
>
> "Republican leaders have high-pressured Mr. Eisenhower into this decision without regard for the possible consequences to him, his family, or the public. But the American people will never go along with it.
>
> "I personally had not thought Mr. Eisenhower would permit himself to be put in this position, not only because of the private and public hazards involved, but because his action establishes an unfortunate precedent.
>
> "The uncertainties of his future health are bound to affect the interest of our country and its citizens and, therefore, will be involved in the coming campaign even though the question of the President's health is not formally raised as a campaign issue by the Democrats. I fear that it will dominate the campaign and tend to obliterate discussion and consideration of the great issues of domestic and foreign policy.
>
> "Mr. Eisenhower's decision does not alter the campaign plans of the Democratic Party. Whether he or someone else is the Republican nominee, we will still be running against the record of failures and shortcoming of the Eisenhower administration.
>
> "Any realistic appraisal of the American political scene shows that the Democratic Party will win against any Republican candidate. The great Democratic trend of the last 3 years has swept everything before it, including 9 governorship victories for Democrats against no losses to Republicans.
>
> "The people of this country may like Mr. Eisenhower and appreciate his military contributions, but they have learned that as a President he has neither the will nor the energy to exert real leadership in the interest of all the people.
>
> "The times call for more than a part-time President. The Communist menace is not a part-time menace. The farm depression is not a part-time depression. The dangerous lag in our guided missile program is not a part-time lag.
>
> "Our country needs a full-time President with the energy and vigor to put a stop to the drift and confusion and bombast in our State Department and to assume the role of leader in the field of foreign policy.
>
> "Our country needs a full-time President with the time and inclination to familiarize himself with the plight of the farmer and to draft a program that will bring back prosperity to that vital segment of our economy.
>
> "Our country needs a full-time President who will personally see to it that our military strength is restored to the point where it will be a safe deterrent to aggression.
>
> "Our country needs a full-time President who is alert to corruption and who does not permit the Talbotts and Strobels to leave the Government with a warm letter and a pat on the back.
>
> "These are not times in which our country can afford four years of government by a shadowy regency acting in the President's name.
>
> "In the crucial 4 years which lie ahead, the people of this country will not settle for anything less than a vigorous, aggressive, full-time President."

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 5 OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT, AS AMENDED

During the course of Mr. HUMPHREY'S speech,

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota for the courteous treatment which I always receive from him.

Mr. President, out of order, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the Civil Service Retirement Act, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD, following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. The statement explains the purposes of the bill, which is to protect civil service workers who have long periods of service in Government, and who then leave the Government for a period and come back. Under the law as it now exists, such employees would not be entitled to any survivorship benefits unless they had been back in Government service for a year or more.

A case in point is the recent death of our very able chief counsel of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. Frank Pellegrini, who had 16 years and 7 months service with the Government, was out of Government for a time, and then returned. He died 11 months and 6 days after his return

to Government service, and therefore his return was 24 days short of entitling him to survivorship benefits for his twin sons and his wife, which benefits they otherwise would have received.

The purpose of the bill is that others in Government service shall not have rights to survivorship benefits denied them when they return to service, such as happened in the case to which I have referred. Such employees should enjoy the same protection that other civil-service workers have.

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

The bill (S. 3315) to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the next to the last paragraph in section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "separated" the following: "has been separated by death or."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect as of August 31, 1954, but no annuity shall be paid by reason of such amendment (a) for any period prior to the date of enactment of this act, or (b) unless the amount of any lump sum death benefit heretofore paid under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is redeposited in the civil service retirement and disability fund.

The statement presented by Mr. MONRONEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONRONEY

The interstate and foreign Commerce Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, was saddened and shocked by the sudden and unexpected death of its Chief Counsel, Mr. Frank Pellegrini, on January 14, 1956.

On January 16, I informed the Senate of his untimely passing and extended the heartfelt sympathy to every member of the committee to his surviving widow and twin sons. I paid tribute to his many years of faithful and efficient service to the Senate and to his country. It is not my present purpose to review the sentiments I attempted to express on that occasion. It is my duty, however, to inform the Senate of an unjust misfortune that will befall the surviving family of Mr. Pellegrini and perhaps others in similar circumstances under the present civil service retirement law.

Under the present law, if an employee with 5, 10 or 15 years of continuous service dies, his surviving widow and children receive an annuity. However, if the same employee should leave the Federal service for a period of time, he would have to be reemployed 1 full year after his return before his surviving widow and children receive an annuity.

At the time of his death Mr. Pellegrini had a total of 16 years and 7 months of Federal service. However, he was out of the Federal service for a time and his most recent period of employment commenced on February 9, 1955. Therefore, at the time of his death, his current period of employment was 11 months and 6 days, which falls some 24 days short of meeting the 1 year reemployment requirement. The result is that under present law, his widow and twin sons are not entitled to an annuity, but had he lived for another 24 days, they would be entitled to such an annuity.

I have no quarrel with the 1 year reemployment requirement generally. I think it is a necessary and proper restriction where employees themselves control their careers and decide whether they wish to leave or remain in the Federal service. However, I think it should not apply when an employee is prevented from fulfilling the requirement by reason of death or disability. These are matters over which the employee has no control.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is always a pleasure to accommodate the Senator from Oklahoma. He always does the same for me.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS BILL—ADDITION OF SENATOR HUMPHREY AS COSPONSOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] is about to leave. Before he does so, I should like to ask him whether the election financing bill which he introduced has been closed for the adding of additional cosponsors. It has not yet been closed; has it?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe the bill is still at the desk, if I am not mistaken. I cannot say definitely that it is, but I think there is still opportunity for cosponsors, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Presiding Officer if that is the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It still is possible to add additional cosponsors.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to have my name added as a cosponsor. The Senator from Oregon has been very helpful in explaining to me his proposed legislation, and I consider it a privilege to be associated with him in its sponsorship.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We are very honored to have the support and cosponsorship of the Senator from Minnesota.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my understanding that the Senate was about ready to recess or adjourn, but I have been told there is another matter which may be brought to the Senate, so I shall continue with my statement.

Just a few moments ago I was saying that I would much rather talk about what should be done in the future, which it is my intention to do, rather than discuss the past, but I cannot help but reiterate that the arguments which have been made by the Secretary of Agriculture and the spokesmen for agriculture in the administration have been so misleading and have tended so to misguide public opinion that it is important to set the record straight.

Where do the temporary surpluses of food and fiber come from? The argument is made that they are the result of wartime policies, as the President said, "too long continued," and, of course, due to 90-percent parity supports.

If we turn back to 1950, we will recall that as a Nation we became involved in a deadly serious attempt to halt Communist aggression in Korea, with grave fears that world war III might result.

We had learned a lesson from World War II, a lesson that could not be forgotten. Food and fiber are urgently needed to win a war, and a greatly expanded supply of food and fiber.

Our top policymakers of Government, charged with the Nation's security, determined the goals of agricultural production that had to be met for the Nation's safety.

I want to underscore that statement, because the decision as to production quotas was taken after much thought and consideration by the top policy makers—not merely by political leaders, but by men who had been brought in from industry and agriculture. Agricultural goals were set in order to strengthen our economy to give us the necessary food and fiber reserves or stocks which would be necessary in a period of war.

They were not goals determined for the sake of the farmer. They were goals determined for the protection of all our people. They were not the product of any Secretary of Agriculture's guess alone. They were the studied needs outlined by our defense officials, our munitions board, our State Department, and our Security Council.

During 1950, 1951, and 1952, we consumed, as feed, more feed grain than we produced.

We were running into a deficit, drawing on what limited small reserves we had.

Despite expanded production—this was only a few few years ago—4 years ago, 3 years ago—we were living off our reserves, and not from current production. Fortunately, we provided those reserves.

One would think we would remember that now, Mr. President, but it is like living out of one's savings instead of one's earnings. In time, one will run out of money and face trouble.

Looking ahead, the only safe answer was to increase production—or risk a shortage in time of national emergency.

The Department of Agriculture was asked, in the Nation's interest, to call upon America's farmers to increase production of feed grains, of cotton, and of other commodities for which potential demand was soaring.

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan was called before the Senate Agriculture Committee in the spring of 1952, to be questioned about whether these national security goals could be met.

No one then, Republican or Democrat, challenged the need for such increased production.

All one has to do is get those hearings.

Not a voice was raised against the goals. The only question was whether 90-percent price supports were high enough to get the production we needed.

Secretary Brannan promised the Senate an all-out campaign to achieve the production needed, regardless of price.

He had faith in America's farmers—faith they would respond to the Nation's needs. However, he expressed a hope

farmers could, in return, have faith in their Government not to let them down afterward if they produced more than was needed.

This is all a matter of official record. His faith in America's farmers was justified. His hope that farmers could have the same kind of faith in their Government apparently was not.

America's farmers responded to the Nation's need, when they were called upon to respond.

I digress to remind the Senate that the Production and Marketing Administration committees—they were called PMA committees—went over the countryside and encouraged farmers to expand their production to meet the national goals, just as the needs for the draft are met by selective service. So many bushels and pounds were to be produced.

Ninety percent of parity was not what got the farmers to produce. What got them to produce was the concentrated campaign by the Government, which called upon the press, radio, and television to ask the farmers to produce. In North Dakota the wheat farmers were appealed to. I am sure the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]—who is a true friend of the farmers, if there ever was one—recalls how the Government asked the wheat farmers of North Dakota to expand their production of wheat.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. First, I wish to express my appreciation of my colleague's statement about my efforts in behalf of the farmers.

Let me say that at that time, Congress provided greatly increased funds for the Department of Agriculture to use in informing the farmers of the plan for increased agricultural production. As a result of those appropriations, meetings were held throughout the Nation in an effort to urge every farmer in the country to increase production.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from North Dakota is absolutely correct.

At that time I was privileged to be a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. A few months later in 1953, I was not on the committee; and, as the Senator from North Dakota will recall, later in 1953 I returned to membership on the committee. I attended the hearings. I remember the great concern then as to whether the farmer would be scolded—scolded as he is being scolded now—for increasing his production. I recall that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was one of those who were much concerned on that point. At that time the farmer was being given a considerable working over; his patriotism was appealed to, and he was requested to expand greatly and to increase his production of agricultural commodities. I recall that the Senator from North Dakota was among those of us who wondered what would happen when the war came to an end. We wondered whether at that time the farmer would be blamed because he had done his job, because he had responded to the appeals to his patriotism. At that time the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, assured us that, of course, everyone would wish to keep faith with the farmer.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. As the Senator from Minnesota knows, at that time every member of the committee expressed concern about what would happen, and whether the Government would keep faith with the farmer if, for war purposes, he expanded his production.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

So, Mr. President, as a result of those appeals to the patriotism of the farmer, he increased his production. That was done because of the appeals made to him; it was not done because of 90 percent of parity price-supports. In order to persuade the farmer to comply with that program, a great campaign was made. As the Senator from North Dakota has said, Congress made large appropriations for that purpose. An organized appeal was made to the patriotic devotion of farm people to their country.

Mass meetings were held all over the country, calling on farmers to produce more, with less manpower to help them, less machinery to work with. Our great farmer-elected committee system in every rural township of every rural county proved its worth, in carrying the appeal to the farmers.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the representatives of the press, who now are in the press gallery—and I say it with all the sincerity at my command—that in 1952, when our farmers were called upon to increase their production in 1952 and 1953, the decision to make that request of the farmers was a Government decision to which there was no dissent. As a result, the farmers increased their production. They did not do so because they were receiving 90 percent of parity. They received 90 percent of parity in 1948, 1949, and 1951. In 1951 and 1952 we did not have any great stocks of agricultural commodities. Instead, in 1952, we were running short; we were reaching a dangerously low level of reserves. I ask any representative of the press or any representative of the radio—those who carry this message to the American people—to check the facts, instead of accepting the gobbledygook which is run off the mimeograph machines in the Department of Agriculture. The simple truth is that the Government had to appeal to the farmers as patriotic citizens—as they are—to plant more crops, to increase the production of cotton, wheat, corn, fats, and oils. The farmers planted more. They got bumper crops. But ever since that day, some persons have been attempting to whip the farmers over the back because they did what their Government asked them to do.

Mr. President, the Government of the United States should be ashamed to treat its citizens in that way. What is more, those who continue to misrepresent that case should be ashamed of themselves.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Minnesota will recall that in July 1952, we were at war; and at that time our carryover of wheat was only 255 million bushels—an extremely small amount for a war period.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and as the Senator from North Dakota will recall, at that time we were running short of fats and oils.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And we were using up our feed grains faster than we were getting them in the pipeline. In 1952, we had a ban on exports of cotton, Mr. President. We did not know but that world war III might almost be upon us. One section of the populace that was ready to do its work was the farmers. We had the ever-normal granary plan, so that sufficient stocks would be on hand. I cannot see why our Government regards it as fit and proper to store food and clothing for the Navy Department and to have on hand a 20-year or 30-year supply of hamburgers, hats, canteens, rifles, and other items of equipment for the Armed Forces—and, of course, it costs money to store those items—whereas if anyone suggests that we have a little reserve—half a year's reserve or a year's reserve—of essential food and fiber, it is said, "It is gross waste to have such staggeringly large, monstrous surpluses."

Mr. President, what kind of an American would we think a person was if he went around the country saying, "I hear that the Government has a year's supply of 155 millimeter shells. That is an awful waste." What do you think would happen then, Mr. President? Such a person would be called before a congressional committee, and would be asked, "What kind of a subversive are you?"

Mr. President, does anyone think it does not cost anything to store the necessary reserves of shells, bombs, planes, and tanks? Why does not someone write an article about the storage costs in the case of munitions? Why does not someone write an article regarding the cost of inventories—a cost which is passed on to the consumers? Today, most of the inventory in agricultural commodities is, of course, in the pipe line of the Commodity Credit Corporation, because of the support program, in order that the farmer will have orderly marketing. Does anyone who is in his right mind think a private industry does not charge as a part of the cost of the finished product, the cost of maintaining an inventory? A businessman would have to have holes in his head if he did not do that, Mr. President. I do not know a great deal about business, but we have a rather large inventory in the small business I am in. Does anyone think that the cost of that inventory is not figured into the cost of the items we sell to our customers? Of course it is.

Does anyone think that the United States Steel Corporation does not include the cost of maintaining its in-

ventory in the cost of the articles it sells? Of course it does.

The record of agriculture's response is a glorious one in our Nation's history. It is a disgrace, now, to tarnish that record by belatedly scolding farmers for producing what the Nation required of them.

Did we berate munitions makers for producing shells that were not needed? Or were we thankful they were not needed, and did we provide public funds to help the manufacturer convert to other items without any financial loss? Did we berate munition and plane manufacturers for producing shells and planes that were not needed, or were we thankful that they were not needed? Did we tell them it was their tough luck that Uncle Sam was going out of the munitions-buying business, or did we use public funds to settle their contracts and provide help for them to convert to other items without any financial loss?

We said to the big companies, "You are so patriotic. Of course, you have made a great deal of money, and you have tax write-offs. Now that the war is over, we are cutting down on defense orders, so we have made arrangements to help you shift your production or changeover."

However, Mr. President, what did we provide for the farmer? We gave him only criticism and complaint.

Mr. President, on tomorrow I shall resume this debate. If there is one thing that outrages my sense of fair play, it is that there has been no more unfairly criticized group in the history of our Nation than the farmers who, at the request of their Government, increased agricultural production. That is particularly true, if I may be pardoned for saying so, of the corn grower, the wheat farmer and the cotton farmer. The Government begged for those commodities. They were commodities which every official of the Government, Democrat or Republican, demanded that the farmer produce. The farmer was told, "Plow up your fields. Forget about conservation. Plant and harvest, plant and harvest. We will see that nothing happens."

Up in the Red River Valley in Minnesota our farmers went ahead and planted wheat. Down in southern Minnesota, our farmers went ahead and planted corn. They did their job. Ever since then they have been booted around as though they were foreign subversives. I am fed up with it. I do not think very much of an official in Government who has such a short memory and such a lack of understanding of this problem that he cannot take into consideration the facts which I have recited.

This is a free and open forum, for anyone who wishes a good fight or a good debate. I am prepared, as I have previously stated, to take on all comers on this issue. I want to hear some member of the administration, or some of its sympathizers attempt to prove to the contrary of what I have said tonight. I want Mr. Benson to have one of his supporters, with whom he can talk and make special side deals, come to the floor of the Senate and point out to me that the farmer was not literally enticed into expanding his production.

The Department of Agriculture ought to be thanking the American farmers for what they did to fulfill their production goals, with no strings, no rapid tax writeoffs, no tax concessions, no 27½ percent depletion allowances. They did not get any braid or stars. They did not get their pictures in the newspapers. They did not receive any awards. All they got was a bawling out. They have become the targets of those who seek to show how mismanaged the program was, when, in fact, it was managed so well that this country is the best fed country on the face of the earth. Food commodities are cheaper in this country than they are in any other country on the face of the earth. This is the only country in the world where one can go on a diet voluntarily. In most other countries one must diet of necessity.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

During the delivery of Mr. HUMPHREY's speech,

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield so that I may propose a unanimous-consent agreement, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to yield, with the understanding that the request and colloquy which may ensue will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which I offer for myself and the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read the proposed agreement, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Thursday, March 8, 1956, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That when no further amendment is to be proposed, the amendments adopted shall be deemed to be engrossed and the bill read the third time; that a motion shall then be in order that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12, an act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes, to which motion the same limitation of debate shall apply as in the case of any other motion or amendment; that in the event the motion to take up the House bill is agreed to, it shall then be deemed to be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof inserting the provisions of Senate bill 3183, as amended; that the amendment shall be deemed to be engrossed and the House bill as amended read the third time.

Ordered further, That in the event the motion to proceed to the consideration of the House bill is not agreed to, the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the question of the final passage of the Senate bill; otherwise it shall proceed to the consideration of the question of the final passage of the House bill, debate on either of which shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders, respectively: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the Senate or the House bill, as the case may be, allot additional time to any Senator or Senators during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal with respect to the Senate bill.

Ordered further, That in the event of the passage of the House bill as amended, Senate bill 3183 shall be deemed to be postponed indefinitely.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I had hoped that we might begin voting on the pending bill this week. I realize, of course, that there are reasons why that cannot be done. I had been very hopeful that we could at least begin voting on the bill by Monday of next week, or by Tuesday, or certainly by Wednesday of next week. Objections were made to beginning the voting on the pending bill on those days.

I certainly hope that we can now reach an agreement to begin voting on the bill on Thursday of next week. The pending measure comprises very important legislation. Members on both sides of the aisle recognize that fact. After the pending bill is passed by the Senate, if it is passed, further action will still be necessary in conference with the House. Therefore, if we are to give assistance to the American farmer, and bring legislation into being, it is important that we begin voting soon.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The colloquy between the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the acting majority leader last week made it very clear that the acting majority leader was hopeful that on Monday we might agree to a unanimous-consent agreement to vote later in the week.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means last week, of course.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Last week. I was hopeful that we would get a unanimous-consent agreement last Monday to begin voting sometime later this week.

However, as is often the case when an important legislative measure is before the Senate, particularly when many Members of the Senate are vitally interested in expressing themselves on it, sometimes it takes a longer time to reach an agreement.

I believe this is a reasonable agreement. I believe it gives to all the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle an opportunity to express themselves and to be heard on this very important legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would be delighted indeed if no objection were raised to the proposed unanimous consent agreement. However, as has been stated by my friend from Kentucky, I had hoped that we would vote this week. That is entirely impossible now. I express the hope, however, that when we start to vote on next Thursday, the majority leader will ask the Senate to meet early on Thursday, perhaps at 10 o'clock, and request that the Senate stay in session a little later, so that we may dispose of the bill certainly not later than by Saturday of next week.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I will say to my friend from Louisiana that although I cannot look into a crystal ball and determine what the program will be on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, I can assure him that I am hopeful that we may complete action on the bill at the earliest possible date. Certainly, the bill offers something to the American farmer that he is not receiving under the present law and under the present administration of the present law. Bad as the legislation which is on the books at this time may be, it could do much more for the farmer if it had sympathetic administration. I can assure the Senator that there will be no delay on my part to bring the bill to an early vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been informed that 43 amendments have been submitted heretofore, and 2 more were submitted a few moments ago.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I will say that there have been three more submitted.

Mr. ELLENDER. If all the time allotted to these amendments is utilized, we may be working on the bill until week after next. But if we can start voting on Thursday, beginning at 10 o'clock, and sit late in the evening, I think it would be well to do so. Let us have it understood that if we cannot complete action on the bill on Friday there will be a session on Saturday.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am not in position to commit the leadership to a schedule of that kind. I think my friend understands fully why I would not want to do so at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that amendments may be offered at any time up to the time voting starts.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is my understanding, but I should like to have a ruling from the Chair on that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Any amendment which is considered germane can be offered and discussed up to the time of the third reading of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Also, in accordance with custom, at least, no vote will be taken on any amendment until the time the Senate meets on Thursday next.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is my understanding that there will be ample speakers to consume the time between now and the time the unanimous-consent agreement will go into effect. It is certainly the understanding of the acting majority leader that there will be no amendment voted upon until after the morning hour on Thursday, provided the unanimous consent agreement is adopted.

Mr. AIKEN. That is my understanding, but I wished to have it spelled out in the RECORD.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield further?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the understanding I have, and I have stated it to quite a number of Senators. It is my hope that Senators who have amendments to propose may in the meantime offer and discuss them.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The agreement would not bar discussion of such amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. Like the Senator from Louisiana, I had hoped we might conclude action on the bill this week, but if we cannot do it until next week it will be better than not to conclude action at all.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I think the Senator from Vermont was on the floor last week when the colloquy between the Senator from Louisiana and the acting majority leader took place. I was hopeful that we would get an agreement as of Monday of this week, but I think the Senator understands the operations of the Senate, and he also recognizes the very great importance of this measure and the desire of many Members of this body to express themselves upon the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand, and I shall be reasonably satisfied if we can adopt the agreement which the acting majority leader has requested.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I think it is a very reasonable request, and I think, if it is adopted, it will give all the Members of the Senate ample opportunity to express themselves on the bill. On Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, if it looks as if there would not be sufficient time, there is no reason why the Senate could not sit longer hours.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is my understanding, from listening to the acting majority leader, that there will be no voting prior to Thursday, March 8, and that it is the understanding of the acting majority leader that the time of the sessions and whether there will be a Saturday session is not being considered at this time. I understand that there will be a regular session on Thursday, which may start as early as 10 o'clock, and possibly the same on Friday, but there is no understanding that there will be a Saturday session. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT AND FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HUMPHREY TOMORROW

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its labors today it stand adjourned until noon tomorrow.

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the morning hour tomorrow, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who will not conclude his statement on the bill tonight, be entitled to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be the order.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, in order that the record may be clear, the Senator from Minnesota has agreed to yield time following the morning hour, after he is recognized, to the Senator from Maryland for a statement on the bill which he desires to make.

THE AMERICAN SYSTEM

During the delivery of Mr. HUMPHREY'S speech,

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me for a few minutes, to discuss another subject?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield, provided I do not lose the floor and that the remarks of the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, sometimes the day is brightened by a little water falling on the wheel that one has been turning almost by oneself for a decade.

The American system includes returning to the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights in the regulation of foreign trade and the national economy.

The American system includes defending the area it is necessary for us to defend for our ultimate security under the Monroe Doctrine principle and retaining the sole right to decide when and at what point our safety is threatened.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "The Flint the Senate Needs," written by Richard L. Jones and published in the Tulsa Tribune of October 29, 1955.

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

What we know about Russia is very little. Two American newspapermen were recently given visas which admitted them into the Soviet capital to see what they were allowed to see, which wasn't much.

The nearest report we have seen that reveals even a glimpse of the vast Soviet empire comes to us from GEORGE MALONE, the United States Senator from Nevada.

Nevada is a rugged State. It is the home of rugged men. MALONE is a mining engineer. By education and vocation he is trained to deal with flinty facts.

Among the Washington correspondents there is not one who has seen more and knows more about life abroad and at home than John O'Donnell, the Washington correspondent of the New York Daily News. O'Donnell is a reporter who is as factually

flinty as the mining engineer Senator from Nevada. They are friends.

Senator MALONE does not pretend to be a student of world diplomacy, but he puts his finger on what seems to be a significant fact. He reports, "The Russians are thinking and building in terms of centuries while we are thinking in terms of years. This is not a hundred-yard dash; we are in a marathon race."

Hundreds of Senators, Congressmen, newsmen, and other American tourist observers have visited Soviet Russia but, Mr. O'Donnell tells us, "The most dedicated anti-Communist who has visited Russia without any question is the tough Senator MALONE of Nevada."

"Furthermore," writes Mr. O'Donnell, "Senator MALONE stayed longer, saw more, traveled farther in Russia than any American we know of since the start of the big diplomatic freeze."

Continuing, Mr. O'Donnell says, "Reports started coming back from Moscow quoting MALONE'S opinion about the political security of the Communist regime and their economic toughness. This caused some high brow-raising in Washington among those who remembered that MALONE, his fellow Republican MCCARTHY, and the late Democratic Senator Pat McCarran were the toughest of the anti-Communist bloc."

The propaganda stories that pictured the flinty Senator from flinty Nevada as having been softened by the Communists caused most Washington writers, including MALONE'S good friend, to wonder if the Russians had a way with them that affected the clear thinking of those who had opposed their brutalities and dictatorial powers.

Lindbergh, it is recalled, was reprimanded, indeed repudiated because he told the truth about the military might of the Germans. MALONE is reported to have softened up because he assures that the Russians have no long-term peaceful intent. He, as Lindbergh once did, urges us to get our own house in order. In a personal letter to his friend, the distinguished Capital writer, John O'Donnell, MALONE wrote a month ago:

"DEAR JOHN: I am indebted to the September 19 Atlantic edition of Time magazine for the information that you had mentioned me in one of your columns. Time wrote its usual garbled story when they do not agree—

"My work here is as complete as I can make it. Have been here a month—August 29 to September 28—tomorrow. Have covered the nation from Kiev on the west to Novosibirsk in the east in Siberia and from the Georgian Republic in the south (Tiflis) to Leningrad in the north. Traveled about 14,000 miles in Russia, inspected steel plants, aluminum plants, mining machinery in the Urals; agricultural machinery at Rubtsovsk, tractor plants, 'gang' plow plants all the way to central Asia at Tashkent and Fiergandy Valley, where they are irrigating 900,000 hectares—about 2,250,000 acres—from their rivers. (All in the heartland of Asia.)

"Well, John, I have the feeling after covering the Balkan countries—Czechoslovakia, Austria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria and 14,000 miles in this country—that the area under Russian control can be made self-sufficient in everything they need for war or peace. And I also believe that there is no sign of revolt in the foreseeable future. They talk in centuries in Europe and Asia. We talk in years.

"I went to Bulgaria because I had reason to believe that they had uranium and other fissionable materials there, and my hunch was verified.

"John—if my feeling is correct that the Communist countries can become self-sufficient in the things they need for war and peace and that there is no sign of a revolt—then it behooves us to make our system work. And one way to do this is certainly not to raise our national debt limit every year to pay the $7 billion interest on our national debt. We better cut off the foreign 'star boarders,' lower our debt, cut our taxes, and begin to put the emphasis on the things that will be used in any third world war—such as guided missiles, atomic energy submarines, sonic speed long range bombers, etc. Foot soldiers, as you and I knew them, will be as obsolete in the next war as a Civil War musket.

"Let's quit making a lot of obsolete equipment and sending it to Europe and elsewhere. We are not fooling anybody. We can build up the modern equipment cheaper than the $32 billion per year we are now spending on our war economy.

"The time to have a business conference is just after you have paid a dividend—not when you owe the phone bill. The time to have a peace conference is when you can whip anybody.

"We all remember the Kellogg pact to outlaw World War II, the Dawes plan, and the 5–5–3 Navy disarmament program when Britain destroyed the blueprints. Japan built some battleships and we sank our battleships and then sold scrap iron and petroleum to Japan. The program of selling everything to a potential enemy except what some joker classifies as strategic material is cockeyed because shirt buttons are strategic material when you are getting ready to fight a war. So we must make up our minds whether to trade or not to trade. We are now trading through third nations and it does not make sense.

"We have to quit following those foreign nations whose policy is based upon ulterior motives—such as holding territory in colonial slavery four or five thousand miles from their mother country. That system is dead, John, and even we Americans, with all our power, can't hold it together.

"Sincerely,

"GEORGE."

MALONE spent 10 weeks touring Russia and her satellites. He comes back with facts and figures. And he asks his colleagues, "What are we elected for? To take the State Department's word for everything?"

The flinty Senator from Nevada assures us that we must make up our minds whether to conduct unrestrained trade across the Iron Curtain or stop all commerce with the Soviet zone and quit supporting allies who deal with the Reds. That is the kind of flint we need in our Senate now. Don't forget the scrap iron we sent to Japan which was forged into weapons that were hurled against our sons.

MALONE makes the Senators who punished MCCARTHY look like the saps they are. It is the Senate itself that has gone soft, not MALONE.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial published in the Territorial Enterprise and Virginia City News, of Virginia City, Nev., of February 24, 1956.

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

SENATOR MALONE MAKES SENSE

The proposal by Nevada's Senator GEORGE MALONE that the United States withdraw all and every military establishment from foreign soil and base its world military policy entirely in continental North America has, of course, been greeted with piercing bleats from the one worlders, the bleeding hearts, and the miscellany of emotional trash left over from the infamy of policy evolved to ruin the United States by Roosevelt, Hopkins, and all the other mushheads of a now discredited administration.

It is conceivable that the lawmakers in Washington will not see eye to jaundiced eye with Senator MALONE, but his proposal will serve notice on the administration that a resolute and ponderable portion of the American taxpayers want out, but completely, finally, and irrevocably, out of all the rathole delusions of saving the entire world by bankrupting America through ceaseless handouts and everlasting pulling out of the fire of other people's chestnuts. If we got so much as a thank you for bailing folks out it might be different, but France insists on coming apart at the seams at our expense, England, rolling in American dollars so that its economy has reached on all-time high and London is once more the luxury capital of the world, wants to do business with the Chinese Communist enemies of mankind and in Israel, a fanciful project floated on American currency, the happy populace is busy stoning the American consulate because we won't go to war for them against the Arabs.

Neither collectively nor singly does the United States need its alleged "allies" as much as they need America. We can get along, and elegantly, without all or any of them. They are a poor risk militarily and the rankest sort of dead beats financially. Except for such isolated eccentrics as the Finns who believe in paying their debts and the Greeks who said thank you in cordial terms for our helping to defend them from Communist aggression by the Russian orangutangs, none of them have so much as tipped their hats in the direction of the American taxpayer. Not only is the rest of the world busy looting the United States but it is kicking Uncle Sap in the pantaloons while doing it.

Senator MALONE voices the sentiments of a number of Americans who, if they were stood up and counted, would frighten the bejezus out of the professional wasters and spendthrifts in Washington. Our poor relations overseas would do well to consult Emily Post on acquiring at least a minimum of manners if they can expect the golden rain to fall incessantly or at least until such time as the United States is flat stonebroke, which may not be too far in the future.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial published by the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of January 31, 1955.

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

THE PROOF

It is traditional, and understandable, that the eastern seaboard of the United States has always had—as the saying goes here on the west coast—"one foot in Europe."

It has been equally traditional—although not understandable at all—that we on the west coast have, by and large, left the Far East to experts who also stem from the eastern seaboard or the Continent or Great Britain.

We who should have tried most of all to understand the Far East have done this. It is our shame and we must bear it.

And as far as Central and South America are concerned we have nearly forgotten them entirely over the years.

It has been a long time now since ex-President Herbert Hoover suggested that this hemisphere of ours, that North and South America together, could—in time of final stress—be a strong fortress unto itself.

He was scoffed at, no new role for this great man.

But now comes the proof.

There is, as you may know, a Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Until our Oregon neighbors let him down last November it was chairmanned by Senator GUY CORDON.

This committee has a Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels. And its chairman is Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada.

It has now issued its report—No. 1627—called Accessibility of Strategic and Critical Materials to the United States in Time of War and for Our Expanding Economy.

We have read this report and can assure you that it blasts into smithereens poppycock that somehow the nations of this Western Hemisphere have become "have not" nations in critical materials.

If the showdown comes—as of course at some future time the showdown must—this hemisphere, from Canada down through Central America to Cape Horn, has what it takes and what it needs.

Out of his experience, his engineering, and this great wisdom, Herbert Hoover knew this when he made his statement suggesting that, first of all, the Western Hemisphere get together—and very solidly.

Now, thanks to Senator MALONE and ex-Senator Cordon we have the proof.

And it is good to have this proof. For when the experimenters have run their course, and the dreamers have dreamed all their dreams, and the chips are down between a free world and a godless one, it will be good to know that we can make our stand.

If, God forbid, we must.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article by Jerry Greene, of the New York News—the Washington bureau, February 28.

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

MOVE ON TO BRING HOME BULK OF GI'S

(By Jerry Greene)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—Several nationally known figures around town, some of them in the Pentagon, are nursing a proposal to quickly bring home most of the American soldiers now stationed abroad. They haven't yet figured how to spring it publicly. Anyhow, they are fearful of a fast throwdown from the White House for diplomatic—not military—purposes.

But the plan is receiving serious consideration, both in the Pentagon and in Congress. It would save billions in the budget and might well cause Russia to make an "agonizing reappraisal" of global strategy.

There is serious discussion going on in high places of a suggestion to withdraw the bulk of our occupation forces in Japan and Germany and to eliminate as soon as possible the use of American bases on foreign soil.

The men working on this project are by no means isolationists, far from it. They have a gimmick which they firmly believe is a near-ideal solution to the problem of running the cold war on a reasonable and economic basis.

THEY DON'T BUY TAYLOR'S STORY

They take vigorous exception to the recent testimony of Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, that the free world could come up with enough manpower to match, and stop, the ground forces of the Kremlin. They point out that Russia has its 175 or more divisions ready for action—and it takes a year or 18 months or more to get a fresh division ready for combat.

Right now the United States has five-plus divisions in Europe, all good troops, but spread very thin and actually not much more of an obstacle to Russia's armor and infantry than a chicken-wire fence would afford a mosquito.

The feeling around the Capital is that our forces overseas, certainly our ground forces, are scarcely more than a token, an indication to our allies that if they get pushed around, the United States would certainly move at top speed to help them.

Well, the troops overseas are an expensive token. The Pentagon tells us that there are 400,000 Army troops, 400,000 sailors, and 260,000 Air Force personnel on foreign duty. In the case of the Navy the figure includes all those on sea duty.

WIVES AND CHILDREN RUN UP THE EXPENSE

These figures, however, tell only part of the story in expenses for maintenance and upkeep. The last available Pentagon count reveals that the Army alone has 175,000 wives and children overseas, and there were more than 116,000 civilians on the foreign Defense Department payroll.

To complicate matters further, the Army was running more than 140 elementary and high schools overseas, with an estimated 60,000 pupils all children of servicemen.

One source—not a general—told us that should war break out with Russia in Europe, some 20,000 service troops would be needed merely to attempt to evacuate families of GIs.

Now comes the proposed solution, in the words of a top military figure who doesn't want his name used because he understandably doesn't want his ears slapped off: "It's about time we took a realistic view of our commitments and did something about it. We might save 4 or 5 billions a year now and a lot more in the long run."

BALLISTIC WEAPONS OUTMODE OUR BASES

"Obviously, it won't be long before the Russians have ballistic missiles which could make our overseas air bases untenable. We have sunk and are sinking billions to build and maintain these bases. Because of the Pentagon's bookkeeping system and the rotation program only God knows what it is costing us to keep hundreds of thousands of men on our far-flung bases.

"What we have in mind, and what makes sense, is this. Bring the boys and their families and the kids and the school teachers and the supply and support forces back home. Now. This year and next.

"We do not violate any of our commitments, any of our treaties and we stick with our allies.

"We simply set up little outposts in each of the treaty countries. We leave a battalion in Germany, one in France, one in Italy, one in Belgium if they want it, and perhaps for a while a few troops in England to service the aircraft. Say a reinforced battalion of about 1,000 men."

SMALLER FORCES MIGHT FILL THE BILL

"These battalions would be combat units, ready for action. They would have no dependents with them, and they could be rotated with no trouble.

"They would set up their camps, or forts, or whatever you want to call them, raise the American flag at sunrise, lower it at sunset and remain ever on guard. The United States Government would simply announce to the world that the instant these American forces were fired upon, or overrun, or what not, the United States would throw its full might against the aggressor. That would mean hydrogen bombs, carried by B–52's or ballistic missiles or by donkey pack train if necessary.

"All we need is guts and the realization that one battalion ready to fight, with one American flag, is as good as a too-thin division which would be sacrificed anyhow, along with women and children."

Several Members of Congress, expressing interest in the idea, were a little concerned about the effect of the plan on allies we are urging to increase their own security precautions.

NO COMMITMENTS FOR LARGE FORCES

The project proponents note that we have no NATO treaty commitments for specific numbers of troops on the scene, and insist that the presence of any of them—backed by the full might of this country and a really strong, mobile striking force based in the United States—would be an ample deterrent.

This thinking has been developing for several years and there have been repeated public warnings that the United States ought not try to hold or defend territory unless the Nation intends to go all the way.

In testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee back in June 1954, Gen. Carl Spaatz, former Air Chief of Staff, said: "It is possible that the area you think you can defend may not be available to you as the war progresses. You may be forced to your own confines."

"Would that be the Western Hemisphere?" asked Senator GEORGE MALONE, Republican, Nevada.

"That might well be the Western Hemisphere," the general replied.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter and resolution sent to me by the Homer Laughlin China Co., of Newell, W. Va., dated December 30, 1955.

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

THE HOMER LAUGHLIN CHINA CO.,
Newell, W. Va., December 30, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: In compliance with your request of December 28, I am delighted to enclose herewith a copy of the resolution which was passed by our United States Potters Association.

I have been assured by the president of the International Brotherhood of Operative Potters, which is the pottery workers' union, that at the next meeting of their executive board, they will approve the same resolution.

Very truly yours,
THE HOMER LAUGHLIN CHINA CO.,
J. M. WELLS.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained, that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingmen or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry; and

Whereas article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have the power to pay and collect duties, imposts and excises (tariffs or import fees) and to regulate foreign commerce; and

Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce and the national economy through the adjustment of duties, imposts and excises, through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and to repeal the 1934 Trade Agreements Act which transferred such responsibility to the President.

THE UNITED STATES POTTERS ASSOCIATION,
W. A. BETZ, *Executive Secretary.*

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter and

resolution sent to me by the Reno Musicians Protective Union, dated December 8, 1955.

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

RENO MUSICIANS PROTECTIVE UNION,
Reno, Nev., December 8, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE W. (MOLLY) MALONE,
Senator from Nevada,
Reno, Nev.

DEAR MOLLY: Thank you for your very fine letter of November 28, relative to the repeal of the 20 percent amusement tax. I appreciate it very much.

Am enclosing a copy of the resolution I had introduced at the Reno Central Trades and Labor Council on foreign trade, and it was accepted and approved.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

PAULA DAY,
Secretary, Local No. 368.

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained, that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry; and

Whereas article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that "the Congress shall have power to lay and collect * * * duties, imposts and excises" (tariffs or import fees) and to regulate foreign commerce; and

Whereas, the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce and the national economy through the adjustment of duties, imposts and excises, through its agent the Tariff Commission and to repeal the 1934 Trade Agreements Act which transferred such responsibility to the President.

PAULA DAY,
TOMMY BLEEKE,
LOU LEVITT,
C. L. BYRD,
LOUIS CHASE,
Musicians Local No. 368.
FRANK WICKINSON,
Machinist Local No. 801.
HARRY HUCHEER,
Culinary Union, No. 45.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of organizations which have adopted resolutions similar to the ones adopted by the Homer Laughlin China Co. and the Reno Musicians' Protective Union.

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

American Mining Congress, Daughters of American Revolution, Nevada State Legislature, Nevada-Idaho Legislatures (joined), Idaho State Legislature, Nevada Republican Party (State convention), Silver State Republican Women's Club of Washoe County, Nevada Young Republicans, California State Legislature, Utah State Legislature, Advisory Mining Board of the State of Nevada, Nevada Mining Association, American Legion of Nevada, Utah Mining Congress, Pioche, Nevada Chamber of Commerce, National Society of Women Descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Co.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, article 1, section 8, of the Constitution places the responsibility in Congress to regulate foreign trade and the national economy through the adjustment of duties and tariffs, not in the President and certainly not in the custody of an international organization known as the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, 3,000 miles away in Geneva, which authority was included in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

The security of the Western Hemisphere must be defended from North America. It must be done by long-range sonic-speed bombers, fighter planes, interceptors, guided-missile bases around North America, atomic-energy submarines, and a complete radar warning system. If this is done, as much as $10 billion can be saved annually to apply on the national debt and to lower taxes.

Let us quit signing pacts to feed and protect almost all of the nations of the world—which cannot be carried through.

The editorials and material which I have today submitted for the RECORD show that the investors and workingmen, to say nothing of the taxpayers, of the Nation, have begun to wake up after 24 years of international socialism, as opposed to the American system.

M. VAUCHER AND COL. WILLARD F. ROCKWELL—WATCHES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a communication from Mr. Maurice Vaucher, president, Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers.

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

[Translation]

FEDERATION SUISSE DES ASSOCIATIONS DE FABRICANTS D'HORLOGERIE,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1956.

The Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: My attention has just been called to the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, page 514 of the Appendix, wherein the association of which I am president, the Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers, was subjected to charges which are unfair, unfounded, and utterly contrary to fact.

The material whose appearance I am protesting appeared in your insertion of a speech by Col. Willard F. Rockwell, of Pittsburgh, Pa. I fully appreciate that since it was done as an act of courtesy to Colonel Rockwell you would not be expected to substantiate or verify all the claims made in the speech. However, because of my acquaintance with your distinguished record in the Senate of the United States, I felt free to write you on the matter because I believe that you would not, even indirectly, want to be responsible for such harsh and unfair charges.

In the portion of the RECORD about which I am writing, the following appears:

"When our State Department complained recently to the Swiss Federation of Watchmakers that a million watch movements are being smuggled into the United States annually, we were told that smuggling cannot, or will not, be stopped until our tariffs are radically reduced."

In full and direct rebuttal to this I shall ask you to please accept the following as facts which can be readily verified:

First. At no time has the United States Department of State complained to the Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers concerning the extent of watch smuggling into the United States.

Second. As long ago as January 1936, in the "Trade Agreement Between United States and Switzerland," specific measures against watch smuggling were incorporated. These measures were subsequently translated into legislation by the Swiss Government, have become the national law of Switzerland, and are therefore rigidly enforced both by the Federal Government and all organizations of the Swiss watch industry.

Third. The Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers has never said, or implied, that our rigid enforcement of the anti-smuggling measures is conditional upon the willingness of the United States to reduce tariffs.

I ask you to accept as a plain statement of principle the fact that the Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers has always been opposed to smuggling activity. From a strictly commercial viewpoint, you may appreciate that smuggling of watches can only be extremely damaging to our trade relations since it could only adversely affect the affairs of the many highly respected, long-established companies in the United States which assemble and distribute Swiss watch products.

Our own investigations have shown that where actual smuggling exists, a large proportion of it originates in countries outside of the borders of Switzerland, and is therefore completely beyond our control. We know, also, that watch smuggling is conducted by individuals who are constantly effecting new methods to elude even the most careful and stringent policing. The prime deterrent to smuggling, of course, is vigilant action by the United States Customs and Treasury officials, and the Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers has always given, prompt and sincere cooperation whenever it is requested by United States officials working on this problem.

From a realistic viewpoint, however, one must recognize, as do the United States Customs officials, the fact that smuggling has significantly increased within the past year and a half. This, we believe, occurred primarily as a result of the sharp increase in watch tariffs which stimulated smuggling activity because it increased the opportunities for illicit gain for people who are by nature inclined to take advantage of such opportunities.

Please believe that I have attempted to treat this problem with the utmost candor in this letter to you. I close this note by reaffirming our expression of continuing esteem for you, and with the sincere hope that you will see fit to take appropriate measures to correct the record in our behalf.

Yours respectfully,

MAURICE VAUCHER,
President.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the communication was the result of an insertion in the Appendix of the daily RECORD by me on January 19, of an address by Col. Willard F. Rockwell, of Pittsburgh, Pa., a manufacturer of steel and steel products. The exception by President Vaucher to a statement by Colonel Rockwell that "when our State Department complained recently to the Swiss Federation of Watchmakers that a million watch movements are being smuggled into the United States annually, we were told that smuggling cannot,

or will not, be stopped until our tariffs are radically reduced," is denied by Mr. Vaucher. Mr. Vaucher goes on to say, "from a realistic viewpoint, however, one must recognize, as do the United States Customs officials, the fact that smuggling has significantly increased within the past year and a half. This, we believe, occurred primarily as a result of the sharp increase in watch tariffs which stimulated smuggling activity because it increased the opportunities for illicit gain for people who are by nature inclined to take advantage of such opportunities," but denies that the "United States Department of State complained of the Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers concerning the extent of watch smuggling into the United States," and also says, "the Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers has never said, or implied, that our rigid enforcement of the antismuggling measures is conditional upon the willingness of the United States to reduce tariffs." Mr. Vaucher goes on to say that "a large proportion of it originates in countries outside of the borders of Switzerland, and is therefore completely beyond our control."

Mr. President. It is recognized that the watches do reach the United States via the smuggling route, and it makes little difference to the workingmen and investors of the United States who brings them.

The raise in the tariff on Swiss watches was not accomplished on any principle whatever. It was an arbitrary decision.

I quote recommendation No. 2, from page 3 of Senate Report No. 1627, filed with the Senate on July 9, 1954:

> 2. We recommend that Congress insure that the regulation of foreign trade conforms to the principles thus laid down in article I, section 8, of the Constitution thus assuring the American workers and investors equal access to American markets.

The committee was convinced that we should revert to the Constitution of the United States, article 1, section 8, in the regulation of foreign trade and the national economy which states that Congress and not the President of the United States, or the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva, shall set the duties or tariffs and shall regulate foreign trade and the national economy.

Mr. President, the Congress, for almost a century of time, has regulated the foreign trade and the national economy and created the United States Tariff Commission in 1916 to do the job on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, the flexible duty or tariff representing the difference between the effective wage standard of living here and abroad.

Mr. President, the answer to the 24-year period of juggling by the executive department of the duties or tariffs in the regulation of foreign trade and the national economy has destroyed the "investment climate" in the United States except in the public utilities, which enjoy a regulated monopoly in industry where taxpayers' money is advanced in the form of actual gifts or loans or short amortization periods, or a guaranteed unit price, or in industries virtually controlled by organizations or groups large enough and of such a nature that they can put their production plants behind the low-wage curtain and furnish the low-wage standard-of-living countries of the world, and import the product into the United States under free trade or a very low duty to sell in conjunction with their domestic product.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, March 1, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 29, 1956:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Thruston B. Morton, resigned.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commisisoned ensign

Albert Larsen, Jr., effective March 1, 1956.
Charles I. Harding.
Leroy W. Heilmann.
Oliver J. Weber.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose blessings are countless, may we daily enter with Thee into an intimate fellowship and have a vivid experience of Thy love and peace.

May we remember Thy mercies and be thankful; may we be mindful of our failures and weaknesses and be humble; may we be conscious of Thy grace and goodness and be hopeful.

Inspire us to meet our tasks and responsibilities, our trials and tribulations, calmly and confidently, assured of Thy presence to direct and strengthen us in the ways of righteousness.

Grant that in all our human relationships we may manifest a spirit that is gracious and gentle, kind and considerate, eager to minister to the needs of others and to help them bear their burdens.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the folowing resolution, Senate Resolution 221:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Honorable HARLEY M. KILGORE, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be a member of said committee, to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce at this time that unanimous-consent requests will not be entertained until after the joint meeting is concluded, at which time the Chair will receive unanimous-consent requests.

The House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess the following proceedings occurred:

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY GIOVANNI GRONCHI, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

The SPEAKER pro tempore presided.

At 12:25 o'clock p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and the Members of the United States Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker pro tempore and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort His Excellency the President of Italy into the Chamber the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. RICHARDS, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. CLEMENTS, the Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND, the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. PASTORE, and the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY.

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and took the seats reserved for them:

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced His Excellency Giovanni Gronchi, President of the Republic of Italy.